

**Debates of the Newfoundland
House of Assembly, 1933**

[This page intentionally left blank.]

Monday, April 10, 1933

His Excellency Sir John Middleton, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Colony of Newfoundland and its Dependencies, by His Proclamation, bearing date the sixth day of May last, having dissolved the late General Assembly; and His Excellency, Admiral David Murray Anderson, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Member of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over Our said Colony of Newfoundland and its Dependencies, by His Proclamation, bearing date the twenty-eighth day of March, Anno Domini, Nineteen Hundred and Thirty-Three, having appointed Monday, the tenth day of April for the meeting of the said General Assembly for the dispatch of business, the following are the names of the Members returned by the Returning Officers of the several Electoral Districts to represent the said Districts in the General Assembly:

*Joseph Moore, Esquire, for the District of White Bay.
 Roland G. Starkes, Esquire, for the District of Green Bay.
 Hon. Kenneth M. Brown, for the District of Grand Falls.
 Norman Gray, Esquire, for the District of Twillingate.
 Harold J. Earle, Esquire, for the District of Fogo.
 Hon. William C. Winsor, for the District of Bonavista North.
 Herman W. Quinton, Esquire, for the District of Bonavista South.
 Hon. John G. Stone, for the District of Trinity North.
 Hon. Harold Mitchell, for the District of Trinity South.
 Hon. John C. Puddester, for the District of Carbonear-Bay de Verde
 Hon. Harry A. Winter, K.C., for the District of Harbour Grace.
 Ernest F. Gear, Esquire, for the District of Port de Grave.
 Charles J. Furey, Esquire, and
 Hon. William J. Browne, for the District of Harbour Main-Bell Island.
 Hon. L. Edward Emerson, K.C., and
 Gerald G. Byrne, Esquire, for the District of St. John's East.
 Hon. Frederick C. Alderdice, and
 Patrick F. Halley, Esquire, for the District of St. John's West.
 Michael A. Shea, Esquire, for the District of Ferryland.
 Philip J. Lewis, Esquire, for the District of Placentia and St. Mary's.
 Hon. William J. Walsh, for the District of Placentia West.
 Hon. Samuel J. Foote, K.C., for the District of Burin.
 Harris M. Mosdell, Esquire, M.D., for the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage.
 J. Alexander Winter, Esquire, K.C., for the District of Burgeo and La Poile.
 William H. Abbott, Esquire, for the District of St. George's-Port au Port.
 F. Gordon Bradley, Esquire, K.C., for the District of Humber.
 George Whiteley, Esquire, for the District of St. Barbe.*

By virtue of a Commission under the Great Seal to the Honourable Michael P. Gibbs, K.C., President of the Legislative Council, the Honourable Frank McNamara and the Honourable Samuel Milley, Members of the said Council which is as follows:

Commission

George The Fifth, by the Grace of God, of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

(sgd.) D. Murray Anderson, Governor (L.S.)

(sgd.) Brian Dunfield, Deputy Minister of Justice

To all to whom these Presents shall come, Greeting:

Know Ye that We have appointed the Hon. Michael P. Gibbs, K.C., the Hon. Frank McNamara and the Hon. Samuel Milley, Members of Our Legislative Council, to be Commissioners, they, or either of them, to administer the Oath of Allegiance to the undermentioned persons, elected to serve in the House of Assembly for the several Districts set opposite their names, respectively, and appointed by Proclamation of Our Governor of Our Colony of Newfoundland to be holden in St. John's on the Tenth day of this instant month:

Joseph Moore, Esquire, White Bay.

Roland G. Starkes, Esquire, Green Bay.

Hon. Kenneth M. Brown, Grand Falls.

Norman Gray, Esquire, Twillingate.

Harold J. Earle, Esquire, Fogo.

Hon. William C. Winsor, Bonavista North.

Herman W. Quinton, Esquire, Bonavista South.

Hon. John G. Stone, Trinity North.

Hon. Harold Mitchell, Trinity South.

Hon. John C. Puddester, Carbonear-Bay de Verde

Hon. Harry A. Winter, K.C., Harbour Grace.

Ernest F. Gear, Esquire, Port de Grave.

Charles J. Furey, Esquire, Harbour Main-Bell Island.

Hon. William J. Browne, Harbour Main-Bell Island.

Hon. L. Edward Emerson, K.C., St. John's East.

Gerald G. Byrne, Esquire, St. John's East.

Hon. Frederick C. Alderdice, St. John's West.

Patrick F. Halley, Esquire, St. John's West.

Michael A. Shea, Esquire, Ferryland.

Philip J. Lewis, Esquire, Placentia and St. Mary's.

Hon. William J. Walsh, Placentia West.
Hon. Samuel J. Foote, K.C., Burin.
Harris M. Mosdell, Esquire, M.D., Fortune Bay and Hermitage.
J. Alexander Winter, Esquire, K.C., Burgeo and La Poile.
William H. Abbott, Esquire, St. George's-Port au Port.
F. Gordon Bradley, Esquire, K.C., Humber.
George Whiteley, Esquire, St. Barbe.

Giving to them, or any of them, full power and authority to perform the matters hereinbefore mentioned, ratifying and confirming all whatsoever they, or any of them, shall do and perform in this behalf, and thereof they, or any of them, are to make due return under their hands and seals unto Our Governor of Our said Colony, with these Presents annexed.

Given under the Great Seal of Our aforesaid Colony of Newfoundland.

Witness Our trusty and well-beloved ADMIRAL SIR DAVID MURRAY ANDERSON, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Member of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over Our said Colony, at St. John's, in Our said Colony, this sixth day of April, A.D. 1933, and in the Twenty-third year of Our Reign.

By His Excellency's Command,
(Sgd.) J. C. Puddester,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

The said Commissioners came into the Council Chamber at twelve of the clock noon on the said tenth day of April, Henry Y. Mott, Esquire, Clerk of the House of Assembly, as in duty bound attending, and the names of the Members returned for the several Districts and Divisions of Districts having been called over by the Clerk, they appeared with the exception of the Honourables John G. Stone, Kenneth M. Brown and Ernest F. Gear,¹ Esquire, and took and subscribed the Oath of Allegiance in the presence of the said Commissioners as follows:

¹ "Three government parliamentary representatives were not in their seats at the opening of the Legislature on Tuesday (April 10, 1933) ... In the case of Mr. Gear, no voters' list was taken (as also occurred in the June election) in order to avoid incurring that expense, and therefore, according to the Election Act, a Bill of Indemnity is necessary. For the Spring election such Bill was passed during the Session preceding, but in the case of the Port de Grave election no provision could be made until the Session of the Assembly.

"In the cases of Hons. K. M. Brown and J. G. Stone, new departments have been formed for which no provision exists under the Legislative Disabilities Act. The Labour Department is a new portfolio while the Fisheries Department was last year amalgamated ... with the Agriculture and Mines Department, the Fisheries portfolio ceasing to exist. Thus the Fisheries being a new Department this Session, it will come under the same classification as that of Labour. As soon as the necessary bills are passed these representatives will take their seats." *Daily News*, April 13, 1933, p. 3.

Joseph Moore, Esquire, for the District of White Bay.
Roland G. Starkes, Esquire, for the District of Green Bay.
Norman Gray, Esquire, for the District of Twillingate.
Harold J. Earle, Esquire, for the District of Fogo.
Hon. William C. Winsor, for the District of Bonavista North.
Herman W. Quinton, Esquire, for the District of Bonavista South.
Hon. Harold Mitchell, for the District of Trinity South.
Hon. John C. Puddester, for the District of Carbonear-Bay de Verde.
Hon. Harry A. Winter, K.C., for the District of Harbour Grace.
Ernest F. Gear, Esquire, for the District of Port de Grave.
Charles J. Furey, Esquire, for the District of Harbour Main-Bell Island.
Hon. William J. Browne, for the District of Harbour Main-Bell Island.
Hon. L. Edward Emerson, K.C., for the District of St. John's East.
Gerald G. Byrne, Esquire, for the District of St. John's East.
Hon. Frederick C. Alderdice, for the District of St. John's West.
Patrick F. Halley, Esquire, for the District of St. John's West.
Michael A. Shea, Esquire, for the District of Ferryland.
Philip J. Lewis, Esquire, for the District of Placentia and St. Mary's.
Hon. William J. Walsh, for the District of Placentia West.
Hon. Samuel J. Foote, K.C., for the District of Burin.
Harris M. Mosdell, Esquire, M.D., for the District of Fortune Bay and Hermitage.
J. Alexander Winter, Esquire, K.C., for the District of Burgeo and La Poile.
William H. Abbott, Esquire, for the District of St. George's-Port au Port.
F. Gordon Bradley, Esquire, K.C., for the District of Humber.
George Whiteley, Esquire, for the District of St. Barbe.

*At three of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar and said:
 "Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:
 His Excellency the Governor requests your immediate attendance in the Council Chamber."*

Accordingly, the Members of the Assembly proceeded to the Council Chamber where the following Commission was read by the Clerk of Legislative Council:

By His Excellency, Admiral David Murray Anderson, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Member of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over Our said Colony of Newfoundland.

(sgd.) D. Murray Anderson, Governor (L.S.)

(sgd.) Brian Dunfield, Deputy Minister of Justice

To Hon. Michael P. Gibbs, K.C., Hon. Frank McNamara and Hon. Samuel Milley. Greeting:

Whereas I have deemed it expedient that the First Session of the Twenty-eighth General Assembly should be opened for the dispatch of business on Monday, the Tenth day of this instant month, whereof I have given notice in my Proclamation dated the Twenty-eighth day of March last; and

Whereas it is not convenient that the purposes for which I have called the said General Assembly together should be declared on the said day, nor until the Members of the House of Assembly have proceeded to the choice of a Speaker, you, the said Hon. Michael P. Gibbs, K.C., Hon. Frank McNamara and Hon. Samuel Milley, are hereby authorized and directed to signify to the Members of the said House of Assembly on the Tenth day of this instant month that it is my pleasure that they should proceed to the choice of some proper person to be their Speaker and present such person on the following day for my approbation.

*Given under my Hand and Seal at the Government House,
St. John's, this sixth day of April, A.D. 1933.*

*By His Excellency's Command
(Sgd.) J.C. Puddester,
Secretary of State.*

The Honourable Michael P. Gibbs, K.C., President of the Legislative Council then said:

"It is not convenient for His Excellency the Governor to declare the reasons for his calling this General Assembly on this day, and it being necessary that a Speaker of the House of Assembly should be first chosen, you, Gentlemen of the House of Assembly, will 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 choose here to-morrow at three of the clock for His Excellency's approbation."

And the Members having returned to the Assembly Room, the Honourable the Prime Minister addressing himself to the Clerk, who standing up, pointed to him and then sat down, moved "that James Alexander Winter, Esquire, K.C., Member elected for the District of Burgeo, do take the Chair of this House as Speaker," which motion was seconded by F. Gordon Bradley, Esquire, K.C., Member elected for the District of Humber.

No other person being proposed as Speaker, Mr. Winter was unanimously called by the House to the Chair, and was conducted to the Chair by the Members who proposed and seconded him.

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

The House then adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday afternoon, at a quarter to three of the clock.

Tuesday, April 11, 1933

The House met at a quarter to three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.²

At three o'clock a message from His Excellency the Governor was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, commanding the immediate presence 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 while in attendance upon His Excellency in the Council Chamber His Excellency had been pleased to approve 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 granted or allowed by His Excellency, or any of his predecessors. Mr. Speaker also expressed his respectful acknowledgements of the high honour which the House had conferred upon him.

Mr. Speaker further announced that while in the Council Chamber His Excellency had been pleased to make a Speech to both branches of the Legislature, of which Speech, for greater accuracy, he had obtained a copy.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to Indemnity.³

Mr. Speaker then read the Speech from the Throne, as follows:

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

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

On this the first occasion of meeting this Legislature in Session since I assumed the Office of Governor, I desire to assure you that the welfare of this most ancient Colony will be the object of my most earnest endeavour and that, fully aware of my responsibilities of my office, I will carry them out to the utmost of my ability.

² "The attendance was the largest for many years. Long before the appointed hour throngs sought admission to the Assembly building and thousands congregated in the grounds and along the iron railing on Military and Bannerman Roads, seeking advantageous points to view the arrival of His Excellency the Governor and the parade of the Newfoundland Constabulary and a detachment of the Church Lads' Brigade with the Brigade band, and a guard of honour from the G.W.V.A.

"... many availed of the opportunity to see the new members of the Legislature and the unusual scene ... when only two members of the Opposition sat to the right of the Speaker ...

"... Amongst the large number of visitors in the council room were the members of the Royal Commission ... Church and State and Consular Services were also represented." *Evening Telegram*, April 12, 1933.

³ "... which was the first official act of the new Legislature." *Evening Telegram*, April 12, 1933.

The General Election which was held in June of last year resulted in a decisive victory for my present Ministers, and this was confirmed in the result of the recent Election held in the District of Port de Grave.

Shortly after the assumption of office by my Ministers, the Imperial Economic Conference was convened at Ottawa. Representative Ministers of high standing from the Mother Country, and from the various Dominions, attended the Sessions of this Conference. Newfoundland was represented by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. It is impossible at the present time to appraise, at their full value, the results that will accrue, but there is no doubt that in the years to come the Empire will benefit largely from the work of this Conference.

It is to be regretted that during the last fiscal year we have seen lower production in connection with all our industries. The codfishery, which is the mainstay of our country, was slightly short of the catch of the previous year, while the value was considerably lower. The exports of pulp and paper were under the figures, both in quantity and value, of the fiscal year ending in June, 1931. The export of iron ore from Bell Island was less than half that of the previous fiscal year, but the production at Buchans of lead and zinc concentrates greatly exceeded the figures for the same period, both in tonnage and value. The imports during the past fiscal year amounted to \$18,135,000, and the exports to \$26,689,000, figures which show a considerable balance of trade in our favour. The total trade amounted to \$44,824,000, as against \$58,798,000 in the previous year. The difference is caused by smaller imports, lower production, and the reduction in value of all commodities.

Our Sealing Fleet up to the present has obtained a fair measure of success. It is hoped that they may be favoured with good weather and return in safety with valuable cargoes.

As was the case last year, we are experiencing, in full measure, the effects of the present world-wide economic disturbances. The great underlying cause of our difficulties lies beyond the power and jurisdiction of this Legislature. While the prices received for our fish, ore, paper, and other products, remain at the present low figures we cannot expect a return to prosperity. The decline in the purchasing power of our people has resulted in a reduction of business and accentuated unemployment.

In common with the rest of the world, my Ministers have had to meet an extremely distressing situation in connection with the relief of able-bodied persons who, through the low prices received for their produce, were unable to provide the means of livelihood for themselves and their families. Upon assuming office at the end of June last, my Ministers found an accumulation of liabilities on account of relief, together with other unpaid bills, amounting to approximately \$800,000. In the Estimates for 1932-33 there was a provision of \$50,000 for Casual Able-Bodied Relief – a sum entirely inadequate even to pay the liabilities already accumulated, and still less to meet the essential expenditure on this account in the present fiscal year. It has been a severe tax upon our resources to make these payments, and to continue the relief which is still of large proportions. My Ministers have endeavoured to see that this relief, which is to assist the destitute, be kept at as low a figure as possible. Every effort has been made to avoid imposition, but the burden is one involving heavy cost.

The financial experts had hoped that the Budget submitted to the last House of Assembly would work out satisfactorily. Unfortunately, it was found that the Estimates did not materialize. The revenue proved to be short of the estimate, while the reduction in expenditure was not sufficient

to produce a balanced budget. My Ministers were faced with a situation on their assumption of office which made it imperative for them to reduce still further the provision for public administration, involving serious decreases in the Education Vote, Salaries and Pensions, and in important Public Services. It was still found, however, at the end of last December, that, in spite of these reductions, we could not meet our liabilities in respect of the interest on the Public Debt, and a sum of \$1,250,000 was placed temporarily at our disposal by Great Britain and the neighbouring Dominion of Canada in order that the interest payments might be made in full.

My Ministers have given much thought to the financial and economic situation – a situation which is serious because of our large public debt, and the international conditions that are outside our control. The position is so unprecedented that we welcome the presence of the Royal Commission, consisting of the Right Honourable Baron Amulree, G.B.E., K.C., Charles A. Magrath, Esq., LL.D., and Sir William Stavert, K.B.E., which is now holding its sessions in this City with a view to reporting upon the financial situation and the prospects of the Dominion. Our people look forward with confidence to the result of its labours, and are sincerely grateful for the grave and careful consideration which the Commission is according to the difficult problems set before them.

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

The financial statements covering the operations of the last fiscal year will be laid before you in due course; they show a large deficit on Current Account. I regret to say also that because of the continued trade depression and the necessity of continuing assistance to the unemployed, the current year will show an excess of expenditure over revenue in spite of the drastic economies which have been made by my Ministers. Every effort is constantly being directed towards the reduction of expenditure to the minimum consistent with the efficient working of the Public Service.

With regard to the next fiscal year, my Ministers propose to await the report of the Royal Commission now sitting, before placing the Estimates and Budget proposals before you.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

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

Action is being taken to put into practice the provisions of the Salt Codfish Act, 1931, with a view to the standardization of our most important product, dried codfish. My Ministers consider that this most valuable asset should not only be carefully safeguarded, but developed so that it will bring a richer return to the fishermen of this country. They also have adopted a policy for the general encouragement of the Fisheries, and a Bill embodying this object will be laid before you.

For purposes of retrenchment, the Departments of Agriculture and Mines and of Marine and Fisheries were combined as a Department of Lands and Fisheries, by legislation introduced at the last Session of the Legislature. My Ministers, realizing the importance of our mines and forests, as well as of our fisheries, have decided that these important matters, which are not closely related, demand separate administration. A Bill will therefore be laid before you under which the Department of Agriculture and Mines will be reconstituted for the administration of our timber, mineral and agricultural products, while another Bill will be introduced reconstituting the Department of Marine and Fisheries which will take into its care that valuable asset, our fishery products.

The labour problem, so acute in this and other lands, has led my Ministers to create a Department of Labour, and a Bill for that purpose will be prepared for your consideration.

Most earnest consideration has been given by my Ministers to the question of the Dependency of Labrador, and its development. It has always been held that this territory is valuable, not only because of its coast fishery, but also because of its timber areas, its water power and its mineral wealth. Confirmation has now been obtained with regard to the valuable mineral deposits there. Actual samples brought from the interior indicate that gold ores of high value are contained in the deposits, while other valuable minerals have also been discovered. My Ministers are taking steps so that, when Spring opens and prospectors enter that country, the work shall proceed under proper regulation and Government administration and authority will be in effect.

My Ministers regard with the highest pleasure the re-awakening of interest in the cultivation of the soil. Of late years, agriculture has been too much neglected. It should be our aim, particularly in the present difficult times, to produce as large a quantity of foodstuffs as we possibly can. The Land Development Association is to be congratulated on the success which its endeavours have so far won, and my Ministers are doing all in their power, by assistance from the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Education, to further this most important work.

A Bill will be submitted for the confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and a firm in Wales, making provision for the carrying out of a barter proposition under which we can exchange pitwood for coal. Under our present Law, the export of unmanufactured wood is not permitted. Because of the employment which the cutting of this wood has given, and the consequent saving in expenditure on able-bodied relief, my Ministers consider that it would be wise to permit the export of this wood in return for the coal. The Bill, therefore, will legalize the export of the wood which has been cut and which will go forward to Wales in the course of the next few months.

A number of other measures will be brought before you dealing with matters of general importance, including the amendment of certain existing Statutes.

The Annual Reports of the various Departments of the Government will be submitted in due course.

I trust that a satisfactory solution will be reached in the grave circumstances that seem at present to threaten international peace and goodwill. There is reason to believe that the economic trends that have been operating with such disastrous effect in the world at large have, in the main, spent themselves. Our people, disciplined by the hardships of economic adversity, which they are bearing with fortitude, determination and courage, and possessing a heritage richly endowed by nature, may look forward with confidence to the return of prosperity.

I leave you now to your deliberations with full confidence that you will faithfully discharge your duties and responsibilities in the best interests of the welfare of this country.

I pray that Divine Providence will guide and bless your work.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the following Resolution:

RESOLVED: that this House desires to record an expression of its deep regret at the death of the late Hon. George Shea, for some time a Member of this House and later a Member of the Legislative Council.

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

This being seconded by Mr. Bradley, it was ordered that it be recorded in the Journal of the House, and that a copy of the said Resolution be forwarded to relatives of the deceased.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the following Resolution:

RESOLVED: that this House desires to record an expression of its deep regret at the death of the late Sir John C. Crosbie, for some time a Member of this House. Whilst mourning his loss, Members of this House desire to convey to his relatives deep sympathy in their bereavement.

This being seconded by Mr. Bradley, it was ordered that it be recorded in the Journal of the House, and that a copy be forwarded to relatives of the deceased.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the following Resolution:

RESOLVED: that this House desires to record an expression of its deep regret at the death of the late Mr. Joseph F. Downey, for many years a Member of this House.

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

This being seconded by Mr. Bradley, it was ordered that it be recorded in the Journal of the House, and that a copy be forwarded to relatives of the deceased.

It was moved by Mr. Earle and seconded by Mr. Halley that an Address of Thanks be presented to His Excellency, the Governor, in reply to the Gracious Speech with which he had been pleased to open the present Session of the Legislature, and that a Select Committee be appointed to draft such an Address in Reply.

Mr. Earle:⁴ I rise to propose that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, with which His Excellency the Governor has been graciously pleased to open the Legislature, and in doing so I ask the permission of the House to make a few observations upon matters referred to therein.

Before making these observations, Sir, I wish to congratulate you on the great honour that has been conferred upon you in your election to the position of Speaker of this Assembly.

It is an honour which your high standing as a citizen, and your equally high standing as a member of the legal profession merits beyond dispute, and I have no doubt whatever, Sir, but that you will uphold the dignity of your position, and adjudicate on matters that come up for your decision without fear or partiality.

I would like also, Sir, to express a hearty welcome to His Excellency Sir Murray Anderson and Lady Anderson.

Only a very short while has elapsed since His Excellency and Lady Anderson have been with us, but already we discern the very keen interest they are taking in the affairs of this country.

⁴ Mr. Earle's speech is taken from *The Daily News*, April 12, 1933, p. 3.

Newfoundland has been continually honoured by the noble class of men who have acted here as representatives of His Majesty. Men who have won by their abilities and lofty ideals, the high positions to which they have been appointed. Of such a type we believe Sir Murray Anderson to be, a man who by his outstanding ability and achievement has risen to the highest rank in the Royal British Navy, whose glorious traditions go back for centuries.

It is over 50 years since His Majesty's government has been pleased to honour us by appointing to represent His Majesty one chosen from the Royal Navy, and his life-long association with the sea and the perils of the deep will, I am sure, be a link of sympathy and good will with His Majesty's subjects in the Dominion, the majority of whom strive for a living on the waters around our coasts.

I am sure every honourable member of this House will join with me in wishing Sir Murray Anderson and Lady Anderson a full measure of good will and happiness.

With your permission, Sir, I will now confine myself to the observations I propose to make dealing with His Excellency's Speech from the Throne.

This session of the Legislature will without a doubt be a momentous one, probably the most momentous one since the inauguration of Responsible Government.

In common with Great Britain and the Empire, Newfoundland is feeling acutely the effects of a world wide economic depression which is unparalleled in the history of the world. In common with other countries, we are suffering from a deflation of our commodity prices below the cost of production, and as in the case of a great many other countries we are suffering from a burden of debt, in many cases stupidly and wantonly incurred, the interest on which in face of the great reduction in revenue, and the small earnings of our people, it is at present extremely difficult to cope with.

In other words, Sir, we are hovering not far from the edge of a financial precipice, and much of the legislation which will come up for discussion during this session of the Legislature will, I feel sure, be directed in placing this country more firmly on its feet, and at a greater distance from that financial disaster which has for some time menaced this country.

I realise, Sir, that our position to-day is a precarious one, but when compared with the situation which faced this country ten months ago, when the present Government assumed office, I have no hesitation in saying we have a lot to be thankful for. Ten months ago national credit [was] extinct and no assistance was possible from the outside.

The present Government on assuming office in June last was faced with what looked like almost insurmountable difficulties. Amongst other things it was found that the outgoing Government had left unpaid bills for dole and other items amounting approximately to \$800,000.

In the Estimates of 1932-33, provision of only \$50,000 was made for able-bodied relief, which in the face of an expenditure of considerably over \$1,000,000 the preceding year, was indeed a ludicrous estimate.

On the whole the situation last June certainly looked hopeless, and I take this opportunity of congratulating the Prime Minister and the members of the Executive Government on the success which has been the reward of their determined and untiring efforts, an endorsement of which was lately recorded by the electors of Port de Grave District which returned Mr. Gear as their representative in the Government ranks.

To enable the country to pay all possible to our creditors, the government expenditure has been cut to the bone, and a tremendous effort has been made to enable us to live within our means.

That the efforts made by the Executive Government have been favourably accepted by the outside world, as being an honest and whole-hearted effort, is very evident.

Whereas ten months ago our national credit was worthless, we found at the end of December it had appreciated to a degree, that, when it was found impossible to meet our bond interest in full, both Great Britain and Canada volunteered to loan jointly sufficient to cover the obligation then due, amounting to \$1,250,000. This gave us a breathing space of six months in which to more fully investigate our economic and financial possibilities, and, in view of the seriousness of our large public debt interest, we are happy to welcome the presence of a Royal Commission, consisting of Lord Amulree, C.B.E., K.C., Charles A. Macgrath, Esq., LL.D., and Sir William Stavert, K.B.E.

These Commissioners, who are gentlemen of very wide experience and proven ability, we welcome for the extensive examination that they will make of our financial and economic structure, and I believe their recommendations will be very helpful to us in regaining our financial equilibrium.

His Excellency in His Speech from the Throne refers to the Imperial Economic Conference which was convened at Ottawa last year, at which representative ministers of Great Britain and the Dominions attended.

Newfoundland was very ably represented by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, and the result of their endeavours will give us the benefit of a preferential tariff on our cod liver oil of ¼ d. per gallon, and chilled or frozen salmon of 1½ d. per gallon in Great Britain. The preference that is given us on these two commodities is, I think, undisputed evidence that the quality of our cod liver oil and salmon is considered to be of a very high standard.

What has been obtained by the careful inspection of these commodities can no doubt be obtained by our codfish exporters when a rigid inspection is applied for export.

It is hoped that the preferential tariff in Great Britain will give us an opportunity of again operating our cod liver oil factories to capacity.

A production equal to 1928 will mean approximately 900 men employed and a revenue of not less than \$150,000 over the value of rotted oil.

The price of our frozen and chilled salmon has suffered from Russian dumping in the British market. This, it is expected, has been overcome, and an extension of the salmon fishery on our coasts is much to be hoped for.

Prompt payments are made to our fishermen for salmon which carries them along, oftentimes at a time when little else can be earned.

Coming at a time when foreign countries are raising their tariff walls, this conference should result in a closer co-operation within the Empire, and this has been evidenced by a visit here in January of the Trade Commissioner from Australia.

His Excellency, Sir, further advises that the Department of Agriculture and Mines will again be reconstructed for the administration of our timber, mineral and agricultural products, and that the Department of Marine and Fisheries will again take care of that most valuable asset, our fishery products.

Those departments were amalgamated by legislation introduced at the last session of the Legislature. I am, Mr. Speaker, very much in accord with the proposed reconstruction of the two

departments. The important commodities which come under the administration of those departments are not closely related and need concentrated and separate administration.

The possibilities for our agriculture are very evident and one has only to examine the list of imports of commodities which can be produced from our own soil to realise not that we have sold our birthright, but that we have never taken possession of it.

To illustrate, I will quote a number of these imports taken from last year's records. Of hay we imported 4,556 tons, eggs 219,658 doz., cheese 411,523 lbs., fresh meats 2,091,462 lbs. (Compare this with rocky Iceland which last year exported 34,762 cuts of fresh mutton). Oats 38,542 bushels, cabbage 472,316 lbs, turnips, carrots, parsnip 12,391 bushels, potatoes (exclusive of seed potatoes) 171,875 bushels, onions and tomatoes \$52,635, milk 2,533,131 lbs., butter 536,398 lbs., a value totaling \$962,958.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have gone out into the neighbouring country, many of us have crossed the country by rail and toured around the bays. All of us, I expect, have been struck by the possibilities for farming, but, having the wherewithal to procure vegetables and other commodities we needed, did not concern ourselves as to the source of their origin.

To-day, Sir, thousands of our people are being fed at the expense of our revenue, who, had any progressive agricultural policy been adopted during the last decade, would be producing probably the greater part of the imported produce I have enumerated.

Chaucer in one of his poems says: "No man is born into this world whose work is not born with him. There is lots of work; and tools to work withal ..." etc. I expect if Geoffrey Chaucer tried to sell that poem to-day in Great Britain or U.S.A. he would be "out of luck," but what he wrote could to a great degree be applied to Newfoundland to-day. There is lots of work staring us in the face, with an abundance of land available for development.

The lectures being broadcast by Mr. Butler of the Agricultural Board are certainly instructive and should prove helpful, and I understand Mr. Butler will, this summer, tour the outports giving lectures on agriculture. Our practical farmers are good, but when aided by scientific knowledge will get better results.

The Land Development Association of which Mr. Frost is the organizing secretary is, I consider, a splendid movement, and I am sure the series of bulletins issued by that association and distributed all over the country will be helpful.

To encourage to any who may consider farming beneath their dignity, I quote from Xenophon: "Agriculture for an honourable and high-minded man, is the best of all occupations or arts, by which men procure the means of living."

I will now, Sir, speak for a few minutes on the Salt Codfish Standardization Bill which was passed in 1931 and which was ably sponsored by Sir William Coaker. I did not have the pleasure of hearing Sir William debate on this Bill, but I understand he exhorted and pleaded for its passing and quoted at some length on the experiences of the Union Trading Company in losses on realization of fish.

By profession, Sir, I am a fish exporter, and I presume I have the privilege of criticizing myself in this House.

There is no doubt whatever but that we have lost and are losing our markets by our present methods, and especially the Labrador markets.

In conversation with Capt. Oldford, who has lately returned from the Mediterranean, he stated that Genoa and Leghorn together last year took 460,000 quintals of salt codfish, of which only 9,200 quintals was from Newfoundland. Twenty years ago these two ports took upwards of 200,000 quintals of our Labrador cure yearly.

Not many years ago cargoes of Newfoundland small Shore fish went to Lisbon and Figueria, but not so to-day. At Oporto, always one of our best markets, we sold in 1927, 378,731 quintals, as compared with 156,365 quintals last year. These figures show us plainly the seriousness of the situation.

From every market we hear the same story, that the consumers prefer the taste of Newfoundland fish, but that the cure is not to be compared with that of our competitors. It is evident that Newfoundland exporters have fallen down on their job. They have encouraged the cure to depreciate by a talqual system of buying, and whereas years ago small cargoes went to the market, we now see as high as 20,000 quintals going forward in bulk.

I know of one firm in this town who 25 years ago had a sailing vessel of their own with a capacity of 4,500 quintals but never more than 3,600 quintals were shipped, as it was considered unwise to send such a large cargo.

We hear of the fishermen becoming despondent. How can they be otherwise when they know the facts as I have stated?

Why the Standardization Bill of 1931 did not become effective at once, I do not know, but I do know, Sir, that it will be in operation when 1933 fish is shipped.

Mr. Davies, who has been our Trade Commissioner at London, has been appointed as head of the Salt Codfish Exportation Board, and in him we have a man with proven organizing ability. He toured the Mediterranean ports with Capt. Oldford and will, I understand, proceed to Norway and Iceland before coming here to take up the management of the board. Probably the Labrador cure and marketing will receive the first attention.

The trained staff will probably not be available to give attention to all cures at the beginning, as it is very necessary that [the] standardization that is undertaken be as perfect as possible.

Now, Sir, I referred to one source of the fishermen's despondency and I will speak of another.

Frequently one hears of the vast amount of money that is being made by the fish exporters, which cannot be substantiated. Only a short while ago I read of \$1,000,000 been made by the exporters on 1932 collection. Last year before the general election, I received letters from lodges in my District complaining of the low price of fish and asking for fair play. I had records taken from our audited statements, and I discussed the matter at some length on the political platform. Our records show 6 cents per quintal profit, and I invited the fishermen to have a reliable committee investigate our figures, and if proven wrong I promised a \$5 bill to every widow in the District. Our 1932 figures will show even worse and I estimate the little profits of 1929, 1930, and 1931 will be wiped out.

When discussing the low profit with a Scotch banker in the town last year, his remark was that we were lucky. There is not much luck in operating four years fish shipments with no profit, and I consider we are lucky to-day, Sir, in having a Prime Minister and Executive Government determined if possible to improve the situation.

It is gratifying, Sir, to learn of the success of the sealing fleet and I extend a welcome home to the master and crew of the *Eagle*, and congratulations to them and the owners on the success of the voyage.

Our prospects for the future are by no means hopeless. Our national credit is greatly restored, our possibilities in agriculture and in development of our fisheries are very promising.

Labrador has large resources in forests and water power and great interest is developing in the discovery of gold there. It might be our crowning asset.

We have a people of British stock and I have every confidence, Sir, that we will surmount our difficulties and regain prosperity.

Mr. Halley:⁵ As junior member for the District of St. John's West, it is my great pleasure to second the motion that a Committee be appointed to draft an Address in reply to His Excellency's most gracious Speech from the Throne, so ably proposed by my learned friend, the Hon. Member for Fogo, Mr. Earle.

He has so effectively covered the various paragraphs of the Speech that even an experienced parliamentarian, not to say a novice like myself, would find it difficult to make comment that would not sound like mere repetition of his remarks.

Before proceeding further, permit me, Sir, to associate myself with the proposer of this motion to tender you my hearty congratulations on the high dignity bestowed upon you by the unanimous voice of the Assembly.

This signal honour of being first Commoner falls to the lot of only a few public men, and your unanimous selection is indicative of the esteem in which you are held by your fellow members, of their confidence in your ability and qualifications to uphold the rights and privileges of this House, [and] to impartially discharge the important duties this post entails.

Since the Assembly last met, several outstanding events have occurred, some of which will form a subject matter for chapters of unusual interest in our checkered history of Responsible Government, and in the first instance, may I welcome in a way that Newfoundland alone can welcome, the newly appointed representative of His Most Gracious Majesty, His Excellency Admiral Sir David Murray Anderson and Lady Anderson. That their sojourn in this country may be pleasant is my earnest wish, and I am sure the wish of the people of the Dominion.

Indicative of the unprecedented crisis we are passing through, a crisis which must evoke the anxiety of all who are conversant with its gravity and scope, and who are unselfishly concerned for the country's future welfare, we have the opening paragraph of His Excellency's Speech, which, Mr. Speaker, I shall take the liberty of reading (*reads*). Such an assurance is more than gratifying, and we, as a people, have a new hope, a courage and a determination to carry on when we realise the knowledge, ability and experience of His Majesty's representative is placed so unreservedly at the country's disposal.

If the impression made during the short time he has been among us be an augury for the future, I predict that His Gracious Majesty's choice of Governor will prove a very fortunate and

⁵ Mr. Halley's speech is taken from *The Daily News*, April 12, 1933, p. 5.

beneficial one to this sorely tried land. We have a well-founded confidence that the administration of our affairs under his guidance will be that of judicious character and vigorous helpfulness and co-operation, which the present problems call for and the critical condition of our financial and economic affairs demand.

This is not the opportune time to take up the attention of the House in lengthy references to the many subjects of public concern which His Excellency has alluded to, nor to attempt an analysis of public affairs which the Speech touches upon. These will come within the range of our deliberations at more fitting periods as the session progresses.

The present is no ordinary time. Our history does not supply us with records of a situation in our public affairs of so great import to the country and people, rich and poor, wage earner and employer, fisherman and merchant, as we have been experiencing for the past three years.

The depressed trade, stagnated industry, destitute condition of a people, widespread unemployment of our wage earning class, country-wide poverty of thousands who formerly knew no indigence, are for the most part unfortunately the sad results of governmental prodigality.

The records of this House show that for years past it has been common practice of members of each successive government to blame its predecessors in office for the country's misfortune, to deny credit for any good that might exist and paint in lurid colours the wretched state of the public finances and disorders in public affairs, due to misgovernment and misdeeds of the men they succeeded in office. It is not my intention to follow their example.

In fact, no words that I could utter, no picture that I could present would so forcibly and vividly portray the deplorable conditions that confronted the present administration on its assumption to office last June, as do the written records of the public departments which presumably will be bared for examination before this session ends.

Therein will be found convincing proofs of misgovernment and maladministration by which the revenues of this country were dissipated and diverted from their legitimate channels by methods and for purposes which appear indefensible.

Here will be seen the true condition of our public affairs when the present Prime Minister undertook the onerous task of bringing order out of unparalleled chaos.

Scarcely seated in office, they were called upon to provide funds to meet unpaid bills for relief of the destitute that had accumulated during the last months of their predecessors, to the extent as stated in the Speech from the Throne of approximately \$800,000, as well as meet the half-yearly financial obligations of the Public Debt, and in addition the current requirements of the increasing numbers of unemployed and destitute for which no provision whatever had been made by the outgoing administration in their fiscal adjustments by which they attempted a balanced budget.

This maladministration was on June 10th, 1932, submitted to a jury, the voters of this country, and their verdict of condemnation was well-nigh unanimous. After six months that verdict has been confirmed, the policy of the present Government has been approved by the voters of Port de Grave, the first District given opportunity since the General Election to pass judgement. No new Government in this country has ever faced a constituency at a by-election under circumstances so unfavourable, yet the good common sense and intellect so characteristic of our people were markedly demonstrated by the voters of this District three weeks ago, who, turning a deaf ear to specious pleadings, gave earnest of their determination to strengthen the hands of our Prime Minister

to continue the work of rehabilitation of our country and the restoration of our credit at home and abroad upon which we must lay the foundation of sound progress for the future.

This the first session of the 28th General Assembly opens with a Government strength unparalleled in the history of Newfoundland since we secured Responsible Government, 100 years ago.

Our ancestors fought for this privilege of responsibility, they fought, with a patriotism, a devotion, a love of country and love of Island Home. Lord Howick in the House of Commons in the defence of Newfoundland's request said "that the time had come for such a boon to be granted" and it was granted, and, we, the living, should dedicate ourselves to the great task remaining before us, that we should take from those honoured dead an increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion, and not abuse the prerogatives and privileges which are ours now by right of 100 years.

The financial and economic rehabilitation of the country's affairs has been the first and foremost consideration of the Government since assuming office June 1932. Night and day the Executive Government have been in council, endeavouring to unravel the tangle that this country has been placed in. After a careful analysis of the financial problems confronting us, the maternal instinct of the Home Government manifested itself to such an extent that a Royal Commission is now sitting and making a thorough investigation in the causes, and their findings will disclose the necessary remedies whereby, we, as a country, will rehabilitate ourselves financially. For obvious reasons, therefore, no reference is made in the Speech from the Throne as to the probability of emergency expenditures to cope with emergency unemployment or a period of stress as is occasioned by the general economic crisis, but as with the individual, so the State, a solvency cannot be attained through further borrowings, and this Government has both the will and the courage when the time is ripe and opportune to enact a required legislation and prevent a squandermania; prevent an abuse of the people's money as has happened so very often in the past.

The Speech refers to the low production in all our industries during 1932. Pulp and paper showed a considerable falling off; ore shipments from Bell Island were scarcely half that of the previous year. The falling off in the production of ore at Bell Island Mines and the decrease in the pulp and paper output seriously reduced the earning power of the men employed in these industries. Loss of earnings through these causes resulted in the privation and suffering hitherto unknown in these section of the country.

While the codfishery may be regarded as an average voyage, the drop in the value was almost ruinous to those engaged therein. The fisheries are undoubtedly the mainstay of the country; their value exceeds that of all other exports combined, and the salt codfish trade is, as it has always been, the source of the greatest earning power for our fishermen. I have not the exact figures, but I hazard the opinion that the fisheries represented at least 70 per cent of our total exports during the past quarter of a century, with salt codfish representing at least 60 per cent.

In view of this it seems almost incredible that so little concern for the perpetuation and extension of the fisheries has been shown by past governments. The salt codfish branch in particular seems to have been allowed to dwindle and become unremunerative by the absence of proper governmental supervision and regulatory enactments. Government after government has merely tinkered with this vital matter. They have temporized and compromised when stern adherence to the

straight line of duty would have redounded to the great benefit of the fisheries and therefore to the financial stability of the country, and the advancement of its industries. This Government is absolutely determined to put a Salt Codfish Act into force. When this Act is brought into operation, private interest and sectional opposition will not be permitted to nullify its effect, nor deter those entrusted with its administration from energetic enforcement of it.

Over 80 years ago an Honourable Member of the Legislature in dealing with the fisheries said "the produce of this country is eagerly sought for in the West Indies, Brazil, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Sicily and all ports of the Mediterranean." During recent years that has been changed. Our fish is not eagerly sought in these markets now; our former customers seek a substitute for Newfoundland codfish and are obtaining it in the product of the fisheries of Iceland and the Scandinavian countries. Our salt codfish has been forced out of these markets. The new policy now to be adopted re: the fishery is going to be maintained and vigorously enforced till we regain our former primacy in those European markets, now fast passing into the hands of our competitors.

It is, I am sure, highly gratifying to learn that the present season's seal fishery has turned out successful. Already profitable returns are assured and each steamer out has fared well. This may be regarded as providential, as the proceeds of the voyage will give a much needed stimulus to the mercantile trade and fair bills to the men engaged in that hazardous enterprise.

As indicated by His Excellency, Newfoundland, in common with the rest of the world, has had a very difficult problem to deal with in the matter of able-bodied relief. This had reached such proportions as to tax to the utmost the country's resources. Great as it has been and still is, the Government continued to provide maintenance for the destitute. Many abuses that had grown up previous to the present Administration's taking office have been eliminated and unnecessary expenditure thereby considerably reduced.

It is a sad condition, more especially as it applies to the District of St. John's West, but the people are sympathetic; the people are realizing the tremendous odds and are bearing their privations and sufferings in silence, fully cognisant of the almost insurmountable difficulties, but confident that they have at the controls a body of men who are working night and day to find a way out; to devise the means whereby the unemployment will be absorbed by industrial enterprise.

The Government's decision to restore to their former status the departments of Agriculture and Mines and Marine and Fisheries will be received with approbation by all who fully value the importance in our political economy of Agriculture and Fisheries. The combining of those two departments was a retrogressive act, and even on the score of economy could not be justified. Surely our great fisheries, which are, as has been already said, the mainstay of the country, is the greatest industry we possess, producing more than two-thirds of our annual wealth, should be of sufficient importance to occupy the exclusive attention of the Minister of Fisheries.

Of the Department of Agriculture and Mines the same may be said. I have here a report of the agricultural products of the country compiled seven years ago, which gives the value of produce at that date as \$9,461,480. That shows agriculture as our third greatest industry. Indeed, in point of actual value I would not hesitate to give it second place, the fisheries alone being greater value. And allowing for normal increase during the past seven years, the total value of agricultural products should not be much below \$12,000,000 to-day. And as misfortunes are said to be sometimes blessings in disguise, the present depression, which has had the effect of turning our attention more

generally to the cultivation of the land, cannot be but productive of the very great progress and development in agricultural pursuits.

In addition to agriculture, there are mines and forests. These are two great revenue producers and labour-giving industries, and the prospective development of the mineral areas of Labrador may greatly enhance their value. To tack that department on to the Marine and Fisheries would be a false economy, and would result in chaos and unsatisfactory service in both departments. Therefore, the Government is acting wisely in re-establishing both departments on their former footing.

To operate our railway system some 50,000 tons of coal per year is necessary. The money to purchase this coal has to be found if we want to keep our system operating, and some \$300,000 would have to be sent out of the country this year to pay for same. The Government, through constructive foresight, arranged a deal whereby this quantity of coal has been obtained and payment on an equitable basis made in pit props, with the result that this very large amount of money was kept within the Dominion, providing employment for hundreds of men who otherwise would be a charge upon the revenue of the country.

If we may judge the future by past similar difficulties, we have no cause for despondency. The remarkable recuperative power of this Old Country has stood her in good stead in almost overwhelming disasters of former times, and may be confidently relied upon to bring us through our present difficulties and give us a new start on the high road of progress and prosperity.

I express the hope, Mr. Speaker, that the session we now enter upon will be marked with unanimous efforts to extricate our country from its present grave situation, and that it may be productive of great and lasting benefits to our people. And I echo the wish expressed by His Excellency, that the international unrest, which threatens the peace and good will of the world, may speedily find a solution satisfactory to the various nations now devoting their efforts towards that object, in which, we have just pride in saying, the responsible ministers of His Majesty's Government are to-day, as they have been since the termination of the Great War, leading the forces of compromise and goodwill to an understanding in the international councils of the world powers. I also trust that the belief entertained by His Excellency that the economic depression that has wrought disaster throughout the world has spent itself, and that the people of the distressed nations will soon find relief from their thralldom of suffering and privation, which had so severely tried the souls of men.

I beg leave to second the motion that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Bradley congratulated the Speaker on his election as first commoner of the land and he joined in the welcome to His Excellency the Governor. He thanked the Prime Minister, who had created a precedent of allowing him an advance copy of the Speech from the Throne, and he hoped that this practice would be carried out in future years.

Months ago the people of the country were told that all the trouble in the country was due to the Government and everything would be well if they would resign or relinquish the power. He feared that it would be many a long day before that would arrive. We are suffering from the depression that is in the world over, though we are only an inconsiderable unit. We are depending on foreign countries, and until they are in a position to pay better prices for our products we will not

have profitable employment or happy days, as were promised by the present Government. At any rate, the party with which he was associated could not be blamed for making promises, as they had made none. But, though we are small, we are active and we will grow, and in influence and in numbers and we will be exchanging positions with you people opposite.

I was interested in another statement made by the mover of this Resolution. He announced – and I believe quite honestly so far as he is concerned – that ten months ago our national credit was extinct, and he intimated that to-day it was reinstated and rehabilitated, and gave as his reason for saying so that the Dominion of Canada along with the United Kingdom had come to our assistance and on December 1st had given us \$1,250,000. Well, Sir, that is a peculiar reason for the statement that the country's credit has been rehabilitated, because my recollection is that during the Squires regime when we wanted money we got it, and we got it from the Associated Banks too. When we wanted \$2,000,000 in June 1931 we got it; when we wanted another \$2,000,000 in December 1931 we got it, and we provided the money for the present Government to pay the interest on the national debt in June last, and further we provided the fund from which you got the money to pay the interest on the money you got from Britain and Canada three months ago. The loan which you claimed as your prosperity loan in June last was arranged for by the Squires Government, because you found yourselves in December last unable to secure the necessary funds in order to meet your own obligations and Britain and Canada found it for you, and then sent a commission out here to tell you what to do.

The honourable mover of the Address also regarded the result of the by-election in the District of Port de Grave as indicative of the will of the people of Newfoundland. My recollection of by-elections in this country is that a government always increases its majority, and frequently takes from an opposition any seat which it had in the House, and, if you want some instances of that, might I refer you to the year 1930 when we re-elected men in Bonavista North and Lewisporte, and took the District of Placentia West from the Tory Party. But in 1933 the story is different. Nine months after you had won Port de Grave District by a majority of over 1,100, you found your majority reduced by over 600. Now, if you regard that as a victory, you are easily satisfied.

We were told this afternoon that Newfoundlanders going abroad were ashamed to admit they were Newfoundlanders. Some of them ought to have good reason for feeling ashamed, judging by the statements made by them between June 1930 and June 1932, because, if ever there was an effort made to damn their own country, it was during that period. A continued fusillade of slander and abuse intended to undermine any confidence in the Government was poured into the ears of foreign investors, and those Newfoundlanders responsible for that ought to hang their heads in shame and deny they were Newfoundlanders, or that they ever had anything to do with the country.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk this afternoon about the standardization of codfish. This has been a subject for discussion for various governments in the past. In fact, governments and political parties have talked on it ever since we have had responsible government. It is true that Sir William Coaker some ten or twelve years ago introduced a Bill into this House for that purpose and it failed to materialize, and there are various reasons for its failure, and the chief of which was the opposition to it of our Newfoundland fish exporters. In 1931, and again in 1932, a Standardization Bill passed through this House, under which the fish exporters were enabled to arrange a system of standardization of export, did they care so to do, but up to the present moment I

have not heard they have done anything in that regard. The Hon. Member for Fogo spoke at some length about the despondency of those engaged in the fisheries, and attributed that despondency in part to the treatment which Newfoundland fishermen got from the fish exporters. He went on to point out that so far as his firm was concerned, there had been no unfair treatment meted out. Well, I am prepared to accept his statement in that latter regard because, in my opinion, 6 and 1/6 cents per quintal is not an excessive profit to make. But, if my information is correct, the people in his territory have been better off than practically any other fishing section of the country, and their prosperity is accounted for by the straight dealing of Mr. Earle and his firm. But I can say here this afternoon that we can find thousands of fishermen who will tell you instances where salt codfish was culled number two and was exported from this country as number one. Consequently, I would warn the Government that in any legislation they may undertake in connection with the standardization and exportation of codfish, to beware of the exporting fish merchants. I had instances related to me last year by fishermen themselves. They told me that they saw their own fish which was culled number two being packed in casks and sold as number one, and when they told the merchant that they had chased the fish into the store and what happened to the branding of it, the merchant replied, "Come into the office and we will fix it up for you."

Sir, the most important portion of the work of this Session is a matter which this afternoon we cannot deal with at all, because we have no information about it. I refer to the rehabilitation of the finances of the Colony. I take it that this will involve measures dealing with the administration of the various departments of the public service, and probably substantial amendments to the revenue laws and other incidentals of which I have no information thus far, so that in reality the Speech from the Throne contains merely the preliminary work of the Session and not the main portion of the legislation which must necessarily come before us later on.

Reference was made to the Imperial Economic Conference at Ottawa, and it has been announced that as a result of arrangements made there, much good will accrue to Newfoundland in the future. I hope that that is true, but I personally have little hope of it. As I understand it, the intention of that Conference was in the main to promote the system of trade within the Empire by the creation of preferential tariffs. Now, while I am willing to admit that I am a confirmed free trader – I do not believe in protection, as I believe that sort of political economy can only lead to disaster in the long run – if that Economic Conference would have the effect of awakening the other nations of the earth to the necessity of calling off all this tariff war, then I believe the Economic Conference will be the greatest force for good we have known in the world for many a long year, otherwise I fear the results are not likely to be profitable to us.

As to the question of agriculture, I am particularly interested in that paragraph in the Speech because of the fact that my own constituency is on the West Coast of the country and which is generally regarded as the "garden of Newfoundland."

The District he represented was largely a farming district, and any legislation that will benefit agricultural development would have his hearty support. We can never hope to develop agriculture so as to have sufficient to export as they do in Canada and the United States, but if we can produce sufficient to provide for our own necessities, much good would be accomplished.

So far as the Opposition was concerned he would say that he and his colleague would support every measure that had for its object the benefit of Newfoundland and anything that they felt

did not tend to this end would be opposed bitterly by them.

Hon. the Prime Minister joined in the congratulations to the Speaker and in the welcome to His Excellency the Governor. He believed His Excellency was going to fit in well with the people, as his experience as a naval man and in South Africa would fit him to fill the position with acceptance to His Majesty the King and benefit to Newfoundland.

He congratulated the mover and seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply. They were the type of men who should be welcomed to the House. Both young and successful businessmen, their experiences would be valuable and he would avail of them on every possible occasion.

Since the Government had assumed office they have had a difficult and most trying time. It was not pleasant to reduce salaries and services but it was necessary to economise, and to prove that we had done our best. That was why the United Kingdom and Canada came to our assistance at the end of December without being asked to do so.

In July 1931 when the late Government was in difficulties, they had to go and ask the assistance of Mr. Bennett of Canada, and in December the same year they had to cable to England, and two days before the end of December in that year, when he was called to the Bank to sign the agreement made, he was told that to do so would be political suicide. He had asked what would happen if he did not sign that agreement and was told that if he did not there would be no accommodation and no bond interest. That was what the last administration was able to do to meet its interest at that time, and in July last year it had met the interest only by creating a petroleum monopoly and bound the country hand and foot for fifteen years. It was by these means that the last Government had obtained the money they required, as spoken of by the Leader of the Opposition.

When he took office, his opinion was that it was unfair to borrow more money, and he was prepared to take all the responsibility of defaulting, but he was determined not to borrow any more. He was still of the opinion that hard work and not loans was the salvation of Newfoundland. At the end of June, 1931, the expenditure was \$7,385,000. This year for the same period it will be \$5,000,000, so that a saving of \$2,385,000 has been made.

He considered that the election in Port de Grave was a complete vindication of the Government. They had gone to the country after cutting educational grants, soldiers' pensions, and expenditure to the bone in an endeavour to live up to our obligations, and that victory was achieved in face of that was, he considered, a complete vindication. Nor could he imagine that the representative of the Opposition, nor the gentleman who had been so actively connected with him, met afterwards and shook hands on their moral victory.

He admitted that the people getting dole were getting little more than a bare existence, but they realised that the Government was endeavouring to save Newfoundland, and for that reason were prepared to suffer their privations, and if the country to-day had not happy days, it had at least, once again, self-respecting days, and that is more than can be said of a year ago. These bad times were a blessing in disguise. He disagreed that our markets will not improve until the people in the foreign markets are in a better position. We are shipping less fish and at lower prices and we are losing business, but he had every reason to believe that conditions would improve in this respect, and that in two years we will be shipping 2,000,000 quintals of fish. Our fish is better than Iceland fish, and all we need is to improve its quality and we are going to do that. The merchants will do better, the

fishermen will do better, and will get a squarer deal than ever before, and prices will be better for all concerned.

We are dependent on ourselves to get out of the rut. It was dishonest to borrow money knowing we cannot pay it back, and we had to take this out of our minds. He told the people in Port de Grave that if a man came along with an offer of \$10,000,000 and wanted interest for it, he would not accept it.

So far as agriculture is concerned, three groups were working hand in hand: the Land Development Association, the Adult Education Association and the Agricultural Department. Thirty years ago we were growing more vegetables than we are to-day. Our people got in bad habits when times were prosperous here, and they had the money to buy everything. What they must learn now is thrift, industry and self-reliance. The Government had determined to give honest administration, to use economy, abolish graft and buy necessities in the cheapest markets. The past 100 years of responsible government had not been successful, and in that time we had annexed approximately \$100,000,000 debt, the great bulk of which was squandered in the past 20 years. It was not a very comforting thought, but the Government was determined that the beginning of the next 100 years would see an improvement.

The Ottawa agreement is not finalized as yet, but if it had the effect of showing the United States that tariff walls are wrong in principle, it will have an effect that would not have come about but for the Conference.

It was hoped to sell 500,000 tons of iron ore, which would put Conception Bay on its feet. That had not yet materialized, but he was hoping it would.

In the recent election, a gentleman connected with the Opposition candidate had said of him that so far as he was concerned, he was only a businessman, and no businessman could successfully run the country; but he could not agree with that stand. Government, after all, is only big business, and the same qualities that can conduct business are necessary for successful government.

The coal for the Railway cost each year the sum of \$200,000. By a deal made it was possible to keep that money in the country, and to get our coal for pitprops. It had also the effect of keeping a number of people off the dole, and went a long way to making these people more contented. He believed that since January we had turned a corner and are now on the up grade. The successful seal fishery will give us a boost.

Since the Government took office, it had taken them till now to clear away the debris left by the past administration, but from now on it would be possible to give attention to upbuilding. He had made no promises in the election, but he did say that if the people would be industrious, thrifty and self-reliant, he would give in return clean, honest government, constructive government and far-seeing government, and that is what he intended to do. He could well understand why the last Prime Minister had made no promises in last year's election; he had made so many previously and fell down on them, that he was ashamed to make any more. We had no right to borrow any more money; no right to pass on this additional burden to others coming after, and he believed that if a real, honest effort was made to economise, if squandering was eliminated, and afterwards it was not possible to meet our bond obligations in full, our bond-holders would be prepared to take half, or whatever they could get, and they would not be unreasonable.

He was glad to know that the Government will get the co-operation of the Leader of the

Opposition, and on the other hand he would say that if there were any courtesies that could be extended, the Government would be happy to do so. [*Daily News*, April 12, 1933, p. 6]

It was ordered accordingly, and that the following gentlemen be such Committee [to draft the Address in reply]: – Mr. Earle, Mr. Halley, Mr. Whiteley, Mr. Bradley, Dr. Mosdell.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on to-morrow he would move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act Respecting the Newfoundland Hotel.”

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act Respecting the Department of Labour.”

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act Respecting the Department of Agriculture and Mines.”

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act in Relation to Taxation of Accident and Other Insurance Companies.”

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Customs Act.”

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act of Indemnity.”

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act in Respect of the Memorial College Grounds.”

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act to Amend Chapter 93 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled ‘Of the Recovery of Possession of Tenements in Certain Cases.’”

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled “An Act Respecting the Liability of Innkeepers.”

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 Judicature Act.”

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 Labrador Act, 1927.”

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 Registration of Deeds Act."

Hon. the Secretary of State gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Export of Pitprops by the Newfoundland Railway."

Hon. the Secretary of State gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Tourist Commission Act."

Hon. the Secretary of State gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to an Election in the District of Port de Grave in the Present Year."

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Agricultural Societies."

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Forest Fires Act."

Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Postal Telegraphs Act."

Hon. the Secretary of State tabled Reports of the Commissioner of Lunacy for the Year 1932.

Hon. the Secretary of State tabled Certified Copy of Minute of Council approving the Schedule of Water and Sewerage Rates for West Corner Brook.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of question.

Mr. Starkes gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday next, the 18th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday, April 18, 1933

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

Mr. Earle presented a largely signed petition from the residents of Fogo asking that a clause dealing with codtrap operations in that section be deleted from the fishery rules and regulations. [*Daily News*, April 19, 1933]

Hon. Minister of Justice tabled [the] Report of Fire Losses of various Insurance Companies for the year 1932.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the following documents:

Report of Liquor Control for Year 1932.

Report of Department of Assessor for the Year 1932.

Customs Returns for the Year 1932.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act."

Mr. Earle presented the Report of the Committee appointed to draft a Reply to the Speech of His Excellency, as follows:

To His Excellency Admiral Sir David Murray Anderson, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Member of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

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

*(Sgd.) Harold J. Earle
Patrick F. Halley
George Whiteley*

*Assembly Room,
April 18, 1933.*

On motion this Report was received and debate thereon deferred.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister,⁶ Supply was granted to His Majesty.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill

⁶ "The Hon. Minister of Finance moved that Supply be granted to His Majesty. The motion was acceded to." *Daily News*, April 19, 1933, p. 5.

entitled "An Act Respecting the Department of Labour" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to Taxation of Accident and Other Insurance Companies" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Respect of the Memorial College Grounds" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Export of Pitprops by the Newfoundland Railway" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Tourist Commission Act" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to an Election in the District of Port de Grave in the Present Year" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Judicature Act" was introduced and read a first time, and it was

ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Labrador Act 1927" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 93 of the Consolidated Statutes, 'Of the Recovery of Possession of Tenements in Certain Cases'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Forest Fires Act" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister Mr. M. A. Shea was appointed Chairman of Committees.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions concerning an amendment of the Consolidated Statutes respecting Accident Insurance Companies.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. the Prime Minister moved the House into [a] Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution in relation to taxation of Accident and other Insurance Companies. The Hon. the Prime Minister stated that the object of this resolution is to bring insurance against riots, plate glass, motor vehicles and such like within the scope of taxation of \$50 a year. Heretofore they were not specifically sanctioned in the Act and were exempt from taxation. The resolution was passed and a

Bill will be introduced to give effect to this resolution. [*Daily News*, April 19, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, has passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 195 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Accident Insurance Companies'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

When this section of the Order Paper was taken up a short debate arising out of three questions asked by Mr. Starkes, Member for Green Bay ensued. His Honour the Speaker took exception to them in the form they appeared, and to bear out his contention, read from Hansard of 1926 the ruling of the then Speaker, Mr. Fox, for the guidance of members on the asking of questions in an improper manner, and gave citations from May's Parliamentary Practice.

Continuing, the Speaker thought that question No. 70, asked by the Member for Green Bay, meant, in large measure, to supply information to the House, and he pointed out that there are certain cases in which Hon. Members are responsible for the accuracy of what is contained in questions. His Honour thought that the idea of asking questions was to elicit information, but not to afford information to the House, to newspapers or to any other medium. Further, he intimated, that in the House of Commons in England or in Canada it is not customary to read the questions, as that gives them publicity before they appear on the Order Paper. No question should be given publicity before it appears on the Order Paper and in that respect he would ask that the House be good enough to carry out the practice of the last parliament, and have two copies of questions made, one for the Clerk and one for the Speaker, as it is impossible to say off hand whether they conform with the rules of the House or not; but certainly questions should not appear through any public medium until the Order Paper has been distributed. "I merely mention this at the beginning of the session," said the Speaker, "as I think there are certain members who have not given it much thought or consideration, and I do ask that all offensive epithets or insinuations or innuendoes, whether directed towards any member of this House or the Upper House, be kept out of questions, and for the reasons stated I do not propose to ask questions 70, 71 and 72, at least, the latter parts of them."

The Hon. Secretary of State and the Hon. Minister of Justice then tabled answers in part to the questions, the latter pointing out how offensively they were put.

The Leader of the Opposition said that whatever may or may not be the correct procedure, Question 70 seemed to him to be proper, he saw nothing offensive about it and thought it should be answered in its entirety, and that if it was a fact that \$6 freight was charged on every barrel of flour at Badger, that the Government should investigate the matter.

The Hon. Secretary of State saw a better and more effective way to have that sort of practice, if true, stopped; but the information should first be given to the head of the department and not to the House.

Mr. Bradley: When a merchant pays that amount, if he does pay it, by way of freight he is not giving that \$6 away and probably it might come off a man's rations and it ought to be investigated.

The Minister of Justice: The matter should not be the subject of question in the House.

The Hon. the Prime Minister questioned that any wrong doing could occur, as all dole orders to Green Bay were scrutinized closely and the cost of freight was incorporated in the cost of flour.

Mr. Starkes: In view of the fact that businessmen have to pay \$6 per barrel for freight, is a merchant justified in charging that extra cost?

The Hon. Secretary of State: Yes, under extraordinary circumstances; but, if he has not applied to get that privilege extended to him, then you are accusing him of falsifying his accounts and somebody here is charged with falsifying accounts. Now are you prepared to stand by that and put your seat in jeopardy?

Mr. Starkes: This flour was shipped out of St. John's last Thursday.

The Hon. Secretary of State: How then do you know charges when the flour only left here a few days ago and has not reached the dole recipients yet?

Mr. Bradley: Charges have been flung across the floors that Mr. Starkes claims that merchants are falsifying their accounts. We are merely asking what the facts are. If the flour is bona fide costing \$12, then it is clearly the duty of the Government to increase the allowance of the dole recipients.

The Hon. Secretary of State: And because of the insinuation that merchants are falsifying their accounts, let Mr. Starkes come down and lay his information on paper and then it will be soon investigated like other things have been investigated.

His Honour the Speaker then ruled as before, that the three questions referred to were out of order as they were not asked in the proper way. [*Daily News*, April 19, 1933]

Mr. Bradley gave notice of Question.

Mr. Starkes gave notice of Question.

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

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

The Governor has the honour to communicate to the Honourable House of Assembly the appointment of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of Section 4, Cap. 7, Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of a Minute of the Honourable Executive Council approved on the 4th of April, 1933.

*Government House,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
11th April, 1933.*

Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable Executive Council Approved by His Excellency the Governor on the 4th of April, 1933.

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

Hon. the President of the Legislative Council

Hon. F. McNamara

Hon. Sir John R. Bennett, K.B.E.

Hon. the Speaker of the House of Assembly

Hon. the Secretary of State

Hon. the Minister of Justice

Hon. K. M. Brown

Certified true copy,

(Sgd.) Arthur Mews,

Deputy Secretary of State.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Thursday afternoon, the 20th instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Thursday, April 20, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Shea from Renews re Fishery Rules.

Mr. Shea from Renews re Harbour Regulations.

Mr. Shea: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the District of Ferryland and Trepassy (*reads*). I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the matter be referred to the department to which it belongs.

I have here another petition from my District (*reads*). Mr. Speaker, each year a number of fishing vessels come down from Placentia Bay and come into Renews, and according as the codfish comes in they throw their ballast into the harbour during the night. Renews was dredged some years ago but it is growing shoaler every year.

Hon. the Secretary of State tabled:

Statement of Municipal Council Revenue for the Year 1933.

Report of Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Reports of the:

Auditor General, Revenue and Appropriation Accounts

Report under Sections 8 and 33(b).

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I ask the Prime Minister if that report is printed and if copies are available.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Copies will be available within four or five days.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of Question.

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

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

An Act respecting the Newfoundland Hotel deferred.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Question 89, Mr. Speaker, is one of a series of questions regarding which I have considerable doubt as to whether or not I shall answer. I am sure that my honourable and

learned friend the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, who was Attorney General in the late Government, will quite appreciate the fact that it is not usual for the Department to give information of this nature. I would quite prefer that he would not press the question.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I quite realize the position taken by the Hon. Minister of Justice and the underlying sound reasons he has for not preferring to answer this question, and I will not press it.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I can of course give you personally the information you are looking for.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Thank you.

Questions Nos. 125, 150, 148, 63, and 82 tabled.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to make a short comment on several questions asked me; 110 will be answered and tabled; 111 is the same as the last question and I do not desire to answer it for the same reasons which I have already stated.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I will not press that question.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The same applies to 114.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I agree there also.

Hon. Minister of Justice: [Question] 115 will be tabled. With regard to 127 re the movements of Acting Sergeant Strange while he was out of the country, I don't think that should be pressed. Regarding 128, does the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggest that the records of the Court be produced in detail? If anyone wanted that information it could be had at the Court. I don't want to see the Department simply overburdened with preparing records. Why, you might just as well ask the number arrested for drunkenness or any other offence. This imposes a burden which I don't think was intended. I have no objection to tabling the information asked for, but it imposes a tremendous amount of trouble. I will table the answer to 129, but I would suggest to my honourable friend that he might just as well ask how many deeds are registered in the Registry of Deeds and who were the parties.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That is stretching it a little too far; however, I will be satisfied if you will give me the answer to sub-sections 2, 3, and 4 (*reads*).

Hon. Minister of Justice: That simply means that I will have to answer the whole question, as we will have to get all the records and go over them, however I will do the best I can, but it entails making long lists and will take up considerable time.

Hon. the Speaker: While we are on this point of asking for information which can be obtained

through ordinary channels, I don't think that such can be the subject of proper questions in this House, and upon that point May's *Parliamentary Practice* lays it down here (*reads*). I haven't looked up the references cited, but I think this is intended to prevent what the Hon. Minister of Justice complains of.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Might I interject at this point, although I know that I am out of order, but with your permission, Sir? May I draw the attention of the House to the discussions we had a few days ago with regard to putting information in questions. I looked up the official reports of the House of Commons in England and it is quite clear, whatever May's may say to the contrary notwithstanding, that it is the actual practice to give lots of information in questions. I do not propose to read all of them but I will only read one or two (*reads*). Right throughout these official reports certain facts are drawn to the attention of Ministers and they are asked what is their attitude towards them. I merely mention this fact in passing because I may have to ask certain questions later on during the Session in which I may have to state certain facts, and I hope that the Hon. Members opposite will realize that I do not do so merely for the purpose of cluttering up the Order Paper.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: That is very different from the innuendo contained in certain questions asked a few days ago regarding a man who was very highly respected while he was in this House, Mr. Philip T. Fudge, and that other question regarding a Mr. Gordon Ash and any connection he may have had with the rioters.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: We don't admit that these were indiscretions, but this matter of charging \$6 a barrel for freight from Badger to points in Green Bay. This is a matter which should be investigated, this money should not be paid by the merchant out of his own pocket and it is not fair to the man who is receiving the dole. And it would be necessary for the Government to increase the allowance in dollars and cents in order that he might get the same amount of flour as he formerly got.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The Department in charge of this matter in connection with the flour is investigating it now and I am sure would be glad to get all the information available.

Hon. Minister of Justice: If you look at the record I don't think you will find a single question was asked which in itself cast a single reflection upon any person.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Department of Labour" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill has for its object the creating of a Department of Labour. I think we will all be agreed that this is a very necessary department. It is extremely necessary, if we are going to have that Department, to have a man in charge who is thoroughly conversant with

labour and its requirements. Since we created the Department we have had ample opportunity of ascertaining its value, and the Minister now at the head of that Department has been successful in stopping two strikes and bringing about an amicable agreement between employer and the employee. The Department now has got a very well worked out system of recording the amount of unemployment. I regret to say that there should be so many unemployed, but at the same time when things get better – I believe that they are now on the upgrade – I hope that any man looking for a job or any employer anxious to get a man will be able to get in communication with the Department, and the result will be that employer and employee will be brought together. The Minister of the Department will be useful in ascertaining what would be fair wages, and would be interesting himself in seeing that the conditions of working men are fair and that they receive considerate treatment. It is a promise on the part of the present Government and we, like all good governments, like to live up to our pre-election pledges. I am quite sure that the Hon. Member for Green Bay is very sympathetic towards labouring people, and he will feel that this is a step in the right direction, and that the cost to the country which, at the present time, does not come to quite \$5,000 a year has been more than saved this year by the saving of loss of time through one or more strikes that might have taken place during the last nine months. It is always well I think to have a mediator when there is any possibility of friction between capital and labour. It is always well to have a man who is able to take a sympathetic view of both sides of the question, and I believe in the present incumbent in the office of Ministry of Labour we have a man who is well adapted to perform this part in the way of conciliation between employer and employed. A great deal of harm can be done if the conflicting interests are not brought together before there is any chance of their becoming bitter against each other, and for that reason I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill in the second reading will be very readily welcomed by the members of this House.

Mr. Bradley, in reply, stated he represented a large labour district⁷ and of necessity as well as conviction supported the principle of the Bill. He objected on the grounds that the work considered could be done by any other department. It was not true that mill-workers and others at Corner Brook and vicinity were satisfied with conditions.

He cited the necessity of legislation regarding mines, miners, logging, etc. The same consideration should be given the sealing industry; all should come under [the] care of the Department of Labour. He also thought that boiler and machine inspection, where danger is often recorded, should come under the purview of the Labour Department, and advocated the necessity [of] having facts and figures of costs, the wages and situation of men employed, and last but not least, the desirability of still further improving the present Workmen's Compensation Act, a matter which should demand especial interest in the Department of Labour. He supported the Bill in the hope that the Government would go further in widening the scope of the Department's work and

⁷ *The Daily News* stated that Bradley represented "one of the largest organizations of labour in the country." He "criticized [the Bill] at great length for not widening the scope of its activities, such as bringing within the purview of the department those engaged at mining, sealing, and logging. He thought the present bill confined itself too much to the collection of statistics as to who were unemployed and who were not, and he stated his constituents did not agree with the activities of the head of the labour department." *Daily News*, April 21, 1933 p. 5.

responsibility. [*Evening Telegram*, April 21, 1933, p. 14]

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Department of Agriculture and Mines" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Alderdice, in supporting the Bill, intimated that it would be impossible for one man to carry out the extensive agricultural policy which the Government proposes to adopt. He predicted that good results were going to be attained. These results could only be accomplished by having a competent Minister and staff in charge of operations. The amalgamation of the Fisheries and Agriculture and Mines was a mistake which the present Government was going to rectify.

Mr. Bradley opposed the Bill on the grounds that it was an added expense.⁸ He hoped the advanced policy of the Government in relation to agriculture and our fisheries would materialize. [*Evening Telegram*, April 21, 1933, p. 14]

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 195 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Accident Insurance Companies'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill is more in the nature of a routine, and is simply intended to bring these companies within the scope of the \$50 tax a year. It is only right that this should be done. The Bill covers insurance on motor vehicles, plate glass and riot which unfortunately was written last year and I hope that there will never be need of it again. In addition, it gives an opportunity to obtain certain statistics regarding the number and amount of accident policies, the insurance premium income and generally all the details in connection with this class of insurance. I feel that there is nothing contentious in this Bill and I have much pleasure in moving that it now be read a second time.

[*Bill read a second time*]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Might I suggest to the Prime Minister that we might proceed with this Bill now in Committee stage, and so get it off the Order Paper?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Yes. All right.

On the Order for second reading of the Bill "An Act in Relation to the Acceptance of Offices of Emolument under the Crown by Certain Members of the Present House of Assembly" the House divided, when there appeared in favour of the motion: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Secretary

⁸ The Prime Minister stated that "the separating of the departments will mean a saving of \$15,000 a year." *Daily News*, April 21, 1933, p. 5.

of State, Hon. Minister of Posts, Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Hon. Mr. Winter, Hon. Mr. Browne, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Moore, Mr. Whiteley, Mr. Halley, Mr. Gray, Mr. Earle; and against it: Mr. Bradley, Mr. Starkes; so passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill was given rather a misleading title in the Order Paper. It is an Act in relation to the acceptance of offices of emolument under the Crown by certain members of the present House of Assembly, and it has to do with the Hon. Member for Grand Falls who has been good enough to accept that very important position of Minister of Labour. I had no idea that that office was going to be so important until my honourable friend on the other side explained what the duties of that Department should be. When the House goes into Committee in connection with the Bill in connection with the Department of Labour, perhaps I will be able to explain more about the duties that refer to that particular Department. Also, Mr. Stone, who is the Commissioner of Fisheries at present and who is going to be such a very important factor in bringing about, as I just stated, that revolution in the fisheries of this country. I know it a source of merriment for the honourable gentlemen on the other side. I hope it will be a source of comfort and prosperity to the fishermen of this country when we try to do something that will protect them in such a way that they will receive a fair return for their labours. Under the ordinary conditions, a minister who takes office can only take office without re-election if he takes it when first sworn in after election. In this case we have to introduce a section, Section 2; it is introduced for the purpose of enabling the Hon. Member for Grand Falls and the Hon. Member for Trinity North to give us their services in taking charge of these two very important departments, and I will read the section (*reads section*).

I do not believe; I cannot believe that there will be any objection to this Bill going through unanimously. These two gentlemen have given valuable services not only in the House but outside the House to the country. I believe the passing of this Bill enables them to give still further services to their country irrespective of the departments over which they have been placed. I have pleasure in moving the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I think, Sir, this is a scandalous infringement of the rights of a free and independent British people. You have the majority and I have no doubt but that it is your intention to put this Bill through. But, just so surely as you do, it will recoil upon your own heads.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Respect of the Memorial College" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act in Respect of the Memorial College."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has for its object the preserving of the grounds around the Memorial College. There has been some talk of cutting a road through close to the College itself. That would destroy the grounds, which, I hope, will be beautified some day. To prevent any interference with those grounds this Bill has been introduced.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Respect of the Memorial College" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Permit the Export of Pitprops by or for the Newfoundland Railway during the Present and Coming Fiscal Years" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Permit the Export of Pitprops by or for the Newfoundland Railway during the Present and Coming Fiscal Years."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, I do not need to recall to Hon. Members of the House the negotiations which took place last year between the Government and firms in Wales and other firms to try and make a barter deal for coal in exchange for pitprops. Negotiations were begun in Ottawa in August last during the Imperial Economic Conference. The Hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice represented this country at that Conference, and they were advised by certain members of the Board of Trade and certain experts. Canada entered into negotiations with a similar object in view. Representatives from British Columbia went over to England and carried on negotiations for a month or two, but their negotiations fell through. But through the instrumentality of a certain gentleman, who represented the Newfoundland Board of Trade at Ottawa, our negotiations were successful. On December 1st last, a representative of a coal firm in Wales came to Newfoundland, together with an agent of some

coal mines in Wales but who resided at Montreal. After negotiations had been carried on for a week, we were able to announce that we had successfully concluded an agreement whereby the coal that would be used by the Newfoundland Railway during the years 1933 and 1934 would be brought from Wales, and that instead of paying money for that coal, payment would be made in wood, and so keep the money in Newfoundland to be circulated among our own people – the people who have been engaged cutting pitprops during the past winter. The general law of the country forbids the export of those pitprops, and this Bill is introduced for the purpose of enabling the Railway to export this wood on the terms that I have outlined. It has been the policy of all governments for many years past to strictly prohibit the exportation of this wood, except when conditions have been so necessitous as we have experienced during the past few years and during the War, when permission was given to export under the War Measures Act. This wood that is now on hand is not yet exported, but we are asking the House for the authority to export so that we may be able to get coal in return for the Railway.

If Hon. Members will bear with me for a few moments I shall give them an outline of what the agreement contains (*reads agreement*).

That is the way the coal owners of Wales have agreed to purchase the wood, by weight and not by measurement. We have made contracts with contractors in various parts of the country, and they must deliver the wood by weight and weight will determine the value of the wood when it is landed out of the ships at Cardiff, Wales.⁹ We propose to have representatives at the point of unloading to be present when the wood is weighed.

The transaction is as follows: (*reads memorandum of transaction*).

The first ship to bring a load of coal under this agreement left Wales on the 18th of April and is due here next week. She will unload part of her cargo at St. John's and the remainder at the Port of Argentia. An amount of \$228,000 will be paid in contracts for pitprops, instead of its going out of the country and going to Wales to pay for coal. The coal obtained under this contract will cost the Railway \$5 per ton c.i.f. Newfoundland ports. This will be quite a reduction on the price which the Railway has paid for coal for the past years. The names of the contractors and the tonnage which they have contracted to deliver are as follows: (*reads names and amounts*¹⁰).

I recommend the Bill to the favourable consideration of the House, and I trust it will be but the beginning of what we shall see in the year to come and in other years. If we can make contracts of this kind and keep the money in circulation in the country, then we will be taking a big step towards prosperity.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

⁹ "The Newfoundland Railway giving [*sic*] 91,200 tons of pitprops in exchange of 48,000 tons of Welsh coal." *Evening Telegram*, April 21, 1933, p. 14.

¹⁰ According to *The Evening Telegram*, April 21, 1933, p. 14, there were sixteen contractors involved, who had completed their work.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Permit the Export of Pitprops by or for the Newfoundland Railway during the Present and Coming Fiscal Years" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Tourist Commission Act" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Secretary of State: This Bill is just an amendment to the present Act extending the terms of the [Act] from two years to four years. They claim that they cannot do good work in two years. They have made representations to the Government that their time be extended, and the Government has agreed to do this.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to an Election in the District of Port de Grave in the Present Year" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Secretary of State: The history of this Bill is as follows. We were confronted with the resignation by the late Member for Port de Grave, the Hon. J. F. Ayre, and we desired to fill the vacancy as soon as possible. An Act was passed in May last year which dealt with the general elections then pending, and authorized the Government to carry out the elections without taking the regular voters' list.

The taking of the voters' list in Port de Grave it is estimated would cost approximately \$800. Therefore the election was carried out without taking the voters' list and we ask in this Bill that whatsoever doubts might arise in connection with it may be set at rest by the provisions of this Bill; that this Bill may go through, and the Member for Port de Grave may be allowed to take his seat. We have effected a saving of about \$800 by taking this course.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: When I hear the degree of solicitation with which the Hon. Secretary of State desires to preserve the public funds, I wonder if he had that object in view when the Bill, which passed its second reading a few moments ago, was introduced. Under other circumstances there might possibly be some excuse for the conduct of the Government in coming in here and asking us to confirm the illegal election of Mr. Gear in the District of Port de Grave. But as the facts are, Sir, I am afraid that this particular Bill will be referred to as the worst piece of political jobbery that ever disgraced this Assembly. The Hon. Secretary of State pleads the poverty of the country to support the conduct of the Government in proceeding with the Port de Grave election in

an unconstitutional manner. He tells us he has saved \$800 by doing this. I am not familiar with the cost of taking voters' lists to-day. But I feel certain it can be done for 5 cents per head and – you would [have] hundreds to do it at 5 cents per head, yes for 4, yes for 3, but I will reckon at 5 cents per head – would cost \$250. Then the printing is going to cost \$550. It is no wonder all the newspapers are on the side of the Government, if they are paid at that rate for their printing.

Hon. Secretary of State: That's what it cost the last election.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You are talking about the election of 1928.

Hon. Secretary of State: No. In May last year it cost \$561 to print the voters' list in Port de Grave.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Then you were going to pay your man well. You were going to have what the other fellow got. That would perhaps be a reasonable excuse if you had to take the public into your confidence before the election. I do not see any sort of reason why you should not have appraised some of us of the fact. You could [have] told us that you were going to use the old voters' list of last year; whoever is elected we will bring in a Bill to cover the election. But you did not do that. It's just as well to record this stand in a little more detail.¹¹

Hon. Secretary of State: I want to say in reference to the Hon. Leader's speech that he is entirely wrong in every word.

[Bill read a second time]

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Respecting Innkeepers" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Respecting Innkeepers."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the object of this Bill is merely to bring the law in Newfoundland in conformance with the law in England. Under our law, an innkeeper cannot exercise any particular rights over the goods of guests who do not pay their board. Under our law there is a lien but there is no provision made for sale of these goods. All the hotels

¹¹ "Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines supported the Bill, and stated if the Opposition candidate had been elected he would likewise vote for it." *Evening Telegram*, April 21, 1933, p. 14.

throughout the country are in favour of this Bill. Provisions 1-4 provide for these particular requirements; 5 deals with registry of guests. This suggestion comes from the Police Department and [is] of value to the police and immigration authorities. There is no hardship entailed in making a guest sign his name in the register.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Law Respecting Innkeepers" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Judicature Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: This is a Bill which is entirely procedural. I sent a copy to my learned friend in advance, so that if there was any point which called for discussion he would be in a position to discuss it in the House to-day (*reads*).

This Act brings us into line with practically every other part of the Empire by providing that we can extend the privilege of re-sealing to any Empire Court. The request for this Bill comes from the British Government, which is endeavouring to have uniform laws in connection with its probates. Furthermore, there is a provision in Section 1 whereby probates can be dealt with here in a simplified form that come from a British Court in a foreign country. Take Constantinople or Shanghai, where there are English Courts or international courts; provision is made for the probates and administration to be accepted. It is entirely procedural; it is desirable to have uniformity of laws throughout the Empire. I have referred the Bill to the Judges of the Supreme Court and the Registrar, and they agree that it is desirable to carry out the practice as it is suggested. You will find it in Canada, Australia, New Zealand. There are one or two of the minor colonies and protectorates

that have not passed, but speaking generally it is Empire-wide.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Judicature Act" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the 21st instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Friday, April 21, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Bradley, from Humber, re Coastal Service.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of the Humber District in connection with what I understand is the proposal of the Government to discontinue the Bay of Islands Steamship Service. The Bay of Islands Steamship Service has been operated for over 25 years to the great benefit of the people there, for it has been of inestimable value in the furtherance of their trade interests.

Bay of Islands is peculiarly situated in this respect. From the time you leave Cooks Brook on the south side until you get to Lark Harbour on the other extremity, there is no road, or where there is, it is utterly impassable. It is utterly impossible to transport goods or human beings along that strip, which is of a distance of about 20 miles. On the opposite shore you have various deep arms between which there is no connecting water. The people of that Bay are entirely dependent on water service for transport. This boat or one of a similar character has been operating for 25 years and is, so to speak, built into the trade of the people there. The service has become particularly important to the people of that section of the country during the past ten years; that is, since the coming into being of the paper industry at Corner Brook. To-day large quantities of all kinds of agricultural products are brought into Corner Brook by those people in first class fresh condition. And, Mr. Speaker, the agricultural production of that section of the country is rapidly increasing. That fact was fully in evidence when I visited there during last September.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that it may be said that these people can bring their goods up to Corner Brook by motor boat. But the distance is great, and the amounts that they have ready from time to time to be brought in are so small, that to send a motor boat 25 miles and back (which they would have to do, could they not avail themselves of the Steam Service), would be such an expensive operation for them that it would leave them with no margin of profit whatever when their goods would have arrived in the market; it would render it utterly impossible for them to make anything out of it whatever; so that it is absolutely essential that some sort of steam service should be kept there. I appeal to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, who has some knowledge of the matter and the locality to which I have referred, and to the gentleman who will in the course of a few days be Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to give this matter their utmost attention and see if they cannot decide to continue the service. I think that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs would be quite right in contending that the whole amount of the subsidy for that service should not be charged to his Department. I understand that the amount of the subsidy is \$250 per week. I know that mails can be carried around the Bay for much less than that, and it is improper that the Department of Posts and Telegraphs should be charged with the expense of Freight and Passenger Service. This subsidy should be charged to possibly the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or should be met by some trade and commerce vote in the Department of Finance and Customs.

Sir, I will say without any possibility of doubt that the Government is making a grave mistake in cutting this service.

The people of that vicinity have viewed with great alarm the possibilities of being deprived of this service, which has been in operation for the past 25 years, and which has become the heart of local trade in the Bay of Islands. I have been talking over this matter with the Board of Trade of Bay of Islands, and these men insist (and having talked to them I do not doubt their sincerity) that it will be disastrous to the trade of that locality if the Bay of Islands Steamship Service is discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates; and I hope and trust that it will be given sufficient consideration. And I may say that the people stand more in need of this service to-day than ever before.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled:

Statement of Newfoundland Public Debt.

Statement of Newfoundland Exchequer Account for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1932.

Hon. the Secretary of State tabled Report of the Operations of the Newfoundland Railway for the year ending June 30, 1932.

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

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Order be deferred, and that we take up the Address in Reply now.

Mr. Starkes took the floor and occupied the time of the House for over two hours.¹² He read from over 60 pages of typewritten manuscript and he read it fairly well for [*illegible*] time. The speech confined itself to a denunciation in bitterest terms of the Government. The language used at times was not very becoming, and His Honour the Speaker asked the Member for Green Bay to moderate it.

The speech stated that Mr. Starkes owed no thanks to the Government for being in the House, and that his victory in January last was a great source of satisfaction to him. He attributed the promises made by the Government [as] responsible for the Squires Government being swept from office. But a most terrible thing, he thought, was for the St. John's daily press to refer to his late leader as a master politician and nothing else, and for them to broadcast how he could not be trusted abroad. He felt Newfoundland got a bad start in 1931 with an indignation meeting at the Majestic Theatre and at which leading people in all walks of life were represented. He accused the present Government for getting ex-servicemen, teachers and others to fight against the cuts they got in salaries and pensions from the Squires Government. Regarding the Gander, he said that a

¹² From 3:30 to 5:45, according to a handwritten note in the transcript.

Government candidate campaigning in the vicinity of the Gander last year was appointing foremen, time-keepers, etc., for Gander operations and that they were told their appointments would not go into effect until after the election. [*Daily News*, April 22, 1933]

Hon. Mr. Browne: Who was it?

Hon. Secretary of State: Did they (promise to¹³) open any branch stores?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have no objection to a reasonable interruption, but this is going too far.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, no Member of this House is allowed to read a speech in this House.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I might have flung that same charge across this House on opening day, when the Address in Reply was moved and seconded, but I refrained through courtesy.

Mr. Starkes, continuing, read [*illegible*] of his late leader for putting through the loan dealing with the petroleum monopoly, and accused the present Prime Minister of taking the credit of getting the British Government to help us out in our financial difficulties. He said the pitprop-coal contract did not appeal to him because there was too much discrimination being used in the cutting of pitprops, and because it meant the destruction of our forest wealth. He was particularly [*illegible*] of the dole question and asked who received the greatest benefit from the dole?¹⁴

Hon. Secretary of State: Why don't you tell us who did?

Mr. Starkes then referred to the prosecutions caused through the dole, and thought that the legal fees, police expenses, etc., were too costly. Dealing with the Salt Codfish Act, he believed Sir William Coaker's was the greatest one of all. American affairs and the gold standard were next dealt with in millions and billions, and Mr. Starkes said that as our circumstances here are somewhat similar to what they are in the United States, that our Premier should emulate President Roosevelt and take his lead.¹⁵

¹³ *Daily News*, April 22, 1933, p. 5.

¹⁴ "At this stage of his speech His Honour the Speaker asked the Member for Green Bay to modify his expressions." *Evening Telegram*, April 22, 1933, p. 9.

¹⁵ "Mr. Starkes ... deplored the coal-pitprop agreement and referred to the political claims of the parties at the last general election. He reviewed the economic situation ... He disputed figures given out by the Government ... and claimed the late Government should be given the credit for most of these reductions [in expenditure]. He admitted the dole question was a problem ... He ... claimed [that the dole allowance] varied according to districts and families in the same districts, and asserted that dole prosecutions were dole persecutions ..." *Evening Telegram*, April 22, 1933.

Further debate on the motion was deferred until next sitting. [*Daily News*, April 22, 1933]

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Labour."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, my view is that the Bill is entirely inadequate. If it goes into operation in its present form, the Department will be nothing more than a casual arbitration tribunal where it is permitted for both parties to arbitrate, and I therefore move as an amendment the following, whereby logging, mining, and sealing operations as well as the tabulating of statistics in other directions, would come within the purview of this Department.

My desire, Sir, is to be helpful. I am entirely in accord with the idea of a Labour Department, but I want to put as many sound teeth in the Bill [as possible and] to have the Department function with as much power as possible. I realize that the experiment is a new one and that new ground has got to be broken; but at the same time the Department must have some power. The proposed new head, Mr. Brown, has displayed his ability in labour disputes in Grand Falls, in the Western provinces of Canada and in other parts of the world. He ought to have some knowledge of labouring conditions in this country too, and I merely want to give him some power whereby he can give the benefit of the knowledge he has gained in other parts of the world in the interests of the working classes of people throughout this country, and for that reason I am moving this amendment, which is an addition to the Bill itself.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, although the honourable gentleman has not done me the courtesy of handing me a copy of his proposed amendment, I am afraid that it is calculated to defeat the very object in view, and it would certainly tend to overburden the Department in its infancy. I quite agree that the additional section he has proposed would be very useful and very desirable, in order to give as much control and as much authority as possible to the Minister of Labour. But I think it would be advisable to withhold the amendment for one year, or at least, until the Department has established itself, because, if it has to be called upon to carry out anything like the amendment suggested by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, it would mean the creation of as large a Department, perhaps, as there is in the civil service. Now, I may say, that all those subsidiary branches of labour referred to in the amendment, have been taken care of in a more or less degree, even without any great flourish of trumpets, by the Government. For instance, take the Statistical Department at the Customs, where there is a competent official engaged for ascertaining the cost of living, without any additional expense to the Department. Then again, it is very interesting to me when I find so many reliable people disagree as to what the earning power of the people of this country is. In fact, some of my colleagues in the Government were wondering what was the correct

way of ascertaining the national earning power of our people. The Hon. Minister of Justice and myself, while at Ottawa, were very fortunate in making friends with some very prominent Canadian officials, experts in their line, who promised to give us the benefit of their knowledge at any time upon request. I wrote the head of the Statistical Department at Ottawa some time ago with a view to getting the formula with regard to the cost of living and the earning power of our people, and I got a reply that within a couple of weeks I will be in receipt of all the necessary forms of ascertaining that information.

So far as exercising supervision over sealing operations is concerned, I may say that matter is already in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The same applies to inspection of boilers and machinery. If we would take away part of the work of the present staff of the Marine and Fisheries Department, it would mean an increased expense to the country, and, altogether, I feel that, generally speaking, the honourable gentleman opposite will agree with me that it will be much better all round to allow the present Bill to stand as it is for one year until the Department has established itself, and next year I will be only too glad to consider inserting the necessary teeth that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition thinks the Bill requires. We have an arbitrator on the spot all the time to go out and adjust grievances and disputes respecting labour matters. As inferentially remarked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the Government displayed very great wisdom in appointing a man of such ripe experience at the head of the Labour Department as Mr. Brown. As is well known, he enjoys the confidence of labouring people and capitalists alike, and will be a tower of strength and a power for good towards bringing capitalist and labourer together.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It is the work of [the] Minister to investigate into the running of all types of machinery and see that dangerous machinery is properly guarded. In short, it is [his] work to care for generally the conditions of the working man of this country. It is his duty to examine into the living conditions of the labouring man, to find out whether his housing conditions are tolerable, to see that he is not being charged excessive rent and to see how he is being dealt with by his landlord. He should be sure that an improper use of existing legislation is not being made by the landlords of this country, and if there is, he should be ready to bring in legislation to determine such abuse of the laws of the country. All that is work for the Department of Labour, and its performance should, properly speaking, be executed by the Minister of that Department. In general, the Minister is supposed to look after the labouring man of this country, and for that reason I have suggested that sub-section (5) in particular ought to be introduced into the Bill.

Then there is the regulation and operation of mines. I want the Minister of Labour to go down into the mines himself and see how they are operated. The Minister ought to be prepared to do that. And I know that if the gentleman who is to be Minister of Labour in a few days is given the power to do that, he will not shrink from it, because I know the man. Then if he should notice any room for improvement in the operation of the mines, if he should find that dangerous machinery is not properly guarded, he should be ready to state what in his judgement ought to be done. If that is not sufficient he should be ready to bring into the House next year a Bill to remedy any evils that he may find. I want to give him the power to do this now, so that he may be ready next year to bring in the proper legislation.

The same thing applies in the employment of men around dangerous machinery in any trade,

for instance in the pulp and paper industry. I want to give the Minister power now to go and investigate into these things, so that he can come into this House next year and have the legislation passed necessary to protect these men.

The same thing applies to the sealfishery. I gave a few days ago in this House an instance of where the men going to the sealfishery were being improperly treated. I want the Minister of Labour to investigate into this matter and ascertain the truth of the statement, and have a Bill ready next year to give fair play to these sealers. I want to give him the power now. So far as the sections relating to statistics are concerned, I am quite willing to drop these in the light of the facts which have been revealed to me; but the 4th section of the Bill ought to be added to by the inclusion of sub-section (5) (*reads*). All these matters belong to the Department of Labour, industrial operations and the conditions under which the labouring men work.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: Why were you not interested in these things four years ago?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Have you always done everything you ought to have done since your existence in this world?

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: I have always tried.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Then all I can say for you is that you have made a very poor attempt. These are my views upon the matter, Mr. Speaker, and I invite the Prime Minister to accept them. I think that sub-section (5) ought to be introduced into the Bill in its entirety. I will withdraw sub-sections (6) and (7) in view of the facts that have been laid before me.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The question of abuses in the seal fishery more properly belongs to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. We have the Minister of Marine and Fisheries looking after that. We don't want to overwhelm the Department of Labour, or spend more money than we can help. We have all these matters under supervision. I have some knowledge about factory inspection and boiler inspection. We are going to look into these matters and give them a thorough shaking up.

Mr. Robinson is much more competent to go down into the mines and investigate matters there. He is a younger man than Mr. Hall, and is much more competent to do that sort of work. The matters contained in the amendments ought not to be brought forward at the present time. We are not ready yet to deal with them on such a large scale, and we cannot afford to spend much money. Of course, if the honorable gentleman wishes he may press the amendment, but I shall have to say that we cannot accept it. We want to give the Department a start first and see how many responsibilities it can take over. Later we may be prepared to pass over much more work to this Department, but all that I can intimate now is that we are unable to accept the amendment at the present time. On [an]other matter. Sub-section (4) of Section 3 gives very wide powers there (*reads*). That's even wider than the scope of the amendment which the Hon. [Member] wishes to introduce.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Wider, and considerably more indefinite.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I can only repeat that at the present time we are unable to accept the amendment. When the Bill was drafted the idea behind this section was that as soon as the Department was ready for more work, it could take it under this section.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for adoption of the Report, Mr. Bradley moved and Mr. Starkes seconded the following amendment:

(5) To have charge of the administration of the laws relating to

(a) The regulation and operation of mines.

(b) Logging and the employment and remuneration of loggers, drivers, and others employed therein.

(c) The inspection of boilers and machinery and the regulation of the use and operation thereof.

(d) The laws relating to the sealfishery, and the employment and remuneration of those employed therein.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favour of the amendment: Mr. Bradley, Mr. Starkes; and against it: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Fisheries, Hon. H. Mitchell, Hon. W. Browne, Hon. H. Winter, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Moore, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Whiteley, Mr. Halley, Mr. Gray, Mr. Earle; so it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

The Report was then adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Labour" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would suggest that perhaps it would be well in view of the time to let this order stand deferred.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 in Relation to the Acceptance of Offices of Emolument under the Crown by Certain Members of the House of Assembly."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would like to point out to the House before the vote is taken that you are setting up there as a fact some thing that is not a fact (*reads*).

I submit that there is no Member for these Districts, and that the Section is very improperly worded. These seats are in reality vacant ...

Hon. Minister of Justice: Under what Act?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The Disabilities Act.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Oh no, that merely imposes a penalty but does not make them vacate their seats.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: (*reads section*). Messrs. Brown and Stone accepted office last year, and according to the Act they are not now Members of this House.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Before we went to the country everyone knew we were going to divide the two Departments of Lands and Fisheries, and that we were going to create a Labour Department, and everyone knew that Mr. Brown and Mr. Stone were going to be the Ministers. It was

tantamount to be confirmed by this House.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am not interested in what the Prime Minister said last Spring; perhaps he should not have said as much as he did, but I would like to point out that your attitude has changed considerably since last year. You raised your hands in holy horror because of the fact that there were certain members of the Government who were accepting emoluments from the Crown, and yet were occupying seats in this House. Now I am not defending this, but now you want to come in here and introduce this Bill which has the effect of taking away from the electors their franchise as electors. These seats are vacant. There are no Members at the present time for the Districts of Trinity North and Grand Falls. Messrs. Brown and Stone are private citizens under the Disabilities Act. You are coming in here now and trying to take the place of the electors. Why not re-contest these seats and give the people a chance to sanction them? As far as the Bill is concerned it is a misstatement of facts.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is somewhat wrong. That there should be some slight amendment whereby it would read that Messrs. Brown and Stone were members-elect I will admit, but apart from that we are doing what should have been done when the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was solicitor for the Railway. We come in here and say that it is necessary that an Act of Parliament should be passed to legalize what we have done. We come out with it openly. Now, the Leader of the Opposition takes two positions that are directly contradictory. In the first place if they are not Members, how can they vacate their seats? They are Members-elect, and until they are sworn in they cannot be called Members.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If you will [look] into your English law, you will find that swearing-in is not necessary.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Was the Hon. Leader a Member before the Proclamation and before he was sworn in? You are not entitled to a seat until you have taken the oath. I remember an incident that occurred some 20 years ago, when Messrs. Morison and Morine came into this House without being sworn in to challenge the validity of the election, and they were expelled by the Speaker. The Act of 1888, I think, makes it clear that until the new Parliament is elected the Speaker is the same, so that until Mr. Winter was elected Speaker, Mr. Walsh was the Speaker.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Are you going to give him his salary?

Hon. Minister of Justice: I think he has already drawn it many times over. However, I would suggest that the word "elect" be inserted there. I think it will cover the point raised.¹⁶

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am still of the opinion that my view is correct. I merely wanted to point out the position as I saw it. Having done that, my powers are at an end.

¹⁶ "The Minister then moved as an amendment that the word 'elect' be added to 'member' in both cases referred to." *Daily News*, April 22, 1933, p. 5.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the same with some amendment.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn, a matter has been drawn to my attention which I would like to draw to the attention of this House, and to the attention of the Prime Minister. It concerns the setting of salmon nets in that section of the District of St. John's East in and around Bauline. It appears that for some seven years the fishermen of Bauline have been occupying four or five salmon berths from Gull Rock to Bradbury's Point, with only two exceptions to the occupancy of these berths (*reads*). A meeting was held at Bauline last night, and they are very anxious that the matter be straightened out. I understand that the Fisheries Board admits taking these berths from these men under a misapprehension, and in point of actual fact the Bauline men should have the berths. These nets are not placed before the 25th April, and there is still time to return [them to] these men to whom they morally belong. I realize of course that no one is given the preference over any part of the coast, but I would like to draw this matter to the attention of the Prime Minister, as I understand that these berths are some five miles from Portugal Cove and are quite handy to Bauline. After explaining these facts, I think every Member will agree with me that these men have been badly used, and I would suggest to the Prime Minister, and to the Minister of Justice who represents the constituency, that justice be done these men. This information has just been handed me at five o'clock and I just give a precis of the matter. I would be glad if you would take up the matter and do justice to these men.¹⁷

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Yes, certainly.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday, the 25th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

¹⁷ "... Mr. Bradley asked consideration for the people of Bauline who objected to the fishermen of Portugal Cove setting salmon nets in five berths in their locality." *Evening Telegram*, April 22, 1933.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday, April 25, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Shea from Cappahayden re Fishery Rules.

Hon. Mr. Browne, from Bell Island, re Keeping of Dogs at Bell Island.

Mr. Shea: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Cappahayden. The petition reads as follows: (*reads*).

I might add that this petition is signed, with the exception of three or four, by everybody in Cappahayden. I presented a petition last week from the people of Renew's asking to define the waters of Renew's. At the present time they want the waters discerned from each other. In other words if this petition goes through it means it will be exactly the same as the old law stood. The only point is that the people of Renew's and Cappahayden want the waters discerned distinctly from each other. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in presenting this petition from the people of Cappahayden.

Hon. Mr. Browne: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Bell Island in the District of Harbour Main on the subject of keeping dogs. The petitioners, who are very numerous, allege that the practice of keeping dogs is injurious to sheep-keepers. The prayer of this petition is not unanimously signed by the residents, as I have a counter-petition signed by quite a number of people who pray that the other petition be not granted. Every year there is an Act with regard to the keeping of dogs, and this year is no exception. I do not know exactly to which department this petition relates, but I am sure that the Clerk is very conversant with such petitions and will direct it to the right department. I beg that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Furey: I beg to ask that both petitions be held over until I have had an opportunity of discussing the matter with my colleague.

Hon. Mr. Browne: I think the best way would be to receive them, and then the Department would confer with the representatives, if necessary.

Mr. Starks gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Certain Mineral Claims on the Labrador."

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging.'"

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Acceptance of Offices of Emolument under the Crown by Certain Members of the Present House of Assembly" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 in Relation to Taxation of Accident and Other Insurance Companies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, I might say that I have asked to have it deferred for a short period to give an opportunity of conferring with some parties interested as to whether this tax should be direct or on a percentage basis. The most equitable way decided upon is to collect a specific tax of \$50 per year, and all Companies incorporated now will be brought within the scope of the Act.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to Taxation of Accident and Other Insurance Companies" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Further to Amend The Tourist Commission Act, 1927."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: When this Act was introduced, I explained that it was a four-year term; I was wrong, it provides a two-year term. In 1927 when the Tourist Commission was established first, the term was two years. In 1930, that term was altered and a one-year term made. Now, the Tourist

Commission appointed in July last, reappointed in January, thought they could do very much better if they had a two-year term instead of a term from year to year. [It] was very embarrassing to them if they started a policy one year, if they would not be in a position to carry it out the next year [*illegible*]. The Government agreed with the Tourist Commission, and this Bill is the result of the agreement, the House to enact the necessary legislation, whereby (*reads*).¹⁸

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend The Tourist Commission Act, 1927" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to an Election in the District of Port de Grave in the Present Year."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 18 George V., entitled 'An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend

¹⁸ "This Bill extends the term of the present Commission from one year to two years and six months and each succeeding Commission two years in office." *Evening Telegram*, April 26, 1933, p. 10.

the Act 18 George V., entitled 'An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: As I have informed my honourable friend, this is a purely technical amendment to the Labrador Act of 1927. In that Act, reference was made to Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled [*omission*].

Chapter 129 was repealed and a new Crown Lands Act was introduced, I think, in 1930. It is desirable that the amendment which we now propose should go into effect, making reference to the Crown Lands Act at any time in force. I think my honourable friend is familiar with the position. The Crown Lands Act has no significance except purely technical.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Surely when the question of verbiage only is concerned, there is no reason why the Bill should not go right through.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 18 George V., entitled 'An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (1916) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (1916) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I would wish to intimate that no question of policy is involved with this Bill. At the present time, it is possible for the witnesses to a deed to appear and swear to the signature, but there is no provision whereby the parties may be compelled to come and acknowledge the signature. This defect was noticed a short time ago when the point arose in a case tried before Mr. Justice Kent. It was then that the defect in the present Act was first noticed, and this amendment is introduced to remedy the fault.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the amendment; I wish to say that it is one that ought to be made, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes (1916) entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Of the Recovery of the possession of tenements in certain cases. Second reading deferred.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Agricultural Societies" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, there is no legislation in force at the present time for the formation of agricultural societies, and no provision which would give them a legal status. Because of the tremendous importance of developing agriculture in Newfoundland, and of getting our people interested in such a policy, I think it is desirable to have legislation which will provide for the promotion of such societies. A copy of the Act under discussion has been placed in the hands of the Leader of the Opposition. There is no contentious matter involved. It merely gives authority for the proper organization of agricultural societies through the various parts of the country where it is desirable to have them in operation. As far back as 1892, the first legislation for the formation of agricultural societies was introduced into this House. At that time a Board of Agriculture was formed composed of the following (*reads names of members*). This Board held office until 1898, at which time they went out of office. Then another Board was appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. Duder, who held the position of Surveyor General, which is now known as

the Ministry of Agriculture and Mines. Mr. Frank H. Simms acted as Secretary, and the only [person] drawing an emolument from the Crown for his work on this Board in those days was the Secretary, who was paid a small salary. As far as my knowledge goes, Mr. Simms is now farming up in Burin District. The present Clerk of the House, Mr. Mott, was also a member of that Board (*reads the names of the remaining members*). This Board ceased to function in 1901. At that time a new Board was formed under the chairmanship of Mr. Clift. Mr. Clift had as his Secretary Mr. Slater. This Board was succeeded on the assumption of Lord Morris to power in 1910 by a new commission under Mr. Blandford. He had with him (*reads names of members*). These three gentlemen were the commissioners in the first Morris administration. In 1919 Dr. Campbell assumed the management of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and a new Board was formed. Mr. Bayley, who has recently retired, was appointed Secretary of Agriculture and three Commissioners of Agriculture were appointed, among whom was a Mr. Winsor who formerly represented Bonavista North. The other two were a Mr. Simpson and a Mr. LeGrow. In 1924 when Mr. Monroe took office, I was appointed as Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and I decided that we were not getting sufficient returns in comparison with the amount of money we were spending, and since this was the case, we decided to abolish that office. Consequently, from 1924 to 1928 there was no Commission, but Mr. Bayley remained as Secretary of Agriculture and he had as such very responsible and very arduous duties to attend to.

There will be some hope that we are going to put agriculture on a more firm foundation, than it has been. In years past all has not been done that might have been done for the encouragement of agriculture, and I don't want to put any blame on any particular administration who has passed out of office. I am prepared to take my full share of just criticism for not having done with agriculture what should have been done. I think at the present time it is great sign of the times when one sees the class of men who are giving freely of time and talent for the purpose of trying to encourage this very important branch of our industry. The Bill before the House is absolutely non-contentious. I don't think it is desirable that I should take up any of the time of the Committee. In the first place, I regret that I am not able to deal with agriculture as I would like. I am not an agriculturist. I am satisfied that with the gentlemen whom we now have in charge; I am glad to endorse what was said a few days ago by the Leader of the Opposition; we have a gentleman in charge of the office and I have full confidence in him; he is well-qualified, energetic, young, without in any way disparaging the work of Mr. Bayley, who was a good servant, but he is now growing old and is not able to undergo the hardships that a man must undergo to get around the country. Mr. Butler is young and he has a free hand; he is in no way hampered by any politician. I myself am not in any way going to interfere with Mr. Butler in the carrying out of the work. I want to say that I am not going to tolerate any political interference from anybody from the Prime Minister down. I don't anticipate that I am going to get any, but I want to serve notice now that no person is going to influence me. When I held office before, I don't think I discriminated against any district, whether it was represented by a Member of the Government or a Member of the Opposition. I am going to carry out the same programme now. There is going to be no political interference. The onus is on Mr. Butler.

It is a difficult thing to get money to buy the wherewithal to try to get people to get back to the land. I may say great encouragement is being given in the development of agriculture, that the Land Development Association and all the clergy throughout the country of every denomination are

giving their support to this effort. We are finding sufficient money to be able to supply the requirements in seed potatoes for the coming spring, but as to the distribution of the seed potatoes, I want to officially say that it is not the intention of the Government to hand out barrels of seed potatoes to people who have no intention of putting them in the ground. Returns must be made, for the Treasury can't afford to make distributions of \$50,000 or \$60,000, and I think the people themselves are beginning to realize. We have to make up our minds that anything required in that nature must be paid for. I think with the cooperation of the people I have referred to, if we don't get the cash in the autumn we are going to get full returns. I would take this opportunity to ask the cooperation of the individual members of the House to get in touch with their constituents and organizations that will be formed, and point out how absolutely essential it is going to be to have sufficient seed from this high grade stock stored away in their cellars, so that when the spring of 1934 comes around they won't be placed in the position that they have no seed to put in the ground, and the Government have no money to buy seed with.

We are going through a trying time for everybody. I sometimes wonder whether our Prime Minister will be able to keep up against the terrific strain that he must be suffering. I am sure he has the sympathy of everyone in this House, irrespective of party politics. I have been a long time in this House. I have been watching the various men; I have been watching myself as I have moved my chair from one side to the other as the people wished. I spent some years on this side with the Government; a number of years on the other side as opposition; only as I am becoming old I sit down in my seat and ask, "Where are the men who were here in 1913?" There is not one man in this House this evening who was here in 1913. Neither is there a man holding a seat this afternoon who had a seat in 1919. Most of them have passed away beyond the reach of party politics. I often question myself the wisdom for the short period we have, whether we play fair by the country or fair by ourselves. I sympathize with the gentlemen sitting in opposition, they are expected to come in and criticize, but I do hope and I feel that the present Leader of the Opposition has ambition; it is natural that he would; he has ability; there is no question about that. It is natural that he has ambition. It is only reasonable that he avail of every opportunity he gets to build up his political career. I do feel the gentleman will not do anything to endanger the prosperity that is around the corner. It is only by working together, forgetting for the time being, at least when dealing with matters of national importance, we should co-operate and I believe we will cooperate. The Bill, as I said before, is non-contentious; Section 1 deals with (*reads*).

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct a statement I made. I made a statement that there was not a gentleman here this evening who was here in 1919. The Secretary of State drew my attention to the fact that the Hon. S. J. Foote held his seat in 1919. Captain Winsor was here in 1913; Captain Winsor did not come back from 1919 to 1924; I was in, but the Captain was not in.

I have much pleasure in moving the second reading.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I must, in courtesy, acknowledge at the outset the very kind if perhaps unwarranted prediction of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines with reference to my own future, but I can agree with the principle of this Bill. It is an effort at the self-help which was referred to by the Prime Minister, I think on opening day. That principle, so far as it concerns the individual in this country to-day, has been attempted by past governments. It really involves the idea of decentralization, and that is a crying need in Newfoundland to-day and for many years past.

There has been throughout the country for a number of years an idea in the minds of the people that where anything was short, where anything has to be done, where any action must be taken to improve anything in particular, it is the government's duty to do it. That principle, in all probability, has in part been the cause of many of the expenditures in Newfoundland which ought, if it could have been so, have been avoided. Now this, as I say, is an effort at self-help. It affords an opportunity to persons with some interest in agriculture in the various communities in the different districts throughout the country to organize themselves, to take an active part in the furtherance of agriculture in their own particular section, and I feel that if these men can be formed into agricultural societies as suggested by this Bill and can be induced sufficiently to make a start, the idea will carry itself on.

Now, I am very pleased indeed to learn from the Minister that he does not intend to permit party politics to enter into the administration of agricultural matters. I believe that to be true, because I have had experience with the Hon. Minister in years gone by, while I was sitting on this side of the House and he was sitting in the Department where he now sits. I have to testify that although in Opposition, I was also given the utmost consideration by the Minister, Mr. Walsh. I am satisfied when he says that we on this side of the House, so far as our Districts are concerned, will receive the same consideration as those Districts which are represented by Members on the other side, that he is telling the unquestionable truth. Before I sit down, there is just one matter which I would like, if possible, to draw to the attention of the Minister. It is a matter that I was discussing with Mr. Butler, the Secretary of Agriculture, a few days ago. It is this: Mr. Butler gave me to understand that a certain quantity of seed potatoes was being ordered, and that the funds at his disposal prevented him from getting any more if needed. The quantity that he mentioned to me was, in my opinion, insufficient for the needs of the country to-day. I want to assure the Minister, if he can induce the Government to increase the grant to increase the amount of seed potatoes by 50 per cent, his efforts will have whatever support I can put behind it.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I would like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and Mines for the way in which he has introduced this Bill; also the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for his conciliatory words, and his desire to cooperate with us in our efforts to rehabilitate, insofar as lies within our power, the people of this country. Our people cannot get off the dole unless we supply them with the wherewithal to get off the dole. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite right when he says that the amount of potatoes will not nearly supply the demand, because if we do as was our intention to do, tell the people, "Here is sufficient potatoes; you require them to carry through the winter," so far as potatoes are concerned, if they don't grow them we are going to tell them we won't help them.

We are setting our backs to the wall to face the inevitable, and get back to self-help. The Minister may have stated we have purchased 17,000 barrels; it will take 40,000 barrels to supply the needs of this country,¹⁹ and I am in hopes we will get that amount of seed. I believe we are going to have a good crop without the likelihood of the destruction that occurred last year. I feel that with this Bill

¹⁹ "The amount of seed potatoes ordered is \$17,000. Really \$40,000 worth is needed." *Evening Telegram*, April 26, 1933, p. 10.

we are making a starting point for getting our people on the self-supporting basis so far as agriculture is concerned. I believe our Fishery Bill, when it comes into the House, will be recognised in the same way by the Hon. Members on the other side of the House; it is another starting point. We must, we cannot hope any longer to live to support the people of this country, and I am quite free to admit that it can scarcely be termed support. It is nothing more than a mere existence, so that this Bill that relates to agriculture is the starting point so far as getting people to produce vegetables for themselves. Our Salt Codfish Act should help the fishermen. I know they will receive a better price, because the rate of exchange will help to get a better price for this summer's catch. I honestly believe that we are well around the corner. Only to-day I got some particulars as to the method by means of which Western farmers get their seed wheat. I am only wondering if we cannot apply the same principle towards obtaining salt for our fishery along the same basis. If we can it will be a great help. I am not going to say any more, but I am sure that the Government appreciates the good work this Department is doing; the good work Mr. Butler is doing in his Department in the agricultural end. It is our purpose that no politics will enter into the distribution of seed potatoes. I think we are going to distribute them through another agency altogether; if we can do this there is not the slightest chance of political consideration being given to the distribution of seed potatoes this spring.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Postal Telegraphs Act" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Postal Telegraphs Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Posts: This is for the purpose of a reduction in postage that was made some months ago. As you are aware, last year the postage rates were advanced all over the country, and we found that by the advanced postage in the City of St. John's, the Department lost around \$15,000 per year through that means, but in the outports, Sir, they gained practically \$25,000. The Government deemed it necessary to reduce the rates in the City of St. John's and in the settlements around the country to try and get back a part of that revenue that we have lost through the increase. Large companies like the Light and Power Co., telephone companies and rent collections, butterine factories and so forth, when the postage was raised from 2 to 3 cents, instead of posting their letters, they ordered messengers to carry around their letters and they found it very much cheaper, so the rate in St. John's and all towns including the town itself, is reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents. Letters foreign, United States, the same fee, 5 cents for the first ounce and 3 on every additional ounce; Canada the same; post cards local 2 cents, formerly 1 [cent]; Dominion 2 cents; foreign 3 cents.

Section 7 extends the members' franking privilege to all year round instead of during the

Session only. Mr. Speaker, I did not recommend to the Government for the franking of letters because I was getting a benefit from it myself. All my letters are franked anyway, but I did think it was unfair to the outport Members of this country, and also some in the City of St. John's, to pay postage on the thousands of letters they receive from their constituents year in and year out. I have been in this House of Assembly, sometimes in and sometimes out, since 1904, and I know what it is if you answer your constituents' letters; I know what it will cost you during twelve months, but since I came here in 1904 the burden of taxation on the Members of the outports of this country has increased 10 per cent. I remember, Sir, very distinctly, when I came to this House first that one would get on an average of two letters from each settlement. There were generally two or three [persons] in each settlement that would manage all local affairs, and these were the only two that you would hear from, but to-day at least 98 per cent of all the constituents write you, therefore if you are a good representative you have to answer, and it entails an enormous amount of expense on Members in answering these letters. Therefore I make a recommendation to the Government to extend to Members that franking privilege. I would like to ask all Members of the House of Assembly not to take advantage of that franking. My recommendation to the Government is that we allow Members to frank letters in connection with their public business and so forth; their own private letters that they have to write, I hope they will not take advantage to frank these as well as those in connection with their constituents. I feel sure that with the class of man in the House to-day, both on the Government side and on the Opposition, that they will certainly see that their own business letters are stamped in the regular way, because I am sure that you feel as well as I do, that the Post Office needs every cent we can possibly get to carry on the work.

Section 3 regarding newspapers: reduced from \$1 per 100 lbs. to 60 cents. I found, after being in the Post Office, that not only the papers printed in this country take advantage of the high rate on papers and periodicals, but foreigners do as well. As soon as the extra postage was put on, the newspapers reduced their papers considerably in weight in this country, and so did the foreign paper and periodical man. Personally I think we lost out, and in consultation with some of the paper printers of this country I figured that the outport people were not getting the papers that they should get. As you know, Sir, the younger generation of the outport to-day are far better educated than their fathers, and they read the papers much more than a good many of the old folks used to do in my father's day, and I may say in my boyhood days. I am glad to see that some newspaper people have reduced the price for their papers in the outports. I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that we will lose any money whatever on the reduction we have made on the stamp business and also on the newspaper business. With your permission, Sir, I would move the second reading.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill

entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Forest Fires Act" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is introduced for the purpose of consolidating various other Acts now on the Statute book concerning Forest Fires. I would like to point out that in Section 4 of the Bill, it makes it compulsory for persons who want to acquire Crown lands for agriculture or other purposes to secure a permit or some authority before they can start on Crown lands, fearing they would menace any particular settlement. Last year we had a case occurred, and it was only through an act of Providence that the city was not threatened by fire. A certain gentleman purchased a farm when the fire hazard was at its height. The forest caught fire in the vicinity of the Sanatorium, Topsail Road, and the members of the Constabulary Department and the Forest Fire officers were called there. If the wind had kept up as it was blowing a conflagration might have occurred, but fortunately the wind altered to another direction and that saved the situation. In former days thousands of dollars was spent in the putting out of fires; to-day there is no such money allotted for that purpose. I remember we used [to] spend as high as \$30,000 over and above the regular grant in that direction. Last year the total expenditure did not exceed \$500, outside of what was spent by the organization at Grand Falls, for the quenching of forest fires. Under the present Act people under 18 years and not over 70, are compelled to go and assist in any settlement, without remuneration, for the subduing and extinguishing of fire.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 22 George V. (First Session) Cap. 11, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Hotel" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister moving the second reading of Bill respecting the Newfoundland Hotel, stated that it will be managed by a Board of Directors with the Controller of the Treasury exercising supervision over the expenditure. The hotel, in his opinion was a very necessary building, and he looked upon it as a public utility as it brought prominent people here from different parts of the world who otherwise would not have come. He was agreeably surprised to hear from people best qualified to judge, that they never saw a better laid-out hotel for the comfort of its guests on any side of the Atlantic.

Although losing from \$500 to \$1,000 per month during the dull season, he felt confident that if at all possible the Board of Directors, under the chairmanship of F. McNamara, will make it a paying proposition. One particular request they made was to have an outside opinion as to the best way it could be managed. The Government applied to the International Power and Paper Company

for a man and they sent Mr. Wharton,²⁰ without charge, who confirmed the policy of the present management in a great many instances. [*Daily News*, April 26, 1933]

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 26th, instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

²⁰ Manager of the Glynmill Inn, Corner Brook. *Evening Telegram*, April 26, 1933.

Wednesday, April 26, 1933

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 Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Certain Mineral Claims on the Labrador" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to an Election in the District of Port de Grave in the Present Year" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Postal Telegraphs Act" was recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House.

Whereupon, 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 Postal Telegraphs Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Postal Telegraphs Act" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to

Agricultural Societies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Dr. Mosdell: Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few remarks at this stage, and my reason for speaking is in relation to the duties of the agricultural societies. I welcome the introduction of this measure, because I do not think there is any question at all but that it is a step in the right direction. A great many of the economic evils from which Newfoundland and its people are suffering to-day is due in no small way to the lack of interest displayed in agriculture. I take it that the intention of this Bill is to encourage people to do more for themselves than they have done for many years past, and it has occurred to me that the Bill will be further strengthened by offering some inducement by way of special privilege to people in the various districts throughout the country to form themselves into agricultural societies. I think it was in 1911 or 1912 that legislation was enforced along the lines of the present measure, and the result was a tremendous increase for agriculture in particular and for the people and the whole country in general.

The development of agriculture will have a consequent beneficial effect upon the well-being of our people. If the Hon. Members will think back to the days when the fishery paid very little better than it does to-day, they will remember that the condition of our people was far advanced over present conditions. There was no such condition of semi-starvation, as appears to exist throughout Newfoundland to-day. The explanation is that the people were more self-respecting, and if we can get back to conditions where we will be producing more, we will by that means have made tremendous strides forward in the condition of the country and of the people generally.

To give you an idea of how far we have retrogressed from conditions as they were 20 years ago, I wish to point out that two years ago there was a survey made by the Department of Public Health of the Districts from Placentia Bay to and including St. George's. A survey was also made starting in the District of Lewisporte. The doctor making the survey was instructed to examine into the economic conditions of the people along the coast, also the interrelation of the same with regard to public health, and as to what was the effect of the neglect of agriculture. He remarks about one place in Fortune Bay where in 1912, when agricultural societies were active, 1,600 barrels of potatoes were raised. The year of the report less than 300 were produced. That is a step very much in the wrong direction, and any measure that can ensure the formation of societies that will assist the people to produce a greater quantity of agricultural produce and raise a greater number of cattle is a step in the right direction. I wonder if the honourable introducer of this Bill can bring a section into the Bill offering inducements to those people who are engaged in agriculture to become members of those societies, and have as many as possible of the people of Newfoundland joining up in their ranks? I congratulate the Minister who has introduced this Bill, and the Government which has inspired such a body of men as the Land Development Association to engage in such an undertaking and to get the people to show an interest in agriculture. There has been a marvellous amount of work done with practically no capital, and as a result of the activities of the Land Development Association, there has been a great deal done to induce the people to put much more land than formerly under cultivation, and as a result of the agricultural movement, public health and [the]

economic conditions of the people have much improved.

The Report, however, of the Health Officer, reveals a condition of affairs on the coast of our island that is to say the least shocking. He reported general conditions of malnutrition under which the young and old were being rapidly destroyed. As far as their health was concerned, the adults were suffering from beri-beri which causes physical weakness and the loss of the use of the limbs. In the children, the results of malnutrition were to be observed as rickets and scurvy. All of them, all of these diseases are absolutely preventable by making more use of agriculture. If the Government, or any government, of itself or through Land Development Association, can inspire the people to make an effort to improve those conditions to which I referred, to get to work to recover their independence and self-respect, then that government will have performed one of the greatest things ever undertaken or put through in Newfoundland. Because I feel that it is absolutely necessary that our experiment should start under the best possible auspices, that it should have every chance, that we should not be taking the least chance of its failing, that I ask that everything be done to strengthen the Bill and to bring the people into line with its provisions. If the Bill is not effective the experiment is going to fail, and the condition of the country is going to be far worse than it is at present. Therefore I ask that the government and the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Bill take under consideration the suggestions I make, that inducements be offered to secure the people's interest in the agricultural societies proposed to be set up and given a legal status.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Has the honourable gentleman any suggestion to make there so as we might induce more of our people to join up in those agricultural societies?

Dr. Mosdell: I am afraid I cannot make a suggestion offhand now. It is better for the Government to take cognisance of any suggestion I shall have to make as I proceed. As this Bill stands now, the societies proposed to be set up under it don't have to be branches of the Land Development Association. We should not have societies all over the country without a central body to which to refer. It is desirable to avoid the confusion that might result. I don't want to delay the Bill unnecessarily. My anxiety is to have it passed under auspices that will make it nearly as possible a certain success.

We have in the country in existence to-day associations under three separate auspices. We have those under the Department of Agriculture and Mines. We have independent organizations in Conception Bay. Then there is the Land Development Association. As far as these societies set up under the Bill are concerned, they may or may not be connected with the Department of Agriculture and Mines. Is it not worthwhile to put the societies into line with a central organization? This could be achieved by a provision making it clear that if any society promoted for the advancement of agriculture wanted to get any privileges and get as a result the benefits accruing from the central organization, that branch would have to be linked up with that central organization.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Will there be any connection between the Committee through which the Department of Agriculture and Mines will distribute seeds this spring, and the societies formed under this Act? It suggests itself to me that it might be worth while to utilize these societies in connection with this distribution scheme.

Hon. Mr. Browne: Perhaps I might be allowed to intervene at this point to explain the purpose of this Act. It is not [the] intention of the Government to interfere with the promotion of the Land Development Association, and it will be seen that the societies formed under this Bill do not conflict with it. This Bill was drafted for the purpose of providing an easy means of registration for societies devoted to agriculture. But the Bill is such that a great deal will depend upon the initiative of the people of the community in the different settlements where these societies will be formed. These societies cannot be closely supervised by the Department of Agriculture and Mines. We have few officials competent to handle that work. The only purpose that the Act can supply at the present time is a means of registration, and of giving these organizations separate entities so that they may have credit and be entitled to hold property collectively.

The Land Development Association movement began as a voluntary movement independent of the Government. It was started by public-minded citizens in St. John's, and its interests are not country-wide. There is no intention on the part of the Government to interfere with or deter in any way that movement. It must be remembered also that this Bill is not the last word of the Government as to its efforts to promote agriculture. The Government will assist the efforts of those who have done so much in the Land Development Association, and as the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay is aware, there are proposals under foot for a large agricultural development that will go much farther than this Bill is intended to go; so that this Bill may be accepted for the purpose of registration of societies that are not organized by the Land Development Association, but it is not intended to do any more than that. I do not see myself how it can be of as much assistance as a society or branch of the Land Development Association. I have already mentioned that the Secretary of Agriculture is going to have his hands fully occupied with attending to the policy of the Government in regard to agriculture in a broad and general way, and he would not be able to undertake any details such as are set out in Section 5. I think, therefore, that it would not be advisable to expect too much from this Bill, and it is not as the Hon. [Member] who has just sat down said, that everything depends upon this Bill, I don't think he meant that. He meant that everything depends upon the movement now under foot for the revival of agriculture.

Dr. Mosdell: Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to make any such suggestion, neither did I intend to say that I thought that everything depended on this measure. This idea has an analogy in the Public Health Department, when if we wanted to get anything done we had to get it done through the instrumentality of the [Newfoundland] Outport Nursing and Industrial Association. We had to induce the people to act in conjunction with NONIA or we would not get anything done. I have the feeling that as far as the Government's agricultural policy is concerned, you will have to look to these voluntary associations to lend the greatest help in making a success of it. I am afraid that under Section 5, that the semi-independence of the L.D.A. and other such associations and the officials, might not have at all times the proper cohesion necessary in a policy of this sort. My idea with regard to Section 4 is to make as many inducements as possible so that the people will enroll in these associations. My anxiety for the success of this Bill is because I feel that its success depends in a large measure on these voluntary organizations. Of course, I realize that its success depends in the last analysis on the L.D.A. If not, we will have the same old trouble all over again and all your work will be nullified.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this Bill is in the nature of an experiment, and a very good experiment it is true, but we do not know if it is going to be a success or not. If, as the Prime Minister said this afternoon, the people will indulge in a little self-help, then next year with the experience they have gained this year the Government will be prepared to [supplement] the Bill with further legislation, and invest these associations with further powers as the situation may warrant. There is this much to be said for these associations, and that is they will be very useful to the Department for the purpose of statistics and for keeping in touch with the agricultural situation generally throughout the country. In that way they will be of great service, but at the present time perhaps it is just as well to let good enough alone and see what advantages we will derive from them, and how the people will take hold of them. In my District there is some very fertile soil, particularly in and around Corner Brook, and up to a short time ago there was an agricultural society operating there and every year they held exhibitions, and I may say that I was amazed at the quantity of what is generally considered in this country tropical fruits. Green tomatoes, cucumbers, etc. were on sale in the stores in Corner Brook during the first week in September. I feel that this Bill is an immense value to the country, and I trust that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will watch it keenly and press the Government to give these associations such encouragement as he deems they ought to have.

Hon. W. J. Browne: The reason the Bill is in its present form is at the request of the societies in Conception Bay. It is on their recommendation that the Justice Department drafted the Bill.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, I would like to offer my sincere thanks to the Leader of the Opposition for the splendid spirit of cooperation he has displayed in the consideration of this very important matter. He has sized up the situation correctly when he said that the purpose of this Bill was to keep tab on the tremendous amount of money spent every year by the Agricultural Department on agriculture. Last year \$20,000 worth of seed potatoes were shipped to various parts of the country, and no check was kept on them. We had no agricultural societies or connecting links through which these seed [potatoes] could be distributed and checked. Just as soon as the schooner arrived in the harbour and the seed put ashore, the Government lost track of them and that was because there was no connecting links except in one or two cases where there was small societies operating in Harbour Grace District, and their returns were nearly 100 per cent. In other places where there was no connecting link, the Agriculture and Mines Department received no returns at all. That is the purpose of the Bill, and I think that the more modest the Bill is, the more confidence I would have in it. I have seen elaborate legislation introduced into this House which brought absolutely no results. I anticipate that this movement is going to grow a great deal, and will awaken the people to the fact that they have to become self-supporting, and I think with the cooperation of the L.D.A., the Education Department and the Harbour Grace movement, with their cooperation we will be able to accomplish a great deal. I do hope, however, that we will not have any two sections working against each other. I hope that the L.D.A. will work in unison with the Agriculture and Mines Department, and I can give my assurance as Minister that I will back the L.D.A. as far as I possibly can. I may say also that it is not the intention of the Association or this House to vote large amounts of moneys to putting men

haphazardly on farms. I feel that the men who have farms at the present time, and who cannot afford to stock them, are the men who we should try to help most at the present time, and I can assure this House that I will use every means in my power to bring this undertaking to a successful conclusion.

I was very much struck with the remarks of the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay, Dr. Mosdell, and particularly his reference to the public health of the people. He made reference to a memorandum of a doctor who had recently made a visitation to the South West Coast. I think this House should be very glad to have amongst its Members a competent medical man. I took down one or two his statements with regard to this memorandum (*reads*). I am sure that every Member of this House realizes the seriousness of having a large number of our people suffering from malnutrition. There are many cases of this in my District, and I think that it is a very important work for this House to see that these diseases are cured. My District is not the only [one] with cases of this sort, they are spread unfortunately almost throughout the country, and I say that it is very important to make the people realize that they should grow their own foodstuffs, and if we can do this we have made a long step forward in overcoming these ills.

When the Bill is finally accepted and passed by the Upper House, there may be suggestions that Hon. Members may like to make to the Department of Agriculture, and I may say that they will be welcomed. There is already one shipment of these seed potatoes in town, and 24 hours after the Bill is passed these societies will be formed and the seed ready for allocation.

Dr. Mosdell: My idea with regard to this Bill, I may say Mr. Chairman, is to have as many people as possible join up in these societies, and in the next place I would like to see some central authority handling the affairs of these various societies and so avoid any clashing of these associations under their different officers. If you feel that this will do that, I am satisfied. We should try, now that we have started, to make this an outstanding success, [and] see to it that the Government keeps out of it and the people become self-supporting.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Agricultural Societies" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Forest Fires."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Perhaps I am harsh in my way of looking at this sort of thing. In previous governments I have objected to the practice of making huge payments of money out of the Public Treasury to people who help extinguish forest fires. It runs into thousands of dollars; the practice has been going on years and years. It has led to abuse, according to some people, and there has in the past been considerable evidence of actually starting fires for the purpose of getting a job. While I was in the Department of Justice there were two or three cases that came under my notice where we proposed, had we got sufficient evidence, but unfortunately we did not, to prosecute people who, all the indications pointed, had actually started fires for the purpose of getting jobs out of it. That was brought about by the fact that all governments were weak enough to pay. It has been done for years. I suggest to the Prime Minister for his consideration, that he enforce the law as it is here now and it was then and compel citizens to do what is their duty, and that is to protect public demesne whenever necessity arises.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: A case of that sort arose the other day. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines was telling me about it, and I understand that they communicated with him saying there was a fire and they wanted assistance. He said, "There is no money to pay; you will have to put it out yourselves." They put it out.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am very glad to learn [that], and I hope they will keep it up.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The one change in that Section is the addition of the words "between the ages of 18 and 50." That is to exclude a certain class of people.

According to the figures given by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, over \$40,000 was expended last year over and above the ordinary grant for the putting out of fires. This, I think, is a scandal, and under this Bill, people must go out and make an effort to save their own property. The section intends that, if a fire occurs, the Chief Ranger or Justice of the Peace has a public duty to perform, and has to notify the person whose property is endangered and if that person fails to do so, he is liable to a fine.

There is a new Section, and it seems at first sight to be a departure. In discussing the Bill with my learned friend, he made the same remark. But where any fire is started in the vicinity of a saw mill with defective spark arrester, the prosecutor will have to prove that the spark arrester was defective. Then the owner will be liable unless he can prove that his saw mill was not defective. At first reading it looks harsh, but I don't think it is so.

(Reads sections of the Act). I do not think that there will be any objections to the matters contained therein, and I ask that the Bill be now read the second time.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Justice has accorded me the courtesy of sending me a copy of the amendment. So far as Sections 1 and 2 of the Bill are concerned they are purely formal, and I cannot see that any sane objection can be raised.

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.

This Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Newfoundland Hotel."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: (*Reads Bill*). This Act will bring the operation of the Newfoundland Hotel under a system of control similar to that which is exercised over the Railway by the Railway Commission. It will be managed by a Board of Directors, and the Controller of the Treasury will exercise a supervision as to expenditure. That appears in Section 5 (*reads section*).

The Hotel, as most of us will remember, was built during the Monroe administration and Mr. Rousseau was the promoter of the project. It cost him at that time about \$1,300,000. Probably, had conditions continued as they were during the period from 1924 to 1929, when there was a large tourist business to cater to, when there were large numbers of travellers all over the world, the Hotel might have been able to pay its operating expenses, but it is questionable whether Mr. Rousseau

would ever have gotten anything out of it.

However, we have in the Newfoundland Hotel one of the best hotels on this side of the Atlantic. I have been agreeably surprised from time to time to hear people who are warranted to judge the matter, say that they have never seen a hotel so laid [out] with a view to the comfort of the guest, or where the guests are given such consideration. Mr. Rousseau was unable to carry on and went into bankruptcy. We had guaranteed \$450,000 principal in bonds, and we had to take of that amount in bonds and the accumulated interest, which made a total of about \$600,000. In any case, we have a fine hotel, first class in every respect, and though it was built with a view to catering to the idle rich and the luxurious, yet it is a necessary building to have here in this town. I consider it as a public utility. We can't bring any volume of tourist traffic here if we have not a first-class hotel where they can stay during their visit. One of the first questions put by people coming down here is as to the hotel accommodation which they may procure. People considering coming down here will say to the booking agent in New York, what sort of hotel accommodation may I expect to find in Newfoundland? If they are told that the best is only a second-class hotel, they are not going to travel a few thousand miles to experience discomfort.

I believe that although it is not paying at the present time – in fact the loss incurred in its operation amounts to from \$500 to \$1,000 per month – it will eventually be paying for itself. Mr. McNamara is Chairman of the Board of Directors and his ability is undoubted, and he is well able to accomplish what he has set out to do. In fact, I will say that if it is at all possible to make the Newfoundland Hotel a paying proposition, the present Board of Directors are well able to do it. As to the general layout of the Hotel, the Government applied to the International Power and Paper Company asking that we might have the services of their Manager, that is the manager of their hotel, the Glynmill Inn at Corner Brook, and they were good enough to let us have his services without any charge whatsoever. They even stood the cost of his travelling expenses so that his services were procured absolutely free of charge. In a good many instances, I will say in a great many instances his report confirmed the policy which the present management had adopted. We have a Directorate ...

Mr. Lewis: With reference to Section 3, there is an observation that I would like to make concerning these certain corporate government bodies, and I wish to compliment the drafter of this Act for the manner in which he has drafted Section 3. You will notice that he has made this corporation that has been constituted by the Newfoundland Hotel liable in tort. With reference to that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to point out that we have in this country to-day an organization known as the Newfoundland Railway which is to some extent a corporate body, but not to the extent that this Act contemplates making the Newfoundland Hotel, and we have just finished dealing with an Act here, the Forest Fires Act, which has very elaborate provisions regarding the safeguarding of railway trains against the occurrence of fires which may cause far-reaching damage. It is alarming, at any rate, that while we have ample provision of that kind in an Act such as the Forest Fires Act, if the Newfoundland Railway trains to-morrow set fire to landed property and cause serious damage to private land, there is no redress against the Newfoundland Railway, while in this Act here, the Newfoundland Hotel Act, as it is now drafted, makes provision whereby that hotel is liable both in tort and contract to an individual. I have brought to the attention of the Justice Department the matter of the immunity of

the Newfoundland Railway in tort, and I intend to have a little more to say about it before this session closes, but I think that the law officers of the Crown should pay particular attention to the constitution of the Newfoundland Railway, and introduce into this House during this session an amendment to that Act making the Newfoundland Railway a fully constituted corporation liable both in contract and in tort to any person suffering injury at the hands of the Railway or its servants.

I would like to point out one instance in which I think very great hardship could be worked to private individuals and citizens of this country. The Newfoundland Railway operates twelve steamships around the coast in the passenger and freight business. Should either one of those ships at any time come into collision with a private-owned vessel and cause damage to life and property, there is no redress against the Railway in tort. I have had some little experience with this matter myself. Some three years ago, I was engaged in a case in the Supreme Court in which the learned Attorney General – he was not Attorney General at that time – was solicitor. I was solicitor for the defence. It was a case in which a man had lost his life in a railway-crossing accident at Holyrood. His widow sued the Railway claiming very substantial damages. We pleaded that the Newfoundland Railway was not liable in tort, and that the Railway was really a Department of the Crown. The Hon. Mr. Justice Kent made no ruling on that point and let the case go to the jury, reserving that point of law. The jury returned a verdict for the defence. Subsequently, an argument was held on the question of the liability of the Railway for costs in the same case, and the learned Attorney General then took advantage of the argument that we adduced and pleaded that the Crown is not liable.

About two months ago a man was crossing from the Southside to Water Street in front of the dock and by the railway station. One of the railway engines shunting in the yard came into collision with his carriage and did considerable damage to his property but not to himself. Proceedings were taken in the Magistrate's Court claiming damages, and the Deputy Attorney General appeared for the Railway and pleaded that the Railway was not liable, and as a result of his plea the case was withdrawn. I say, Mr. Chairman, that is a condition of affairs that should not be allowed to exist any longer. I might say in passing that I think that the reason that the Newfoundland Railway Act is faulty in that respect, is due to an oversight on the part of the drafters of the original Railway Shipping Act. The Act in question was based on Canadian National legislation, and in Canada they have an Act known as the Exchequer Act which allows the Crown to be sued in tort. The drafters of the original Railway and Shipping Act in 1926 overlooked the existence of the Exchequer Act, and as a result copied or redrafted the Canadian National Railway legislation, omitting to insert into the Act provision such as I speak of to-day. I wish to bring this matter to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and I make no apology for interjecting here and telling the House on this point, because I think it is of sufficient importance to claim the undivided attention of the House, and I call it again to the attention of the law officers of the Crown and I hope before the session closes that in addition to having legislation amended in the Newfoundland Hotel Act, we shall also have legislation amended in the Railway and Shipping Act along the lines I have suggested.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Placentia East, and I agree with everything he has said. It is peculiar that the Crown going into business is not liable for the ordinary obligations of a businessman. Of course, in

days gone by the government was merely an instrument of government, but our modern civilization has placed government in a position where it now has to take, in some cases at any rate, [a place] in the ordinary commercial life of the country. Because of the peculiarity of our constitution the Crown, represented by the government, has certain immunities from obligation under varying conditions, and that has, as he has pointed out, placed the Newfoundland Railway in a position where they, operating a railway throughout this country, are not responsible for the results of their own negligence, while any other organization operating a railway, such as the A.N.D. Company for instance, would be bound by such negligence. I quite agree with him that it is most fortunate that the Newfoundland Hotel is now taken out of that category, and, being a commercial institution as it is, is bound by the ordinary rules which the law places on commercial institutions. It will give me great pleasure if a Bill comes before the House to amend the Railway and Shipping Act to bring it into line with the Newfoundland Hotel Act.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I have listened with very great care and considerable sympathy to the arguments suggested by my learned friend the Hon. Member for Placentia East and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think, however, before we embark upon legislation such as that suggested by Mr. Lewis and Mr. Bradley, we have to look at the possibilities that might arise, and before we can realise what those possibilities are we should, I think, look at the history of countries older than ourselves and see what has been done in those countries. Speaking generally, it is all very well to make a government liable when it is handling a railway in the same as if it were being handled by a private individual. It has not been done in England. It has been up before a Commission appointed by the Lord Chancellor to consider making the Crown liable in tort, and that Commission, after looking at it in the public interest, has reported against it, and do you think it would be wise for us to embark upon a policy of that kind when a country such as England, which has had it under consideration in the hands of real experts, far greater experts than we are, condemned it as being at the present time unworkable unless brought in in small sections, such as we have done here?

I think it would be a dangerous thing at the present time when the Government has embarked upon a big enterprise, to suddenly make the new hotel company liable in tort over a period of years covering other management. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that if a government admits a principle of liability under such circumstances, then it will be hard to resist the political pressure that will be brought to bear upon the government. It is not a legal question; it is a political question, and I am satisfied, in my own opinion, that when the Leader of the Opposition agreed with the Member for Harbour Main that it was the Government he sponsored were responsible for the cases which came up for discussion and were deliberately let off.

It has been suggested that the Government has been afraid to pronounce upon such a contingency until it had an opportunity of studying the results in other countries. I think it is quite right to be afraid, because it might ultimately result in making the Government always liable in tort, and it would be made liable if a motor car goes through a house. It will be readily recognized that the easiest way always is to make the Crown liable in tort in every respect. The present measure is but an experiment, and subsequently we can apply the Act to our shipping and our Railway and ultimately to our government enterprises; but you have to be very careful towards breaking away from the rule of centuries. It has been definitely settled in England that they will not break away

from that. In fact, in England, under all public works, they are not liable under the Workmen's Compensation Act. We have made ourselves liable under that law, but I would be sorry to see a government made liable in tort in the case of the Newfoundland Hotel and which liability may have extended over a period of years. It is not a question of policy; it is a question of merely working out a scheme whereby those who have to deal with Crown accounts and property will see that the Crown will not be subjected to fraud, and the rights of the people will be protected. I have considerable sympathy with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the member for Harbour Main, and I frankly think we cannot afford to take the steps they have suggested.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Referring to [the] section that passes powers to [the] Controller of the Treasury (*reads*). That doesn't seem to give him any particular power. I don't see exactly what that amounts to. Is it intended that the Controller of the Treasury shall act through the government?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The Controller will act in conjunction with the government. That is not an undue restriction. If we put too much restriction on the Commission, if we don't give them much freedom, we will rob them of their initiative. But at the same time we must have some restrictions on them.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The position is, then, that the Controller of the Treasury goes to the government with his recommendations.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Customs" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This is quite a Bill, and I am afraid that in the time we now have I am unable to do justice to it. When we come to the Committee stage, Mr. Browne was going to go through it and explain the legal technicalities. The idea is to bring order out of chaos. The honourable gentleman the Leader of the Opposition knows what a difficult matter it is even for a lawyer to go through the Customs Act, and place his finger on what he wanted in a few moments. Mr. Browne has devoted considerable time to the consolidation of these Acts, and now we will have the Act in good form so that the lawyers or Customs to get what they want.

(Reads Sections 45, 53, and 71).

Japanese goods have been coming into the country which are made cheaper, and are

underselling their competitors. Our friends in the United States have had tremendous difficulty in meeting their prices. But this dumping of Japanese goods upon our market is unfair competition, and we will now be in a position to protect the rest of the Empire against unfair competition and at the same time increase our revenue. Another matter that was always in dispute was as to what constituted "fair market value," whether it was the value in the country where the goods were exported or their value here. It is now settled. It means the foreign market value.

[Section] 399 and the various sub-sections have to do with the prevention of bootlegging. Formerly a shipment [which] was shipped out of Port aux Basques [could] go out and simply drop back into one of our ports. If any vessel comes in in distress, her cargo must be shipped to St. John's and really exported in a vessel of 200 tons or more. I often wonder if it pays us to have the warehouses here. It simply gives people dealing with liquor [a chance] to get a high seas clearance, and in most cases the ship comes back to Newfoundland. This is quite a lengthy document, and I have no desire to rush it if the honourable gentleman on the other side cares to postpone the Committee stage for a few days longer. My learned friend Mr. Browne will help me out in giving it its legal interpretation.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have no desire to delay the passing of this Act. I can realize that the Customs Act wants consolidation. I am prepared to facilitate the passage of this Act, and may I suggest it would facilitate it and help me considerably, if you would let me have an annotated copy showing which Sections are amended, as the Honourable Minister of Justice has done.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I will as a matter of fact. Mr. Browne has that ready.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Thanks very much.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, May 1st, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Monday, May 1, 1933

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

Hon. the Prime Minister informed the House that His Excellency the Governor would attend in the Legislative Council and assent to certain Bills at quarter to four.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I wish to acquaint the House that His Excellency the Governor will come down at 3:45 p.m. to assent to certain Bills passed by this House.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it has passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to an Election in the District of Port de Grave" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively "An Act to Amend the Law Relating to Innkeepers"; "An Act to Permit the Export of Pitprops by or for the Newfoundland Railway during the Present and Coming Fiscal Years"; "An Act to Amend the Judicature Act"; "An Act Relating to the Department of Labour"; "An Act Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines"; and "An Act in Relation to the Acceptance of Offices of Emolument under the Crown by Certain Members of the Present House of Assembly" without amendment.

Mr. Abbott presented a petition from St. George's District re Setting of Salmon Nets.

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from 170 residents of Stephenville Crossing and St. George's relative to the setting of salmon nets. I do not want to weary the House by reading the petition, so I will ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates, with a request that it receive earnest and sympathetic consideration.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines tabled certain Reports of his Department for the Year 1932.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lie upon the table of the House the reports and returns under Crown Lands laws for the year 1932.

Hon. the Minister of Justice tabled the Report of the Inspector General of the Constabulary respecting Arrests during the Year 1932.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House a report of the number of persons arrested, together with other comparative statements dealing with my Department for the past year.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Public Accounts 1931-32; Report of Commissioner for Newfoundland in London with regard to the Newfoundland's Stand at the British Industries Fair at Olympia in March last.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House the Public Accounts for the years 1931 and 1932.

Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs tabled Report of his Department for the year ended June 30th, 1932.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House the annual report of the Post Office for the year ending June 30, 1932.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm Certain Temporary Loans."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 20 George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public.'"

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Corporations and Institutions Guaranteed or Subsidized by the Government."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Ratification of the Guaranteeing of certain Borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a Bill respecting certain temporary loans; also an Act for the creation of a public utility commission re prices charged the public; also an Act respecting corporations and institutions guaranteed or subsidized by the Government. I also give notice that at the next sitting of the House I will give notice to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider the ratification of the guaranteeing of certain bonds by the St. John's Municipal Council.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Newfoundland Hotel" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself

into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Forest Fires Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: When we were last in Committee on this Bill, there were three Sections deferred for further consideration. There was an objection taken to Section 21 as being too drastic. I suggest that it be eliminated and we revert to the position under Chapter 136, Section 9. Section 22 was referred to, and somebody pointed out that there was no penalty provided in connection with the putting up of these notices. I suggest that the companies who received these notices and who have timber grants will be most anxious to put them up, and there is no necessity to provide any measure to ensure that they may be put up.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I agree.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Section 24 was objected to on the grounds that it was offering a reward for information. There seems to be a standing objection in this country in connection with the administration of law, to offering rewards for information leading to conviction. Personally I don't agree, and I think my honourable friend Mr. Bradley, who has occupied the office of Solicitor General, will agree that the administration of law in this country is very difficult. If the Members of the House disapprove of this Section providing for the paying of rewards for information, I have no objection to striking it out.

As for Section 19 of the Act of 1905, (*reads*). It is just a matter of furnishing information, whereas in Section 21 there is a provision whereby he would be put upon his [*illegible*] if a fire occurred, and I think it is objectionable. If it is agreeable to the House, we will substitute Section 19 of the old Act for Section 21 of the new Act. As to Section 24, the Section which provides for the offering of a reward for information, this is not a party measure. Personally I am in favour of leaving the Section as it is, but possibly we might take the opinion of the House and decide the matter.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I agree with my honourable friend as to the difficulty of procuring information necessary to the proper enforcement of the laws in this country. There seems to be a sort of feeling that it is not playing the game to tell the authorities when any breach of the law occurs. Now I think it is not only playing the game, but it is one's duty to assist in the enforcement of the law, particularly where it concerns the preservation of valuable property. Personally I agree with the Hon. Minister. I have no objection to the paying of rewards for information, but we have gone too far in this country with splitting up fines, though. Under the Customs Act and other penal statutes, those fines are split up between the Crown and certain other officials or officers. That sort of thing we have carried too far, but I do not wish to [tie] the Government's hands in regard to getting information to protect what will soon cease to be one of our natural resources, if not protected.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I know of one policeman who, when he died, had collected \$40,000 in fines.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I presume that it was by this splitting up of fines that this particular police officer amassed his fortune – by the shares of fines he got. But if the Government wants to pay certain amounts for information, I have no objection. For instance, the Prime Minister laid on the table the other day a statement showing where he had received \$120 for Secret Service. He undoubtedly utilized that amount for the purpose of collecting information he could not otherwise obtain. I think that amount was legitimately spent. But introducing into penal statutes a provision that such fine shall be paid to the prosecutor, is simply providing an inducement to the person giving the information to exaggerate the facts in order that he may obtain the fine.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Section [omission] will go out. Section 19 of the last Act will take its place. Section 24 will stand.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: With regard to Section 24 (*reads*). That's not reasonable. It suggests itself to me that since, when a fire happens the Fire Department has to be called upon, and if the Department of Agriculture and Mines has to send out the fire apparatus to quench the forest fire, surely the owner of the property ought at least to contribute to this expenditure.

At quarter to four, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a Message from His Excellency the Governor commanding the immediate attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber, when His Excellency was pleased to assent to the following Bills:

An Act Relating to an Election in the District of Port de Grave in the Present Year.

An Act to Amend the Law Relating to the Innkeepers.

An Act to Permit the Export of Pitprops by or for the Newfoundland Railway during the Present and Coming Fiscal Years.

An Act to Amend the Judicature Act.

An Act Relating to the Department of Labour.

An Act Relating to the Department of Agriculture and Mines, and

An Act in Relation to the Acceptance of Offices of Emolument under the Crown by Certain Members of the Present House of Assembly.

The Oath having been administered by His Excellency's Commissioners, the Honourables John G. Stone, Kenneth M. Brown and Ernest Gear, Esquire, Members elected respectively for the Districts of Trinity North, Grand Falls and Port de Grave, were introduced and took their seats.

[House in Committee of the Whole on Forest Fires Act.]

Hon. Mr. Browne: I would like to draw the attention of the Minister in charge the fact that, supposing a fire occurs in the neighbourhood of Corner Brook or Grand Falls, where large companies own considerable areas of land, the Chief Ranger will have to order all the residents in the nearby settlements to engage in fire fighting for the companies without any reward. It seems imposing a rather serious burden on them. I understand that formerly it was the practice to grant compensation to those who engaged in fire fighting. I could understand where the fire was near the settlement, that they would certainly be compelled to protect their own property. I am considering now the question of where we might have a large area owned by one or other of these companies.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I see the advisability for making provision for saddling companies with at least a proportion of the expense. The difficulty at the moment is I doubt the advisability of passing any amendment without having fully considered the matter. As there appears to be some doubt in the minds of Members as to what ought to be done, might I suggest to the Minister that the Bill might be deferred for a day or two. There is no immediate necessity that the Bill should be passed to-day. I would suggest the advisability of deferring it until the Minister has an opportunity of further considering it.

It must be remembered that the people who are called upon to protect a forest from fire are protecting one of the natural resources of the country. The Government, or no official of the Government, is going to drag a man 50 or 60 miles to put out a fire, if a fire does occur in the centre of the country; they are not going to drag a man a long distance like that.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: No matter what the legislation is, the administration of the Act will have to depend to a large extent [on] how the situation is being handled by those in charge, by the Fire Ranger and his employees. We have had in the past, as I pointed out the other day, been called upon to pay large amounts of money for fire fighting. If a fire took place in any part of the Island, notwithstanding that we have legislation already on the statutes making it compulsory for the people to respond, there was very little response. That section of the Act was not put into force. We had fires on Crown lands owned by the people, where the people of that section depended upon them for their very existence. There were cases where the Fire Department sent the police and fire trucks. There was one particular instance where the fire truck trying to put out fires got off the road. The people refused to respond to put the truck on the track unless they were paid. I can see, if the suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Harbour Main and Bell Island is put into effect, we are going to have a clause in the Act whereby we will not be in a position to be able to compel people to put out a fire. The Department of Agriculture and Mines will have to be presented with a cheque for \$50,000 for the coming year. Last year, because we had no money to pay for fire fighting there was very little money spent. In each case where reports of fires came in, I replied to the Magistrate, pointed out that section of the Act which made it compulsory for the people to respond, and that we had no money to spend. We were not called upon to spend more than other years, it was \$50,000.

There is the serious situation that I see if we are going to eliminate the penalty clause in the Act. Instead of interfering with it, we ought to see that the Act is carried out. I intend to see that the

Act is going to be carried out to the letter of the law. I don't see that by suspending consideration for a further session we could get any further. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to allow the Act to go through.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have no objection. My only objection was to see that the Government paid no more than was necessary, [and] to see that the Government should be reimbursed for its expenditures.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Forest Fires Act" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Customs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Mr. Browne: Mr. Chairman, this Bill is a consolidation and revision of Chapter 22 of the Consolidated Statutes with the amendments passed from 1917 to 1932, and such amendments as are contemplated for 1933. As Chapter 22 was very difficult to follow, the whole Act has been assorted and rearranged under proper heads. There were ten amendments of the Act passed since the consolidation of the statutes, and all of them are embodied in this Act.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: (*Reads Section 46*). There is a provision that when goods are lying at the warehouse and cannot be sold at a price which would amount to the duty on them, they are to be destroyed. We had some goods here in the warehouse for more than four years. They were rubbers, and of course they had depreciated considerably during that period. They could not be sold at a price which would fetch the duty. According to the Act they would have to be destroyed. Instead of destroying them, we distributed to deserving cases all over the country. We thereby made as fair a distribution as we could, exclusive of whether the District had an Opposition or Government member sitting in the House. Perhaps no other Minister of Customs would take the law into his own

hands in this way, but I considered that it would be a shame to destroy these goods when they could so well be devoted to a charitable purpose.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: As I understand it, you distributed them among the people rather than destroy them. I might say, Sir, that while legally you were maybe wrong, morally you were right.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I should like to see some provision there to the effect that if the goods cannot be sold at a price which will pay the duty they may be given to charity. As the law is at present they would have to be destroyed.

Hon. Mr. Browne: (*explained changes in Bill*).²¹

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Customs" reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Before the House adjourns, there is a matter on which possibly the Prime Minister can give a little information, and which closely concerns me, in that the matter involves the conditions under which and [*omission*] the wages received by constituents. I have had several telegrams during the past two or three days in connection with the wages paid to drivers in the logging district at Corner Brook and vicinity. The legal rate is 35 cents an hour. That Act was passed 1930 or 1931. It appears now that the International Power and Paper Company is farming out driving to contractors, and as a result of their action, contractors find themselves unable to pay more than 22 cents an hour. The men are extremely indignant over the matter and have applied to me, and I understand the Government has received a number of communications from them. Of course there are two sides to every story, and I notice in one of our daily newspapers a reference to the matter both from the standpoint of an item of news, and it was also noted in the editorial column. From the information and comment to be gathered from that paper, one would imagine that driving is an occupation which has entirely changed its character, and is now merely an ordinary avocation

²¹ "The Bill contains 272 Sections. After 212 of them were passed, the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again." *Daily News*, May 2, 1933, p. 5.

such as one finds in and about the city and mill. While it is true that logging has changed, and the man no longer travels down stream on a log with his peavie in his hand, yet the suggestion that the occupation of driver no longer has any element of danger in it is not correct. I remember about twelve months ago or perhaps a little less, I was fortunate enough to witness one of the sights of my life, and that was the breaking of a log jam on a river and its piling up again a little lower down. It was about four in the afternoon when this jam broke, and it was a truly wonderful sight. I was standing just a bit below, perhaps 100 or 150 yards below the point where the jam broke, and about an equal distance above the point where the log jam was going. The bank of the river on which I was standing was probably fifteen feet above the level of the river, and in the course of three or four minutes I and those who were with me had to fly up over the bank as fast as we could. Where the jam got going the river rose up fully 20 feet. When that jam broke there were four or five men out in the middle of it. To be quite frank how they got out of it I don't know, but they did.

I can testify that the elements of danger have not disappeared from logging yet. Furthermore, that avocation has elements that would be appreciated by medical men more than by anybody else. If you will observe on rivers where log-driving is carried on, you will find that 100 per cent of the men are wet to the skin all the time, and if any one of them would dare suggest a change of clothing for himself, the boss would almost collapse at the idea. Therefore, I say, Sir, those men are entitled to more than 22 cents an hour. I have communicated to the Prime Minister's Department any messages or copies of messages I have received anent this matter, and I would honestly and sincerely like to hear what the Prime Minister has got to say about it.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I may say that we telegraphed to Corner Brook and Grand Falls and asked their woods representatives to come here, and they had a meeting with the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Labour and discussed the situation. Unfortunately, the representative of Corner Brook was most unsatisfactory. However, we have decided, as the outcome of a meeting held this afternoon, that the minimum wage for log drivers of 35 cents an hour would still obtain for another year. Another matter that has been in our minds, and which we have given consideration to, is the high cost of board charged to men while in the woods, and before the gentlemen referred to go home, I am going to tell them pretty plainly that they will have to try and have their rate of 66 cents per day dropped to 50 cents per day. We know that the prices of food commodities used in the woods menu have reduced all the way from 15 to almost 40 per cent,²² and we know that certain people are not out for a handsome profit out of the board and lodging business, as their business is paper manufacturing. But I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that we have very great sympathy with the men and this minimum wage that some people are trying to circumvent. We realize that those men are exposed to considerable hardship in their work, and I think they should be well recompensed for their work and ought to be given a more liberal rate of board.

²² "... the prices of the food that the men use, according to figures furnished by the Customs, have reduced from 20 to 40 per cent since 1929." *Daily News*, May 2, 1933, p. 5.

"It is learned that the Government consider the living charges of the lumberman, at over 60 cents per day, are higher than the present cost of supplies justify, and that the company will be instructed to reduce the amount to 50 cents per day." *Evening Telegram*, May 2, 1933, p. 5.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I agree with everything the Prime Minister has said, and shall be glad at any time to be at his disposal or the Minister of Labour towards getting these men engaged at log-driving a living wage.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I thank the Hon. Member for his assistance.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, the 2nd of May instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday, May 2, 1933

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

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Report of his Department for 1932.

Hon. the Secretary of State tabled Report of Inspector of Weights and Measures for 1932.

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

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Corporations and Institutions Guaranteed or Subsidized by the Government" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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 and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Customs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Mr. Browne: Yesterday it was decided that Section 46 be re-considered in light of a statement of the Minister of Finance. Upon investigating the matter, I find since that Section 157 provides for the thing we had in mind. Section 157 deals with the disposition of goods forfeited and suits the thing we had in mind, and Section 46 is amended by dropping the last two and a half lines. I think that this covers the situation; 46 is the new section and that phase is new. I suppose that when the Bill was drafted it was forgotten that 157 deals with the same subject. Yesterday we went as far as 239. (*Continues with explanation of the Bill.*) I think that ought to be sufficient explanation of the Bill, and so that we might get through it expeditiously, I would suggest to my learned friend that the Sections in which there are changes from the old Act be read, and the Sections that are the same be taken as read.

(Clerk starts [to] read sections.)

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The people are without the wherewithal to secure sufficient clothing for themselves. Conditions have grown worse during the last few years. Many of our people are clothed in brin and empty sugar bags. After all, when a man imports an article he expects to pay duty on the value of the article, and the value of the article is the price he has to pay. The exporter from the country of origin of these goods gets what he can for his goods, and what he can get is the value of the goods in the country where they are manufactured.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This section is devised mainly to protect against Japanese goods. These goods are being dumped on the market. The people are suffering in Japan. They are being paid wholly insufficient wages. The Japanese are underselling.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It may be that in Japan these goods are being produced cheaper than they could be manufactured in any other country to-day; but that is no argument from the standpoint of the Newfoundlander who to-day needs goods, of which type of commodity increasing quantities are being sold to-day. It is a pretty hard thing if on an article which costs him 10 cents in Newfoundland money he has to pay a duty of 20 cents. That is, he has to pay a duty of a considerably larger amount than he has to pay for the goods themselves. I suggest to the Government that in the exercise of the powers conferred upon them in this Section, they bear in mind the needs of the people of this country to-day, and the necessity of their getting many of these articles which come within the purview of this Section at the cheapest possible price.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, here is another point. Suppose we do take these goods in at the valuation of the Japanese invoice, we will be getting that much less duty, and we will have to put duty on something else, for we have to get as much revenue as possible. In spite of the valuation of these invoices, our people are still able to import these goods cheaper than from any part of the British Empire, although we have penalized the Japanese manufacturer. We must raise the revenue somehow.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: This section puts into effect the principle of inter-Empire trade. Under ordinary conditions it might be excusable, but under existing conditions it is not (*reads section*). Mr. Chairman, I contend that it is the duty of the Government, before protecting manufacturers of any other part of the Empire, to protect the interests of the Newfoundlander firstly. Economics is one thing, and patriotism another. That is an extension of the very principle which the foremost economists of the world unanimously say is killing the trade of the world to-day. It is an attempt to bar out the products of foreign [countries] in the interests of some countries which happen to be within the British Commonwealth of Nations. The principle is false and in the long run can only lead to disaster. And if the Government is going to protect the Empire countries, where does the Newfoundlander who is down and out get off to-day? If conditions were different, one might say there was some excuse for this course, but to-day the people have nothing, and where we have a poverty-stricken people, to cling to this policy is to court destruction. Are we going to charge these thousands of people additional duty to protect the manufacturers in Great Britain, Australia or New Zealand? Even in Newfoundland the manufacturer ought not to be protected at the expense of the

starving people. There are, its true, a few people, but comparatively very few people, employed in these industries, and all the rest of the community have to pay to keep these industries going.

Hon. Mr. Browne: That is an extraordinary statement.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would like to hear you show how it is extraordinary. Mr. Chairman, my learned and honourable friend has interjected that my statement is extraordinary. I should like him to show how it is so.

Hon. Mr. Browne: You made that statement and now I am asking you to back it up with proof. That's what I want, proof.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I think you ought to explain why it is extraordinary. If you wish it, I shall repeat what I said for your benefit. I said that there are in this country to-day certain industries protected by tariffs which would not be able to run if they were not so protected. But for that protective tariff, they could not compete with outside manufacturers. They are only kept in existence because the protective tariff enables [them to] sell at a higher price than they could otherwise do.

Hon. Mr. Browne: That is quite different from what you said in your first statement.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That is what I said, there are certain [industries] in Newfoundland to-day which if not protected would have to go out of business.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Does not that apply to the industries of every country?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It applies to the industries of most countries, unfortunately for all countries.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Should we take the lead? We all agree that the tariff barriers are impeding trade. Just when we should knock down the tariff barriers, so as to let every continental country, every yellow race dump their goods in here ...

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am not talking about yellow race or blue race or brown race. This places in the hands of the Executive Government a power which, should [they] exercise [it] for the purpose of protecting manufacturers in the Empire, is likely to cause a poverty-stricken people to pay more for goods than they otherwise would. I think it is clear; it cannot be contradicted. I think I can talk here all afternoon and it won't make any effect; the Government mean to put it through. I want my views to be clearly understood. I utter it as a warning. In the exercise of this wide power be careful; the poor people of this country have too [omission].

Hon. Mr. Browne: I would just like to call Mr. Bradley's attention to the attitude adopted by his

Government.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It is not that we are dealing with; it is this.

Hon. Mr. Browne: I would just like to remind you about it. I ask that my learned friend have a little patience until I am finished.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I wish you had little more patience.

Hon. Mr. Browne: I did not interrupt. I wish to remind you of the ridiculous position created by the Squires government. They were hardly a week in office when they reduced the duties. The position they created for themselves was that the articles were coming in at a lower rate of duty than the materials and ingredients for the making of those articles here. If my learned friend has not learned a little more about economics than he knew at that time, it is not worthwhile listening to him.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If the Government that preceded the Squires government had not put on those duties, the Squires government would not have had to take them off.

Hon. Mr. Browne: If they had not been as extravagant and dishonest, they would not have had to put on any duties.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Keep your temper.

Hon. Mr. Browne: I have not lost my temper, though I was a bit hot then.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: For the four years that the Liberal government sat on that side of the House, they abused them up hill and down dale. Now that is over; let the Squires government alone; for the present we are dealing with this Act here. No matter how bad or good the Squires government may have been, it makes no difference. You are dealing with this Section. Whether the Squires government did right or wrong, it's none of your business. Don't defend your wrongdoing by suggesting that the Squires government did wrong.

Hon. Mr. Browne: We are not doing anything wrong.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: No, you are all paragons of virtue. You will be doing something wrong if you utilize the power conferred upon you in this section to improperly increase the cost of articles upon an impoverished people. I am not going to deal with the question of squandermania this afternoon. You know perfectly well, and if you don't know, look at the public accounts, and you will see where the squandermania began, long before the Squires government came into office. Look over the records from 1924 to 1928; look over the records from August 1924 to October 1928; that will give you something to think about [*omission*].

Capt. Whiteley: Mr. Chairman, before the Act is passed finally, I am going to ask that Section 53 be deleted. It may be a solitary case, but there's danger, I imagine, in that clause. It does not materially affect the Bill. It may arise in the case of a vessel from Bonavista Bay or Green Bay going down to Labrador and catching her fish and drying it on the Canadian side, and then bringing her cargo home. According to this section her owner would be liable to a fine.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: My idea is that it has got to do with St. Pierre fish; it has got quite a heavy bounty on a lot shipped to Martinique. One of our Newfoundlanders is shipping fish from St. Pierre to Martinique; that is more or less of a detriment to our own people. If this Section were not here, he would have to bring the St. Pierre fish to St. John's, and might make arrangements for a better shipment. I have been trying to find out what it meant. According to the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, it must have been put there for some reason. I might see a hardship that it would inflict as Mr. Whiteley points out if, for instance, at Bonne Esperance where Newfoundlanders were catching fish, they would be penalized for bringing it into their own country.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That would only arise occasionally. There is a section in the Interpretation Act which gives the Governor-in-Council power to get over that.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Might I ask the Prime Minister if it be possible to give us copies of these Bills before the second reading?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It was because we had to consult on some of the minor details, that is why. We won't ask for a second reading until Hon. Members have had them in their possession for 24 hours.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 3rd instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Wednesday, May 3, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. the Prime Minister, from Blackhead Road, re Public Roads.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of a road leading off the Blackhead Road. These people are very industrious and are very hard-working citizens, and for the information of the House I will read the petition (*reads*).

It goes on to state that one resident of this section, a woman, was taken seriously ill with pleurisy, and a doctor not only could not get up to visit her, but they had to take her down on a stretcher to where the road was in a passable condition. I beg to ask that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of question.

Mr. Starkes gave notice of question.

Hon. the Secretary of State tabled Report of the Commission of Internal Economy.

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 and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Customs."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Customs" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday next, the 9th

instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday, May 9, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Byrne from Logy Bay re Roads.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from 60-odd of the residents of Logy Bay, Middle Cove and Outer Cove, District of St. John's East, and some of the residents on this side of Torbay. The request set forth in this petition is that a by-road that is now in a very bad state of repair, and in fact quite overgrown in most places and known as the Black Ridge Road, is impassable, and has been for the past two or three years back to vehicular traffic. These people, as they set out, point [out] that for a very small allocation the top growth could be removed from this road, and it might be made fairly passable so that they can get on their carts and carriages from Torbay to those three settlements. The point about this road is that when open and able to be used by carts, it would cut off practically a day's journey for these people. Now instead of going to Middle Cove, they have to go down by the sea, that is, as members probably know the new bridge to Logy Bay, they have to come up and go around by the sea. By having this road placed in fairly good condition for a small amount, they will be able to make a shortcut from either one of those parishes to Torbay or the main road. I might say also that there is quite a lot of agricultural land open on either side of the road, and that too will be available to work for market. At present it is a matter of walking over it and carrying things to and from.

I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, and I respectfully ask that it will be referred to the parties to whom it concerns.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition. I am very familiar with the road. Under ordinary circumstances, Sir, and were I not a Member for the District, I would be very much interested in opposing the petition for my own personal interest. I would much sooner see the road grow over; it would be a fine protection to my property, but there is no question about it, that it is very much in the interest of the people that they should be able to pass from Outer Cove over to the Torbay Road, and that the Torbay people may be able to pass to Middle Cove. It saves several miles in their journey and the intercommunication is quite considerable, and they should have every possible facility. It is not asked that any large sum should be spent on the road as long as it is made passable. It is in large measure overgrown, and apparently a small sum of money would do the work which is necessary at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Stone from the Society of United Fishermen, re Fishery Matters.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: I ask leave to present a petition, Sir, from the Society of United Fishermen, which wants a cull and standardization. Not only a cull and standardization; they want to see an improvement in connection with the making of fish in this country, and for the benefit

of the House, I think it would be better if I read the memorial as it is presented (*reads memorial*).²³

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I desire very much to endorse the petition, and I think it is a very encouraging sign of the times when fishermen themselves are alive to the urgency of the fish situation. Further, I feel that with the cooperation of merchants and fishermen we are going to make real progress with the enactment of the Salt Codfish Act, as a great deal embodied in the petition will be contained in the new legislation. While it is generally known that the cure of fish has not been all that might be desired, with a consequent low price offered by the merchants, on the other hand those engaged in the marketing of fish must refrain from glutting the markets. Very often it has happened through indiscretion that by not regulating shipments, there has been a great reduction in prices in the foreign markets, and to recoup their losses fish exporters have quoted low prices to the fishermen. Therefore, I think it is a good sign of the times to see fishermen determined to produce a good article, and if we are going to assist them we must see that their products are properly marketed.

Hon. Mr. Puddester from Carbonear-Bay de Verde, re Fishery Matters.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, following on the memorial presented by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and supported by the Prime Minister, I have also a number of petitions, asking a similar request, from the residents of Bay de Verde, Western Bay, Grates Cove, Daniel's Cove, Old Perlican, Red Head Cove and Burnt Point in the District of Carbonear-Bay de Verde. The petitions set forth (*reads*). As they express the desire of the fishermen of the whole country, I give my utmost and heartiest support and ask that they receive that earnest consideration which their importance merits.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Fire Insurance Companies."

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 to Confirm an Agreement whereby the Governor-in-Council Guaranteed Certain Loans Raised by the Municipal Council.

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 to the amendment of the Loan Act (22 George V., Cap. 32).

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a

²³ "... a petition in the form of a memorial [was presented] ... respecting the curing, culling and grading, handling, packing, and marketing of dried codfish. The memorial outlined certain regulations. It also decried the present cost of salt, which the Minister contented was prohibitive. Hon. The Prime Minister endorsed the petition and ... stated ... the new bill which will shortly be presented to the House contains a great deal of legislation embodied in the petition." *Evening Telegram*, May 10, 1933, p. 5.

Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 22 George V., Chapter 25, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto.'"

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors."

Hon. the Secretary of State gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Health and Welfare Act, 1931."

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

Hon. 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 and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

Mr. Starkes 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 it had passed the Bills sent up, entitled, respectively, "An Act Relating to Agricultural Societies" and "An Act to Amend the Act 22, Geo. V., (1st Session) Cap. 11, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs,'" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act to Amend the Act 22, Geo. V., Chapter 13, entitled 'An Act Relating to the Memorial University College, St. John's'"; "An Act Respecting an Amendment to Chapter 195 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Accident Insurance Companies'"; "An Act to Amend the Act 18, Geo. V., Chapter 11, entitled 'An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador'"; "An Act to Amend Chapter III of the Consolidated Statutes, 1916, entitled 'Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents'"; and "An Act Further to Amend The Tourist Commission Act, 1927'" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services'" with some amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Amendment is as follows:

Section 2 (4): Strike out the words "on public business" and insert the words "pertaining to Electoral District Matters."

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts the said Amendment was read a first time.

With unanimous consent, the said Amendment was read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the Amendment sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services'" has been agreed to without amendment.

[Debate on Address in Reply]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, at the outset this afternoon I desire to again to extend on behalf of the Liberal party which I have the honour to represent here, and on behalf of all the Liberals in Newfoundland (and in this connection I feel sure that I can speak for all Tories and other political parties in this country as well), a most hearty welcome to His Excellency the Governor. He comes to us with all the glorious traditions of the British Navy which go back some four hundred years, traditions which bespeak a strict adherence to duty, and when His Excellency gives us his assurance that his earnest endeavours will be directed to the promotion of the interests of the country we have a real guarantee of his sense of responsibility of his office. We are satisfied that he has a high sense of duty and that he will be actuated by his sense of responsibility of office in carrying out the duties of his high office. We welcome him as a people, and feel that his term of office here will be characterized by an endeavour to further the interests of this country, and his best activities to carry that out.

Now, before I proceed further, it is necessary to clear up a situation which has arisen, to my knowledge at any rate, within the past hour. I have here a message from the Secretary of the Papermakers' Union at Corner Brook, and in this message the following statement is made: (*reads message*).

Mr. Speaker, I say here and now that statement is a filthy falsehood ...

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will allow me, I may say that statement is untrue.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It is necessary for me to make my position clear. My first intimation of this whole matter was when I received a message from the Drivers' Committee intimating to me the cut to 22½ cents per hour. I took the first occasion, and there are many within hearing of my voice who know it, to draw this matter to the attention of the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister gave me his assurance that there would be no interference with the minimum wage of 35 cents this year. This information I communicated to the Committee at Corner Brook. The next morning I think it was, I received a visit from a Mr. Bentley who was representing the Paper Company's interests, and at that interview we discussed among other things the minimum wage, and he intimated that it was justifiable from the company's viewpoint because they had reduced the charge for board per day from 75 cents to 60 cents. Now I don't think that anybody can accuse me of being unreasonable, in fact I always try to see the other fellow's point of view; that is my

business, to anticipate the other side of the story, and I think the Hon. Minister of Justice can bear me out. I saw that there might be something in Mr. Bentley's contention that a wage of 35 cents per hour with a ten-hour day, when they were charging board at the rate of 75 cents per day, would be no better than 33½ cents per day charging 60 cents for board, it would be exactly the same. I immediately wired back to the Drivers' Committee.

During our conversation I drew to his attention reports I had received from the District, to the effect that there were men cutting pulpwood at the rate of 75 cents per cord. I asked for an explanation, and this is the explanation. These men were looking after certain surplus supplies of wood belonging to the Company in certain tracts of the district, and rather than have them kicking their heels against the trees, they decided they would give them an opportunity to cut pulpwood at the rate of 75 cents per cord. I replied that it was an odd situation for these men in addition to looking after the property of the Company, to cut wood at the rate of 75 cents per cord, and I can't say that I got a satisfactory explanation.

The next afternoon after the House had been in session, the Prime Minister called me over to his desk, and he told me right over there by his desk that he was going to have a conference with these gentlemen who were representing the companies the next morning, and he asked me if I would care to be present. I replied that I would. If there was anything I could do to help bring about an amicable settlement I would be only too glad. I am not going to tell what transpired at that office the next morning, because I gave the Prime Minister my word that what went on there would be confidential, but I am justified in saying that on no occasion did I assent to any cut, and the last words I uttered before I left the room, and I was the first to leave, were these: "I am taking no responsibility for any action which is taken." I think the Prime Minister will admit that is what I said.

I don't know where this emanated from. It is not the Minister of Labour, because he was not at the meeting unless he got the information before leaving this House, but I hope the Prime Minister will deny the statement contained in this message, and tell this House and the country generally that I did not concur in this reduction of the minimum wage. I told the meeting that I would not be responsible. I pointed out the difference in the situation between the ordinary working man and these drivers in Corner Brook. I pointed out how the ordinary labouring man with his 28 cents per hour and his dry home to go to when his day's work was done, was much better off than these men who were driving and were subject to certain physical risks besides being wet three parts of the time. I pointed out that these men should have a better wage than the ordinary labouring man. I want to take this occasion of repudiating this statement that I concurred in this reduction of the minimum wage.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I want to corroborate what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just said. It looked like a strike, and I asked a representative of the A.N.D. Co. and a representative of the I.P.P. Co., and as an act of courtesy I asked the representative of the District and also the Minister of Justice to meet me to discuss the situation. I told the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he would not be bound by it, that he would not be held responsible. I told him we would be very glad of his advice, but I would take the responsibility for the outcome of this meeting. It looked like a deadlock, and I said will you take 27½ cents an hour, and they said they could get plenty of men to

do the work at the lower rate. The representative of the other company said yes, they would accept it, and he urged the other representative to do and [so] reduce the cost of board 15 cents a day. I want to tell the truth about this matter and put the Leader of the Opposition in the proper light. He came to the meeting, he listened and he was sympathetic. Now the Minister of Labour is very seriously ill; the day after the House closed last week he was taken very ill with a form of bronchial trouble with a serious congestion of the lungs, and he is unlikely to be around for some little time. I did tell him that I asked Mr. Bradley to the meeting, and I said that you would take no responsibility. I think that a half a loaf is better than no bread. I think this was a very good advance and a fair compromise. If the men do not want to accept it they are free agents. I know that they have to undergo a lot of hardships, but there have been fewer fatalities at that work than in any other branch of the industry. I hope that is sufficient explanation, if there is any other information I can give, I will be glad to give it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The Prime Minister is correct. Of course, he is able to give much more information than I would be able to give. He has told you about the 27½ cents per hour, and this I could not do. I am very glad that the Prime Minister has seen fit, following on my complaint, to place me in the proper light with regard to this situation. I don't know how the Minister of Labour got the idea. I don't blame him, he wasn't at the meeting. I don't know who is responsible, but the fact that it has been denied by the first Minister of the Crown is sufficient for me.

Now, Sir, with regard to the Speech from the Throne. It is, as you know, a political document. It emanates not from His Excellency the Governor, but from his Council who are the Government of the day, and beyond the first paragraph, which I think we can fairly assume to be the sentiments of His Excellency the Governor being, as they are, personal in character, we must regard the Speech from the Throne as purely a political document, and it is with the very second section of it that I first have to take issue.

Its first sentence is a statement of fact: "The general election which was held in June last resulted in a decisive victory for my present administration." I don't think anybody within the sound of my voice this afternoon is likely to dispute that; the victory was overwhelming, more overwhelming than any victory that was ever won in this country since responsible government. You were swept into office on the crest of a wave such as never rolled in on the shores of this country since it has been inhabited. But the second statement is an entirely different matter. "This victory was confirmed in the result of the recent election held in the District of Port de Grave." That is not even a statement of fact; it is a statement of the opinion of the Executive Government that the result of the election in the District of Port de Grave was a confirmation of the policy which has been adopted and carried out by the present administration since their advent to office in June last, and that is not true; that is not true. The causes which assisted most materially, which in fact were the main causes of the election in the District of Port de Grave, are not an assurance of continued confidence in the present administration, but rather an indication of a lack of confidence in that administration.

Now, in the ordinary course of events it is well known to everybody who has followed political history in this country, that at a by-election the Government usually has a handicap against the Opposition. I don't know that I can translate that handicap into percentages, but at a rough guess

it would be fair to say that the Government starts off at a by-election with a 15 per cent advantage, and yet in March of 1933, the District which had returned the candidate for the Alderdice party in June last at the general election with a majority of 1,100, more than a two to one vote, in the by-election of 1933 had that majority reduced to about 350. Just how that can be regarded as a further confirmation of confidence in the Government and its policy it is difficult for me to say. It surely indicated that there are fewer people in the District of Port de Grave who have confidence in this Government than had it six or nine months ago. In June last Mr. Ayre polled 2,200 or 2,300. The Government candidate in March 1933 only polled 1,500 or 1,600, what a difference! What a difference between the numbers who had confidence in the Tory party in June last, and the number who have confidence in it to-day, or who had such confidence on the 31st March last. The statement is not correct and, Sir, it is a more or less immaterial statement but for this fact, that being a statement of opinion which is not borne out by fact. It was very, very bad taste to place such a statement in the mouth of His Excellency the Governor.

Now, in what I have to say to you this afternoon I claim that I speak for a majority of the people of this country. I have done a little travelling around Newfoundland since the election; I have had numerous communications from various persons in districts all over the country; I can form some opinion as to how the tide is setting since the 11th day of June last. I can assure you, Sir, that the feeling of confidence which existed in the Tory party in June last is gone, and that to-day, insignificant though I may be personally, to-day, perhaps by force of circumstance rather than by my own personal [*omission*], to-day I more truly represent the sentiments of the people of this country than the huge majority which sits on the other side of the House. I am here, Sir, to utter what are their views this afternoon, to tell the House what are their sentiments, and say for them what they would say if they could stand in my place and become articulate. They expect it of me, and I intend to carry out that duty to the best of my ability.

In order that I may picture the situation clearly, it is necessary for me to carry you back to about the 1st day of November, 1928. There had just been a general election, and the Tory administration led by the present Prime Minister, who took office when his predecessor, Mr. Monroe, retired, was swept out of office by the people of this country by a majority of practically three to one. I think it was exactly three to one, and soon as it became quite clear that the Government was defeated and that the Liberal party was sustained at the polls, an announcement appeared in one of the daily newspapers of this city, both of which were supporting the then Tory Government, and this was the statement: "The Liberal party has won, but the fight is just begun."

Now, I want the significance of that statement to sink into the minds of the Members of this House, because it bears a significance, as it carries with it an import which became abundantly apparent in the course of the next four years, highly at variance with constitutional government in this country or in any British-speaking dominion. "The fight has just begun." That was the statement of the Tory party through its official press about the 1st day of November, 1928. What does the statement mean? What mental attitude does it reflect? What implications does it carry with it? "The fight has just begun." In other words, the party which that paper represented had, at that time, immediately they knew they were defeated, made up their minds that they were going to fight against the new Liberal administration from that day; that it was to be continued, and continued relentlessly throughout the years, if necessary, until the Liberal administration was driven out of

office, no matter whether it was a good administration or a bad administration; no matter whether it was a careful administration or a careless administration; it made no difference whether it was an honest administration or a dishonest administration; it mattered not whether it might confer on the people of this country more benefits than any government which had preceded it or not. "The fight has just begun." That was the statement made before the Liberal administration was sworn in, the very mental attitude of that Tory party. Their only object was to oust the Liberal government from power as soon as possible, quite regardless of their own conduct, regardless of how they handled the affairs of the country, regardless of the benefits or of the evils which they conferred upon the nation. It was all the same to them; out they had to go, as soon as they could be gotten out. That was the attitude with which the campaign [against] the Liberal administration of 1932 started on the 1st November, 1928.

With that in view, one can imagine just how much fair play, just how much honest criticism, just what mead of reasonable praise that might be conferred upon the Liberal administration when such was due. Fair criticism could not be expected under circumstances of that kind. With such an announcement, their mental attitude would be one of bitter hostility at the outset, and the subsequent events proved exactly what was meant by that statement. During the four years, history speaks for itself. The utterances of the representatives of that party in the House of Assembly, the utterances of their press, the whole of which they control in this country – it was nothing but a continued shower of abuse, slander and vilification, endeavouring all the time to bring the Government into hatred and disrepute, an effort to keep people politically minded in and out of season, in and out of the House of Assembly, Sundays and Mondays, night and day. Nothing that the Liberal Government did was good, and if by any chance there appeared to be anything done which they could not very well describe as bad, it was then alleged to be done out of a bad motive. Every whisper of wrong-doing, every suggestion of impropriety, everything possible that they could rake out of the dung pits of their imagination was immediately magnified and fastened on the Liberal administration, and this continued for two and a half years until the spring of 1931, and without much avail.

They did not succeed up to that time in shaking the position of the Government to any appreciable extent. Three by-elections had been fought in the meantime; two of them as a result of vacancies on the Government side and one as a result of a vacancy in the Opposition ranks itself. The two Government seats were retained by the Government with an increased majority. The increased majority was probably due to that 15 per cent handicap which I mentioned a few moments ago, and it must be remembered that we took an Opposition seat from them, and brought the Government ranks up to 30 instead of 29, rather a different picture. You could see disappointment on the faces of these Tory representatives in the House, as they sat somewhere around where I am now sitting. It was eloquent in their faces, their disappointment at the failure of their efforts to discredit the administration then in office.

Then, in the Spring of 1931 there came their gallant opportunity, a God-sent opportunity, Mr. Speaker, it was then that the hell-hounds of an over [omission] broke loose, and joined with the profit-making madness of the Water Street merchants to bring about the greatest depression this country has ever known. There was an opportunity given to capitalize [on] the miseries of the people of this country and to utilize [them] for their political advantage.

It is necessary for a moment or two to have a clear picture in order to visualize the Tory party

in and out of office, and in their attitude towards the Government in the spring of 1931 and up until June, 1932, and to examine the causes for depression. The first is internal; the second is external. The internal sub-divided themselves into two branches as well, and one of those internal causes was over-expansion. From 1922 until 1929 or 1930, there was continued over-expansion in this country, and so as to visualize properly all the causes of depression which submerged this country gradually, I may go back to 1910 when this country started on the downward grade by an insane policy of the building of branch railways. I am well aware that there are parties who have carried the name Liberal as well as Tory who are both in part responsible for that programme, but I am not here to-day to defend any party which contributed to the ills from which the people are suffering to-day, and so I intend to do some hitting regardless who is in the way.

In my opinion, it was when those branch railways were started that our public debt began to mount rapidly because of the huge expenditures made out of borrowed money. Then came along the war, when we had again heavy borrowings and unprecedented expenditures to carry the people along, and then followed lack of employment and destitution in the country. From 1920 onwards this country has borrowed money almost every year, and those borrowings for the most part were applied to payments on current expenditure rather than to pay the interest on the public debt. Every government engaged in the same scheme. The result was that deposits in the savings banks grew, the amount of life insurance grew and the standard of living improved all round, and all this was on borrowed [money]. There was scarcely a thinking man in Newfoundland from 1920 to 1930 to get up and cry halt to this borrowing practice. Nobody seemed to have the courage to start. But Newfoundland was not the only offender along those lines. Canada had her over-expenditure, far in excess of Newfoundland. The United States of America also had its over-expenditure, away ahead of Newfoundland comparatively speaking, and every country got the idea into its head that was never going to be bad times again.

Thus in the course of a few years Newfoundland had piled up a national debt of about \$100,000,000. People without the buying power in dollars and cents could not, and cannot support themselves and families when the first charge upon their earnings is their proportionate share to pay on this public debt, and this works out at about \$4[00] per head. The fisherman, the farmer or the mill hand, either in his own right or in the hands of capitalists, could not find a way to do it, and that is one of the things that brought about the financial collapse of Newfoundland.

Then again, there is the insane incompetence of local fish exporters. These gentlemen have been with us for the past 400 years. They were brought here in the early days by fishing admirals, controlled the catch of fish just as they do to-day, and when the voyage was over they were brought back again. It was a crime for a fisherman to build a house here in the olden days; but gradually they got the right to stay here, but still there survives out of that system the principle of making it the duty of the man who caught the fish to pass it over to the merchant, and all the cash he got was a few dollars for the clergy. I am afraid that is as much as the fisherman sees to-day. The attitude of the average fish exporter to-day is to give a fisherman supplies in the Spring, and he has to turn in his catch in the Fall. Then, if there is anything left after the merchant has got his account satisfied, the fishermen can have it, but if there nothing left he must go to the Government of Newfoundland to look for food. It is no use for these gentlemen to plead ignorance now, Mr. Speaker. They knew the situation years ago. They knew that the fishery was fast declining and degenerating. They knew

that the time was fast coming when the fishermen and their families could not exist under the conditions and circumstances meted out to them, but they made no move. With that phase of the subject I propose to deal later, but the fact remains that as a result of their failure to endeavour to keep the quality of their fish up to a decent standard, to-day Newfoundland is fast losing her markets and, in consequence, depression has gained further inroads on our people than it was in 1931.

And now I come to the external causes of this depression. Some people are of the opinion that the depression started in this country in October, 1928; but I contend it began six months before, when the stock markets abroad broke. After all, the stock market is only a thermometer and not a cause; but from 1922 to 1929, and particularly during the latter year, this inflating wave had a gathering speed and the stock markets showed that world conditions were going to suffer. I bear out my contention. Let us look at some of the statements of prominent financial men and politicians in the United States (*reads*).

Radio corporations dropped from 505 in September to 28 in November. Union Carbide from 413 in September to 59 in September [*sic*]. Even then the presence of the depression was not recognized, but it was felt that it was a mere passing phase and that in the course of a few months business conditions would be normal again. Let me read from the extracts from statements made by some very prominent men, when they discussed the condition of business at the time. Mr. Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury in the United States, said (*reads*). Now let us turn to a statement made by Mr. Pachon (*reads*). And he is one of the richest men in America, by the way. He did not believe there was anything alarming about this sudden burst in the stock markets. And then we have the words of President Hoover himself, twelve months after the break in the stock markets (*reads*). Even he agreed that it was only a temporary setback. And then there came the greatest bank failure in the history of the United States of America. Now listen to Mr. J. J. [*omission*], Secretary of Labour, in a public statement made in July 1930 (*reads*). Mr. Robert P. Lamont, Secretary of Commerce, said in 1930 (*reads*). Again on the 22 of September, he said this (*reads*). Again in December he says this (*reads*). That was on the 6th of December, more than six months after the stock market debacle. Again, I would ask you to listen to the words of Henry Ford. In 1931 he says (*reads*). In that year 1931, there were 2,290 banks closed their doors. That was the year when the depression became apparent in Newfoundland, the United States, and all over the civilized world. In the last three months of that year banks closed their doors at the rate of ten a day. In that year in the United States alone, business houses closed their doors in such numbers as to create a record in American history up to that time.

I utilized these statements for the purpose of indicating to you, Sir, the fact that the greatest financial [*illegible*] of the North American continent had no idea of the magnitude of this depression up to 1931. They had made no preparation to meet it. They had no idea that the whole world was going to be involved, and we, the Liberal administration of the day, had no thought that any such depression was about to hit the country. Not only is that so, but when we put that loan on the market in 1931, even the Bank of Montreal had no thought of it. If they had, since they were our financial advisors, the financial advisors of the colony, it was their duty to warn the Government of the day as to the impending danger, and they did not do it. We can only conclude from this either that they did not know or had not realized the seriousness of the depression up to that time, or on the other hand that they wanted to injure Newfoundland. And surely we cannot assume the latter. Can we say that

the Bank of Montreal deliberately withheld financial information and advice which they could have given, that they deliberately withheld it in order to injure Newfoundland? Surely not. We can only assume then that they, even at that late day May 1931, had no inkling as to what was about to take place.

Now let us look at the situation. Here we have in these heartbreaking days of 1931 the whole financial structure crashing, foreign money markets in a desperate condition, banks closing, business houses going insolvent, government as well as municipal bonds falling in the market. How was it possible for the Government, or any government under those circumstances, to raise money from people whose investments have already been decimated considerably, or in many cases had been entirely wiped out, whose wealth had shrunk and was still decreasing? How was it possible, Sir, to induce those people to put money into government bonds during that crisis? We could have floated a loan. We had bids somewhere in the neighbourhood of 90, which we naturally and quite properly refused.

Now it is necessary to describe the situation in the country at that particular time, in order to view in a suitable light the subsequent events leading up to the general election of 1932. In 1928, conditions had been such that never before, since the war, was there such prosperity among our people. The standard of living of the people had gone up. The amount of money in the Savings Banks had increased. The amount of life insurance of our people had increased, and we were faced with the situation where the Government could not raise a loan to make up the deficiency in the revenue collected for that year. The practice had been carried for years. It was not the custom of the Liberal government alone, but of the Tories when in power also. It was like a cyclone that struck the country without anybody being aware that it was going to happen. The country may be compared to a ship sailing along in calm water and suddenly struck by a tornado; and our difficulty was aggravated by the dropping of commodity prices. Not only was there the usual deficit in the Treasury, but we were faced with a further deficiency as the result of the falling of the prices of commodities. Nothing in history can in any way approach the situation that was created, or the difficulties that the Government had to face. From May of 1931 to June of 1932 difficulties were met and mastered, the magnitude of which no one outside of the Government will ever be able to appreciate. The manner in which they met the situations that arose, and the way in which they handled them, is a matter of credit to the Government of that day. I claim for that Liberal administration that they had begun a serious effort to reduce expenditures of the country before the failure of the attempt to raise the loan in the year of 1931. Many here present in the House were here then, and they know that in the Session of 1931 the Government reduced certain expenditures and made cuts in the civil service. An effort was made to cut expenditure in so far as it was possible to do so at that time. When we found that we could not get a loan it was driven home to us then, and we were made to realize as we had never done before, that the time had come to call a halt. The day had arrived when we could no longer go on borrowing money as we had been doing for a number of years. With every intelligent man in Newfoundland, it was only a question as to how long we could go on borrowing. Everybody realized that this country could go on borrowing only so long, but nobody had the courage to face the situation squarely before that time. I do not claim that we were men of above the average in ability, but we faced the situation which was put squarely up to us as it had never before been faced. And we immediately tried to handle it.

We introduced retrenchment measures with all possible speed. Now perhaps the members of the present Government are beginning to learn that when it comes to making retrenchment, it is not a matter of sitting down and lopping off so much a year there and then. They will have found no doubt that it is a far different thing in the doing. It is not so simple as that. It takes months in fact to do it properly. In fact, I will venture to say that it will be years before the Prime Minister will have thoroughly adjusted the civil service cuts in this country. We did the best we could in the time we had at our disposal to do the work. And we did succeed in lopping off considerable amounts from expenditure. We felt at the time, and subsequent events justified it, that it was better to get somebody from outside to examine into our conditions and bring in a report making recommendations in the nature of reduction of expenditure. We got our man that year. And on being recommended to do so, we made further and more drastic cuts in the civil service and in the public expenditure. We closed Branch Railways which ought never to have been opened. We reduced education grants. We introduced and put into effect a system of financial control that will be remembered by generations as yet unborn as the greatest financial work ever done in this country.

I know we will be told that we were compelled to do it – the banks compelled us to do it. My reply is that [that] is untrue, that [it] was under consideration in 1929 before the banks compelled us to do it. We realized the very great advantages that an independent Controller of the Treasury would bring, and we put it into effect. All that was done by the Liberal government, that slandered, vilified and abused Liberal government, within twelve months of a general election. We committed political suicide, but we did it with our eyes open. We knew when these cuts were confirmed at the Council Board, that every cut we put into effect was a nail driven further into our political coffin. Railwaymen, civil servants, soldiers, pensioners, everybody of any account in this country were antagonized because we were taking something from them that up to this [point] they had enjoyed. We had sense enough, and we do not claim to have any more than the ordinary common sense, but we had sense enough to ensure that we would go down to defeat, but we did it and the result was shown in the general election of last year. That is how the Liberal administration dealt with the situation in 1931.

How did the Tory party act during this period? I call it the Tory party, it is not a political entity, call it the Tory supporters or the Tories generally; how did these men who have been a political factor in the country at all times, how did they deal with the situation? Did they take the position that it was the country that was at stake? Did they take the position that now was the time to forget all political enmity and difference, and join hands with the powers that be, and everybody would do their best to assist the country in such a time of stress and despondency? Did they try to save the country from the impending and almost inevitable catastrophe that was hanging over us? Was that their attitude? Was that their attitude towards the nation that gave them birth? Were all their efforts directed to righting the ship of state? No, Sir, far from it. As I said a few moments ago, this was their golden God-sent opportunity to get their political opponents, and the propaganda against the Liberal party in and out of this House, in the press, on the platforms and placards, was doubled and redoubled and redoubled, when along came this golden opportunity to blame all the ills of the country on the Liberal party of the day. It was rather an odd coincidence, Mr. Speaker, that while the banks were advertising the loan in 1931 in the foreign markets, a meeting was [being] held in the Majestic Theatre by the Tory merchants of Water Street in an effort to embarrass the

Government of the day. Was that done to help their country? Was that meeting held to try and improve the general trade of the country, or was it just another crack at their political foes? What were the activities of the local and foreign press at this time? What was their attitude? They deluged the whole of North America and the Old Country with messages and statements damning everything connected with Newfoundland. Why did they represent Newfoundland as being nearly bankrupt and say that the Savings Bank was going to close? Why, if they had ordinary decency, if they had the commonest kind of common decency, under such circumstances they would have kept their mouths shut at least, but instead of that they went out of their way to ensure that the Government would not get the loan and go on with their job of righting their ship of state. At such a time, when there were so many people destitute and starving, when the country was in the grip of an economic depression which was strangling the whole world, they insisted on playing politics. One cannot by the wildest stretch of imagination assume that they had a grudge against their country and it must be assumed that their activities were directed towards getting their political opponents by any means, regardless of the repercussions on their native land. We find ex-Tory ministers, yes, even ex-Prime Ministers, men who were prominent in the public life of this country, and whose [omission] for that reason would count for something, making statements in foreign countries to the effect that Newfoundland was bankrupt and that the Savings Bank was gone. When we find these men who were prominent in public life, and whose word carried some weight, going out of their way to damn our country, they did not do it because they had a grudge against their country or the people in it, we can only assume that they did it regardless of the country or the people in it, they did it with the sole purpose of damning the government in power at the time.

We were told through the press and on the street, on the platform and through pamphlets, in this House of Assembly and out of it, that it was the government of the day that couldn't get the loan. The Liberal administration led by Sir Richard Squires was the stumbling block. There was no such thing as a depression. We could not be affected by a depression. The only thing required was that the Liberal government be ousted, put the Tory party in power and Newfoundland could get all the money she wanted. All this propaganda placed the responsibility for all the ills the country was suffering from on the Liberal administration. It was necessary for their political aims for them to arouse all the bitterness and hatred they could in the minds of the people against the Liberal administration. From May 1931 to May 1932 we were told unceasingly that the failure to raise the loan was due simply and solely to the reputation of the Squires government in the foreign markets, and if we would only put Alderdice in power we would get all the money we wanted. The civil servants, the soldiers, the teachers, the pensioners, all were incited against the government. They played upon the cupidity which is common to all men to egg them on, and bring the government into disrepute. They publicly condemned the cut in pensions which was passed by the Tory administration in 1926. Look at the riot. In one breath they tell us it was just a crowd of small boys, and then in the next they put placards over Mr. Alderdice's signature, telling the people to be quiet. He was doing his best to get the government out ...

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Read it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Yes, I will (*reads*). Now, which is it? Was it merely a bunch of

small boys out on a racket, or was it an interpretation by Mr. Alderdice as being a demand on the part of the people for the resignation of the Squires administration? He was exerting himself; he and his party were exhorting themselves to do their utmost to ensure that resignation, and yet in the same breath we are told that this was only a bunch of small boys. Why were the stores closed on that day? Why was that meeting, which hundreds of citizens predicted was going to cause trouble, proceeded with? Why was that parade proceeded with the next day? And the Tory Water Street merchants closed their stores, in some cases with menaces, to drive their employees down here to the House of Assembly.

Their conduct from the beginning, from November of 1928, and with increased strength and bitterness from May of 1931 down to June of 1932 can be described as being nothing but that of incendiaries applying the torch to the blaze, wherever they found it being put out by the government in office. That is the situation. Here was the Liberal government – whatever they had been prior to that I am not going to discuss that this afternoon, I have no time at my disposal – whatever their deeds or misdeeds up to that time, from that date onward at any rate, they were directing their energies and trying to [right] the ship of state; that can't be denied by anybody, and here was the other party deliberately bringing them into this at home and abroad; attacking them on all sides; creating the utmost bitterness and hostility against them in the minds of the people, blaming them for all ills the people were suffering from the price of fish to too heavy a rainfall. That was the line of attack on the government of the day, that was struggling with conditions of an unprecedented character from 1931 to 1932. Then we come to the election.

I cannot state positively what the various candidates for the Liberal party told their constituents in the different districts throughout the Island. I can only say that it was an understood thing among the members of the party, so far as I came in contact with them before I left for Corner Brook, that it was the Government policy to tell the people conditions as they were, and to tell them that under the circumstances it was impossible for the Government to bring about a change of conditions; that these had to change gradually, and that is what I told the people in my District of the Humber. I put it to them straight. I told them there was nothing we could do for them. There were no public expenditures that we could make, it was useless for them to look for road grants in future, the only thing we could do was to observe greater economies; cut down expenditure more if possible, and if they were not satisfied with that, they had better go for my opponent, and on the last occasion from the Majestic Theatre in Corner Brook, the night before polling day. What were the activities of my opponents? What did they say? What did they say during that general election? First of all, we were told, and the people were told, and they were in the frame of mind to believe this – remember here you have a poverty-stricken people, in many cases hungry, existing on dole under a system that had to be suddenly created and without any experience in handling that kind of thing before, poor, despairing, desolate, hungry and cold, ready to grasp at anything that might be the least possible help to bring them out of the slough of despondency in which they were sunk, and look what was dangled before their eyes – promises. Mr. Speaker, all political parties may promise. From the time we first had responsible government, I suppose there never was a party that went to an election that did not make some promise, and in the ordinary course of the political history of our country, I think it will be found that there was not a single government elected by the people that ever did carry out all the promises that it had made; that is not humanly possible, but, Sir, there are

times when promises which are not fulfilled and perhaps could not be fulfilled, might be excused. I don't mean now that a man should go to a constituency and promise the electorate something which he knows he can't perform, but I do say this, that on many occasions in the past history of this country, candidates have gone to their constituencies and have made promises, possible or impossible of performance. These candidates believed these promises could be performed, and I can say for myself that when I fought the election of 1928, I was fully satisfied myself that we could perform the promises which we made. I may not have been justified in that satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, but I was satisfied, and these promises were made at a time when they were reasonably possible. Times were good in the Fall of 1928; money was flowing quite freely; we were in the best portion of inflation which very few recognized until deflation came; industries were opening up everywhere, and I submit that we had reasonable grounds for the making of the promises which we made in the Fall of 1928. But look at the position in 1932. There was no money for anything; there was no money to get food for people to eat; there was no possibility of an industry coming in here or anything else; yet, and yet the Tory party made promises, lots of them, lots of promises. They led the people to believe that they could change this country from the ill of poverty into the paradise of plenty in 24 hours, no 48, excuse me. All the evils from which the people were suffering were blamed upon the Squires administration. There was no labour in the country, the price of fish was low. The reason there was no labour was because the Government could not get money to give labour. The Government could not get that money to give labour because nobody would trust them in the foreign market, but Mr. Alderdice could get money, at least, so he said. He could get all the money that he reasonably wanted, not only that, but he could get it in 48 hours. That 48 hours has long since passed, and I regret to say that the average citizen of Newfoundland [is] content to-day that Mr. Alderdice has not got the money yet.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: When did Mr. Alderdice make that promise?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: When did you make that promise? The promises that you made, Sir, are so numerous.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: You must answer that question.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I will answer that question in my own way. Every time that you came into this House of Assembly during the period 1924 to 1928 and criticized the conduct of the Government, you impliedly promised that you would do different.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: No.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Wait a minute now; every time your press criticized the doings of the Liberal party, they impliedly promised in your name that you would do different.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Come down ...

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Every time you smiled in this House of Assembly, and the cut of your jib was a promise.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I am afraid you will have to withdraw that. I never made any such promise.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Pardon me, I am not quite finished yet. I was given to understand, though I was not in the City of St. John's at the time, that you made a speech in the Star Theatre wherein you made a statement that within 48 hours after the election, you could get all the money that was reasonably necessary for the purpose of the government. That statement was broadcast also. Do you now deny that you made that statement?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: For the purposes of running the government, but I did not say that I could get any amount of money.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You said for the purposes of running the government.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Honestly; remember that.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Honestly. The statement that is in the minds of numerous people in and out of St. John's to-day, is that you made a promise to them that within 48 hours after election you would get all the money that was reasonably necessary, not merely to run the government honestly, but to give them labour.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I did not.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You did not. Well, Mr. Prime Minister, that is odd. I can't make a statement as of my own knowledge, as I already told you, because I was not here. I was not in the Star Theatre, neither was I listening in to the radio. I was engaged at that time in licking your candidate, but there are a lot of people who were in the Star Theatre and who thought you made that statement. Can you give the people any information as to who was the scoundrel that impersonated you and made that promise, because there are thousands of them ...

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I never made any such statement.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't want to send you away lopsided. I will give you another one. I can't possibly stand here and tell you all of them, I have not the endurance. I am going to give you another one so that you will be decently balanced. On the 23rd April, 1932, you made this statement in the House of Assembly (*reads*).

And the country was told there was to be started a \$4,000,000 industry immediately after the general election. Now I am willing to admit that I have not seen anything of that industry yet, nor have I seen a single effort made about any other industry since the Squires Government went out of

office. These are two of the promises that you made to the country. First you promised labour within 48 hours after the election, and secondly you promised a \$4,000,000 industry three months after you got power. Even if we were lacking, like Satan calling the devil devil, it's a poor excuse for you to say now that somebody else broke their promises too. Then we come to dole. Oh, this disgraceful dole we were told, and that the idea of offering 6 cents a day was an insult to the people.

The present Government, through their press, promised instead of dole, progress, prosperity and profitable employment. Well, there [is] a large number of people throughout the country looking for this much-heralded progress, prosperity and profitable employment, and there are thousands of people who on the 11th of June last voted for the Alderdice party [and] had their bags packed to go to work on the Gander. The teachers and civil servants all felt that this new wonderful Government was going to do them justice. Their pay was to be put back to where it was, and the educational grant was going to be restored if their party was returned to power.

Well, they won an overwhelmingly [*omission*] victory on the crest of the biggest wave that ever washed our shores, but that wave has since receded and they are left stranded to-day. You succeeded in convincing and deluding the people, but the pity of it, the irony and tragedy of it all, is that the people you so grossly and basely deceived are the sufferers. In July last year, I saw crowds of hungry labouring men around public platforms, and the burden of their talk was they were waiting for this money to put them to work, as they were promised it, 48 hours after the election was over. The Prime Minister said he did not tell them; well, someone told them, because hundreds of men were not foolish enough to set up such a story if there was not something to it. Somebody in the Government told them that the Prime Minister promised them the loan. It started among the men at the Star Theatre and it culminated in the smashing of the windows of the stores on Water Street. Then the Government admits their inability to get the money, although on the eve of the election they could get it. The electorate was told that outside investors would not trust the scoundrels in the Liberal government, but "if you put us in we will get it." If the present Prime Minister believed that he could get the money to put the men to work prior to the election, it was a huge blunder; if he did not, it was a damned crime to deceive those people. Prior to the election he could borrow all the money he needed, and a few days ago he said he would not take it if it was offered him. My friends on the other side say now that they did not know what it all meant until they took office. Last year, the then Opposition asked 302 questions, and 95 per cent of them were answered sufficiently fully to make them aware of the financial situation of the country, and what they had to face on assuming office. And now the Prime Minister tells us that he would not borrow the money, but that before the election he could. The real reason is that he cannot get it. The credit of the Alderdice government is not one whit better than that of the previous government's.²⁴

[*Omission in the transcript*]

²⁴ **"Hon. the Prime Minister** – The day before the Squires Government went out of office our bonds were worth \$50 to the 100. To day they are worth \$80. They jumped 10 points the day after the present Government were returned to office.

"Mr. Bradley – His opinion from a financial standpoint was that Great Britain was behind Newfoundland and nobody else." *Daily News*, May 10, 1933.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: What is a remarkable fact is that there so many people who believe that they were promised a Gander two months after the election last June, they were told this. We did not tell them this. Who told it to them? Who was it that promised the people of this country a Gander development two months after the election? There is to be no Gander development as it appears in answer to questions put to the Government.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Did you read my answer which I gave you to-day?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: According to this answer, there is no information to be tabled. There will not be any development of the Gander until the writ complication is cleared up. I had not intended to go back into ancient history at all, but in view of the fact that you put a political cast into the answer to the question, I must do so. Surely the Government can very easily clear up whatever complications that exist with regard to the Gander lands. Surely, if the Government were anxious to start a Gander project, the fact of the writs having been issued would not prevent them. These complications can be cleared up very easily.

I know something of the Gander myself. We promised the people of Newfoundland a Gander development in our campaign of 1928. I make no apology for it, and none is needed for our having made that promise. Our intentions were honest. We honestly believed that we could do it, and we believed that it would be a good thing in the interests of the Colony. In the Fall of 1929, sometime in October, Mr. John P. Powell, who represented the Reid interests, came to St. John's and he presented a memorandum to the Government, containing the terms of a Gander deal on which he wanted the verdict of the Government at once. One of the terms which that memorandum contained was a guarantee of \$50,000,000 by the Government, and there [were] various other terms of that kind.

He wanted an answer to that memorandum within as few days as possible. The impression I got was that he wanted his answer within a week. The Prime Minister will realize that such a suggestion was impossible, that no executive of any government was going to agree to make immediate decisions on such questions without having a detailed agreement to consider, showing all the concessions which the Government was going to make, and what the country was going to get out of it in return. We had to have all the agreement there before we could decide. We appointed a sub-committee to go into the matter, and it met Mr. Powell on two or three occasions in the course of a week, and discussed certain features of the proposed agreement. They intimated some concessions that were unacceptable to the Government, including the \$50,000,000 guarantee. And then Mr. Powell disappeared. We did not hear from him any more until February, and then he produced a copy of an agreement which was supposed to constitute the Gander project. One copy of that agreement was given to the Government, provided that it was for their consideration and not for publication. Subsequently he published it himself. In that document itself were the seeds of suspicion that everything was not genuine. In any place where there were payments of money to be made, the piece of paper was cut out, and that alone was enough to throw suspicion on the matter. I presently made enquiry and much was revealed to confirm my suspicions. We pointed out that we were not prepared to agree to any document providing for the payment of money to anybody, unless we knew where the money was going. We tried several meetings and endeavoured to come to some

agreement. We asked him to modify the terms, we pleaded with him to submit something to us that we could accept. We asked him to get Mr. Hearst down here or his representative. We said we could not take the agreement as it stood, and I was prepared to resign my seat in the Government before I voted for the deal as it stood, and I say so still. Before I will agree to such a contract I will resign my seat in this House. I am not going further into the discussion. I submit it is for me to merely state my position on the matter. I reiterate that I would not vote for it, and I told the Government so.

We were accused with that we had killed the Gander by placing those writs on the Reids' lands. I am prepared to take full responsibility for placing these writs, and under similar circumstances I would do it again. I have no apology to offer. I know something about the efforts that were made to get these writs lifted. I happened to be Attorney General at the time, and I took the position that they were not going to be lifted and they were not. These writs were placed there for a specific purpose. We had our suspicions at the time and they have been confirmed, that there was something crooked about this alleged Gander deal. Mr. Butler confirmed that in my presence, when he made the statement that there was no intention on the part of Hearst to go on with the deal, when he said that Hearst simply used it to beat down the price of paper in America and to land a long-term contract; and he had come into it after the first attempt to put the deal through. And if those writs had not been placed on the Gander lands they would have gone to the International Power and Paper Company, and the action which the Reids took for damages for clouding their title, as it's popularly called, by placing those writs on the lands, disclosed the evidence which showed beyond all doubt that but for the placing of those writs on the lands they would have gone to the International Power and Paper Company, and everybody knows that that would have killed forever the bird called the Gander.

Everybody knows about the deal of 1921 and the bluff that was put over on the then Tory government. They never had any intention of building a mill on the Gander. They wanted these lands as a reserve for their mill at Corner Brook. But we wanted that mill on the Gander. We wanted something that would clear up the labour situation in the country. If the writs had been removed, the lands would have gone to the International Power and Paper Company and all hope of the Gander development would have been gone forever. If there is at the present time any complication in connection with these writs, it can be cleared up in 24 hours. The lifting of the writs would finish that situation, and then when the writs are lifted everything would be clear. We could have done it if we had wished, in 24 hours.

Hon. Minister of Justice: That is not correct.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: No complication can be so serious that the Government cannot still clear it up by issuing new licences.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The Government cannot do so.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It can. There is no situation which can arise that cannot be settled by agreement.

Hon. Minister of Justice: It can be done only by legislation.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Now you tell us that the writs of forfeiture must be cleared up before the Gander can be developed. If that is so, bring in a Bill immediately and clear up all doubts and start the Gander at once. Now it is right up to you. We will forget your past.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: You mean your past.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: No, it's your past. We will forget the past, bring in a Bill to start the Gander. Bring in your Bill and we'll put the Gander through. I challenge you to do it. The people will welcome it. They would welcome it although it is belated. You promised the labour 48 hours after the election last June. I wonder what the teachers think of you to-day? They all felt sure that they were going to get their salaries back, and if there was ever a disappointed body of men and women in the world, I am sure it is the teachers of Newfoundland. You were false to them, you betrayed them, instead of giving them back their salaries you gave them another cut. It is not a question in their minds as to whether the circumstances of the country warranted another cut, you took the position that they ought not to be cut, you said the position of the country did not warrant a cut and as soon as you were elected to power you would put it back, and instead of that you cut them nearly as much as we did.

In the Spring of the year, on the recommendation, of the British experts, the administration in power recommended a reduction in the soldiers' pensions. Look at the scorn and abuse and vilification and slander that was showered on the Government. Look at the slander we got from the Opposition members, some of whom are in this House to-day, look at the abuse we received for recommending a cut in the soldiers' pay ...

Hon. Minister of Public Works: Yes, but there was plenty of graft.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You sit down there now and take your medicine, and keep your mouth shut, you'll get an opportunity later on to speak. You were one of those opposed to the recommendation made to the Government by these experts from England. Do you think it was a pleasant job for us? Do you think we liked the idea? Do you think we brought in that recommendation with any degree of pleasure? Can't you realise that this sort of thing was absolutely the last resort? We disliked to do it, we hated to do it, but there was the recommendation, and there had to be an effort to balance the budget, and it was agreed as a matter of logic at any rate that all should share some part of the burden. Look at the storm of abuse we met with. We withdrew them then, but these same very gentlemen who were so hostile to these reductions when the Squires government was in power, were the very same gentlemen who gave these cuts some three months afterwards. I am not saying that you did them an injustice in giving them these cuts. I am not arguing that point, but I am saying that if these cuts were not justified in May or June, they were not justified in August. You have got to answer to these men ...

Hon. Minister of Public Works: We can do that.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Now if you don't mind, there are only two of us; some people admire us for our courage in facing 24, and the least you can do is to give us fair play. I hold no personal animosities against any gentleman on the other side, but your public actions we are prepared to criticize as you did with us. We are prepared to criticize you and then shake hands with you afterwards, and then criticize you again the next day as you did with us.

Why, even the dole was cut. We were pillorized and painted as scoundrels of the deepest dye because we gave the people but \$1.80 a month to live on. I admit that was not enough. We are facing an unprecedented situation as you are doing to-day, but you condemned our system as iniquitous, and then you proceeded to cut the allowance, in some sections at any rate, and when a starving white-faced people raised a cry, and although there was very little damage done, they were sent to prison. If you were wise you would have handled that situation in a very different manner. It was a fact that these people in Spaniard's Bay and Carbonear were actually hungry and starving, and under the circumstances, the Government ought to have realized that the food would have to be provided for them in the long run, yet they fought them back and fought them back. Your very conduct induced rioting, which could have been avoided if you gave them the food in the first instance. What a tragedy. These hungry, despairing people looking to these men for the salvation which they had promised as soon as they were elected. They promised them everything would be changed. The scene would shift, instead of poverty and hunger there would [be] ease and plenty. The tragedy of these people, the jolt they received, when their hopes which had been so basely raised collapsed. Never were a people so basely deceived as by the Tory party in 1932.

I want you to understand me clearly. I do not blame you for making these reductions. I am not blaming you [for] not making this country a paradise. I am not blaming you for not putting every man back to work. I am not blaming you for not replacing the soldiers' pensions. I have sense enough to know that you can't do it, but I do blame you for raising yourselves to power on promises to do so. You basely, you grossly deceived the electors of this country. That is the story I have to tell. The people of this country will entertain nothing but scorn and hatred for you, not because of your failure to do these things, but because of the promises with which you so basely deceived them. Very few of you would survive if you went back to your constituencies to-day, not because you can't do what you were going to do, but because of the base manner in which you said you could. Many of you have not put foot in your constituencies since you were elected, and I would not like to contemplate the welcome you will receive when you do. The people realize that they have been betrayed. They realise that the Liberal party is not responsible for the depression. The Liberal [party] has the vices and virtues of the ordinary political party, and the Tory party can do no more than we did, but then no words of mine are needed to convict them of their offences.

Taking up the Speech from the Throne (*reads*). It was all Squires' fault twelve months ago; there was no depression then, there was nothing required to bring the country back to normal but to put the Tory party in power.²⁵

²⁵ The rest of the day's session does not appear in the surviving transcript. *The Evening Telegram*, May 10, 1933, p. 5, states, "It was now after 6 o'clock and as he could not conclude his speech before closing hour, he adjourned the debate until the next sitting."

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

The Bill respecting the Crown Lands Act was given second reading, and will be referred to a committee of the Whole House this afternoon for discussion. [*Daily News*, May 10, 1933]

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Certain Mineral Claims on the Labrador" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Government."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 10th instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

"At 6:20 he moved the adjournment of the debate, which he will continue this afternoon as he stated he had a lot to say on fishery matters." *Daily News*, May 10, 1933, p. 5.

Wednesday, May 10, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Mr. Stone from Masters and Mates Association, re Foreign Freighting.

Hon. Mr. Stone from New Melbourne, re Marketing of Fish.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the masters and mates of this Colony in connection with the foreign-going as well as the coastwise shipping trade. In order to give the House a proper idea of what this matter means, I shall read the petition (*reads petition*).

A few years ago we had 100 vessels, with an average of six men each, taking 600 men. Apparently of late that has been wiped out, and the seafaring trade of the country taken over by foreigners, leaving our own men trying to exist on dole. This is a petition that I am heartily in accord with and I give it my fullest support, and I ask that it be given the utmost consideration from the Department to which it relates.²⁶

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It is a difficult proposition, but the honourable gentleman who has just sat down has brought another point up that seems to me to be very strong, and that is the inference he made when he said that in the event of war, we would be in a very difficult position, and we would have no means to transport our fish. One of our greatest difficulties to-day is the problem of insurance. The rate of insurance on a schooner is 12 per cent, while the rate on a steamship is $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 per cent. I was speaking to a man the other day on this subject, and he told me that if we could provide proper vessels and suitable captains, the rate of insurance on our schooners could undoubtedly be reduced to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. We are considering whether we could not give a bonus for fish carried by schooner. The idea is that if all the fish was carried by schooner, the labour entailed would give a certain purchasing power to the people engaged in it, and that would be returned to the carriers in the form of a bonus on every quintal of fish carried. We would be no worse off than we are to-day as far as revenue is concerned, and we would be giving a livelihood to the people. These

²⁶ "The petition was a protest against the operations of foreign vessels in the shipping of fish to our markets. It also recommended that the Royal Naval Reserve be re-organized.

"Mr. Bradley, in support of the petition recalled facts which have come to light during the past year or so. He hoped the petition would receive the sympathetic support it warranted.

"Hon. the Prime Minister likewise endorsed the prayer of the petition. He pointed out an important fact that in case of war, we would not have any command over those foreign vessels which are now engaged carrying our fish to the markets. He also stated that the matter was receiving consideration at the hands of the Government. He was entirely in agreement with any proposal that would mean that all vessels employed would be of British register." *Evening Telegram*, May 11, 1933.

"The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries presented a petition signed by fifty odd Newfoundland masters and mates in connection with foreign going and coastwise trade, asking that their services be availed of in preference to foreigners." *Daily News*, May 11, 1933, p. 5.

things are occupying our minds. We know how difficult it is to put the plan into operation. Yet it is detrimental to our fishing industry to have ships going into foreign ports carrying large cargoes of fish. I would like to see the cargoes limited to a certain maximum amount. But I do think that the ships which carry our fish, whether they be steamers or schooners, should be under the British flag.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: I beg to present petitions from several places in the District of Trinity South, in the absence of the Member who happens to be away. These petitions deal with the culling, the standardization and the marketing of fish. The petitions are signed by the residents of the District, and the Hon. Secretary of State, Mr. Puddester, yesterday presented petitions of a similar nature. I ask that they be given every consideration and be referred to the Department to which they relate.

Mr. Starkes gave notice of question.

On motion all Orders were deferred to permit Mr. Bradley to continue his Speech on the Address in Reply. [*Evening Telegram*, May 11, 1932]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I come now to a consideration of the financial position in which this country found itself at the end of May, 1931, and this condition has continued getting perhaps worse day by day ever since. The funded debt of the colony, together with the temporary loans raised since the failure to raise a loan in May of 1931, is roughly speaking \$100,000,000. Averaging the interest on that debt as being in the neighbourhood of 5 per cent, then there is an annual burden of \$5,000,000 upon the citizens of the Colony. That has to be earned by our people before we have a cent for ourselves. In addition to that an amount – considerably lessened, of course, when compared to that of previous years – has to be raised to carry on the public services. I think I am safe in saying that the people of the country have to-day to earn, if they are to remain solvent, in the neighbourhood of \$8,000,000 before they have one cent to provide food and clothing for their families. I will say that with the value of money as it is to-day, or even if it had a considerably lessened value, it is humanly impossible for the 270,000 people of the colony, who are already rendered poor, to carry the burden. It can't be done.

Many of these burdens were made when money was cheap. For instance, they were created and carried from the beginning of the war until the crash in 1931. Money was then very cheap. It was worth comparatively less than it is to-day in its relation to industrial products. Commodities of all kinds were dear. A quintal of fish in 1918 provided interest on \$300 of our national debt.

To-day we have to provide the interest on \$50,000,000 of our national debt, [and] in order to-day to meet the situation which we could handle in 1918, the people have to produce six times as much codfish. Six times as much as [they] would have to in 1918. Where we borrowed \$100 in 1918, when it was the value of six or seven quintals of fish, to-day \$100 is the value of 50 quintals of fish. From these figures it is abundantly clear that the situation has changed from when we had to pay the bondholders \$5 [on] \$100 or one-third the value of a barrel of flour, to [the situation] we have to-day, [where] that \$5 is worth the full value of a barrel of flour. The original theory of money was that it would be a medium of exchange from a strictly economic standpoint. To-day the

situation is that where we pay 5 per cent on our money, we are paying five times as much as when these loans were raised, or in other words the bondholders are getting far more from their investments that they ever expected. The position in 1918-19 [was that] when a man invested \$100 in our bonds [he] expected it to bear interest to the value of a third of a barrel of flour; [it is] to-day changed to where a man gets from his \$100 investment the price of a full barrel of flour. That economic situation cannot be disputed; the fall in the price of commodities and the increase in the value of money has led in a large measure to the situation which has arisen in this country to-day.

Money one time was regarded as a medium of exchange. It was a useful way for exchanging the products of the world between producer and buyer. Say if a man had two goats which were the value of one cow, instead of getting one cow for his two goats he could get the cash for them, and with that cash he could buy flour, and the man who sold the flour could get a fishing boat, nets, lines and twines etc., and so be able to prosecute the fishery. But from being as it originally was a medium of exchange, money became a terrific and potent weapon in the hands of capitalists to-day. It is no longer a medium of exchange; it has become the grinding power which is gradually crushing the life out of the industry and the public of this country.

The Prime Minister has said that we are finished with interest-bearing loans. I do not intend to deal with his attitude to that question before the elections in June last, I am done with political questions as far as this Address in Reply is concerned – this is a time when we have to forget political differences and march side by side in the best interests of this country. In taking this attitude the Prime Minister is taking the only possible course open to him under the circumstances. Even if we could borrow more money, I do think it would be a great mistake to fasten a greater burden on the people of this country. If we fasten a greater burden on them, the result will be that they will die of starvation unless some kind, charitable country comes to our aid. Further loans will so increase our burden that ultimately it will be impossible for the country to carry on at all. I do not wish to make any statement which will be detrimental to the best interest of this country, but I say that [since] 1930 this country could not meet the interest, and I go further and say that for the next two or three years, neither in June or December, will we be able to meet our interest, if conditions are what they are to-day. Our people are taxed to the limit and we can go no further in that direction, our people are starving and it is a human impossibility to take more money out of these people. The burdens that our people have to bear have to be reduced, and reduced quickly.

I don't know what method the Government has in mind to save the situation, I don't know if it is possible to create a situation that will be satisfactory to all concerned. We have to expect that the bondholders will demand their pound of flesh, we can't blame them for that. They can say that "When we loaned you this money you agreed to pay the interest, and you took the risk that the value of money would change just as we did, and you ought to pay up." It is not an unreasonable position to take, but the position is that it is up to us to reduce this burden. If we continue squeezing the people in order to liquidate our bondholders, what will our people live on? How will they prosecute the fisheries? How can we even produce what we are doing now? Much less, how can we pay our bondholders? How can we satisfy these Shylocks who are looking for their pound of flesh? It is the old, old story, money capitalists levying tribute on future generations. The dead past will have its claws hooked into future generations. It is not for [me] to dictate to the Government the course to be adopted. I know they are waiting for the report of the Royal Commission to see if they advocate

changing the status of bondholders, but I do know that Newfoundland will have to be taken from under this burden which is gradually killing them. You can't kill the people in the interest of the bondholders. While the people are labouring under this heavy burden, we must remember that their children are starving and in many cases going without sufficient clothes. Let us ask ourselves what effect want is going to have on our future generations. That question is a large one, and the people are looking to the Royal Commission and the Government of the day to take this killing burden off their shoulders.

I do not desire to take too much time of this House this afternoon. I know there is work to be done before the Minister of Justice goes to England to-morrow or next day, but there is one matter I must mention, and it is matter which has been a political football for all political parties since time immemorial, and it is just as well to state the matter in plain facts and I do not care whose head I hit. There has been no manifesto of any political party since the days of responsible government that didn't make some promise to do something for the encouragement of the fisheries and the fishermen. My party was equally guilty in that respect ...

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: We are not guilty; we are going to do something.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You are guilty of making promises and you have got to fulfill them, and if there is anything I can do that is in my power to help, I will do it. The fisheries in this country are in the hands of the descendants of the fishing admirals. In earlier days the fishermen were brought out to this country in the Spring of the year. They were not allowed to remain here; they were not allowed to build a house here. The system that they followed was that the captain of the first ship to arrive here in the Spring was the nabob of the land for that season, regardless of his honesty, his ability, or the wishes of the people. The only factors were the speed of his ship and the date he left port. The fisheries were exploited to the advantage of these fishing admirals.

Gradually the scene changed, until we came to the time of the fish merchants who gave the fisherman his supplies in the Spring, and if the fishermen were fortunate enough to have a surplus at the end of the year, they left it in the hands of the merchants, they didn't have education enough to know whether they had any surplus or not. He had to take the word of an interested party that the account was so-and-so. The situation was entirely in the hands of these men who controlled the industry. I don't say they were all dishonest; I don't say they all cheated the fishermen. The fact remained that the fishermen remained in a state of servitude. He seldom saw the colour of a dollar. He might be given enough to pay his clergyman, or if he happened to live in a settlement where there was a medical doctor, he might be given enough to pay him, but very little of the coin of the realm was seen by the fishermen in those earlier days.

Times moved on; civilization advanced; commerce became more complex; this wonderful power, money, got a greater grip on things; banks were instituted; [the] exchanges of various countries fluctuated in value; the complications of the fishery trade increased year by year, all of which, of course, was Greek, Dutch, Italian or Sanskrit or anything you like to the fisherman of Newfoundland. He could not; he did not understand it. He had no education comparatively speaking. He had to take what was told him as being correct, and we find that after a time he begins to get suspicious. He begins to wonder why it is that fish with a little bit of a broken tail is thrown

out as cullage, and what is called good fish is thrown into a cask, screwed down and the tails broken up in the process. It made him suspicious; he wondered why that was; he is wondering yet how it comes that perfectly good fish that happens to be broken is thrown out as cullage, when fish that goes in the cask must necessarily be broken in the process. Can you blame him for being suspicious? Take the situation last Fall. It is a notorious fact known by everybody to-day, that the fish paid for as No. 2 by the Water Street merchant was shipped to the foreign market as No. 1. One of two conclusions must be drawn from that: either the merchant was beating the fisherman, or he was beating the foreign buyer. Take which horn of the dilemma you like.

The culler is the paid servant of the merchant, and what can one expect from a man under circumstances of that kind? One can't blame the culler if he feels that if there is any edge at all, if I may use that term, it must be given to the man who pays him his wages. He always has the fear that his job is dependent on giving satisfaction, not to the fishermen but to his master the fish merchant. All these things have created that suspicion and dissatisfaction in the minds of the fishermen. The fishermen feel to-day that they are being robbed, being despoiled of the production of their labour. Take the insane system of buying fish in this country that was inaugurated years ago, commonly known as the tal qual. It could result in the production of nothing but an increased quantity of bad fish. I have been amongst these fishermen too often not to know what their own views are upon the question. I have heard them talking about it too often not to know what their attitude and intention was, in view of the situation created. They have told me time and time again that they have seen the men, have been the men who produced good fish, looked after it carefully and brought it to the merchant in the Fall, and because of this tal qual cull, as it is called, or lack of cull, got no more for their fish upon which they had expended time and labour than did the man who gave it the sleight of hand. What encouragement is that? Is it any wonder that the quality of production necessarily degenerated?

Take the situation in connection with – it has been referred to this afternoon in connection with the presentation of a petition by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries [and] the Prime Minister referred to it himself – these merchants in their insatiable desire to make immediate profit, are engaged in a race for the markets annually, regardless of the quality of the fish that they are sending over. I know what I have been told by fishermen and by small merchants in the District of Port de Grave, which I once represented, about the conditions under which fish was taken aboard steamers down on the Labrador coast, conditions as I would not dare describe to this House this afternoon. That fish was regarded not as an article of food, at the utmost it was only considered an article of commerce, and it was treated in many cases equally as badly as you would treat ordinary stable manure. If any gentleman wants proof of it, come to me and I will send you to two or three men who are prepared to swear to it, and tell you the circumstances. They tell me they have seen steamers down in Labrador ports with clouds of fishing boats around them with fish to ship; they have rushed that fish regardless of whether it was properly cured or not. It has been trodden on by the men on stowage who have been walking over coal passed out of the bunkers, and that coal and the dust and cinders [were] trodden into it, simply because the merchant who had that steamer down on that coast wanted to get all the fish he could and rush to the market ahead of his competitor, and get a good price for it. It is going on to-day. Last year, I am told, in spite of the fact that the Water Street merchants were saying “We don't want any fish,” they were rushing that fish out of St. John's

as fast as it came in, flooding the markets on the other side with a result of a drop in price, and reclamations that were made against them because of the fact that what they sent over was not what they represented it to be.

Now, there have been one or two attempts to do something for the fishery in this country. The first one that comes to my mind at the moment is the Fishery Regulations of 1920, and I want to say at the outset that I am not an advocate of these Regulations as they then stood. In the first place, I think that the rising of the price was a mistake, but these Regulations emanated from six or seven Water Street merchants and by a director of the firm, and they were submitted to Sir William Coaker who thought there was a germ of good in them, brought the Bill into this House, passed it, and attempted to enforce the Fishery Regulations. In a very short time the group broke up and attacked the Regulations, and the other merchants set upon the Regulations like a crowd of wolves – sent advices over to the Italian markets advising them not to buy, actually advising buyers in the foreign markets not to buy Newfoundland fish, to wait until the price went down. The house divided against itself. It is simply an illustration of what has always gone on amongst these men, and what will always go on. They have a congenital disability to agree and it was born with them, and it will remain with them until they go back to Mother Earth. I think the Hon. Prime Minister went far to describe [this] and the Hon. Minister of Justice, who I am sorry is not here this afternoon, completed the picture. Last year the Hon. Prime Minister said, “When we meet men so temperamental ... I am not surprised.” The Minister of Justice used these words: “If you asked me, I would get a large picture of a codfish; around it I would place smaller photos of the Water Street fish dealers. Under the whole picture I would print the words of a popular song ‘They go wild, simply wild over me.’”

Now in the circumstances in which this Colony finds itself to-day, with our markets slipping away from us, indeed in many cases almost entirely gone, with the cure of our fish, as a result of the insane tal qual procedure, dropped so low that imitation Labrador, for instance, is openly sold in the market, named as such in preference to the genuine article coming from Newfoundland; to-day, in view of the fact that our people are no longer able to earn their living at the fishery; in view of the fact that the insane tactics of these Water Street merchants result in losses to themselves which they in turn hand over to the fishermen the next year, so that they really suffer no loss, we can no longer trust or permit them to control the staple industry of this country. It must be taken out of their hands and at the earliest possible date. It is no use to pander with these men or accept their promises to do better in the future. The situation is too serious. It requires handling and handling at once, and we must take forever from their hands the control of the staple industry of this country.

The Hon. Prime Minister addressed a gathering of the Llewellyn Club some few days ago, and I was frankly surprised, and as pleased as I was surprised, to find him make a certain statement in reference to the fisheries. I have not the exact phraseology, but he can correct me if I am in any substantial particular in error. He said he is looking forward to the day when the fishermen of Newfoundland would cooperatively export their fish and supply themselves. Is that correct?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: That they would learn to buy cooperatively.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That has got to come, there is not any question about it, and I am going to give a lead, if I may be permitted from this side of the House, to the Prime Minister to-day.

I believe that I am right; I am sure that I am right, and the Prime Minister will make no mistake if he will follow the lead that I will give him now. The profits of any industry should go to the producer. I think that is the fundamental principle that will be denied by none. The producer of fish in Newfoundland is the fisherman, and therefore the profits of that production should go to that fisherman. It is beyond all doubt that he is the one who in the past has seldom if ever got any of the profits. He has been given frequently, as a sort of charity to keep him alive, enough of the profits of the industry to prevent starvation. He has never had any of the good things of this life. He has never had any decent leisure. He has merely been kept alive in order that he might catch codfish. He was given a bare crust of bread while the Water Street merchant pilfered the jam. It is time we took the jam pot away from them.

Perhaps many of you have heard of Aaron Sapiro, described as the greatest authority on the cooperative movement. I suggest to the Prime Minister to get in touch with this gentleman, and invite him here to confer with the Government and representative fishermen of the country – if you like, to have some of the fish exporters of Water Street represented – with a view to have a cooperative marketing of our staple product. I do not know what it will cost you, nor do I know whether Aaron Sapiro would come here or not; but I would not criticize the Government for any fee they would pay him to come here, because I believe that if they did get him here for the purpose mentioned, they would get full value for the money they would pay him. I realize that this thing cannot be worked out under six months, and for that reason I suggest that a start should be made immediately or as soon after the House closes this year.

I appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has been a practical fisherman himself, and who knows what he is talking about in that connection, and who will agree with me that it is a simple matter to improve anyone's product when he knows he is going to be paid for his work. But there is no encouragement for the fisherman to-day to try and improve his product. Apparently it makes no difference whether he makes his fish good or bad, particularly when it is common knowledge that fish has been culled as No. 2 and shipped out of this country as No. 1. Therefore, if there is anything that can be done to improve that condition, it ought to be taken hold of immediately. My plea to-day is one for action – action on behalf of the populace. I am not usually of a gambling tendency, but the situation to-day is that Newfoundland has nothing to lose and everything to gain, and if I were the Prime Minister I would risk everything and try and encourage the producers in the best interests of Newfoundland, with a view to bringing this country out of the condition she is now in, and to bring her back to prosperity once again.

This is no time for the playing of party politics. There will be lots of room for the playing of that game again. If we have any regard for the future of the country and for future generations, we must make a serious effort to stave off what may ultimately prove to be the destruction of all. For my own part I can assure the Prime Minister of my wholehearted support and cooperation in any effort his Government may inaugurate for the amelioration and the betterment of the conditions of our suffering masses throughout the country.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House to any great length, but merely to make a few observations in reply somewhat to the strictures of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

My first word is to extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on the high honour conferred upon you for being elected as the first commoner of Newfoundland, and it must be gratifying to you to be thus honoured because you are filling a position to-day that was filled in 1877 by your illustrious father, who afterwards became Prime Minister of this country.²⁷ So do I say it must be gratifying to you, Sir, to feel that the commoners of Newfoundland of 1933 have confidence in you, the son of the man whom they elected in 1877 to preside over their deliberations.

I must also offer a word of congratulation, in accordance with the time-honoured fashion, to the Mover and Secunder of the Motion for the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor. I have not during my experience in this House within the past nine years heard two better orations delivered than I did on the opening day by the Hon. Members for Fogo and St. John's West. Nearly a month has passed since this House has opened and five months have elapsed since His Excellency the Governor came to Newfoundland, and I think that from what has been said in this House, as well as from what has been recorded in the press of the country, His Excellency must be convinced that he has come to a people who will give him the warmest welcome, and who will help to make his sojourn here as pleasurable and as enjoyable as possible; also that he will accept the assurance from us, as the commoners of Newfoundland, that we will follow his lead, as the King's representative, just as we have done with his predecessors. Therefore, we, the commoners of Newfoundland, on behalf of the public, extend to His Excellency and Lady Anderson a right royal and hearty welcome to our shores, and hope and pray that their tenure of office will be successful, and that they will go away from here feeling that the people of Newfoundland did all they could for them during their stay here.

In listening to the address of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, one could not help from feeling that perhaps some of us would be better placed if we were on the other side of the House, where for nearly four years our mouths were almost warped from talking, where we were freelances so far as speech-making was concerned, and when we were not responsible for our utterances other than that we felt we had done our duty to the people who sent us here. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition, now that he is a freelance, feels that way about it too. But it is altogether different when you sit in the Government as a responsible Minister of the Crown, loaded with responsibilities, when one's utterances have got to be weighed before giving expression to them, and when we have the burden of carrying on the Government of Newfoundland in a time of very great strain and stress.

But during our four years in Opposition, I do not think anyone ever heard us complain half as much as the present Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been complaining. Well, if I thought as much about being defeated, I surely would not let anybody know. My advice to that gentleman is not to take it so much to heart. Cheer up, "every dog will have his day." You know there is a wailing wall in the Holy Lands where the Arabs go to wail, but not in the House of Assembly. It is a terrible thing because some people are not now enjoying the fleshpots of Egypt, and I can hardly blame them because there were mighty fleshpots partaken of when the present Opposition were in office. The Opposition I was a member of did their duty in the House, and I hope the present Opposition will do their duty too, because, after all, they must remember they have a duty to perform to this country and

²⁷ Sir James Spearman Winter, Premier 1897-1900.

that is to criticize in constructive fashion every measure the Government will put forward; but not obstruct every Government measure, because if they do that they will be derelict in their duty. Of course not, we expect criticism. We don't expect that the members of the Opposition are going to get up and say we are the best government, as every Opposition will say that the present government is the worst.

The Leader of the Opposition complains about this and that. He complains that they were defeated and that the Opposition in the election engendered the wrong spirit into the people of Newfoundland. However, it is clear that in June 1932 the people had lost confidence in the administration then in power, and that they turned out the government then power in no uncertain way is clear from the election returns. The people did not want us to deceive them. In this case the deceivers were the government of 1928-32, who fell far short of the promises they made to the country in the election of 1928. Not only did their supporters around Newfoundland lose confidence in the government of 1928-32, but their supporters in the House lost confidence. We had men crossing the House. We had the spectacle of Ministers of the Crown standing up in this House and telling the government of the day that they had lost all confidence in them. We did our best to create non-confidence in the government of the day because we thought it was our duty to do so, because we believed they had fallen down in their job. We told the people as much as we could that the Government in power was not looking after their interests. Ministers of the Crown and former supporters of the Government had no confidence whatsoever in the administration when it came to the election of June 1932. From May 1931 to the election in June 1932, it was not the Opposition, it was the Ministers of the Crown sitting in the seats we sit in to-day who condemned the government of the day, and said they could not support it.

The present Opposition complain of newspapers. They reported the words spoken in the House and reported them truthfully. And I trust that the papers supporting the Opposition to-day will be as truthful as the newspapers of 1928-32. The Government of that time were never called murderers by the Opposition newspapers of the time.²⁸ Thank God we are no murders. We have been trying to do our best since we came into power, and we have been cleaning up what we found lying around the Government offices.

In 1931, Mr. Speaker, a crisis came upon the country. On May 23, 1931, and from that date until June 30, 1932, the Squires administration was in power. And the depression coming on before that was aggravated by that crisis. Can you tell me one solitary thing that the Government then in power did during that twelve months to try and stop the depression? They could not borrow money. They were turned down everywhere. Even though they were turned down, they found a way to spend \$14,500,000 during that year. With every man in Newfoundland gasping for breath they only found a way to spend money, but they never found a way to stop the depression that was going to come upon Newfoundland if they carried on in their mad career.

Somebody spoke the other day of the habit of the Government in presenting, along with the answers to questions regarding the expenditure of the present Government, the accounts of 1931-32. They tell a lovely story, but they are not the public accounts of the present Government. They are

²⁸ "Newspapers have been criticized for their reports of the House; but they never called people murderers like a paper supporting the present Opposition did." *Daily News*, May 11, 1933.

accounts of the expenditure of the previous administration, and they tell a lovely story. And I advise the gentlemen of this side of the House to get these accounts and study them, and find what really became of the money that was spent. Get these accounts, gentlemen, and study them. They are accessible to you. They are yours for the asking. A terrible crisis came upon Newfoundland in May, 1931, and let the right horse wear the right saddle. The Government of the time are responsible, because they made no effort to try to stop the depression that was then bearing its weight down, until in June 1932 the people who had lost confidence in them rose up in their might, and turned them out of power.

The honourable gentleman the Leader of the Opposition talks of the promises this Government made. We have been a very few short months in power, this is the first session of the House, and we are going to try to carry out the promises that we made. Did the administration defeated at the polls in June 1932 carry out the promises that they made? We did not have much to say about their promises when we were on the other side of the House. We once in a while made reference to a famous gramophone record that went over the country in the Fall of 1928. Get that and play it, and see how it tallies with the years of the Squires administration in power. Then you will see the promises of 1928 compared with the performances of 1928-32.

The Gander was referred to. I don't want to talk much about it; it makes very, very sad telling. You cannot convince me that we could not have had a Gander in Newfoundland to-day. I am as certain of that as I am of standing on this floor, that if the Government in power in 1929 had done the right thing, if they had cooperated with the gentleman named yesterday, if they had come together and settled their differences, we would have a Gander to-day. The gentlemen of the Opposition complain very much that the Opposition of that day, or members of it, saw the agreement. I myself was given a copy of the agreement by a Minister of the Crown. The man who showed it to me told me that it was a good proposition, that he favoured it, and that he was going to support it. The present Government throughout their campaign said that they were going to do their best to resurrect the Gander deal. They are trying to do that, and the gentleman who is entrusted with the task of trying to put through the deal has not been lying on his oars for the past twelve months. But it is a very hard thing to breathe life into that bird to-day. The breath of industrial life was going to be breathed into it in 1928. It was easy going then, there was lots of money. But it is harder to do it to-day. But that does not mean that we are not trying. We are still trying. We are trying to get a man to bring a proposition to the Government, and he will not be turned away empty-handed. We will go into it and give it every consideration. There will be friendly co-operation, and anything we have submitted to us will be given a fair trial. During the election campaign in my District I did not tell my constituents more than that. I never told them that they were going to be given jobs on the Tuesday after the election. I was not so foolish as to do so. But I told them that we would try to resurrect that deal, and we stand to that to-day. That is our policy at the present time. When the depression lifts we shall be doing our might and main as soon as we can get the tentacles off that are on Newfoundland to-day. What is the Minister of Justice going to England for next week, but to try and fight the claim that is against Newfoundland because of the writs placed on the Gander lands by the Squires administration. We have a \$10,000,000 claim against Newfoundland because of the unjust placing of these writs.

Until these complications are set aside, negotiations between the paper interests of the State

of New York and the Gander interests of Newfoundland, these negotiations cannot be resumed. As soon as these writs are cleared up we will be able to resume negotiations. Mr. Butler said that but for these writs the Gander would have gone through, they were prepared to spend \$70,000,000 but for these writs. Mr. Butler had taken up negotiation to raise this huge amount of money with no little trouble and expense, and when the Newfoundland Government issued these writs he said, "I am going to make a claim against them," and he did so. The Supreme Court through one judge first turned down his claim, and then the full Bench turned down his claim, and now he is going to appeal to the Privy Council, and now we have got to fight this claim on behalf of the Government, so that the people of Newfoundland will not have to pay this \$10,000,000. We are resisting it, and we will resist it to the death. When these complications are cleared up, we will leave no stone unturned to see that something is done.

In 1931 there was no loan forthcoming. We told the people in June '32 that we would do all we could to restore confidence in Newfoundland, and we went very little further than that. We said that when the Alderdice government came in to power we would try might and main to restore confidence. The Government of the day could not get a dollar until they asked the Prime Minister of Canada, and he asked the banks to accommodate them. Everything went on until 1931 when again they couldn't get the loan, and you can say what you like, but we would have got the loan if the financiers of the world had any confidence in the Government of the day. December came, and there was no loan. Default was staring us in the face. The Government appealed to the British Government. What did they say? They said, "No, no. We have no confidence in your Government, they are not playing fair to the people of Newfoundland." The Prime Minister could not get a loan unless the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Alderdice, went down to the Bank of Montreal and signed on the dotted line. He was responsible for seeing that certain legislation was introduced handing out over \$16,000 a day to the bank for the payment of the interest on our debt. What happened in 1932? We were hard pressed for money. From the time we took office until the end of the year, we were \$1,500,000 better off than the Government before. We scraped enough to pay \$1,500,000 on our debt, and we were not going to appeal to the British Government, but here is the difference between 1931. On the end of the year the British Government said, "We will not allow you to default, we have confidence in you." And without asking for a dollar, the British Government told us that we could have what money we wanted. We were prepared to take a partial default.

Reference has been made here this afternoon to the "Shylocks." They were not "Shylocks" when they gave us the money to spend. When they dug down into their own pockets for us to squander, they weren't "Shylocks." There are quite a lot of orphans and widows among the bondholders of Newfoundland. The Prudential Assurance Company of England took quite a lot of our bonds, as did several other insurance companies and trust companies, and their money belonged to the poorer classes. Were they "Shylocks"? Is the Permanent Marine Disaster Fund "Shylocks"? Are all these widows and orphans "Shylocks"? Haven't we got a duty towards these people? Is it their fault that we squandered their money? I agree that every government is to blame, but we have got to pay our bondholders. Too much has been said to try to tell the people that all our bondholders are "Shylocks," and when we say bondholders we should figure out who they are. They are some of them, some of the poorest people in England, some of them are the poorest people in New York who have invested their money through insurance companies and such like. It is not the millionaires and

multi-millionaires; they are not the people who bought our bonds.

I do not mean that the bondholders should not take some part of the difficulties that Newfoundland is going through to-day. I am in accord with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that Newfoundland can't pay this \$5,000,000 interest every year. I am in accord in condemning the people who squandered the money, and also the people who are eternally after the government for every little thing they can possibly think of which could possibly make them prosperous for a few months or a year. We are to-day facing a very serious situation when we are facing default. We promised to pay 100 cents in the dollar together with interest; it was a contract, signed, sealed, and delivered on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, and it is a very hard thing to break that contract, but there are ways and means whereby we can help out that situation.

It was said that the Government of 1928 spent a lot of money. We sat on the Opposition [side] for four years, and there was never a time when the Budget Speech was presented, with the possible exception of 1932, that the Alderdice government was not blamed for spending money in 1928. Now, it is up to me to clear up that situation. There was never such an unfair charge. I have here before me the Budget Speech of 1929 – that's where the whole thing came from. It is nothing but a gross political document to bolster up the doings of the government in years to come. Every bit of money that was spent in 1928 was tabulated in that, and then the Government charged us with buying the electorate and spending \$1,300,000 as a slush fund. There was never, I say, a more unfair charge.

The highroads money spent that year, \$300,000; the money voted in the House in 1928 and spent in the Spring was charged up to the candidates of the Alderdice party as a slush fund.²⁹ Why not charge up as slush funds all the money that was spent on highroads during the past ten years? Was it thought that because a loan was procured to do the highroads in 1928, that that was done because the Alderdice government was going to the country in the Fall of the year and wanted to spend the money on highroads to buy votes? No such thing was ever contemplated, because the highroads started in April and continued until October. In that length of time \$300,000 was spent, and the Government had to bear the brunt of spending that as a slush fund. In 1930 the Squires government spent \$1,500,000 on highroads in one year. What [illegible] for. Is it not unfair to charge the Alderdice government with spending \$320,000 on highroads, and say it was spent as a slush fund to buy votes? The Alderdice government took office in August, 1928. Three parts of the

²⁹ "They were charged with spending over a million dollars as a slush fund; whereas the money had been earmarked and spent on the Highroads, the diversion of the railroad on the Topsails and various other public works and members on both sides got their shares for their Districts. Besides, over three parts of that money was spent before the Alderdice party ever thought of coming into power. When those charges were made he (Mr. Puddester) was attacked as the chief culprit and the Squires Government has paid hundred of dollars to scavengers to go through the various departments to see what they could get against him; but to-day he was in a position to refute that. All this was done against him because he was a strong supporter of the Alderdice party. Some of his traducers have since gone down to ignominious defeat, some of them were slandering him to the country and the warfare was still going on and he had documents in his possession to show that they were keeping up their filthy game since he was elected last June. He read from an Opposition paper showing that he was accused of getting for his District \$70,000 out of a total grant of \$129,000 for marine and road works. The fact was, as the public accounts showed, that he got \$10,000 and \$1,400 of that was spent on a public wharf that had been promised for 50 years." *Daily News*, May 11, 1933.

money was spent before the Alderdice government came into power. There was a diversion on which \$3 [omission] of that money was voted in the spring of 1928; the money was spent on that diversion because the Government of the day and the Railway of the day thought it was necessary. The money was provided for by this Legislature. No such thought as a slush fund was in the minds of the Legislature. It was done because they thought that the road should be diverted. They thought it was good business to do it, still we are charged with spending that money as a slush fund. No such thing. That \$700,000 odd, that \$1,300,000, those other things named in that Budget Speech, that is absolutely foreign to the election that year, absolutely foreign. \$200,000 was voted in that Spring as encouragement to the fishery of this country, and it had to be spent. The Members on both sides of the House were glad to spend it, and to have it to encourage the fisheries. It was the first time that money was voted for the encouragement of the fisheries; \$200,000 was set aside for the encouragement of the fisheries; we were charged with spending that as a slush fund, while the members on the other side had their proportion of it and spent it in their Districts.

I was the chief culprit; thank goodness I am in a position to refute the charges where I have the figures under my control. There were men who tried to slander and to blacken my reputation, to see what they could get on me, to try and get the electorate of this country to turn on me. I have not been discredited, anyhow. They got their answer when we went to the polls. Some of them went down to ignominious defeat, some of the men who were trying to scandalize me in this House and trying to scandalize me in this country. I want to say that they have not ceased; they are going on still. I have papers under my hands now to show this country and this House, who they [are, that] have kept up that dirty, filthy game. Now, a few months ago I sent to the Marine and Fisheries Department and the Public Works Department, and asked them for the real figures. I went over to the District, spent \$20,000; came back for another; went over, spent \$70,000 and came back for another; went over and spent \$70,000; only \$169,000 was spent. Out of \$169,000, lo and behold, I spent \$70,000. Was there ever a more unfair charge? I asked for \$12,000 and I got \$10,000; there were \$14,000 spent in my District from the time the Alderdice government took charge in 1928; from August 15th up to the end of the year. That is what was spent; \$4,500 of that went to a public wharf that was promised the men for 50 years. The Alderdice candidates on that occasion were not guilty of what they were accused of. \$200,000 was voted in this House, and the [second] reading of the Bill and the Committee stage of the Bill went through with the unanimous consent of the House, and third reading was unanimous. I do trust that people when making charges concerning Members of this House, [they] will be sure of their ground before they make such charges, and not listen to every scoundrel who is paid to go down to the Department and try to add up all the money that was spent for years, and spent for months before we got into the government, add it all together and say it was spent by the candidates of the Alderdice party. The candidates of the Government party spent three times as much as ever the candidates of the Alderdice party spent.

I have no fault to find, Mr. Speaker, none whatever, with the attitude of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I think his was fair criticism. He made a good speech, he took high ground and I do trust that that attitude will be kept. I am sorry that I can't say so much for his colleague. The political harangue that he delivered in this House a day or two after the House opened, written by somebody outside, is nothing more than a political harangue, not worth notice; it is beneath contempt. We are glad to have the assurance of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that he will co-

operate; that he will do what he can to walk side by side with the Government in trying to bring the country out of the slough of despond in which we found her when we took office.

We are accused to-day or yesterday – I have a paper in my hands, read it for yourself – “What the Alderdice Government has spent since they came into office: \$46,000 of a Contingency Account.” If we did spend \$46,000 it was far and away below what was spent the year before, when \$130,000 was spent. Some of the items in this are worth notice, because they are just another list of expenditures that we had to clean up – paid our good, hard money for that [which] we had nothing whatever to do with, contracting the account. The third in this list is a claim of W. I. Bishop, settlement of claim. Certainly, we had nothing to do with getting W. I. Bishop here in 1930 to report on the Gander deal. I don’t know why he came here, Mr. Speaker. Nobody seems to know, and we repudiated his claim in July and in August when we were faced with an action. We repudiated his claim, he had no claim on the Government. What did his solicitors do, but bring forward messages that were sent to W. I. Bishop in Montreal asking him to come down here and report on the Gander deal. There were men in this country in connection with the Gander deal, on both sides, who could give as good a report any time as W. I. Bishop. We had to face a bill of \$500 and expenses. We did not ask W. I. Bishop to come down. The Government had to pay the bill two years afterwards. The country ought to know. Another item: C. O’N. Conroy, legal fees; Mines and Forests and Gander Valley, \$5,619. What did we have to do with that? This Government never employed Mr. Conroy to go in and defend their actions. It was a bill handed over which we had to clean up when we came in to office; \$5,619, we had nothing to do with that. Imperial Oil Company, gas for the Sullivan search and a few other items like that. We did not authorize that; that was done during the election period. The Government authorized it. We had to pay the bill, yet we are told that the country should know that we spent money. C. J. Fox, Corner Brook, \$575. We had nothing to do with sending Mr. Fox over to Corner Brook in March or February, we were not in office. Fox, Knight & Thelan, Martin – Jardine – what had we to do with that? We never heard of it until the bill was sent to us. Compensation for something that happened in this House in April – we had nothing to do with that; we did not authorize any legal fees but we had to foot the bill. Canadian Airways search for Sullivan, we did not authorize that. Harvey and Company, bonus on fish; we did not authorize it, and so it goes down. R. Gushue, Poor Relief Enquiry, \$353; Judge Morris; L. Curtis, Miss Rowe for the *Viking* enquiry. We got out of it for \$1,000. The bills came in for thousands. We got out of it for hundreds; we did [omission] power. Here is a letter from the Controller of the Treasury saying that when he took charge of the country’s finances, when he came over in September, after being in power for two months, he tells me that when he took charge there were bills outstanding from the year before of \$1,100,000. We did not contract those bills, but we have been sweating blood for the past ten months to try and get money to pay them.

There is a reference to the cuts in the Education grants; we had to. We cut the soldiers’ pensions; we had to. Why? Because only \$50,000 was provided for us to feed the starving people of this country, and we had to get money somewhere. We had to cut everything down to get it. We have been paying everything we could since the 1st July, 1932, out of the money that we saved from the Civil Service. If other governments had done the same for the last five or six years, this country would not be in the mess she is in to-day. Every bit of money we got to pay for the dole the last ten months we had to save. The Hon. Member complains that they lost votes because of the reduction in

the Education Grant, [and] they lost votes because of the reduction in the Civil Service salaries. I absolutely agree.

Cut down everything until you are able to pay your bills. That is the kind of government the people of this country believe in – the government that will live within their income. The present Opposition were driven out of office because they appointed so many commissions and other like useless things, that could draw money for themselves out of the public exchequer of this country. Retrenchment will never hurt any government. It may hurt a few individuals at first, but you gain in the long run. We have done all we could do to assist and carry the starving people of the country. The Prime Minister has made the statement that he was not going to borrow any more money, and justifiably so, because this country has been bankrupted by the borrowing of money for every kind of wildcat scheme that came our way. That policy made it easy for the politicians. Irresponsible persons outside this House have been belittling the contracts we made with people, some of them widows and orphans, who lent us money when we needed it.

Need I read you a list of the Districts that were given money on able-bodied poor relief accounts to feed the people last year? It will surprise this country to know that from 1931 to 1932 the sum of \$1,170,000 was spent, and in addition there was \$300,000 worth of outstanding bills for us to pay in July last. In other words, for the year 1931-32 there was close on \$1,500,000 spent on able-bodied poor relief. Some of the bills that we paid, running into thousands of dollars, were unknown to some of the Members of the Opposition side, as they were brought about by undertakings given by Ministers of the Crown in the last Government. Only a week ago the Bank of Commerce sent us a claim for \$5,000 authorized by the Secretary of State in 1930 to a man to cut pulpwood. That bill has to be paid, although the pulpwood is rotten on the bank. We were told there was a Minute of Council for it, and the bill was not paid when we came into power. I am sorry to say that the dole expenditure is still going on, but we are not spending as much as was spent for the year 1931-32, although the need is greater, and we are going to get out of it for the year 1932-33 \$250,000 less than was spent in the year previous.

We have been told that we should not have prosecuted people who behaved fraudulently with poor relief. My answer is that it is our duty to try and stop fraud from being perpetrated, and we intend to continue making prosecutions whenever and wherever necessary. If we had not started prosecutions when we did, our expenditure on dole account would have far and away exceeded what it was during the past winter. It is about time that governments realize that they are the appointed trustees of the people of the country, and that the money they spend is not their own. It is useless to think that we can get money from anywhere else except through the taxes, and it is pretty hard for one-half of the people to have to feed the other half, without being further imposed on by frauds. Now, there will be quite a considerable saving this year on able-bodied relief. In Green Bay alone, we will save \$20,000. Here is the list of the dole expenditure for the year 1931-32, alphabetically arranged, amounting to \$1,170,000, together with \$300,000 outstanding, making a total of \$1,470,000. I ask any Member of this House, how can that sort of thing go on, if we are going to try and make an honest attempt to regain our financial position? Something must be done by way of retrenchment to remedy such a condition of affairs. Then again take the medical service, which cost this country \$440,000 for the year 1931-32. We cannot cut that expenditure down too fine in the first year, but we are doing our best towards getting the people to try and become self-reliant and

independent. Sir, there is an end to everything, even to government money.

I am heartily in accord with what the Leader of the Opposition said with regard to encouragement for the fisheries, but I do not agree with him in putting the merchants up against the fishermen and vice versa, as I think it is a dangerous thing. That was tried before in this country, and we all know the result. The merchants might be bad sometimes, but they are not the descendants of the fishing admirals. The Crosbys, the Hickmans, the Templemans, the Earles and other peoples are not descendants of the fishing admirals, but they are trying to do business in a legitimate way. Look at the merchants who supplied the fisheries 30 years ago like the Duders, the Tessiers, the Goodridges and others, and what have they left to those who came after them? Many of the present-day fish merchants are struggling to try and keep their heads above water. I realize that something has to be done to get the fisheries back to where they were, because I am the son of a fisherman. My grandfather came from Jersey and established a fishing premises on the north side of Conception Bay. He fished in a western boat off Cape Race and landed his catch and marketed it, and tried to get along independently; but I never heard of expressions such as "descendants of fishing admirals" being used by them when referring to the merchants. I am not a blue blood, and I certainly want to see both classes of people work in harmony and get fair play. I do not think that the men who try to do the best they can to all concerned should be dubbed as Shylocks. I think the time has come for a cooperative spirit to exist in the marketing of our staple product, even if we have to get Mr. Sapiro here for a few years. I listened to a debate some years ago in connection with a scheme in Canada, promoted by Mr. Sapiro, in regard to the pooling of wheat. Some of the farmers got into a wheat pool and had to accept 12 cents a bushel, considerably less than they expected to get, and some of the co-operative pools were not against trying to beat the farmers in their wheat prices. These things were started and nursed by that gentleman whom the Leader of the Opposition tells us this afternoon should be brought here, to show us the way towards cooperative marketing of our product.

That is not saying I am against his coming here to see what he can do. He has had some good ideas the same as others, when there was lots of prosperity floating around. When this is not the case, nobody can remedy the situation. The purchasing power of the people must be raised, and if it is not there is not much hope for future government in Newfoundland. We may be able to reduce interest payments, and even if we can we will still have to stint and scrape and get along as best we can. We need cooperative effort in accordance with the efforts of the Prime Minister to remedy the fisheries situation. And he has given more consideration to our fisheries problems since the Government came into power, than the Squires administration did during their four years in office. What happened to the Act introduced by Sir William Coaker relating to the fisheries? It was killed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He would not support [it] unless the Act was altered to suit him. That is the reason why the Salt Codfish Act introduced in 1931 had no success. We do hope that we will do more good for the present Act than the Government of 1931 did for the Act introduced by Sir William Coaker.

We welcome the cooperation of the Hon. Members on the other side of the House. As he said yesterday, he can criticize [us] as public officials and speak to us as men afterwards. So also we can speak in a heated way on matters of public import, and still hold no grudge for the Members of the Opposition personally. This which I have said is not in defense of the present Government. This Government needs no defenders of its actions. We were on the aggressive in 1932 for four years.

We are still on the aggressive. We have nothing to be ashamed of. We are going out of office with our skirts [as] clean as they were when we came in.

On motion the Report of the Committee on the Address in Reply was adopted, and it was ordered to be presented to the Governor at His Excellency's convenience.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions to the Amendment of the Loan Act, 1932 (22 George V., Cap. 32).

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea 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, has passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Amendment of the Loan Act, 1932 (22 George V., Cap. 32)" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

The resolutions respecting certain loans raised by the Municipal Council was deleted from the Order Paper. [*Evening Telegram*, May 11, 1933, p. 8]

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 22 George V., Chapter 25, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Health and Welfare Act, 1931" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

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

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill dealing with the appointment and jurisdiction of Justices of the Peace. It is well within the minds of the Members of this House that at the present time it is very difficult to go out on the fishing grounds and fire a gun without hitting a Justice of the Peace, and as a result the position of Justice of the Peace is one to be avoided. In a country such as this, a Justice of the Peace should be a man chosen for his particular standing in the community. They should be limited in numbers and it should be a position of honour and dignity and should be lived up to. Unfortunately, at the present time there is frequently pressure of different kinds brought to bear on Members to induce them to offer some of their most ardent supporters some form of recognition, and when that recognition is not given by an office of emolument, the last ditch is reached when supporters of substance asked to be appointed Justices of the Peace and Members found it difficult to withstand the pressure.

This measure will result in Justices of the Peace being men of higher standing than the majority of those holding this office to-day. The proposal in the Bill is that there should be in each area a bench of justices consisting of Judges of the Supreme Court, the Judges of the District Court, the Stipendiary Magistrates and a certain number of Justices of the Peace to be appointed for the area defined in the Act. That area will be the same as the area of the Stipendiary Magistrate. As you know, the area of the Stipendiary Magistrate is not the same as the Electoral Districts. There are many cases where the Stipendiary Magistrate serves two Districts, but now the area will be defined by commission and the proposed area will have a certain number of Justices. It is further proposed that the number be limited, and further that a commission be issued setting forth the number of Justices in each District, and only when a vacancy occurs will a new appointment be made. The number will be settled on the recommendation of the Department of Justice after an examination into the necessities of that particular area. Their jurisdiction will be as Justices of Newfoundland, so that if an offence is committed outside any particular area and the prisoner is arrested and brought before a Justice in another area, that Justice will have jurisdiction to deal with the case.

I need hardly say that in addition to enquiries made by the Department of Justice as to the standing of nominees, the views of the Members for the various Districts will be taken into consideration. The Act states that at the present time, it will not come into force until October, 1933. That will give an opportunity of settling the number of Justices in each area, and within the next few

weeks it is the intention of the Department of Justice to confer with the various members as to the placing of these various Justices of the Peace, and the particular persons to be appointed. When the Act comes into force all commissions at present in force will be withdrawn. I think the Act is one which is aimed at the improvement of affairs in this connection, and I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will agree that the time has come when the status of J.P.s should be raised, and Members of this House relieved of the pressure which is continually brought to bear to promote the appointment of men who are great political friends of theirs. This will not interfere with the appointment of temporary J.P.s in connection with relief matters. These commissions will exist for only six months and if necessary will be extended from time to time, but the permanent Justices will be appointed in the manner indicated in this Act.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: All legal and many lay Members of this House can realize that in the Old Country, the position of Justice of the Peace is a high honour. I regret that I have to agree with the Hon. Minister of Justice when he says in effect that the position has fallen somewhat into disrepute by reason of too lavish using of commissions, and I am afraid that some of those who are supposed to adorn the position do not measure up to the standard required in the Old Country. I feel that the idea is a good one. The number ought to be limited, and the standing raised in the eyes of the ordinary man, and for that reason I agree entirely with the principle of the Bill. If we could have our J.P.s regarded as they are in the Old Country, it would go for much better administration of justice in the outport communities generally.

There is one thing that has just crossed my mind in this connection, and it is this. There are a number of men in this country who have held commissions for a very considerable time, and who will in a few years at the most be outside the worries of this world. These men are very respectable citizens, but perhaps are not very competent for carrying out the duties of a J.P. if they were called upon, but nevertheless they are very decent and very respectable men who are looked up to in their community. Despite their lack of ability, it might be possible to save their faces in some fashion. Isn't there some way whereby they may be appointed honorary J.P.s without being a member of the bench of justices? They could hold the letters J.P. after their name until the grave, they would have no powers to do anyone any harm, and would be much appreciated by a man who is well past 60 years of age.

Hon. Minister of Justice: If there is anything that can be done in connection with the last matter mentioned, I can assure the Hon. Member it will be done. If there are men in his District, if there are any men in your District when the matter comes up for discussion, I can assure you they will receive the most sympathetic consideration, and also all Members of the House. A number of old gentlemen who have held this honour for some years might feel it rather keenly if they were deprived of it. The Bill is more of an administrative matter rather than sympathetic.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would keep them off the Bench as Magistrates.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Certain Mineral Claims on the Labrador."

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: I am extremely sorry to have to ask to have this matter again deferred. Yesterday when the House was good enough to permit me to have the Second Reading before the Bill was presented, I gave my undertaking to have the Bill before the House this afternoon. Since coming to the House I was told by the printers and the Department of Justice it was impossible to have this Bill until to-morrow. I would ask to have it deferred.

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 93 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of the Recovery of Possession of Tenements in Certain Cases.'"

Hon. Minister of Justice: This motion has been on the Order Paper for some days; it has been on the Order Paper for some days over a period of years. For the same reason that caused it to be removed from the Order Paper on other occasions, I now ask consent to have it withdrawn.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I would like to point out to this House that previous to 1930, the Department of Agriculture and Mines operated under several sections with various Acts of Parliament, but we had no real Crown Lands Act. I think it was about 1927 when I happened to be a head of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, [and] at that time we commenced to compile information for the purpose of introducing a Crown Lands Act, but I went out of office without completing this work. It is a very important work and was taken up by my successor in office and by the Government of 1928, with the result that in 1930 the Act that we are now asking to amend was passed through this House. I am of [the] opinion that we should interfere as little as possible with Acts that have taken up so much time and attention as this Act did, but on the other hand it is only after a measure has been in operation for some time that you discover various defects, something that calls for amendment, and the amendments that I am now introducing are very important, and it is only because the Department finds that it is absolutely essential that we are now introducing them.

The first amendment deals with a situation which we have to-day under the present Act, where a man may be on a piece of land for fifteen years and have no grant. He can't get a grant now without waiting for five years. He can apply for a grant, but under this present Act – under the present law – he has to apply, and if he has five acres he has to cultivate 10 per cent in two years, and 25 per cent in five years; then he gets a grant in fee simple. He may at the present time have 100 per cent of his five-acre lot under cultivation, [but] still he has to wait for five years. This amendment simply gives him the opportunity of paying the full amount and receiving the grant in fee simple. That is the first one. The next one, residential lots, land up to five acres; farming lots, land up to 50 acres. We have the same situation here. A farmer may have 50 acres under cultivation and not have a grant for it; by paying the fee he may have the grant. Section 4 merely deals with certain precautions to be taken against claims made by partners, there may be four or five brothers

living on the one lot. These are precautions where a person applying would have to satisfy the Department that he has the consent of the other parties, before a grant will be given.

(*Reads*). That just means that any person applying to the office and paying \$5 will receive a miner's permit to prospect. The next amendment deals with the size of the claim.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That is hardly the position. It will now read, "Any person or any company shall be entitled ..."

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Any person or any company.

Hon. Minister of Justice: It is intended to strike out the words "Company incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland," and simply leave it "Any person." A company cannot prospect.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Formerly the size of a mining area used to be a square mile. In 1930 it was cut down to 40 acres, [which] was the size of the area granted in Quebec and Ontario. I think the House will agree that we have not the same facilities to give the mining prospector as they have in Quebec or Ontario. Forty acres is a very small area of land. A prospector may go in to the country and may find something. When he comes to look for assistance, 40 acres would not be very much on which to seek finances. We have decided to increase the area from 40 acres to 160 acres.

The next amendment deals with staking under the 1930 Act. Under the 1930 Act the man would have to be a scientific man to be able to make stakes at all, and would have to be able to understand astronomy. We don't eliminate that it is desirable to have staking done as scientifically as possible.

The next Section deals with the matter of assessment (*reads*).

I think we ought give a great deal more encouragement to the mining industry at the present time than has been given to it in the past. We want to take care of our unemployed throughout the country, and the quicker we realize that and get men to work, the better for all concerned. Therefore, I think it a shame to sit here wasting time while people are awaiting a chance to get to work.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm Certain Temporary Loans" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, the idea is that the Banks desire that the temporary loans should be confirmed by Statute. The loans advanced by the Banks started on December 22, 1931, and they run then to December 30, 1932. They confirmed a loan guaranteed by the Canadian Government for \$600,000, and they now wanted it confirmed by Statute and in conformity with the Audit Act, thus placing it in the same position as the funded debt of the Colony.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to

Amend 20, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public' was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I may point out that it is along the lines of the Public Utilities Act of 1929. That Act was introduced for the purpose of appointing a body to recommend prices. The present Bill will enable the Public Utilities Commission to make rates and prices, but we have eliminated one or two items as in the original Bill, such as food and clothing. We do feel that profiteering has been and is going on, and we are very anxious to deal with some of it, particularly do we feel it is very necessary to get over the high prices charged for coal and salt, and the rates charged by fire insurance companies, who have been receiving premiums to the extent of four times their losses in St. John's.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Corporations and Institutions Guaranteed or Subsidized by the Government" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

With unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm Certain Temporary Loans" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, the 11th instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Thursday, May 11, 1933

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

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Ratification of the Guaranteeing of Certain Borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Lewis took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, these Resolutions are for the purpose of ratifying and guaranteeing certain borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council. There are two transactions referred to in those Resolutions, one in connection with the loan of \$134,000, in which we have no interest. The Government is making no guarantee for the payment of that sum. The other transaction [is] with the sum of \$100,000, which is guaranteed by the Government.

The history of the matter is as follows: (*reads*).

The balance due on the \$134,000 loan at present is \$69,000. This will be paid off with interest by applying the proceeds of the sale of city bonds against it. The present indebtedness of the \$100,000 loan is \$79,000 and half the annual duty received on coal by the Council, amounting to \$36,000, will be applied as against this loan, so that in three and half years they will have taken care of it and interest as well, and he did not think the Government was taking any risk in giving this guarantee. In answer to a question of Mr. Bradley, the Prime Minister replied that the Council sold \$70,000 or \$80,000 worth of bonds last year, and that the proceeds were applied to the \$134,000 loan. [*Daily News*, May 12, 1933, p. 5]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Ratification of the Guaranteeing of Certain Borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

With unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Ratification of the Guaranteeing of Certain Borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

With unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Ratification of the Guaranteeing of Certain Borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Lewis took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Ratification of the Guaranteeing of Certain Borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Lewis took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. the Prime Minister explained that because of certain circumstances the Government could not at the moment introduce Supply, but in view of the fact that the Executive Government could not expend money whilst Parliament was in session on its own authority, he accordingly was asking the sanction of the House by submitting Supplementary Supply. The various items were explained by the departmental heads.

Hon. the Prime Minister related that a large number of bills were awaiting payment. The principal ones were on the dole account. The allocation for seed potatoes was \$72,000, and \$400,000 was required to meet Poor Relief and Dole accounts outstanding. A vote of \$25,500 for fishery encouragement was due to the balance which the Government must pay in the supplying of 1,400 men for the fishery last year. The Newfoundland Railway required \$150,000 to meet pressing bills. There was a deficit in this Department, June 30th, 1932, of \$339,000 which was paid by the present administration without asking the government for one cent. This was brought about by economy and reduced expenditure, but in this particular period the work of preparing the steamers and railway for the season's work was imperative, and the amount asked, necessary.

The amount \$22,000 voted for Protective Service is accounted for by the introduction of a new system, substituting the old service performed by the *S. S. Daley*. Three fast motor boats under

the direction of Mr. Philip [illegible] would operate the South West and West coasts and other sections of the coast if necessary. Each 45-foot boat would have four men.

The total amount required was \$1,[illegible],395.24. [*Evening Telegram*, May 12, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain votes, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Ratify Certain Agreements Relating to Mining Concessions in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: When this Bill was given a first reading I did not give a very lengthy explanation as to its contents, and I don't intend to make a speech on the matter now, but I think I ought to say that the Bill is merely for the purpose of adopting 24 separate agreements entered into by the Government and 23 or 24 individuals.

So far as I know, this is the first time a serious attempt was made for the purpose of a mineral development on the Labrador. There is no question in my mind but that at last Labrador is going to be called upon to yield up its wealth which has been lying dormant for many years. Captain Bondurant was the first person who came to the Government seeking a concession in that territory. He showed me sufficient private information to convince me, without the shadow of a doubt, that in Labrador we have great mineral wealth and that there is a tremendous development pending, like that which took place in Northern Ontario in the past 25 years. As far back as 1868 the first attempt was made there at gold production, and a few years after the discovery was made the claim was exhausted and mining petered out. There was very little activity there from then until 1903, when the silver discovery in the Cobalt district brought in thousands of prospectors from North America and in 25 years Northern Ontario produced \$400 billion worth of minerals, and the investments made by Canadians, Americans, or the people of any other country who invested in it during that 25-year period yielded over \$100 million profits.

I don't wish to minimize the extreme importance of our staple industry. I myself represent a fishing District, and I am prepared to do all in my power to assist any legislation brought into this House to better conditions in regard to that industry. It is a well-known fact that prompt action must be taken by the Government or the trade or both, if our main industry is to be saved. That fact was brought out by the Leader of the Opposition the other day, and here I must take time to compliment him on the splendid spirit of cooperation which he has displayed. I haven't seen such a spirit of

cooperation displayed by any Opposition in this House for a long time. It is the first time during a period of 25 years that I saw an Opposition cooperating with the Government in this House, in such a helpful way. And during [omission] I was guilty oftentimes of holding up important proceedings of this House when I was in Opposition. I held up legislation and delayed it, and that is one of the principal reasons why I say there is great hope for the country, when we have the Opposition working with the Government in such a friendly spirit of cooperation. It is only by the cooperation of all those who hold office in the country, and of all those who have the welfare of the country at heart, of all those who are engaged in the trade of this country, that we can hope to come back.

Now as I said before, I don't want it to be understood that any remarks of mine with regard to the industrial development of our country in any way reflect upon our staple industry, but I would like to point out to the Committee that industrial development of our Island is more important than it may appear to be. Bell Island in 1930 paid over \$2,250,000 in wages and salaries. In 1931 they paid \$1,900,000, and in 1932 less than \$500,000 was paid by the BESCO Company. The decrease was due to their inability to market their ore. The baby mine at Buchans paid in salaries and wages in 1930 over \$500,000. Then we have our timber resources. In my opinion, the three chief factors are our mineral and timber resources and our fisheries. The two mills at Corner Brook, for their operation and their operations in the woods and all other employment given by and in connection with them, paid a wage bill in 1930 of \$3,200,000. The A.N.D. Company paid out \$3,400,000. There's \$9,500,000 paid out in 1930 on industries other than our main industry, the fisheries, and you may add to that the five or six hundred mills that are being operated all over the country, and which yield \$500,000 dollars at a conservative estimate.

It is extremely important that we encourage and foster in every shape and form every new industry that is started in our country. This gentleman, Captain Bondurant, who had been prospecting on the Labrador, came to the City last autumn and made an application to the Government for the exclusive right to prospect over 1,100 square miles of territory on the Labrador. I assured [him] that there was no possibility of his getting this Government or any Government to seriously consider his application for 1,100 square miles. Then he came down to 400 square miles, and I told him that the Government would be unwilling to grant that amount of territory to one individual for prospecting purposes. I told him that if he made an application for 100 square miles of land, that is, the exclusive right to prospect over it, that I would take it up with the Government, and that the right to prospect over that amount of territory would probably be granted to him.

He made an application for that amount, and I put the matter before the Executive and recommended that the right to prospect over that area be granted to him. But my colleagues thought that was too extensive an area to grant to an outsider, and decided to give him the exclusive right to prospect over 40 square miles, and charged him \$1,000 rental for it. After Bondurant's application was made there were other applications. Bondurant's is number one. The other 23 were applications from people of this country. Captain Bondurant's rental charge was, so far as I know, put up by himself, but the rental charges on the other 22 or 23 applications were put up by Newfoundlanders. And if there is a development of any importance, there are going to be four or five hundred Newfoundlanders benefit. These are small investors who put in \$5, \$10 or \$20. If there is a rich strike made in this section, four or five hundred Newfoundlanders will benefit materially by it. And I trust such will be the case, because the greater the number of people who become wealthy here, the

better it will be for the country. The concession in the agreements made with these people merely gives the right to go into the country and prospect for three years. By this means the grantee of this right will be spending money in properly investigating the mineral potentialities of the Labrador.

It is absolutely essential to have scientific men to properly prospect the mineral potentialities of the Labrador. We need geologists and mineralogists, because it is a well-known fact that when the practical prospector goes over the ground, he is not going to waste time examining mountains and valleys which could not possibly contain the precious metal. Gold is only found in a certain formation – the Pre-Cambrian – and we know that the Labrador is in the same belt as Alaska. But there has never been a geological survey of the Labrador. Consequently we have no information of a scientific nature in the Department of Agriculture and Mines to pass over to those people who have paid us their money for rental charges. The scientific men to conduct a proper scientific survey of the Labrador will have to be brought here by outside money. A clause in the agreement makes it compulsory in order to make the agreement stand, for \$5,000 per year to be spent in prospecting each 100 square miles of territory granted under each agreement. It is impossible for these men to spend any more to find out if there is gold in the territory granted to them. It is necessary for them to interest outside capital to prospect their territories. This is a job for big capital. The prospecting of these territories is barred to the small prospector. The small man is absolutely debarred from going there. The only way he can participate in the mineral wealth is by being able to secure a share in one of the companies that are formed. The locus of this gold discovery is about 600 miles inland. That is where Bondurant made the strike. There is no train to take one there. The only possible way to get there is by airplane, and that is a costly undertaking. Most of the people who have put their money into securing these applications have succeeded in interesting outside capital. At least three of four of the outside companies have all their arrangements made. They are very anxious to know why the legislation confirming their agreements has been held up. Captain Bondurant intends to leave Seven Islands on the first of June.

[*omission*]

... the class of man that Dr. James is. In 1927 when I was in charge of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, the Metallurgical Conference met in Toronto, and I succeeded in interesting some of them to come down here, hoping to interest them in the possible mineral development of Newfoundland. Among these men who came was Dr. James, and I happened to meet him several times – had several conversations with him, and kept track of his activities after he left here. In 1928 after I went out of office, I was hoping to do something in the way of mineral development for myself and for the good of the country. Dr. James was one of the first men that I sought assistance from. He had charge of a large syndicate in Quebec. That syndicate had received from the Government of Quebec the exclusive right over 2,100 miles of land for a rental of \$4,000, it being compulsory for them to spend \$25,000 for the 2,100 miles. The Quebec Government have a Geological Department, geological maps and mineralogical data, and all the other things which a department of mines ought to have, but which is too expensive for us. I imagine the estimates that would be asked in the Quebec office, in the Department of the Interior, would be about \$2,000,000 for running that Department, as compared with mine, less than \$25,000. We have no maps, no official information; we have to depend on the courtesy of the Dominion of Canada. Down in my office, the only maps I have, I received from Canada for the asking.

Now then, the concession, as I said before, is only for three years. It is the exclusive right for three years to prospect. If, during the three years, they discover something that they consider to be of sufficient value to ask for a fee simple grant, they merely ask the right to be able to discard what they don't want, and pay the ordinary rental on what they do want on any mineral that they find down there. They have to pay us the same royalty that the Province of Ontario exacts from mining companies, and the Province of Quebec. They do far better for us than we get from [the] Buchans contract made in 1926, when 2,000 square miles fee simple was given to the A.N.D. Company. That company is supposed to pay us 5 per cent profits. It is a job for big money. Big money is interested, big money is going in there, and I predict that by the 15th of August there will be a rush of prospectors into Labrador sent by big people. I am bombarded day by day with enquiries from outsiders. I had official samples that were sent me by Capt. Bondurant. I gave to the press a report of two samples, one of them over [omission]; one of the richest mines in Northern Ontario only per ton has an average of about 8 [omission]; it is a tremendous tonnage. Capt. Bondurant showed me himself 21 official results of assays he made from various parts of Labrador. These 21 average anywhere from a trace of gold up to 248; that was the highest he showed me. Since going up, he promised to send me down some samples, and the samples he sent me a few days ago were brought out to Seven Islands by Indians.

Capt. Bondurant first became interested in the possibilities of the area [when] he was employed by the Canadian Air Force in connection with aerial survey work in Labrador. In 1927, after his leaving the service of the Canadian Government, he and a couple of others invested in an airplane to do private work. While thus engaged, he was employed by American interests to go in and examine around on our territory. From what I have seen from a report made by the company, the ore on our territory contains, in a conservative estimate, 6 billion tons. The iron is far superior to any iron we have seen in this country. Bell Island ore is not the high grade hematite ore. This ore that I have seen is a very high grade ore. It compares favourably with the Swedish ore, though it would be a costly matter to have it taken out from the interior. A railroad would have to be built. I should imagine a shipping port would have to be made down around Seven Islands, and I suppose it would cost \$9,000,000 to build a railroad and erect a shipping port. At the present time there is very little activity with regard to iron ore. Some time ago I read a speech made by the President of the United Steel Co. – I just forget his name – but he predicted that the time is now ripe. He advised the directorate to look around for raw material. We had struck rock bottom as far as depression was concerned, we were on upgrade, [and] he predicted a period of unprecedented prosperity. If his predictions turn out to be true, we have in Labrador in that mine 6 billion tons of hematite iron – the salvation of the country. While we have these rich areas in Labrador and Newfoundland, there is nothing to worry about so far as the future is concerned. It is quite true at the present time it is a very difficult matter to make ends meet; the world has always had its cycles of depression and periods of prosperity. I think if we have really struck bottom, now we are starting on the up grade, and if we pull together in this House and outside, I think if we do that, I see a bright future for Newfoundland, and I think we should avail of the facilities offered in Labrador at the present time to try and get the country out of its difficulties, and get it out quickly.

I said in introducing these resolutions I was not going to make a speech. I think that is all that it is necessary for me to explain (*reads*).

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the Committee this afternoon. This particular agreement is something new in this country. It apparently contemplates the giving of a monopoly, not of a certain particular trade, but of the right to go and look for it covering a certain area. Ordinarily, of course, it is the right of a citizen to go and look for minerals. It may be that in view of the fact that these particular areas are regarded as being rather inaccessible, it can be regarded as justifiable that individuals should be given the right to examine into large areas to the exclusion of all others in the meantime. Now, I can quite appreciate the fact that the rentals are appealing in their character under existing circumstances, and I can quite appreciate the fact that having found that one at least of the provinces of Canada is prepared to permit this type of exclusive right to search, the Government felt itself justified in adopting a similar course, [but] I am not sure that we are right. I am not sufficiently well posted on matters of this kind to be able to say that we are wrong, but it looks to me as if these agreements are capable of creating a monopoly. It ties up the particular portions of the Labrador covered by the schedules in the latter end of the Bill for a period of three years. It then gives the right to these gentlemen or corporations to pick out whatever portions in the meantime they require and leave the rest, so that in the course of the three years they, by their geological and geophysical examinations conducted by their experts, will have taken good care that nothing will be left for anybody else except barren ground. I don't like the idea; I don't like the idea of selecting 200 or 300 miles of territory and permitting 23 or 24 licencees to go down on these territories and for a period of three years, to the exclusion of all others, [giving them] the right to take whatever is of value unto themselves. It does not look right to me. It has all the earmarks and characteristics of a monopoly.

Now, as I say, I am not prepared to discuss the matter in detail. I am not a mining man. I know nothing whatever about mining, although it has cost me some money. There is perhaps another matter with which I may be regarded as being more familiar, and that is in connection with the royalties that are to be paid. It is not so much the amounts that are set forth in Section 9 of the agreement that I take exception to, it is the very fact that the amounts are specified. I don't know whether 4 cents for every unit of copper is too much or too little; I don't know whether 2 cents for every unit of lead is too much or too little. I do say this, that when you make an agreement with these people to accept a specific proportion out of the production of a particular property which they may decide to retain, you are limiting the right not only of yourselves, but of all future governments to vary that, if circumstances and conditions warrant it. It may be that while copper is 20 or 30 cents a pound or less, as I understand it is to-day, 4 cents would be a fair royalty, but on the other hand if copper were to jump to 60, 70, 80 or 90 or \$1, as it has done in the past, it strikes me that this Colony ought to have a proportion of that amount.

Hon. Mr. Browne: It never went to that, 22 cents a pound.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You would get a lot of copper for 22 cents in 1918. I only use these figures arbitrarily. My point is that if any of these metals should advance in value or price at any time after either of these possible mines begins to operate, I think the Colony should get a little share of that. For that reason I do take exception to the agreement as it stands. It is tying the hands of the Colony for evermore under an agreement which you make here yourselves, and which in the

ordinary course no Government succeeding you can decently break. When the amount to be paid by them was in the statute, we were at liberty at any time to alter that statute if we felt that the operations warranted it, but you have tied the hands of succeeding governments, as well as your own, behind your backs. I claim that is improper, highly improper. Too much of this kind of thing has been done in this country. We have been entering into agreements with every Tom, Dick, and Harry that comes in here looking for concessions [omission].

He asked for information as to whether or not the taxes mentioned therein interfered in any way with the income or corporation taxes.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines explained that some protection should be given the investors who are compelled to spend \$5,000 a year in research work. It was a matter for the government to regulate the tax of the profits or income tax. [*Evening Telegram*, May 12, 1933]

Hon. H. A. Winter: Mr. Chairman, I think the apprehension of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the important point he presses is quite justifiable, but I think I can re-assure [him] and allay his fears. If he will look at Section 111 of the [Crown Lands] Act, which refers to it specifically, he will notice that the situation is saved so far as his apprehension is concerned. As the Minister has explained, the terms embodied in this contract were adopted from the Canadian method and given on the special advice of the best informed men in the mining world. Now, Section 111 points out clearly that there is no specific exclusion on the profits through income tax, except by implication (*reads Section 111*). In the same way, here it is for the purpose of ascertaining the 5, 6, or 7 per cent on the profits. If any person should make enormous profit we get it on the income tax, anyhow. Then you allow him to deduct that and get him under this schedule.

He said that by making agreements like this we were tying the hands of the present administration. Under the Act there is a specific 5 per cent prescribed. Under the Crown Lands Act there's a specific rental of \$2 per square mile. I think my learned and honourable friend will agree with me, when I say that so far as the morality of the matter is concerned, there is very little difference between altering the agreement, and altering an Act of Parliament to the detriment of a person who relying on it has spent an amount of money. I think also that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will agree that this question has another side, and I ask him to put himself in the position of an intending speculator who is taking a long chance, a very long chance, and who was not aware of the change in the Act before taking it. Anyway, I think we have reached a satisfactory position. 90 per cent of the detriment which the Government might suffer [omission]. I think such cases as my honourable and learned friend supposes are met by Section 111 of the Crown Lands Act. If the very unusual case should arise that any company concerned at present should be placed in the fortunate position of making more money than is now indicated, there are other methods outside of an Act of Parliament to induce them to enter into a new agreement and allow an extra charge against them.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Ratify Certain Agreements Relating to Mining Concessions in Labrador" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Council of Higher Education Report of Examinations, 1932.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the 12th of May instant, at 3 p.m.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: On the motion to adjourn it is in order for me to say that if the Government do not already know, I am in receipt of a telegram from the Chairman of the Drivers' Committee at Corner Brook saying that they have won their point. The Company has caved in. They are getting their 35 cents an hour.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Friday, May 12, 1933

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

Hon. the Prime Minister presented a petition from the St. John's Gas Light Company praying for a further extension of freedom from duties and taxes for a period of two years.

On motion this petition was received and referred to a Select Committee to enquire and report as to whether the Rules of the House in relation to Private Bills have been complied with.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. Mr. Browne, Hon. Mr. Winter, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Bradley.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:

Supplemental Supply, 1932-33\$1,185,395.24

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.³⁰

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Justices of the Peace."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act."

³⁰ "More than half this sum is represented by votes to meet dole orders (\$400,000), outstanding debts of the Railway (\$150,000), and seed potatoes (\$72,000). The government hopes to liquidate all these expenditures by the end of June." *Daily News*, May 15, 1933.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There is a matter which arises out of Section [*omission*] which I think ought to be considered very carefully, and which, in my opinion, involves a principle which should be adopted. The same has been in my mind for some years, but I have not been able to get my way thus far. It is this. We all know that the Newfoundlander, in common with citizens of many countries, places an abnormal value upon the possession of land. They will fight bitterly and lose half they possess, in order to obtain six inches of land which they think somebody else has taken from them. In years past it has been the practice of individuals in various settlements throughout this country to obtain grants of land from the Crown far in excess of their actual needs, and I have no doubt that other Honourable Members here to-day can call to mind instances where individuals have secured for themselves considerably more land than was necessary for their ordinary use, in and around settlements where they live, and others living in that settlement did not have enough. These individuals with more than their share act more or less as dogs in the manger – they don't utilize these lands, but prevent other people who would utilize them from getting them. I know of many instances around the country of that kind. I do think it is a shame that one can sit on acre upon acre upon acre of good land in and near a settlement in which he lives, and do absolutely nothing with it, when there are other poor unfortunates in the same settlement who are metaphorically starving for a piece of land. I am going to ask the Hon. Minister if he would consider the advisability of enforcing a forfeiture in certain contingencies where people hold land which they do not utilize. Everyone in the sound of my voice knows that kind of thing is going on, this grabbing of land. We have heard talk of the timber shark for years. Right under our nose we have had the land shark all the time, gathering in land grant after land grant wherever he gets the opportunity, sitting close, doing nothing with it, and preventing another man from doing something. I do seriously suggest this afternoon before we pass this Bill, that the Government take into consideration the idea of adopting some statutory regulation under which a man must either utilize the land or it reverts to the Crown.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the suggestion from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and am entirely in accord with what he says. As one who happens to have more knowledge than he has, because of being actually in touch with these matters daily, I know of thousands of acres of land tied up around this country. Some of it may not have been granted at all, and certainly a large portion of it never saw a pick or a shovel and [*is*] unfenced, despite the fact that the Department is besieged daily by people who are looking for land to cultivate, and who have not got enough land now to set a bucket of potatoes in. In the District of Humber there are 15,000 acres of land held up by speculators, who took over this land a few years ago thinking a road was going to be put through there. That land is not under cultivation, while scores of people in that locality have no land, and who are only too anxious to get a piece to cultivate for their own use. The matter is so serious, Sir, that I suggest the Committee rise in order to give the Department of Justice an opportunity to deal with the point raised.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, I know from the Minister of Justice that we must apply to

the Courts if we want to dispossess those people holding those lands. I know of a case at Thorburn Turnpike in the District of St. John's West, where 60 acres of land are held in the name of O'Neill, a person who left this country 60 years ago, while a number of other people in that community have not enough land to cultivate for their private requirements. There is another large tract of land held on the Ruby Line. A grant for that was given to an English officer in the olden days when the soldiers were here. Now all that land is badly needed for cultivation purposes. I know of some young men who are returning from agricultural colleges abroad, and who have actually their agricultural machinery bought to go farming, but cannot procure land. The Justice Department say they can do nothing about the matter, and that the only recourse is to the Courts. Perhaps, now that we have a new Acting Minister of Justice, he might be able to devise some plan to solve this problem.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have no doubt, Sir, that the Government is powerless now in the matter, but this House, with the concurrence of the other branch, is supreme and we can give the Government the power.

Hon. Mr. Browne: Mr. Chairman, if the Committee acts upon the suggestion of the honourable introducer of the Bill, I promise to take the matter up and see what can be done. As most of us are aware, it is a matter that has been engaging the attention of the Minister of Justice for some time past. But as the problem seems to be an acute one at the present time, I shall endeavour to find a solution for it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If the policy of the Act is to prevent the export of unmanufactured timber from Newfoundland, then surely any Act which is dictated by immediate necessity to permit [this practice] should be placed in an independent Act temporary in character, and not placed in the Crown Lands Act, thus making it permanent.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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 20, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: This Bill is a step in the right direction. It is [the] placing in the Act of teeth which I hope will prove to be strong teeth, and which I wanted placed in the Act originally, but I am sorry to say I did not get my way. There is one point there that I think has been missed, and that is the question of rents.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: That point was brought up the other evening when we were discussing the Bill, when somebody said, does anybody pay rents nowadays?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If rents were lower, the ordinary man would make greater efforts to pay them to-day. It applies not only to the working man who is pretty badly up against it to-day, but it applies to all property in [the] City and all over the world. Rents are based to-day on the market value of the property rented, not on its intrinsic value. I understand that the Island of Manhattan was originally sold by the Indians for the nominal sum of \$24. This well-known piece of land was originally worth only what it could produce. But its value has increased, multiplied many times since. It is the same way with any piece of land. It is originally worth only what it can produce. By reason of people congregating there it becomes valuable. The people themselves make the land valuable, and the owner charges the people, who have made the land valuable, excessive rent. This applies particularly in this country, because of the fact that a great many of the people charging rentals have never done anything to increase the value of the land – absentee landlords, who are draining the money out of this country and giving no services whatever. Hundreds of years ago their ancestors got grants of land. The people have made it valuable by trading there and living there, and these people have had to pay increased rental. The owner has had his land increased in value a thousandfold. The owner then turns around and compels them to pay him rent upon land which they have made valuable, far in excess of the original value, and based upon the value which they themselves have made.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I welcome the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The owner sits down and waits for the land to become valuable; and furthermore, as far as excess of rent is concerned, it applies more to the poorer than to the better classes. I know cases where people pay \$10 per month on houses which are not worth \$10. We did discuss it, but we know that there are many people who are unable to pay rent [and] we are glad of the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and welcome it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into

a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Corporations and Institutions Guaranteed or Subsidized by the Government."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Corporations and Institutions Guaranteed or Subsidized by the Government" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Further to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there is any necessity for the Government proceeding with this Bill this year. I am in receipt of advices from Corner Brook saying that the Company has agreed to give the men the minimum wage. I don't know if this applies to Grand Falls or not, but the discussions that have taken place in and out of this House during the past week in reference to this matter have been illuminating to me, and I feel that though there may be occasions where the Company is justified in asking for a reduction of wages of loggers, the maintenance of the law upon the Statute Book will at least serve as a protection against any undue decrease in wages.

I speak now as a lawyer, and what I say will probably be appreciated more by the Hon. Acting Minister of Justice and Hon. Mr. Winter, than by the ordinary lay members of the House. I am inclined to think that under the Act as it now stands, these men and the companies have the right to negotiate and come to an agreement which would be valid in law despite the Act. The presence of a minimum wage on the statute book would have a strong moral effect. I do not know what the merits of the Company's contention are, and I did not get at my interview with the Company's representative any actual figures on the cost of driving. He made no statement as to the aggregate amount paid the men, but it strikes me as being an effort to get the pulpwood moved as cheaply as possible. Under the ordinary laws of competition this is not unnatural, but it leaves the other man open to protect himself so far as he can. I do think that if this Act were not in existence, the men

would be getting 21 or 22 cents an hour. It was admitted by the representative of the Company that the ordinary labourer around the mills and stockpiles got 28 cents an hour, besides being dry and comfortable all day and having a home to go to in the evening. This is an attempt on the part of the Company to throw an unfair proportion of their losses over on these men who are not like the ordinary labouring men, [who] are not always comfortable, but they are for three parts of the day soaking wet with April snow water, and you all know what that is like. Then there is the question of danger. I agree that the days when a man had to ride a log down the river are over, as the pulp logs are only four feet long, but the element of danger is not entirely removed from their work. I have seen a log jam break, and there was some small degree of danger to myself, although I was only a spectator. I saw some half dozen men out in the middle of that heaving pile of logs when it broke, and it is a mystery to me yet how they ever escaped. In addition to that, it must be remembered that from the standpoint of a medical man the danger is considerable. While the effects of the cold snow water of April or May may not be at once apparent, still they may have their effect in a year or two years, or even later. Perhaps that is not realized at all, but it is a fact, and I feel that these men should get more wages than the ordinary labourer with a comfortable home, working in a town at 28 cents an hour. Why should the driver who is in some danger, both immediate and prospective, get less? The amount finally offered by the Company was 27½ cents. Even that itself is less than the man in the mill yard is getting, and I feel that I am quite sincere when I say this, that the Government will be well advised to let this matter stand so far as that particular portion of the Bill is concerned this year.

I don't exactly know at the moment the purport of the other amendments. I presume these will be explained, but on that particular point on this second reading, I do earnestly urge the Government to drop the proposed amendment. If it is necessary, and it is justified on some future occasion next year, we can amend, but one outstanding thing that does strike me at the moment is that it is apparent now that the I.P.P. Company have realized the justice of the men's contention, and have agreed to give them their 35 cents an hour. I have no further observations to make. I do urge that upon the second reading, because it is really a most important portion of the Bill, and I do trust when we go into the Committee stage, the Government will be good enough to drop that Section out of the Bill altogether.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: In reply to the honourable gentleman who just sat down, I wish to assure him and the House that I am in entire sympathy with his attempt to try to better conditions for loggers or any other class of workmen. In all the years I have been in the House, and before I ever came to the House, I have been in close touch with the workmen in practically every [omission] of employment in the country. I was not a Member of the House when the present legislation went through. On several occasions when I was a Member, and when I occupied the position of Minister of Agriculture and Mines, we had applications from certain sections of the country asking for the minimum wage. We sent out on two or three occasions a commission to make enquiry, and we found the men very much divided.

Now, with regard to the amendments that were made to suspend this particular Section of the Logging Act until May of 1935, I don't see that any real hardship is going to be imposed on the people at all. We have a situation in the country to-day when we come in and discuss certain men getting 35 cents an hour or 28 cents an hour, where Hon. Members must realize that we have

thousands of men scattered all over the country who can't get 5 cents an hour, who can't get employment at all. If we force a company or companies to adhere to this Act, to the 35 cents an hour, does it not naturally follow that a certain section of the men will be given jobs and the other men thrown out? Take the younger men – if we have to pay to-day higher wages, if we compel them by law to pay that amount, won't they retaliate, won't they put out the middle-aged man, perhaps the man with a large family will be thrown out without consideration. It would be alright to do so if there was some other avenue of employment, if we could send them to Buchans, Grand Falls or Bell Island, but the men who have jobs to-day are very lucky to be able to draw even 25 to 30 cents an hour.

I know in my constituency we have 25 per cent of the fishermen, able-bodied fishermen, I don't know where they are going to turn this summer to earn a dollar. I am afraid a large number of them will be unable to secure supplies for the fishery. The avenues of employment that they had before, such as going to Gloucester, Sydney, Boston, that is closed, and it is a horrible thing to look forward to, having that class of men during July, August, September when they should be earning, lying around on the rocks.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the commencement, I am in entire sympathy with the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition in advocating the cause of the labouring man, especially the logger who has to undergo a certain amount of danger and hardship that other sections of the industry don't have to undergo. I think if we did embody a minimum wage, I would like to see that that minimum should cover every avenue of employment. The miner should be embodied, the factory worker, and the man who works in the mill and the man who works along the river bank. I don't agree that the position is full of hazards or any more danger; that the man driving logs suffers any more hardship, in fact, he does not suffer as much as the man who has to go in the woods and hew down [trees] for \$1.50 or 75 cents [per day] – that man has to go half-clad. I think the work is harder. That man has to undergo more privation than the man who trails along the river.

Honestly, I think that this amendment that we are making to the Logging Act is imposing no hardship whatever on the men. It is a strange thing to me that since the strike at Corner Brook, I have not heard a word from Grand Falls. Ever since that Company commenced work on the West Coast, there has been nothing but strikes. If it is not a strike at the mill, it is a strike somewhere else. There is nobody seems to have confidence in the Company. No matter what Government has been in office, men get up and denounce the Company and there is very good reason for it.

I don't want to delay the House any further; as I said in the commencement, if I saw any real hardship imposed on the men by the adoption of these amendments, I would certainly ask to have the Bill withdrawn. I don't think it is going to inflict hardship on anyone. I think it must work out in the interests of the men. When the Minister of Labour was unable to attend the conference when these negotiations were on, the Prime Minister succeeded in getting the Company to cut down 5 cents a meal on the amount charged the men working in the lumber camps, that is 15 cents a day they save on their board, and they were getting 22 cents an hour. The Company decided through the advocacy of the Prime Minister to raise it to 27 cents. We only ask to have this Section dealing with the minimum wage suspended until May of 1935, when conditions may be normal. If I am going to be here when conditions are normal, I am prepared to join hands with the Leader of the Opposition to assist him to put that Company in their place.

The men asked my advice with regard to the price paid for wood. I told them if they could make a price that would pay them to cut, I would do all in my power to get the Government to allow the Company to buy from them wood cut on Crown Lands. On the way back I met a delegation from Robinson's section. The men joined the train and discussed the matter with me. The best they could do with the Company was \$2 a cord. The railway people freighted the wood from Robinson's to Corner Brook for \$3.50. There is no mill in the world able to get wood as cheap as that. There are mills in the United States that have to pay over \$20 a cord for their wood. If we had a situation here where I could see where I would turn the men to employment, I would have no hesitation in joining in the strike. I would shut down their mill. We want to think twice before we put the men out of employment, no matter how small the stipend they receive. If the Corner Brook company wanted 100 men and there were only 100 men, it would be very easy to get a decent wage. But when they want 100 men and there are 4,000 or 5,000 looking for jobs, there is very little that a poor man can do.

In moving the second reading, I want to assure the Leader of the Opposition that my heart is in the right place with regard to the working man. My voice has always been raised in their behalf, and it always will be as long as I have a seat in this House.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I think I should explain my position, Mr. Speaker. To begin with, although we are quite prepared to bring this Act to May, 1935, I am opposed to the setting of a minimum wage. Why should we wish to take a particular branch of the industry and say they must have a minimum wage, and not of any other branch of the industry, so far as lumbering is concerned? In the United States they have never endeavoured to set a minimum wage. Why should we want to do it? I am sure the water is no wetter in Newfoundland than it is anywhere else.

Unfortunately, owing to certain circumstances there is a stress of employment, and some men are being paid [*omission*] plus their board. I don't want to see our men reduced to that. When we met the Company, I said, "We can't tolerate 22 cents an hour." They said, "We can't pay 35. The only [way] we can carry on our industry at the present, running on full time, is by having everything cut down. We have cut down our own salaries, we have cut down everything that is of a cuttable nature.

By doing that we have been able to arrange a price for the *Daily News* in London, so that we will be able to run on full time for the next twelve months." Surely, 27 cents an hour under those conditions is much better than coercing, trying to force them to pay 35 cents and perhaps reducing production. I have given my word. The word I gave them was, "If you will make the rate 27½ cents and keep to that, and reduce the cost of living 5 cents a meal, I will promise you I will use all my exertions to have this section removed from the Act until May 1935."

We have talked about the hazards of this particular employment. I am informed that the Company have had fewer claims through accidents from the river branch than from any other branch of the industry. Then again, there is another inequality where you have experienced axe men in the wood areas working far harder than those engaged at the river, and getting only half their rate of pay. It is positively unfair to have boys and inexperienced men demanding 35 cents an hour on the river, in view of the adversities and hardships encountered by the woodsmen. If the demand for a minimum wage applied to experienced log drivers, there would be some reason for it, but I cannot see any justifiable reason for putting in a minimum wage clause in the light of the present

circumstances.

Of course, it must be remembered that our newsprint companies are competing against Canadian and United States companies, and after all, that Corner Brook company, and I hold no brief for them, have just been paying their bond interests and no more, but if we so hamper them by forcing them to pay more wages than they are able, it might mean a default on their payment of bond interests, which is \$2,000,000 on second mortgage bonds.

I am not dodging this issue. I am as much responsible as the Minister in charge of this measure, and I am prepared to take out this minimum clause section until May, 1935.³¹

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Fire Insurance Companies" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has for its object the protecting to a large extent policy-holders with the different fire insurance companies doing business in the country. After discussing the matter with the various companies here, they admitted the reasonableness in our proposals, and are prepared to abide by the conditions, in a way, outlined in this Bill.

In our Public Utilities Bill we have made provisions for the enquiring into insurance rates, and I have some figures here from the Department of Finance showing that from 1923 to 1931 the premiums collected in St. John's amounted to \$3,845,000 and the losses \$926,000. In other words, they collected four times what they paid out. There is an opportunity right away for our Public Utilities Board, as I think these profits are outrageous. So far as the outports are concerned, for four years from 1929 to 1932 inclusive, the premiums collected amounted to \$674,000 as against \$373,000 paid out in losses, and that surely is good business, according to the figures I got of what obtains in Canada.

The purpose we have in mind is for the protection of policyholders in the event of any insurance company going into liquidation or defaulting in any way. So companies have to procure

³¹ "Hon. the Prime Minister in explanation of this act, stated that whilst he was of the opinion that no government should regulate a minimum wage, particularly if requested to do so for one industry, but in view of the circumstances he asked legislation which would be effective until 1935. He pointed out newsprint manufacturing at the present time. In view of the fact that the I.P.P. Co. had agreed to observe the rate paid to drivers last year, only one year would be effected by this legislation. He was of the opinion that the men working in the wood areas worked far harder than the river men but received less than half the wage paid to drivers. He also referred to the fact that it was in the best interests of the country that operations at Corner Brook be continued without interruptions as Newfoundland was committed to pay interest on second mortgage bonds if the company failed to do so.

"Mr. Bradley expressed his views to the contrary and in view of the fact that the company had agreed to pay the drivers the rate of wage paid them last year, he did not see the necessity of the Act.

"Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines appreciated the views of the Leader of the Opposition. He had at all times advocated the cause of the workingman and he was familiar with the circumstances. He had worked in the mines and knew the conditions of the men who worked the hardest and were paid less. He, however, had in mind men who cannot get 5 cents an hour much less than 35 cents an hour. The miner, the farmer, the tradesmen and all other classes of workman were not thus protected. The men working in the lumber woods were getting only \$1.50 a day." *Evening Telegram*, May 13, 1933.

licenses authorizing them to carry on the business of fire insurance in Newfoundland, and then have to put up 100 per cent of their net premium incomes; that will give policyholders ample security against any possibility of default.

Many companies are finding their assets in a frozen condition, and it would be exceedingly difficult for them to pay out losses if a conflagration occurred. According to the Bill, there is nothing to prevent any person or company outside the country doing their business through Lloyds, but on that business policyholders have no protection, while city policyholders will have security to the extent of \$450,000 and outport policy-holders about \$600,000.

Another Section in the Bill states that if the premium interest is less than \$5,000, the companies have to deposit securities to the value of \$5,000. The idea is to work in conjunction with the Superintendents of Insurance Companies in Canada, so that unless a company is eligible to obtain a license from the Canadian authorities, they will not be able to get one here, because they will not be considered sufficiently solvent to carry on business according to the provisions of this Bill. As we go through Committee, the matter can be explained more fully.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I have to approve of the principle laid down by the honourable introducer of this measure. People in this country have been badly bitten by insurance companies within the past 40 years, as is well known. The idea of collecting premiums from people four times as much as the actual losses met with, is absurd. Even if the premiums collected were twice the amount of losses paid, [it] would seem excessive to me. Another point is that within recent years the Government of Newfoundland very considerably improved and increased the fire fighting forces in the city, but that was done with the intention of obtaining the money through tax from the insurance companies to pay for it. But what happened was that the companies added this tax to the bill of property owners. In other words, we have succeeded over a period of years of lessening the risks of the companies, and that we have to pay for, lessening the risks. It's about time they were brought to task. I am heartily in accord with the principle of the Bill.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Amendment of the Loan Act, 1932 (22 George V., Cap. 32)" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Amendment of the Loan Act, 1932 (22 George V., Cap. 32)."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Amendment of the Loan Act, 1932 (22 George V., Cap. 32)" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Health and Welfare Act, 1931" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would like to say a few words in connection with the amendments. In 1931, the Public Health and Welfare Act was passed. It was an enormous document of several hundred sections, and the Act has not been put in force to the fullest extent from that day until this. The Bureau created by that Act was very unwieldy, and I don't think it has met since it was created. It was composed of every member of the Executive Council, and some of the members were not in the Executive Council, and it was very hard for it to function. The idea is to limit the Bureau itself to five members – the Secretary of State, the Minister of Justice, the Controller of the Treasury, the Secretary of Public Health, and [omission].

There is a change in Section 2. It was not clear that the Bureau had disciplinary control around the institutions. The idea is now for the Bureau not to exercise that control, but to have financial control. The Minister of Public Works reverts back to the function he occupied before the Bill was enacted. The Superintendent of an institution gets more power than he had before. The public is only exercising general control over the different institutions. In Section 3 of the old Act it was provided that the Chairman of the Pensions Commission had to be Secretary for Public Health. It may be desirable for him to be Chairman of the Board of Pensions Commission, but it should not be laid down as necessary in the Act. The Chairman of the Board of Pensions Commission has been acting for the past twelve months. It is now proposed to change Section 30 by deleting the words "and Chairman of the Board of Pensions Commissioners for the Colony."

Section 40 of the Act is changed (*reads*). Section 5 relates to the sleeping of two men in a berth. It might be desirable to have single berths, but most of the men like to sleep together and I see no objection to it. There's another provision contained in the last two or three sections, that when a patient is committed to the insane asylum in St. John's, he must be certified by two doctors. There are not many places in the country where there are two doctors. We are now going to provide that he be certified by one doctor and examined by Doctor Anderson when he comes into St. John's. There is no change in Section 8. We are only clarifying the Section and not changing it. When we go through the Bill and come to every section, I will explain it in more detail. I move the second reading.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill

entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: In relation to this Act, I may say there are few changes. In moving the second reading, I may say the intention of the Act is to amend Schedule C to read \$20 instead of \$25 per ton as before. Formerly under Schedule [omission] it was \$30, under B \$25 and under C \$25, and in order to make it more uniform Schedule C is made to read \$20 instead of \$25. Otherwise there are no changes. If there is anything else in connection with this Bill, I will be only too happy to explain it. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading. There is one other change. We have decided to cut out the payment of the bounty paid for rebuilding of a ship. Owing to the finances of the country being in such a state, and since we have such a small amount of money at our disposal, we have decided to cut out the bounty on rebuilding a ship and to confine the bounty to ships which are built new. A ship built practically new and fitted with good second-hand gear will get two-thirds of the bounty instead of one-half as heretofore.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, the 15th of May instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Monday, May 15, 1933

*The House met at three of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.*³²

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Byrne, from Outer Cove, re Electric Light.

Mr. Byrne: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the fishermen of Outer Cove and the farming people of the White Hills, asking to have an electric light placed on the hill overlooking Outer Cove beach, in order to enable them to carry on their daily avocations. Apart from the merits of the petition itself, it should be remembered obviously that those thriving and industrious people represented therein never requested or never received any dole, and, therefore, their request at this juncture is entitled to the most earnest and sympathetic consideration of the Government. For the information of the House I shall read the petition, which is signed by 95 residents of that settlement (*reads*).

Hon. the Secretary of State, on behalf of the Special Committee, presented the following Report:

To the Honourable the House of Assembly:

Your Select Committee appointed to ascertain whether the Rules of the House have been complied with in regard to the St. John's Gas Light Company's petition beg to report that they have examined the papers and find that the Company has not strictly complied with said Rules but would recommend that this discrepancy be waived and that leave be given to introduce the Bill.

(Sgd.) J. C. Puddester

W. J. Browne

H. A. Winter

F. G. Bradley

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 22 Geo. V. Cap. 6" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Artificial Fertilizers."

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Justices of the Peace."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

³² "The Prime Minister was absent, being slightly indisposed." *Daily News*, May 16, 1933, p. 2.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Mr. Browne explained that a new section had been drafted to be inserted in the Bill replacing Section 9, which had been left over for further consideration. With this amendment the Bill went through Committee, was given third reading and ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council for concurrence. [*Daily News*, May 16, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and has passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of the Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Justices of the Peace" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 20, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: With regard to that Bill, Mr. Bradley has raised the question of the advisability of including rents within the scope of the Commission's activities. After giving this matter some consideration, it was felt that the Commission would have enough work for the present to keep them fully occupied, and that the question of investigating rents was a very big one and more difficult than all the others put together. With regard to rents in this town, there are a few large landlords, and the rest are private individuals, most of whom are no better off than the ordinary working man, and in regard to landlords' ground rents the same considerations apply. There is no great demand for an investigation at the present time, and for that reason it was felt that it would be better to allow the Commission's activities to run along the lines suggested in the Bill, and next year if it is possible, they will enlarge the scope of their work to include the question of rents. If they tackled this question now, they would have to turn themselves into a rent corps, every house rented would have to be submitted to them and receive their approval, and because of the great difference in the classes of houses in St. John's, this would entail endless work. For these reasons I would ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to allow the Bill to go through now, and next session we may

have an opportunity of doing these things as well.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am sorry that the Government feels that the time is not opportune to include the question of rents within the purview of the Commission's activities. It is a step in the right direction, and it is difficult to understand why the power is not there. If it is because of the large amount of work to be done, it is a different matter. This matter is of particular importance to-day when the earning power of our people is so low. Ten years ago when money was comparatively of little value, it was not felt as it is to-day. I had in mind when I made this suggestion the rents charged to the working man, and it should be remembered that not only the question of house rents should be investigated, but the question of ground rents as well. A day or so ago, I pointed out that much of our ground rents and some of our house rents are simply taxes on future earnings by individuals who give nothing in return. I might enlarge that point and say that all capitalists are in that position, but nevertheless these rents are a great hardship on our people. I feel that there is far too much money collected by individuals who were fortunate enough to grab large pieces of land many years ago when the city was not even built, and now they are taxing the people for lands they never laid their eyes on. I think this clause should be in the Bill now, so that it could be dealt with at an early date. If there is too much work for the Commission it can wait for a hearing, but in the meantime I cannot agree that it should be postponed. But I am afraid that the few will have to bow to the will of the many.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and has passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of the Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 20, George V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging.'"'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that in view of the fact that I am not in accord with the Bill, that it take its usual course.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

A Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Fire Insurance Companies," deferred.

A Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Health and Welfare Act 1931," deferred.

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 and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: May I ask the Hon. Minister whether most of the Act is not a repetition of the old Act?

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: It is mostly the old Act, with the exception of the change of \$5 under Schedule C. This change was made so as to make it more uniform. The new Act is practically the same as the old.³³

Re the bounty, the idea was that owing to economic conditions and the fact that we have only a small amount of money at our disposal, we can only pay bounty on all ships built from the new. If the ship is fitted with good second-hand gear, we will pay three-quarters of the bounty now, instead of one-half as formerly. According to the state of some vessels that I saw being rebuilt, it is about time that the payment of bounty for rebuilding was cut out.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I think that I agree with you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

³³ "The amendment ... [was] to reduce by \$5 per ton the bounty paid under Schedule C on schooners not less than 12 tons and not more than 40 tons." *Daily News*, May 16, 1933.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has asked me to introduce this Bill in his absence. This Bill is merely a consolidation of the two Acts passed in the years 1924 and 1929. There are very few real alterations, and the Government trusts that the Members of the Opposition will bear in mind that the Government does not regard this as a party measure, and asks their cooperation in reaching a solution of the problems that are raised.

No question has raised more dissension in Newfoundland [than] the sale of alcoholic liquors. There is nothing very serious in this Bill which will give cause for dissension. The 1924 Act was introduced very suddenly as a reversal of the policy of several years under Prohibition law, and I feel it was a success as far as it went. The drafting of the Act was not all that it might have been, and a good many provisions were taken as transcript from the Act dealing with local licences made many years ago.³⁴ The principal changes that were made in 1929 were a strengthening up of penalties clauses, and the introduction of the principle of interdicting premises where a certain number of sales had taken place in the course of a prescribed period of time.

That is considered to have [had] a very good effect, but it is not sufficient to keep down the numbers engaged in illicit traffic in alcohol, and some slight extension is introduced here so that persons convicted of three offences will not only be interdicted, but if that person moves from one premises to another the ban will follow him. Some people think this will be an advertisement for him, that it will serve as a sign above the door, sort of, "Here you are boys, I sell it," but this has been devised with the assistance and cooperation of the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control, the Inspector General and Magistrate McCarthy, who have much more experience with this problem than anyone else. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has also much experience in connection with the old Liquor Act, and I feel that we will have his cooperation in Committee stage.

There is also provision being made to rectify an omission in the old Act. For example, there is no provision for keeping beer and wines in a separate store, and there is no provision for sale at branch stores. It is possible for an outport of 5,000 inhabitants to petition for a branch store, and

³⁴ "... many provisions in it were taken from Local Option and Local Licensing laws from years before." *Daily News*, May 16, 1933.

there is no provision made for that stipulation. Another novel feature is that it is proposed to give the Board authority to deliver goods to their customers. With regard to the keeping of liquor in the bottles of the Board, the law is very strict, in fact it is so strict that it is ridiculous, why you can't even take a bottle home and pour the contents into a decanter, if you want to entertain your friends in the good old Newfoundland way, without committing an offence, and I think every reasonable man will admit that is going too far. It should also make provision for the delivery by the Board of its goods to the consumer. Take beer and wines, I don't think that it would be a very serious inconvenience if it were not delivered, but there are certain people who are not doing business in purchasing the more moderate stimulants, who would do it now.

There was also an omission before with regard to transportation. Take the case at Bell Island. The Controller's Department appointed a man in 1924 as their agent there. He was not paid by them nor was there any legal sanction for his appointment. Now it was proposed to have a responsible man legally appointed. There was also provision for the licensing of restaurants which can sell wines and beers at meals between 9:00 a.m. and midnight. Another provision was for the Governor-in-Council to decide the hours of closing the Liquor Control stores. At present these hours were defined by the old Acts; it was thought preferable to give the Government power to alter these from time to time as circumstances arose.

Another provision in the Bill which he feared was going to give rise to adverse comment and which arose out of a trial in the magistrate's court a short time ago, was to the right of the police to hang up motor cars on the highroads. It was decided then the police did not have the right to stop a motor car at nightfall with lights on, and did not have grounds to suspect that it was carrying alcohol illegally. However, a provision had been inserted that such reasonable grounds the magistrate called for in that case should not be necessary. He felt that the police and Customs authorities had been working overtime watching the main arteries by which liquor could be introduced into St. John's and disposed of for sale. The country had suffered a big loss of revenue from that source and it was the duty of the authorities to prevent that sort of traffic; while at the same time it was annoying to people being held up at so many places on the highroad to be searched for liquor, so that he called the attention of Hon. Members to that phase of the situation in order to deal with it in the proper manner when the Bill goes into Committee.

The principle the government of 1929 went on, was that in cases for breaches of the Liquor Act connected with beers and wines, lighter penalties were imposed than for offences dealing with spirits. The Government in the present measure have a different principle, namely, they make the penalty lighter for a person who accidentally commits a breach of the Act, but where it was known that the offender was an habitual offender and a professional dealer in alcohol, then the penalty becomes severe. He did not think anyone could disagree with this principle. He also pointed out that any person found on an interdicted premises will be liable to a severe penalty. [*Daily News*, May 16, 1933]

I don't think there are any more serious changes. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has had the advantage of studying the Bill and he is probably even more familiar with its provisions that I

am. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.³⁵

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't think there are any serious moral principles involved in the principles of the Bill on which we could lock horns. Most men will agree from the experience of the past fifteen or twenty years that if men want liquor they are going to get it, and it [is] merely a matter, in so far as the Government is concerned, of trying to regulate the use of liquor in the best interests of the country at large. I do not propose to offer any criticisms on this Bill, but there are one or two points to which I would like to refer.

In my very casual examination of the Bill the other night, I find there is no reference to the blacklist. The reason I mention this is because I would like the Government to take into consideration an amendment along the lines I would suggest. Most Members know that since 1924 it has been the duty and the practice of the Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control to publish this list. Now, I have no objection to the publication of the name of a man convicted of illicitly selling liquor, I have no desire to throw any cloak over moonshiners, smugglers or keepers of blind pigs, but taking the case of a decent respectable citizen who may at some time or another overstep the mark, and as a result could find himself before the Magistrate charged with being drunk on a public street, I can see no more moral obliquity in being drunk on the street or at home. In the past nine years we have been publishing the names of perfectly respectable and innocent citizens who may have had a drink or two too many. Will this Bill repeal all preceding Acts?

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Yes.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Are there provisions for the publication of offenders' names?

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: It is being discontinued.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It has been currently rumoured the past two or three months that it is contemplated establishing beer taverns at various places. I don't know how far the idea has been

³⁵ “[The Act] also provided for the increased sale of beer and wine which could be dispersed by innkeepers and proprietors of tourist hotels and institutions [which] sought a permit from the Board, which was also granted the power to deliver c.o.d. orders for beer to residences.... Restaurants under the Act would be enabled to sell beer and wine with food between the hours of 9 a.m. and midnight.

“It also provides that any person authorized to that effect by the Board, or any constable, may, even by force, if entrance is refused him, go on board and if necessary stop for the purpose any ship, boat or vehicle, and enter any place, lot or building in which he has reason to suspect that any alcoholic liquor is kept or sold in contravention of this Act, make any search, and open, with all the necessary aid, and even by force in the case of refusal to do so, any cupboard or receptacle in which he thinks such liquor is contained; and if he discovers any alcoholic liquor, he shall, without a warrant being required, seize it, as well as every receptacle containing it.

“No specific ground of suspicion shall be necessary to warrant stopping, entry or search under this Section. The measure would give power to alter if necessary the present regulations respecting the closing of the Liquor Control stores. Several changes are made in the penalties for breaches of certain Sections of the Act. In the main, the fines for minor breaches are reduced and in some instances the penalties for serious offences are increased.” *Evening Telegram*, May 16, 1933.

considered by the Government, but I do feel that it would do no harm to considerably further loosen the restrictions on beer. I think that if it were easier to obtain beer there would be much less hard liquor drunk.

With the question of the hours of closing I agree, there is only the point I would like to make. Up to the present time it has been the practice of the Board of Liquor Control to close at 12 or 1 o'clock on Saturdays, and this sometimes makes it very awkward for many decent citizens who work in stores or offices or places not easily accessible to the liquor stores. They may not be able to go during work, and they go to work before the store opens, and when they have finished the store has closed. Many men like to get a bottle of liquor on Saturday evening to take to the country with him on a Sunday, and under existing conditions he is driven to a bootlegger, and I would suggest that in the interest of health and in the interest of the revenue that the stores be kept open on Saturdays and days previous to holidays until 6 o'clock.

On the question of search, I have the same feelings as the ordinary citizen. There is a road ... which is the best piece of road in Newfoundland, and is the natural channel for smugglers who bring their stuff over from Long Harbour to Chapel Arm, and then right through to St. John's by road in a couple of hours. I would suggest to the Government that they ought to go very carefully in this matter. A citizen has some rights, and as under the Alcoholic Liquors Act a certain percentage of the fine in these cases goes to the policeman or police agent, it is only human that when they see a chance of a little additional remuneration that they may be a little over-zealous, and interfere with the liberty of citizens who do not like being treated as common offenders. I feel that the Government should go very carefully in widening the rights of the police to hold up and search people on the roads because they think that they may have a quantity of liquor in their car. However, we will have an opportunity of discussing the matter in Committee, and as it is not a party measure, perhaps the Government may act on any constructive [suggestion] we may have to make.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, the 16th of May instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday, May 16, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Secretary of State, from New Melbourne, re road.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Trinity South, Hon. Mr. Mitchell,³⁶ I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of New Melbourne, New Chelsea and neighbouring settlements praying that a road be built around the place called the "ridge." The late Government Engineer, Mr. T. A. Hall, reported favourably on this road and the work was intended to be done a few years ago. The petitioners now ask that the work of building this contemplated road be gone on with this year. I would ask that the petition be given that consideration which it merits from the Department to which it refers.

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1930."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: When the Committee last sat, the Leader of the Opposition made some suggestions regarding the amendments which he proposed in the Bill, and which were favourable to the House. The Committee rose at that time to consider the suggestions made. The principal amendment suggested was one dealing with the possibility of bringing in legislation dealing with the holding up of large tracts of land throughout the country, which are in some cases held by absentee landlords, and the people who are desirous of obtaining land to cultivate were unable to do so. The Government took the matter in hand, and I think I can now say that in the course of a day or two there will be a special Act introduced dealing with this point. The

³⁶ "... who is absent from the country." *Evening Telegram*, May 17, 1933, p. 10.

other point had to do with the amendment of the 1930 Act. I now submit this amendment, Section 6, sub-section (1), which I think will cover that point (*reads sub-section*).³⁷

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1930" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Health and Welfare Act, 1931."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: The Act of 1931 constituted a Bureau which was comprised of every member of the Executive Council in addition to the Secretary of Public Health and the Commissioner of Public Works. Now the Minister of Justice represents the Executive Council on the Bureau. The Controller of the Treasury is added, and the Secretary of Public Health and the Commissioner of Public Works, Mr. Brown. The Bureau was unwieldy before and I don't think it held one meeting. It was thought better to correct that state of affairs if the Bureau was going to function. It is better to have a Board that can function.

Hon. Minister of Public Works: In view of the fact that the Department of the Minister of Public Works, whoever he may be at the time, is responsible for a large expenditure of money, I think he ought to be represented on the Bureau.

Hon. Secretary of State: There was an error on my part. The Minister of Public Works is included.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

³⁷ "The other suggested amendment had to do with the cutting of lines around the areas ..." *Daily News*, May 17, 1933, p. 5.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Health and Welfare Act, 1931" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

... some 40 Sections were passed, a few sub-sections being left over for re-drafting. Discussion then centred around Section 46 and its sub-sections which give officers of the law the right to search ships, boats, vehicles and buildings without specific grounds of suspicion. [*Daily News*, May 17, 1933]

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay the proceedings or to take up the time of this House, but at this juncture I must aver my most strenuous opposition to Section 46 of this Act. We are giving too much power to the gentlemen of the Constabulary, who under this Act may inflict severe embarrassment and a great deal of hardship on the people throughout this country. I submit that it is very severe to have the general public submitted to this class of legislation. I want to go on record for having very little concern personally with this section of the Act. I may say that during the years when this legislation was in operation, my name appears very little on the books of the Board. I don't think that in the past four years my name appears on the books for more than a bottle a year. But I don't [want] to inflict my temperance views on the country. But I hope the committee of the gentleman in charge of this Bill will be able to eliminate entirely from the Act the power given to the Constabulary. Under the Bill now before the Committee, a member of the police will possess the right if he wants to make himself troublesome, to go into a person's home at any time of the day or night, and turn his house out to search for liquor. It is absolutely too much power to be placed in the hands of the Constabulary. I am strictly opposed to it, and if the section is not removed from the Bill I will vote against the whole Act. I refer to sub-section (3) of Section 46.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, with this particular sub-section I want to deal this afternoon. I have to support the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines. This is an

infringement of the liberty of the private person and is altogether intolerable. I have every sympathy with the officers of the law, but they must not go so far in carrying out their duties as to become tyrants. Under this sub-section, without any reason whatsoever any police officer, just because he thinks an individual might have some liquor in his possession, he can go into his house, even into his bedroom, and under this Section he has the right to search his premises without alleging any grounds whatever to justify his act. Without grounds for suspicion, he has the right to search any person's house, or to hold up and search any car. As a matter of fact, a good deal of that has been done in the past. The officers of the law have for some years been in the habit of searching vehicles and buildings without any grounds to justify a suspicion that there was alcoholic liquor there. Their efforts in that connection were not relaxed until some time last year, when the police stopped a vehicle out on the Salmonier road and said they were going to make a search. The owner resisted, and found himself before the Magistrate's Court on a charge of assaulting a police officer and obstructing the police in the discharge of their duties. He did the only thing he could do under the circumstances to protect his property from the wrongful act of the officer of the law. It has recently come to my knowledge, in fact within the past four or five hours, that there have been stopped on the public roads of the country, as a matter of course in this country, clergymen, a Judge of Supreme Court, [and] some ladies returning from a religious function, who had no more thought of carrying liquor than I have at the present moment. This state of affairs is intolerable. For instance, if a man takes his family out into the country for a holiday, when he is returning, without any reason he [can be] held up by a young police officer who has the power to stop him, [and] make everybody in the car get out while he ascertains if there is any liquor there. This is intolerable.

Now, one may say this doesn't affect an innocent man. Well, it delays him for one thing, but there is a more serious reason than that for objecting to this section. No matter how innocent he may be, no matter whether or not the police cannot find liquor in his car, everybody who sees him being held up, or hears that he has been held up by the police, will always believe that he was engaged in the trade of bootlegging. And we know what happens in this country in a case of this kind. Start a tale of that kind going, and in twenty years time it will be held against the man who was thereby placed under suspicion. Now, I claim this is altogether too much authority to give to the ordinary constable. I agree that there are some officers in this country to whom this House would be perfectly safe in giving this power. He would not go beyond the limits of reason. But it would be of no use to a man of that type. The man with judgement is not going to utilize that Section, because he will not hold up people unless he has reasonable grounds of suspicion. But the younger officers, who want to justify themselves in the eyes of their superiors, will make it their business to have their eyes wide open and to stop as many cars as possible, to be always on the alert to see what captures they can make. It may develop into some sort of rivalry, as that which existed among the Indians in their efforts to secure scalps in years gone by. Whoever could secure the most scalps was the ablest warrior. In this case whoever will secure the most convictions will be considered the best policeman.

I don't want to delay the House, but I want to refer again to the case which arose in the Magistrate's Court some months ago. The honourable judge there held that the policeman had no right to search that man's car unless he had reasonable grounds for expecting that there was alcoholic liquor in the car. He very properly dismissed the case, and in the course of his discussion the

learned judge noted the words of a famous English judge which I propose to read for the House (*reads*). Baron Martin was the judge (*reads*).

The same is alleged here in this case here in St. John's. That is a basic right of a British citizen, and unless an officer of the law has reasonable grounds for suspecting that any particular individual is breaking the law, he has no right to interfere. I object to that Section because it is going too far; it is quite possible that a police officer may have a grudge against an individual, and may hold up [his] car and search him in a public place merely to humiliate him. I therefore move that subsection (3) be stricken from the Act.³⁸

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Before that is done, it is necessary that the Committee be aware of the reasons why this is done. It is very easy for a person to work themselves up over a Section of this kind. Every day our liberties are being reduced and restricted. Every steamer that comes into port is searched, and the luggage of every passenger is examined for possible contraband. This is done on very good grounds, because it would mean that the Customs would suffer the loss of a great deal of revenue if such were not the case. Every passenger's luggage is examined, and the Customs Officers could make themselves very annoying if they wished. Of course they realize that the majority are not engaged in smuggling, but there must be some efficient system to prevent wrongdoing, and individuals getting clear with revenue which rightfully belongs to the country. So the passengers are detained only momentarily, and any inconveniences are overborne by the benefits that the country receives. I cite that example of where the power is there, but it is not always used to the disadvantage of citizens.

Not to mince matters, it is a well known fact that there is considerable smuggling over the Whitbourne and Salmonier roads, and not only liquor but cigarettes and tobacco are being smuggled in over these roads in large quantities. Why, the quantities of cigarettes smuggled in over these roads is so great that the tobacco factory [practically] had to close down. When this system was introduced and the police were watching these roads, the sale of liquor at the Controller's visibly increased, and the quantity of cigarettes sold by the tobacco factory increased to such an extent that they increased their production 2,000 pounds per month. If smuggling is going on to such an extent, I think that it is up to this Committee to see to it that there is sufficient machinery in existence to prevent this smuggling.

The Leader of the Opposition has referred to young officers going too far, but that he would gladly give such powers to certain officers he knew. If we analyze this Section, we can see whether on certain points this power can be abused. On entry to a house, there is great objection to giving powers to enter without reasonable suspicion. If the police enter a house to search, they should have some grounds upon which to base their suspicions, and I am prepared to go to that extent. If we take the case of a ship coming in here at say 2 a.m., she should be liable to be searched. The practice was for these boats to come in here under shadow of darkness, and when the police boat came towards them to turn around and run out again. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows from his own experience as Attorney General that there is a large amount of smuggling going on and the police are

³⁸ "... he ... moved that the Section reading 'No specific ground of suspicion shall be necessary to warrant stopping, entry or search under Section 46' be deleted ..." *Evening Telegram*, May 17, 1933.

endeavouring to help out the Customs every way they can. The idea is to assist in carrying out the Customs Act. We have here a monopoly on liquor, and we should see to it that there is the proper machinery to protect it. You have the Customs Act being evaded because we haven't got sufficient men to enforce its regulations. You have the Board of Liquor Control, their business is being interfered with. Lately, during the past few years, it has been possible to get whole kegs and cases of liquor from unlawful sources. The police, however, now have their finger on this unlawful trade, and have prevented this business going on to any great extent, and it is for the purposes of prevention that these powers are now asked for.

The only question left now is whether we will give the police power to search all vehicles. I know it is a very great inconvenience. I pointed out yesterday – I wanted to be fair – the objections as well as the advantages. Unfortunately, there are people who have been found guilty of breaches of this Act, and they have not been confined to the criminal class, and some of those who should use every endeavour to assist the police in this respect were found guilty. If smuggling is going on to such an extent, it is the duty of this House to place a weapon in the hands of the Board of Liquor Control by which it may effectively be wiped out. It is easy to take the sentimental point of view, but it must be remembered that we are here as legislators, and we have a duty to perform. There are probably 2,000 motor car owners in the Peninsula of Avalon, and there are probably 280,000 people throughout the Island who benefit from the revenue the Government collects. We have a duty to these other 278,000 as well as to the 2,000 motor car owners. Are we going to say that these 2,000 must be protected and the revenue suffer? It is only fair that I should point these things out so that we can see that this Section will be benefitting the revenue to a large extent. I agree that in the case cited by my learned friend the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the magistrate was right in law in his decision, but is it not desirable that power should be given to the police, or proper authorized people, to search for smugglers along the routes used by them? Let us look at it from our own point of view. I own a car and when I am driving along the roads I come to a place where the police are watching. The policeman signals me to stop, he comes up to me and sees that I am a very respectable citizen, and I am allowed to go on. If it were a suspicious person, would he be very much wrong if he searched the car? If I have no liquor, what objection can I have to his searching? I have been on the Salmonier road very many times, and I have seen very many cars going back and forth, and I don't remember any unpleasant incidents. I don't say that they did not occur, and I do not say that there are many prominent people who would not object to being searched, feeling, like Caesar's wife, that they were above suspicion, but it must be remembered that the law is there for the protection of the majority, and there is no reason why car owners, whether they be in the civil or ecclesiastical walks of life, should object to having their cars searched. I do not think that this power would be exercised to any such extent, but I do think that before we accept the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that the House should have all the reasons which justify the police and Board of Liquor Control in asking for this power to search boats and vehicles. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in so far as it applies to houses, but I would ask that he reconsider his motion with regard to boats and vehicles.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: My motion is not [*omission*] right of police to search; that right existed under the old Act; the only contention I have to make, is that before doing so they should

have reasonable grounds.³⁹ Why should I be subjected to the indignity of being held up on the street, and my property searched by a policeman looking for liquor, unless that policeman has some grounds, some reasonable grounds for suspecting even that I may have liquor? Under this Section he can go out on the road and can hold up every motor car, every horse car, every carriage, every hen cart, every child with a wheelbarrow that passes along the road, without any reason whatever, can hold up every single vehicle of every kind or description that passes along, regardless of whether he has any idea of whether a single one has liquor or cigarettes, or anything else aboard.

My learned friend was rather unhappy in his reference to the Customs. That is an entirely different matter. We all know that when a steamer comes into a port in this country everybody brings his luggage to be inspected by the Customs authorities, not merely because he is suspected of smuggling, but because he may have some things in his grip or trunk which are dutiable articles. He does not know in all probability whether they are dutiable or not. He certainly does not know what the duty is going to be. He simply throws the whole thing open: "Here you are – what is dutiable and what have I got to pay?" That is an ordinary business transaction that is usual in every country on the face of the earth. In England itself you have to do that to-day, but the police are not allowed to hold up every motor car that comes along the road in England, looking for smuggled goods or liquor. They can't do that in England, unless they have reasonable grounds for suspecting that the particular vehicle that they are stopping contains smuggled goods.

I know what has been going on over that road [*omission*]. It happens to be [in] the District that I represented from 1928 to 1932. I happen to have built that road. I know that liquor comes across to Chapel Arm, is brought through to Whitbourne and along to St. John's. I am told that you can buy whisky, and if you wait 24 hours you could get a dozen cases of whisky. Still, we have got to remember that the citizen has some rights. I don't want to take away the right to search, but I do want that right to search to be based upon reasonable grounds, and, as I say, the Section, as it stands now, includes not only motor cars but every type of vehicle, and in addition to that, every house, every boat.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: I wonder would you let that stand over till to-morrow?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: May I suggest this to you, that you exempt the house and the vehicle, not particularly the motor car, but I am quite willing that the boat should be searched.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: We will see if the Bill can't be revised to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

³⁹ "Mr. Bradley stated his motion did not involve ships or boats, but vehicles and buildings ..." *Daily News*, May 17, 1933.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The Marine Shell and Fire Insurance Acts were deferred, as was also the Act respecting Local Government. [*Evening Telegram*, May 17, 1933, p. 10]

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 22, Geo. V., Cap. 6," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: This is an Act in connection with the petition of the Gas Light Company. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't intend to delay the House with any lengthy remarks, but on principle I oppose the Bill. This company which, by the way, I am willing to admit "put one over," in the vernacular, on the late Liberal government of which I was a member, when they made that arrangement under which they had to pay I think some – I just forget the figures now, but they beat us to the extent of some \$15,000 or \$20,000. Much against my wishes, they got concessions from us enabling them to import such as they would require for the extension of their system for two years. Now they come along and want that extended for another two years. Upon what grounds? It has been the practice of this Legislature for years past to consider most favourably the demands of any foreign corporations looking for considerations of this kind, and giving nothing in return. If these people, having received a concession from the Government such as I doubt would be accorded to them in any other country than Newfoundland, are not satisfied with what they have been given, then let them do without it.

Hon. Secretary of State: In reply to the Hon. Member who has just sat down, I say that that will be for the Select Committee to ascertain the whys and reasons. The Bill at the present time is being referred to a Select Committee of the House so that they can enquire and report as to the feasibility of granting their request.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: We adopt the principle by the second reading.

Hon. Secretary of State: When a company introduces a private bill, I think it should go to a Select Committee of the House to be enquired into, and the Select Committee can kill it if it be desirable.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I understand from that, Mr. Speaker, that you don't regard it as a party measure at all.

Hon. Secretary of State: No, I don't.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee, as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. W. J. Browne, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Halley, Mr. Byrne.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 17th instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Wednesday, May 17, 1933

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

Mr. Speaker announced that His Excellency the Governor would receive the Address in Reply at three forty-five o'clock.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Starkes from Pilley's Island, re keeping of dogs.

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:

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

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present session was opened.

*(Sgd.) D. Murray Anderson, Admiral,
Governor.*

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Fire Insurance Companies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I take this opportunity to explain my position on this Bill. I am afraid I have incurred the ire of the insurance companies by saying that they make a tremendous profit that amounts to four times the amount of the losses they pay. If that was what I was taken to have said I was wrong, and if that was the impression which my words conveyed it was wrong, because it would not be allowing for the expenses that the companies have to pay. I did not wish to convey to the Hon. Members of this House the impression that these companies were making all that profit. But all the same, it is interesting to take the figures and compare the returns of the fire insurance companies in Canada and the returns of the fire insurance companies in St. John's (*reads*).

The net premium returns for last year in Canada were \$37,316,152 and their net losses \$33,291,000. In other words, out of every \$100 they received in premiums they paid out \$91.1. So far as St. John's was concerned, the average net premiums received each year for the past nine years

was \$427,013 and their losses \$102,956; or out of every \$100 for premiums, they paid out \$23.50. [*Daily News*, May 18, 1933]

No doubt some of the profit of the fire insurance companies operating here goes in expenses, but that doesn't absorb all of it. I asked the permission of the House to go into Committee in so far as this Bill is concerned, to give me a chance to explain my position. And I do not mean to infer that for every \$400 received by the insurance companies as premiums, they receive a profit of \$300.

The companies have asked that this Bill be deferred until they have a chance to confer with their principals. They don't object to the principle of the Bill, but there are some details they would like to submit to their head offices before we go ahead with the Bill, and for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, has made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Yesterday we proceeded as far as Section 46, and we also passed over Section 16 and sub-section (5) of Section 25. I have had a new section drafted to substitute for Section 16 as it now stands in the Bill (*reads new section*). That will get over the difficulty raised by the Hon. Minister of Public Works, by which orders that come in, but not directly to the Board, but to other people, may be brought to the Board to be filled. Sub-section (5) of Section 25, with regard to that section a point was raised that in certain out-of-the-way places, it was impossible for a man under the present system adopted by the Board to get the requirement of liquor which he is entitled to under the Act. The Board would only honour one order at a time, and I think this new section will cover this point.

We now come to a more contentious section, 46. Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to test the feeling of the Committee. The new sub-section reads as follows: (*reads*).⁴⁰ The areas mentioned have a special significance, as will be seen by referring to the definitions clause. It means: (*reads*).

⁴⁰ "At places designated by the Minister of Finance and Customs it shall be lawful for any person or constable to stop, enter and search ships, boats and vehicles without specific ground of suspicion." *Daily News*, May 18, 1933.

What is intended there is that the police will not have the absolute right to hold up cars anywhere, but only on arteries along which this illegal traffic is going on. There should be some regulations to put a stop to that sort of traffic. There is no use pussyfooting about it. This is worthwhile, and this traffic should be stopped. By putting in here "at points," it will narrow it down considerably. The most objectionable feature has been removed. They cannot search a house or building without suspicion, it is now confined to points along the road which the Minister of Finance and Customs may designate. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition agreed yesterday that this law in respect to ships and boats is not so objectionable, and if he concedes that, he has come a long way to seeing the point in issue. In many parts of the country the only means of communication is by water, and there is no great difference between a boat and a car.

I pointed out that in practice this matter will be conducted so that there will be no unnecessary delay and only a small portion of the public will be affected, and as the officials in charge of this work get more accustomed to their work, they will be able to tell readily enough who are suspicious and who are not. I feel that this section as it is now framed will be acceptable, and I beg to move that it be put in place of Section 3.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: When I made my objection to this section, I did so without having any personal interest in the matter at all. I have no desire to hamper the police in the discharge of their duty, and I have no desire to make it easy for those who wish to buy smuggled liquor, but I must disagree with the Minister of Justice when he makes some little allowance for placing the onus on the Minister of Customs. The objectionable clause still remains. Section 46 [with sub-sections (1) and (2)] reads: (*reads*). Now that, in my opinion, should give ample authority for them to carry out the law. [Sub-section (3)] gives them power [if refused admittance] to enter churches and clubs. They can break down the door at any time they like. They can go down to the Knights of Columbus or the Masonic or the B.I.S.⁴¹ or any other club around town, and break down the door whenever they feel like it. The Acting Attorney General has pointed out that we are only dealing with 2,000 cars. We are doing more than that, we are dealing with every house in the country. Under this section they can go in without having the least suspicion, or the least grounds for suspicion. I must adhere to my decision not to support Section 3 [but would support the amendment made by Mr. Bradley the previous day].⁴²

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: I am afraid that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines is not following my argument. The section whereby houses are included is now deleted, and they cannot enter without reasonable grounds for suspicion. It must be obvious that it is no good trying to stop this sort of thing without giving the police power to search. I have already pointed out that all this smuggling is going on over certain roads, and at night it is impossible to tell one car from another, you can't tell by the glare of the headlights, and it seems to me that something should be done. If we don't pass this section, we offer this to those engaged in that traffic, that there is a loophole in the

⁴¹ Benevolent Irish Society.

⁴² Interpolations from the report in *The Daily News*, May 18, 1933.

law by which they may escape. They may ride scot free over the roads and transport their liquor, and the police or authorities can't touch them.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have no doubt of the bona fides of the Hon. Acting Minister in this connection, but I can't agree with his logic. He says that there is a loophole in the Act through which any malefactor can escape. That is not the position. Even this power to search is purely statutory, it is an infringement of the citizen's original right, original right, proprietary right. You have all heard the old phrase that an Englishman's house is his castle, but the Customs Act and this Section 46, sub-section (1), clearly infringe that right. That was the first infringement on a man's privacy, for formerly they could not go into a man's house to make a search, they could not go there at all unless they had a warrant, and that has to be based upon substantial grounds. Under that Act a police constable is given power to go in there without any warrant, which is something new, provided he has reasonable grounds for suspecting the owner of that house is conducting himself improperly, or is carrying something improper in his car. If there [are] reasonable grounds, the law says he can go further. This section gives him authority to go in there if he does not like the colour of the necktie of the man who owns the house.

I have no interest in this section. No constable is ever going to catch me with any contraband liquor in my car. I don't drink contraband liquor for the simple reason that I am afraid of it. There is no reason why we should not be stopped. Any police constable has the right to stop any vehicle at any place, and at night time, on any road. A police constable can stop a vehicle, can see whose vehicle that is, can see if the driver or owner of that particular vehicle is a man who he has reasonable ground to suppose has contraband liquor on board, then he has the right to search. But if it happens to be a man that he can have no suspicion of, or that ordinarily he would not be justified in having suspicion of, a clergyman or a Judge of the Supreme Court, why should he have the right to turn that man out of his car, turn everybody out of the car, pull up the seats and the floor in order that he may find out whether there is, by some strange chance, contraband liquor in that car? It is not fair; it is not just; it is an infraction of the ordinary liberties of the citizen. You might just as well give him the right to hold me up on the street when I leave the House and say, "Here, I am going to search you. Have you got any cigarettes?"

There are some men in the police force to whom I would not object to giving this power, because I know they would not use it. Take Constable O'Keefe, for instance. He is not a man who will search a man's property unless he has some reasonable grounds, some reason for believing wrongdoing. But we have an increased number of constables to-day, many of them inexperienced. What they would do, I don't know. The other day I heard of a citizen being stopped, a respectable citizen who does not handle smuggled liquor. He was stopped on the road, ordered out of his car; the car was searched and the constable found a part bottle of Controller's rum. The constable demanded that man's permit in order that he might compare the number of the permit with the serial number on the bottle, which could not be, because the permit has a specific number, and every time a man gets a bottle of liquor the number is changed. There is an example of what has been done by inexperienced constables.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Does the honourable gentleman know what would happen in Nova Scotia if that same thing happened? What would happen there if a man had a partly consumed bottle of

liquor in his car? It would be taken from him and he would be fined \$200.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That is because it is illegal to carry liquor in a motor car. That man was committing a breach of the law by having that partly consumed bottle of liquor in his car. I am speaking of the man who has a part bottle of liquor lawfully and properly in his car. That man is held up. A police constable thinks that there may be a chance of a man having a bottle of liquor in his car, there may be a chance of a fine, and part of that comes to him. It is a regular trouting expedition. They go out and set their nets. All they can catch in their nets is fish to them.

There is a wide difference between searching a vessel and searching a motor car. The searching of vessels is something that is done in all civilized countries in the world. It is the ordinary duty of Customs officers in every country to search luggage, and the whole cargo of a vessel when it comes into port from a foreign country, and that, of course, is the ordinary course. That is not the case of holding a man up on his way; that is done in a special place provided for the purpose. When a man has had his luggage examined down at the wharf and he walks up Water Street, he is not likely to be hung up by every police constable on Water Street in order that he might be searched again, but that can be done in a hundred cases to a vehicle coming from Chapel Arm to St. John's. There may be a hundred police constables hold him up, and it is perfectly within the law.

I submit that is not proper. The search that is made down at the wharf is a search that everybody expects to be made. To my knowledge people come in with dutiable articles in their grip. They don't know what the duty is, they want to pay the duty and they are only too glad to hand their suitcase over to the Customs officers to have the articles valued and the duty charged up on them and paid. That is an ordinary occurrence.

Now, come down to the amendment which the Hon. Acting Minister has suggested, he says, "At a point designated by the Minister." I want to know what that point is. Frankly, I don't know. It must be something more than an infinitesimal point, it must be a place of some dimensions. That could be interpreted to include a house.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: You know the definition of a point.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have forgotten it. It has position but no magnitude. Clearly that is not intended. It must be a place with some superficial area, [and] that would include a house. And, of course, as to the rest of the section, it is exactly the same. You have still got the searching of ships, boats and vehicles.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: The house is left out.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: House is left out. If the house is on an area, they can search the house. My objection to the Section is if the officer has any reasonable grounds for suspecting; that does not mean sufficient grounds to convict by any means. If he has any reasonable information which is a sufficient ground for suspecting, not for convicting, suspecting that a man has liquor in his car, then he can search, that is sufficient. He has this wide authority to go out at will, when and where he will at all times, provided this specific area has been designated by the Minister of Finance

and Customs, who, by the way, ought to vote against this Section in order to escape the responsibility, because it is not fair to thrust the responsibility on him. If he has authority to go without a warrant and search the premises or car or boat of a man who, he reasonable suspects, may have liquor illicitly, that is enough, but I do most strenuously object to this infraction of the ordinary citizen's right, that he should be subject to search at the whim of every police constable. I think it is entirely unfair. It has caused situations that, in my opinion, are nothing short of a disgrace to this country. I stated one yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Gray: I don't think that this Act really covers altogether alcoholic liquors. There is quite a lot of smuggling going on. I think it is really a Customs Act, the prevention of smuggling liquor, I don't think, comes into it at all, except as part of the goods smuggled.⁴³ I think the citizen should do everything he possibly can to help putting down smuggling.

A "point" has been mentioned by Mr. Browne. I think that on the roads leading in to the city there may be special places designated where a car would stop automatically, and at that point, wherever the place is you decide to, say along the Peninsula of Avalon. Owing to the geographical position of Newfoundland we have many points and many ways of getting in, at which there are no Customs officers located. Those who wish to bring in goods without paying duty, such as spirits, cigarettes, tobacco, any article that they wish to bring in, they can probably get in if there is no search made, or if there is no point where they can be stopped and examined. I think it proper to establish certain points where they could [come] to a stop. The officer in charge there would simply say "Pass on," or "I would like to examine you." As to cases regarding buildings and houses, those should be examined under warrant in the usual way. But moving vehicles such as motor boats, ships, aeroplanes, horses, and carts, and anything that may convey goods, all such, I think there should be some reasonable way to examine those. Of course, every public-minded man would be agreeable to stopping at a point where he could pass on [if] everything is alright. The same thing applies to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his own District. People may land goods at Curling and bring them up by motor car to Corner Brook. What is going to prevent it? It is owing to our extensive coastline that we have so many ways of getting in, and the authorities have only one chance in 99; the smuggler has 99 chances to one of the Collector. I think it is quite easy to agree on something that would stop the smuggling that is going on all over the country. I have heard of its being in the north, as well as the Peninsula of Avalon. I think there should be some agreement made to prevent that thing. Why should a certain class of people in the country be allowed to get liquor without paying duty, and others have to pay duty?

Mr. Gear: I support the Bill and the amendment. Now, I don't suppose anyone has gone over the Salmonier Line the past years more than I have. I have just heard comments on the police constables. What I have seen, and the treatment accorded me by the police has been most courteous, and if you are going to take away their power, where is it going to end? This country has got to support the powers of the police, and therefore I support the Bill wholeheartedly, that the areas that

⁴³ "... smuggling should be the concern of the Customs Act to deal with more than the Alcoholic Liquors Act." *Daily News*, May 18, 1933.

are specified, or points, that they be guarded by the police as they have been last year in every way possible to stop this traffic of liquor.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I have heard more talk on liquor bills since 1904 than any one man in this House, and I have listened with interest to the discussion with reference to the amendment in this Bill. Personally, I think it is the duty of every Member of this House to see that all revenue possible belonging to the Government is secured, because God knows it is needed badly enough. We have thousands of people in this country who have been practically starving during the past two years, and the Government has been at it wits end to know where to get the money to procure the food to keep these people alive. Yet through channels from Placentia Bay and from Pouch Cove to different settlements on the Northeast coast, illicit trafficking in liquor has been going on with a consequent loss of thousands of dollars to the revenue of the Colony. My opinion is that when I was elected to come here and help to put Bills through this House, that it was my duty to try and protect the revenue. Therefore, this amendment to stop all motor cars and have them searched for contraband goods has my fullest support. I do not say that any particular cars should be stopped, because that would be class legislation and I could not and never will support class legislation. Some Member this afternoon objected to a car in which was a clergyman and a judge being stopped. Now I exonerate nobody in this country in regard to the smuggling of liquor. We have known people within the past year or so who have smuggled liquor under the cloak of clergymen, the clergymen not knowing there was liquor in the car they were in. When it is generally known that hundreds of gallons of liquor is being smuggled over a certain road, I fail to see what objection can be had to having all cars searched in the interest of revenue. If a man is innocent, he can pass on; but if he is caught with the goods, it is only right he should have to pay for it. And it is not only liquor that is smuggled. Hundreds of thousands of cigarettes find their way into the city, and not through the poor man either, but through what is known as the aristocracy of this country.

Now if we are sincere, and want to try and protect the revenue, let us vest the power in the police and Customs officers to carry out the law to the utmost extent. If some policemen will not hold up all cars, then you are opening up a wide door for smuggling. The Leader of the Opposition said he could pick out certain police officers in this country who could do their duty without offending anybody, but you cannot get among any crowd of people in this country where everyone can do their duty alike. I think the policemen of this country are doing very well, considering the amount of training they got. Take any business in the country where you have 200 men employed. They are not all equally as good as those trained in it for a number of years. Now, Sir, it is an undeniable fact that smuggling to-day in this country is worse than it ever was. I have cruised over the Northeast coast of this country for the past 40 years, and I will say that the northern people did not engage in smuggling up to a half dozen years ago, and I am sorry to say that it is nearly as bad there now as it is among the west coast people. So far as the District of Bonavista North is concerned, I move that every vessel that comes in there from foreign countries or any other place be held up and searched, and if I have not got enough of men in that District to uphold the law then I am prepared to go down to defeat the next election. Some of my friends have asked me to protest against this sub-section (3) going through, because they do not like to have their cars held up. All I

can say to them is that if they do not like it, let them stay at home.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Chairman, I am getting tired listening to accusations in this House hurled against the people in Placentia Bay, and I seriously resent them. I want to say right here and now – not for political purposes, because unless I change my mind I will never go look for a vote again – in defence of those people, that I do not know of any big land-grabbing syndicates in Placentia Bay. At the present time the people there are looking for solid food, not liquid food, and if any of them have occasion to go to St. Pierre, it is to get a sack of flour or some such necessary article of food for their families.

If you want to find the real smugglers of the country, you don't have to go north or west to look for them, as they are to be found right here in St. John's, and they are not the poorer classes either. Seventy-five per cent of the Members of this House, as at present constituted, and 90 per cent of the Legislative Council, as now constituted, pay very little to the revenue of the Colony for the wearing apparel they bring in on their backs and in trunks after returning from trips to England and the United States.

I am not trying to place any barrier in the path of the Finance Minister or the Inspector General of Police, or to interfere with their lawful work or protecting the revenue, but I cannot see how any Member of this Assembly can give any officer of the law the power to break into a man's home or his motor car, and search without any ground of suspicion. I have no personal interest in the Liquor Bill, and, consequently, I am not pleading on my own behalf. I am pleading for what I consider to be British justice and British fair play. I disagree also with the Member for Bonavista North, when he said there was no difference between the ordinary individual being held up in his car, and people who hold high places in the ecclesiastical life of the community. I believe that no clergyman would attempt to be a party to smuggling goods, and I would most strenuously object to any police or Customs officer holding up their cars to be searched. I do not think that the Hon. Member meant that they would, and yet this Section gives the police power to hold up anybody's car. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out that a clergyman, a Judge of the Supreme Court, a music professor and several ladies were stopped on one of the highroads very recently, while returning from a religious function. I am not going to be a party to any such transaction. I am in sympathy with other parts of the Bill. We need every dollar we can get by way of revenue, but we are not going to get any dollars via the way under discussion; rather will we lose dollars. I oppose the amendment.

Hon. Secretary of State: As far as the question of searching these cars is concerned, I question whether, when the members of the police force held up these cars and found they contained a Judge of the Supreme Court or clergymen, or religious, I say I question whether they went so far as to search these cars. I think it will be found that they did not search these cars when they found they were occupied by decent responsible people. I believe in giving the police the right to stop all cars, but I don't believe in giving them the right to search all cars.

Hon. Minister of Public Works: I personally feel that under Section 46 all the power the police require to apprehend smugglers is given them. Therefore [sub-]section (3) doesn't appear to be

necessary.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: In answer to the statement of the Minister of Public Works, I would like to explain the position as it stands to-day. The point arose out of a case tried in the Magistrates' Court. A motor driver coming in over the Salmonier road was held up at night by the police, and when they attempted to search his car he assaulted the police who attempted the search. He was tried for assault on the police, and with obstructing them in the course of the discharge of their duties. The defence asserted that the police had no reasonable grounds for suspecting that the car contained alcoholic liquor, and therefore they had no right to search the car. Section 46 is as follows (*reads*). Under this Section the burden is on the prosecution to prove that they had a reason to suspect that any car which they search contains alcoholic liquor, and there was no particular reason to suspect there was alcoholic liquor in the car in this case. Therefore the case was dismissed. Arising out of that therefore, it was necessary to insert some provision to help the policemen to carry out the idea behind the Act. Section 42 in the Act of 1929 is much more alarming in my opinion, and if a man made a mistake as to a bottle of liquor not only would it be confiscated, but it would be *prima facie* evidence against him. My learned friend the Leader of the Opposition did not strenuously object to that when it was going through. Then why should he take the stand he now takes?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The police acted illegally last Fall, and now we are going to give them the power of going far beyond that.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: How often has it happened that a flaw has been discovered in the law?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: This is not a case of discovering a flaw in the law.

Mr. Lewis: I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Minister of Public Works. In this country the question of liquor is something like dynamite. Even a mention of the question brings an explosion whether great or small. I did not intend to be drawn into the discussion at all this afternoon, but a point raised by the Hon. Member for Placentia West encouraged me to say a word or two. I too happen to represent a certain section of that territory described popularly as "smugglers' paradise." I resent that insinuation, and in justice to the District I represent I consider there is an obligation on my part to register my resentment here to-day. I would like to see proof that the people in the territory of Placentia East or any part of it, have done any more smuggling than the people of any other section in this country. And I would like to endorse what the Hon. Member for Placentia West has said regarding the traffic with St. Pierre. I know something of the conditions that prevail in my District, and if any of the people of that District go to St. Pierre, they do not bring back liquor, but if they smuggle in anything it is the necessities of life that they bring back; and I would say further that the majority of them have very little money with which to buy even these things. I want to register my strongest protest against such insinuations as have been made in the House this afternoon. It has been insinuated that if this Act is passed, the people of certain sections in the

country are going to be proscribed, and that one of those proscribed sections is going to be in the very District which I have the honour to represent. That suggestion has been thrown out, and I am certainly not going to stand for my District or any part of it to be put on the map as a nest of smugglers.

Neither am I going to stand for the police to be given plenipotentiary powers to search every house and vehicle that is in or comes from that section. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he calls this an infringement of the property rights of the citizen. I also agree with the Acting Minister of Justice as to the introduction of the section four years ago. I was a member of that Government and the Leader of the Opposition, who was Solicitor General at the time, can bear me out when I say that I was opposed to the introduction of that section. The very fact that this new legislation is introduced proves that a wrong step was taken, so we are going to take a further one now to make a bad situation worse. The more we endeavour to legislate against a man's exercise of his free will or to govern his moral conduct by legislation, whether it deals with the drinking of liquor or the smoking of cigarettes, the greater trouble we get into. I want to go on record as being wholeheartedly opposed to an extension of any such powers as have been given in this Act and proposed to be given to-day.

That a man's house is his castle is a fundamental principle of British justice and underlies all systems of justice. We were born and bred to British justice and our fathers died and bled to obtain it, and now we come in here and by a stroke of the pen we propose to wipe out our liberties that it took centuries to obtain. Under Section 46 of the Act as it stands to-day there is ample power given to a member of the police force or to a police agent to make a search in a house, place or vehicle, provided that individual has reasonable and probable cause to suspect that there is liquor contained there. He has the means provided there if he has reasonable common sense, and if he doesn't abuse the powers vested in him. Now, instead of being reasonable or having common sense or exercising reasonable judgement, a policeman will go out and hold up everybody indiscriminately, if we give the power proposed under this Bill. A fellow who has no respect for any class or creed in this country, an ignorant policeman, will hold up your or my car because he thinks that by this means he might make a \$5 bill out of it. If you will read through [*omission*] you will find that a part of the penalties in the shape of fines is collected by the policeman who secures the conviction. By this means rewards are held out to policemen to secure convictions, and in these times of stress both in public matters and in private life, there is far more useful employment for money. In this Bill I submit we are merely holding out an inducement to encourage that sort of thing. I submit further that we should not be wasting our time or the time of the House talking about the rights of the policeman in this connection, when there are more important matters to be discussed concerning the country, matters far more important than the question of whether or not the police have the right to search a house or a car for alcoholic liquor.

I know of one example which came to my attention in my profession as a solicitor, where a man of the highest prominence in this city was stopped in his car by the police on several occasions. The first time he was stopped he said nothing. The third time he resisted and said he was not going to allow the search of his car. The policeman said, "Come with me." He was taken to the police station. The superintendent told him to go, of course. He came to consult us. We advised him to take an action for false imprisonment. But of course he did not feel like doing it. Now it is highly

improper to encourage that sort of thing. I am going to vote against it if I am the only Member in this House who does so. I object to it on principle. I think it is an infringement of the private rights of the citizen. I think that under Section 44 there is ample power given to the police to carry out a search in a reasonable manner and stamp out bootlegging. The policeman has a right to search a car under the Act as at present constituted, but only where there is a reasonable suspicion and probable cause to lead him to think that there is liquor in that particular car.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I would like to know what is considered a reasonable cause of suspicion. If a policeman sees a motor car coming from Holyrood when there are twenty Lunenburg bankers there, is that a reasonable cause to suspect that that car is carrying liquor?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would submit that it is a question for the judge to decide in each particular case what is a reasonable cause for suspicion. I suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister that if a policeman sees a car driving over a suspected road in the ordinary way at night, he can have no reasonable cause to suspect that that car is carrying liquor. But if the car is coming without any lights, then it is a different question. There is no motive on my part to prevent a policeman from stopping a car. There is no suggestion that the car should not be stopped. There is no objection to that. The objection is that when in the case of the person in the car there are no grounds to suspect that he has alcoholic liquor, we have no right to turn him out of his car [and turn it] inside out to search for contraband. Once that man's car is searched and the story goes around, it is pretty hard to clear him afterwards from the suspicion that he was peddling in liquor. It will be raked up against him twenty years hence.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I know something of these roads. I happen to live on Topsail Road during the summer months. I see these trucks and cars going past, and I think that seven out of ten carry liquor. We need all the money we can collect in the shape of revenue and we should assist the police in every possible way to put down smuggling.

Mr. Whiteley: Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. Member for Placentia East, Mr. Lewis, was carried away by his rhetoric. After all, we must consider the fact that the police force is not composed of Russians. They are all Newfoundlanders. We know them all. Are we [to] pass an Act in this House and then draw all the teeth from that law? If we do, it won't have much value. We are not here to make laws for the motor car owners. We are here to make laws for the country, for the 40,000 fishermen of this country. We are not here to make laws for the privileged few.

If a man has a quantity of liquor in his car, what objection can he have to being searched? If he is going to run the risk of smuggling, let him take his medicine and put up with it like a man. The main question as I see it here to-day is that we are up to our necks in debt – our fishermen are taxed to the teeth. Every day we are asking for relief and looking for supplies, and we are told we have no money to give you. Here we are endeavouring to collect revenue in a legitimate manner, and the House is objecting to the manner in which we are trying to do it. You make a law and then you immediately make it ineffective by inserting clauses which nullify it. I am not interested in the liquor traffic – I have no use for it – but I am interested in seeing that the revenue of the country is

collected, and I certainly will not vote for the amendment.

Capt. Byrne: As I see it, this matter of Section 26 in which we give power to policemen to stop and search cars has given rise to considerable discussion, and I feel that the fact has been overlooked that the police are capable of doing a little detective work. Take, for instance, the case of a string of cars coming along the road. The police stop the first and then he must stop and examine all the rest. I think that a citizen's rights are to be protected, and this amendment is not needed. I agree with several of the previous speakers who maintain that Section 46 is sufficient for the authorities, and that beyond that they should not interfere with us as a people and as Britishers. In my opinion, as it stands now, or in the recent amendment that the police have the right to stop and search, it is an infringement on our rights as citizens and it should not stand.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: In order to clear up a somewhat tangled situation with regard to my amendment, your amendment and the proposed new section, I now make the amendment, if I am allowed to withdraw informally my amendment, that the words "entry or search" in Section 46, subsection (3), be deleted. That leaves the right to stop, and if there are any grounds for suspicion they can go ahead and search. I have no objection to the police stopping a car. I therefore move that amendment – it merely deletes three words in the section.

Hon. Mr. Winter: That is what I had in mind myself as a sort of compromise. I would suggest that you put in there "ships, boats, or vehicles."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, the 18th day of May instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Thursday, May 18, 1933

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

Hon. the Prime Minister presented a petition from the North West Products Company praying for certain concessions in connection with the establishment of the business of canning of fish and fishery products in the District of St. George's, and moved for the appointment of a Select Committee to enquire and report to the House as to whether the Rules of the House have been observed respecting such petitions.⁴⁴

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Mr. Winter, Hon. Mr. Foote, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Starkes.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited, of a Licence to Cut Timber."

Hon. the Secretary of State gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an Amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922.

Hon. the Secretary of State gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Bonus Additions to Pensions under the War Pensions Act 1922.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Tables answer to Question 166.⁴⁵

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might amplify the reply. The trade, that is, the trade in connection

⁴⁴ "The petitioners ask for the exclusive right to catch shell fish within a 25 mile radius from the company's factory. It is also proposed to extend cold storage facilities and request the right to import machinery and other equipment which cannot be supplied locally at a reduced daily rate. The petition also asked permission to introduce a Bill relative to the matter." *Evening Telegram*, May 19, 1933, p. 12.

⁴⁵ "In submitting the answer, he asked the privilege to make an explanation regarding this matter. "1,010 second-hand oil barrels were imported into the port of St. John's, since November 1932. 1,000 of these being imported after March 21st, paid duty at 10 cents per barrel net in accordance with Minute in Council of March 21st, 1933. Ten paid regular duty as they were imported on January 17th, 1933. There was no rebate of duty but, as there existed a shortage of wooden packages for the holding of cod and other fish oils for export, the following Order in Council was issued March 21st, 1933, viz:

"As there exists a shortage of wooden packages for the holding of cod and other fish oils for export, and as the merchants will need to import second-hand oak or hardwood oil packages for the requirements of the trade, on recommendation of the Deputy Minister of Customs, it was ordered that permission be given for the importation of 25,000 second-hand oak or hardwood oil packages, at a nominal rate of duty of 10 cents net." *Evening Telegram*, May 19, 1933, p. 12.

with the export of seal oil and whale oil, has been very much embarrassed by the fact that there are no secondhand barrels. Since the Imperial Oil established themselves here in a large way, they have been delivering kerosene and gasoline in metal containers, and the consequence is that there has been a great shortage of wooden packages, and we require on the average for the export of cod oil, seal oil, and whale oil, in the vicinity of 30,000 barrels a year. The average importation of wooden packages, mostly for the butterine factories, amounts to not more than 10,000; consequently there is a standing shortage of 20,000. This year we expect it to be rather more, because [one of] the whale companies, the one at Hawke's Bay, is going to operate, consequently the trade is in a dilemma as to what to do. They could not afford to pay full price for these barrels. The full amount would be well over \$3, and they approached the Department of Customs, and we decided that for this year they might be permitted, that is, the trade, to import I think it is 25,000 barrels – yes, 25,000 – secondhand hardwood oil packages. They are going to cost in the vicinity of \$2 each. The re-conditioning of them will come to about \$2.20 each. I am informed that is the average cost, being a nominal rate of duty of 10 cents. I may say we could not promise to do it again for another year. I sent for the Executive Committee of the Coopers' Union and told them the situation. I said, "Now if you can think out some plan by means of which you can keep this business in the country, so far as we are concerned, the Government will be only too glad to help you." Unfortunately, I have not seen any of these gentlemen since. Perhaps they are still considering it. That is how the matter stands. It was a question of whether we would allow these secondhand barrels to come in, or whether we were going to embarrass the trade by forcing them to pay a price they could not afford, or their failing to export their product. I can well understand the reason which prompted the honourable gentleman. If later he would like to go into the matter, I will be glad to give him any further information that lies in my power.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Yesterday we almost completed this Bill with the exception of the two last sections, and the amendment to Section 25, sub-section (5) which was left over for further consideration. Now, I beg to move that there be added to sub-section (5) the following: "Provided that in cases of orders from districts where no branch exists, the Board may ... not exceed."⁴⁶

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

⁴⁶ "The Alcoholic Liquor Act containing the amendments which give the right to stop vehicles and deleting the power to search without grounds for suspicion, was read in Committee. The right to enter or search houses without specific suspicion was ... deleted from the Act." *Evening Telegram*, May 19, 1933, p. 12.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

Hon. Acting Attorney General: If my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition will consent, we will have that Bill read a third time.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Certainly.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 22 George V., Chapter 25, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 22 George V., Chapter 25, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill, this Act rather, has the purpose of extending the time of the Marine Shell Labrador Export Company, to give them a year's grace. The Section 2 referred to in the amended Bill reads as follows: (*reads*). The motion will affect every one of us so far as the trade is concerned. Because of the depression there was very little chance to interest capital; consequently, the Company was not able to carry on operations as they had hoped for that year. They are now asking that they should be granted a year's grace. Section 4 of the original Act, of the old Act, the old Amendment Act of 1931, reads: (*reads*). The purport of the Bill is set forth in Section 2, which reads as follows:

"The Company shall between the date of the passing of this Act and the close of the shipping season of 1933 export not less than 25,000 tons of marine shells and thereafter each year a like quantity. All rights acquired under this Act shall cease and determine if the said quantity shall not be exported in any such shipping season or in the initial period ending 1933, provided by this section."

The Company have gone through many vicissitudes and troubles within the past year, and they now ask for an extension of time to enable them to load this shell in vessels. The loading of 25,000 tons gives employment to 200-300 men every season on the Labrador coast between the middle of June and the end of November, depending of course on weather conditions as to operations in the late Fall. Later, when operations get up to 200,000 tons, it will mean employment for at least 500 men. Therefore, I recommend this amendment to the favourable consideration of the House, and move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have no objection to giving one year's grace to this Company to carry on their operations, because I realize the difficulties they have had to contend with to do any business within the past twelve months, and I can imagine that they did not make any great inroads in the United States market where their products go within the past year. For that reason I have no objection to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 22 George V., Chapter 25, entitled 'An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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. Mr. Winter, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Government" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Hon. Mr. Winter: Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to say a few words by way of introduction to this Bill. The importance of this measure is apparent on the face of it, and I do not think it is necessary for me to delay the time of the House at any length. As members will see in an explanatory note in the prefix draft of the Bill,⁴⁷ what I have to say will be a brief supplement to that note. The note

⁴⁷ The note reads as follows: "This Act is an enabling Act giving the Governor-in-Council power to establish a municipal corporation in any place desiring the same or considered fitted for the same. It thus enables local self-government to be introduced by gradual steps as may seem expedient, beginning with the largest communities, or those which desire it.

The Act may appear lengthy; but it is submitted that as it is for the use of persons unaccustomed for the most part to deal with legal matters, it is better to have all possible matters clearly stated in the Act than to leave much to be

explains the various provisions of the Act itself, and gives us authority of general tenor.

In a general comprehensive way, I know I could expatiate eloquently at great length on the obvious importance and manifest advantages of this measure, but I do not think that is necessary, because I feel that I am speaking to a sympathetic audience who will fully appreciate the various points. I know I can speak for the Government in that respect, and I know that the Leader of the Opposition will not fall short in this respect either, because I think the District he represents is an – if any district or community is to benefit by the introduction of this measure – outstanding instance of the necessity of it. I think the measure is long overdue. It has been promised on several occasions in past sessions, and I think it went so far as to appear on the Order Paper, but there it seemed to have been brought to a conclusion. I presume the reason was that it was felt that the temper of the people of the country was not sufficiently disciplined. But I think a considerable change has come over the people in this respect as in many other respects, perhaps, during the past few years, and I think that

understood or implied merely for the sake of brevity.

The Act enables three classes of corporations to be established, viz: a town (of not less than 1,000 people), a village, (of not less than 500 people), or a division (consisting of several adjacent communities and having possibly a larger population than a town). Thus, for example, five adjacent villages, each of 500 people, could be incorporated either separately as five villages or together as a division having five wards.

A town is to have not more than six councillors, a village not more than four and a division any convenient number, probably one for each village included.

The first councillors and the mayors and chairman are to be selected and appointed by the Governor-in-Council. After two years' experience the people may by petition change over to an electoral system, if they so desire.

The whole system is to be under a Board of Control consisting of several Ministers, with power to supervise and, if necessary, over-rule the proceedings of any council, thus providing against any serious error until operating experience has been gained. The organization and executive work is to be done by a superintendent of local affairs, who will be a Civil Servant.

Elections will be held at meetings called for the purpose. The Governor-in-Council is to make regulations for the holding of these. Persons having interests, etc., in contracts with the council, or the like, are disqualified from being elected.

Councils are to hold meetings monthly or oftener. Each council will appoint a clerk to keep its books and accounts; and also auditors.

Revenue. Councils must be paid the whole or any part of the legislative provision for local roads and marine works within their jurisdiction. They may also be required to undertake poor relief, and allocations made to them for that purpose. They may also be given an allocation out of monies for highroads or main roads, and the whole or any part of locally collected motor vehicle license fees. If this money is not sufficient for them, they have powers (subject to the Board of Control) to impose local taxation of the following kinds: poll tax, amusement tax, tax on foreign builders and contractors, real property tax (subject to approval of the Governor-in-Council) and business tax. Provision is made for appraisements.

A council is permitted to obtain temporary accommodation from banks up to a limit fixed by the Board of Control. There is no other borrowing power.

A council is given power to carry on all the ordinary public works of a small municipality: to control sanitary matters, etc., and to take lands subject to payment for the same by arbitration. It may also appoint fire wardens and fire constables.

The Bill in the main extends to the people in the various districts the power to regulate their local affairs and should result in dispersing with a great deal of what was known as political patronage, and consequently do away with many of the evils existing at the present time." *Evening Telegram*, May 19, 1933.

the rigours of the times have emphasized the responsibilities and other advantages of citizenship more than ever before, and if this Bill becomes law and [is] put into operation, and if it does nothing more, it will bring home to the people of the country how interdependent, how interlocked and how closely, are the advantages of citizenship.

By way of general remark, might I say that we are prone [to be] critics of ourselves. We do not hesitate to find out our own shortcomings and for many years, particularly during the last few months, criticism has been heard on all sides as to whether or not we are really fit to govern ourselves in this country. We have heard talk of commissions and so on, and without going into the merits or demerits of the question, to consider [whether] such statements are justified or not. That seems to me to be very unfair. Before you can judge the capabilities of any person to perform any duty of office, that person is at least entitled to the right to be given an opportunity of exercising the duties involved. And, after all, what practical lesson in self-government [do] the masses in this country ever have, excepting the selecting of a candidate, the marking of ballot papers every four years, and then leaving to him and his centralized government the real burden of what we call self-government. Civil government or municipal government is very largely national government, though in a miniature way. Any community, given an opportunity of handling its own affairs, will I think retain a truer conception of what self-government really means, than the present over-centralized system we have had in the past.

One of the points which seems to follow that, is that finance is the most important aspect of all our affairs, and in no other respect will the influence of this measure be shown more beneficially than through finance. When the people of this country realize, as they will be forced to realize, that when they enjoy the benefits of, and take up the responsibilities of this Act, that they are using their own money for their own benefit, they will be the first to appreciate what has been done in the past and, if no other result follows, they will spend public moneys more economically and for better purposes. They will learn that a great deal of waste and extravagance went on in the past, and they will realize that a government, or what is called the public chest, has not an inexhaustible supply of money to squander. When they are taxed to provide the money to be expended for their own benefit they will realize, as perhaps they have failed to realize in the past, that the money is to be used to the best advantage, rather than through the wasteful medium of the government chest.

There is no need to deal any more in a general way with this measure, and I merely fill in the very explanatory note appended to the draft of the Bill. First of all, the communities who apply for self-government are divided in the Bill in three parts, called towns, villages or divisions. A town is not less than 1,000 people; a village is not less than 500; [and] a division consisting of several adjacent communities, and having possibly a larger population than a town. Thus five adjacent villages, each of 500 people, could be incorporated either separately as five villages, or together [as] a division [having] five wards. The Act can always be applied immediately to the need of communities.

This Act will immediately apply to some sixteen or seventeen, or perhaps a score of communities, to which it will apply almost automatically, such as Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Bell Island, and to such large fishing communities as Grand Bank, Carbonear, Harbour Grace, and Greenspond. Some of these places have already expressed a desire for something of this sort, and it is, to say the least, the height of absurdity that a place like Corner Brook should not be allowed some

measure of government over local affairs, just the same as St. John's. They are desirous of exercising control. They have asked for the power and they should have it, together with the responsibilities that accrue to the exercise of such control. The case of villages presents a little more difficulty, and in this connection the Act is largely in the nature of an experiment. Provision is made for trying out the experiment, and if it does not suit some particular place or places, or if any community does not show itself sufficiently zealous and does not show a desire to fall in with the Act, it can be left under the present system of control from St. John's and the central government. But the majority will probably show a desire to come within the provisions of the Act. It is more difficult to apply this Act to what is left of the country, but if I know the temper of the people aright, they will be most anxious, if they see the system working well in the neighbouring towns and villages, they will be very anxious to avail of the opportunities to enable the Governor-in-Council to proclaim them as divisions and to incorporate them.

As to the size and form of this new local government, this Act provides in the case of a town for not more than six councillors, and in the case of a village not more than four; and with respect to a division, any convenient number, probably one for each village. In the beginning these bodies corporate will be proclaimed by the Governor-in-Council. This raises the important question as to whether it should be left to the special desire of each separate community to be incorporated, or whether the Governor-in-Council should impose it upon all of them. I believe from former experience, for instance in the case of the Prohibition Act, that if we waited for the different communities to get together their efforts would be spasmodic, and it is better to let the move come from the government; to let the government create these councils and see afterwards how they will work, and how they are accepted by the different communities. That can be done by proclamation in the first place, and these corporations shall have all the attributes of corporations sole. The councils will be appointed by the Governor-in-Council for two years, which time is considered sufficient time to give the experiment a chance to work, and thereafter each town or village can take full control through election of a council, but failing its express desire to do so, the Governor-in-Council can do as before.

Here in the great majority of cases, the community will ask full control of its own affairs, will ask for power to elect its own officials. The next section of the Act gives specifications for the election of councillors and holding office. They are all set out here in the Act, and there is no necessity to go through them. One or two sections may possibly be amended in the Committee stage, as some of them may give rise to a difference of opinion. Section 22 and onwards deal with the regulation of the affairs of the council, the manner and time and place in which their meetings are to be held. They don't seem to call for special comment at this stage. Important sections of the Act are Sections 28 to 32. They deal with the matter of auditing, and as most of these councils will be possibly dealing with large sums of money, and they will have had little or no experience in this connection, there is a provision to ensure that there will be as little waste as possible of the funds which they handle.

I might say in anticipation of the Act itself, that the whole working of these councils will be under the supervision of a Board of Control appointed by the Governor-in-Council, and it will be the connection link between these councils and the central government. It will consist very largely of a Superintendent of Local Affairs, who will be a member of that Board of Control, and he will journey

around the country keeping in touch with the various councils all the time, and reporting to the government.

The next section is most important, and deals with the question of revenue, and gives each council power to be subsidized as to part of the money needed for expenditure. A general provision allows the government to provide these councils, but I hope that section will not be put into operation very much. Of course, a very large part of the affairs of the country will be of a public nature, and will be left in the hands of the government still. I hope that in the course of time it will be unnecessary for the government to supplement the councils, except in the case of amounts of a temporary nature. We hope that in time each council will be able to look after the poor in its own district, and I would like to point out the potentialities of this Act. May I refer the Members to Section 34, which indicates the alluring possibility that poor relief, or dole as it is popularly called here, may be handled by each section of the country for itself. That is not, in the contemplation of the Government, a change which will be made immediately, but we are taking this step towards it. There is the possibility that in the more progressive communities the matter of poor relief will be taken off the shoulders of the Government at some time in the future. Each section of the country knows its own needs best, and will be able to take the situation in its own hands and handle it itself, and save its own money.

The provision for a poll tax is an innovation in this country. It is familiar in other countries and has worked well there. There is a provision for an amusement tax, a certain tax on contracts, a fire insurance tax, and perhaps most important of all and a complete innovation in this country, a real property and business tax. I don't propose to go into details, but I don't think I need to do more than indicate in passing what an important reformation these sections alone will bring about. It will bring home to the minds of the people the realization that the possession of property carries with it a responsibility and a duty to contribute to the upkeep of the community, and the country in general. There are provisions for the appraisalment of property for this purpose.

Then we come to a matter which might well cause some concern. The power to borrow money necessarily incident to the matters over which these councils will have control, ought for obvious reasons be confined within narrow limits. If these councils were given too wide powers, we might have a loophole for abuse, and the same abuse of which governments of this country were accused shifted to these councils. Under the Act borrowing will be carefully supervised.

Under the heading of expenditure, there are very wide powers given to the councils, such as laying out, building and increasing roads (*roads*), the construction of water supply, with which a good part of the country is already familiar, and other matters not of great importance, but the power is there to be availed of when necessary. There follow then provisions rather in the nature of by-laws governing in general the exercise of the powers to which I have just referred. There are also certain health regulations contained in the Act. How far they are competent to carry on the work created, I am not in a position to say. There are some rough corners in the Act which can be smoothed off in the Committee stage. There is a general power given to each council to regulate its own affairs. Power is given in the Act to the councils to take land for certain purposes. That, in places like Corner Brook and Grand Falls, is of first importance. In the smaller communities it is not likely to matter very much.

There are the usual provisions for questions. Fire wardens are specially dealt with. It is felt

that this is a matter which can well be handed over to the different communities to control themselves. At the end of the Act, provision is made for a Board of Control to serve as a connecting link between the various councils and the Government. I feel sure that any suggestion that the Hon. Members of the Opposition [may have] will be gladly received by the Government. As I said already, by reason of the fact that this is a measure which has already been considered in some form or another, and as the Act speaks for itself, I do not propose to say anything more, and I therefore commend the Bill to the members, and although it is largely, although not altogether an experiment, I feel that it is long overdue.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Winter, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Government."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

*Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.*⁴⁸

Hon. Leader of the Opposition:⁴⁹ This Bill is the logical and natural concomitant of the programme of retrenchment which was introduced some two days ago. I rather think that retrenchment has hastened the move. This measure is long overdue, and I can recollect at least two such Bills, since I first held a seat in this House, on the same subject, and from a casual glance through the Bill, I think it is incorporated largely from the latter of these. As the honourable introducer has pointed out, this country is over-centralized. The central government is looked to for everything possible in the nature of a public improvement, and unfortunately this has led to much over-expending of public moneys on works which were not warranted under the circumstances. This Bill will bring home to the people their duty of providing money for their own immediate needs, and leads to a realization of what the money is being spent for. It is one thing for a community to apply to the central government for a grant of money for improvements out of all proportion to the size of the community, and another thing for them to dig down in their own pockets for it. In my opinion it will lead to a more economic and reasonable expenditure of public funds. Where the government makes the expenditure for some particular section, the people do not realize what it means, but when [they] get it from the taxes out of their own pockets, they can better realize what it means to expend public moneys better than they have in the past.

Then again, it will give the people an education in matters of self-government. I have often heard the statement that Newfoundlanders are not fit to govern themselves. Perhaps they have made blunders which have resulted in the financial situation in which we find ourselves to-day, but I would point out that there are many countries in the world to-day in the same fix as we are, and there are some a great deal worse off than we are. This Bill will be of an educational character, a

⁴⁸ "The Bill is comprised of 87 sections, two-thirds of which were passed before the committee rose to sit again." *Evening Telegram*, May 19, 1933.

⁴⁹ It is unclear whether this speech was delivered before or after the House moved into Committee of the Whole.

continuation of the education which has been given our people during the past 40 years, and which has rendered them more capable of governing themselves than ever before. I feel that this country to-day is far better to govern itself than in the past. The percentage of illiterates in this country has been reduced within the past 40 years from 40 to sixteen. If that is not an advantage, what is it? I believe that this Bill will be instrumental in aiding the people in making rapid strides to a 100 [per cent] capacity to govern themselves.

I have to support the Bill. I always supported the Bill. I know that two administrations before, the Monroe administration of 1924 and the Squires administration of 1928 had considered this matter before, and perhaps for adequate reasons it was not brought into effect. This legislation has my unqualified support, and I feel sure that it will be a great advantage to all Newfoundland and to Corner Brook, which is the capital of my constituency, in particular. We may have some suggestions to make from this side which will improve the Bill, and I feel sure that they will be received in the same spirit as the amendments which we have already suggested with regard to legislation which has already passed through this House so far this year. We will cooperate to the best of our limited ability in moulding legislation which will react to the best possible advantage of the communities affected by the Bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Sale of Artificial Fertilizers" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: This Bill has an important bearing on the success of agriculture, and is a result of a great deal of thought, and a great many conferences between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Land Development Association and some farmers. At the present time there is no provision for the standardization of fertilizer in this country. There is no way in which the farmer can seek protection from the sale of injurious fertilizer. I do not intend to go further into the matter, but I am satisfied that the gentleman who made a study of the question before the Bill was submitted understood the situation entirely (*reads through sections*).

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the 19th of May instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Friday, May 19, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Earle, from Musgrave Harbour, re Fisheries.

Mr. Earle: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Musgrave Harbour and Doting Cove in the District of Fogo, in connection with the culling, curing and marketing of codfish. This is a repetition of a number of petitions which were so ably presented by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago. I am in hearty accord with the prayer of the petition, and bespeak for it the earnest and sympathetic consideration of the department to which it relates.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the report of the Select Committee on the petition of the North West Products Corporation, as follows:

To the Hon. the House of Assembly:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the North West Products Company, Limited, beg to report that they find that the rules of the House have been observed in connection therewith and recommend that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

(Sgd.) F. C. Alderdice

H. A. Winter

S. J. Foote

R. G. Starkes

May 19, 1933

Whereupon a Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Advantages to North West Products Company, Limited," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the Report of Messrs. Davies and Oldford.⁵⁰

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd. of a Licence to Cut Timber" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I

⁵⁰ "Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the annual report of his Department." *Daily News*, May 20, 1933, p. 5. *The Evening Telegram* concurs.

would like to make a brief explanation as to why this legislation is necessary. In 1924, when the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company required timber limits for the purpose of erecting an anticipated mill upon the Gander, they purchased considerable timber from private holders. In the District of Fogo there were timber lands which the Company thought desirable for them to acquire. They went to the government of that day, and instead of getting the right to cut timber over those areas by paying \$2 per square mile, under the Crown Lands Act, they paid \$45,000 as a bonus to the Newfoundland government, and since that time have been paying, in addition, the regular Crown lands rental of \$2 per square mile. A grant should have been issued to them in 1924. But there was another area in the same section controlled by the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and the Gander Valley Company were anxious to make an exchange with them for a similar size area in some other part of the country, which should be just as convenient to the Nova Scotia Company because they use timber for their mining business on Bell Island, and the area had to be cruised and surveyed and had to come to finalized agreement. It was never finalized, and in 1930, when the new Crown Lands Act came into effect, it was impossible for the government of that day to issue the licences, because no licences could then be issued at \$2 per square mile; and that all such timber lands were then to be sold.

Therefore, the present Bill is merely for the sanction of an agreement entered into between the Government and the Gander Valley Company in 1924. They have possession of the lands, and it is the first time that any company or any individual paid any such large amount of money for land as the Gander Valley Company have paid. Previous to that, all previous governments had been granting timber lands in this country for comparatively small rentals, both as regards Newfoundland and Labrador timber lands. I think, Sir, it is very gratifying indeed to see that the Gander Valley Company are still able to start development and erect a mill, and I do not think they should be hampered in their enterprise, and, consequently, that is the reason why this Bill is brought in (*reads*). I don't think that any further comment is necessary, and I move the second reading of the Bill.⁵¹

With unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd. of a Licence to Cut Timber" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Bonus Addition to

⁵¹ "Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines was granted leave to introduce a Bill entitled 'An Act to authorise the issue to the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co. Ltd., of a license to cut timber,' which was read a first time. The introducer explained the circumstances relating to the application. He stated the company had already expended a large sum of money in acquiring the property in Fogo District and a grant should have been issued to them in 1924, but because of a proposed arrangement with the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company who had timber rights elsewhere whereby an exchange was contemplated the grant was never finalized. Later the new Crown Lands Act made it impossible for the Government to issue licenses to cut timber on areas under the plan of the \$2 per square mile. The company had already paid \$45,000. He approved of the application and asked that the Bill be read a second time which was accordingly permitted and will be considered in committee at the next sitting of the House." *Evening Telegram*, May 20, 1933.

Pensions under "The War Pensions Act, 1922."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: We are taking the second resolution on the order paper first. It is usual to put this through in one day.⁵²

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and has passed the said Resolutions without amendment and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Bonus Addition to Pensions under The War Pensions Act, 1922'" was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, an on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Bonus Addition to Pensions under 'The War Pensions Act, 1922'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

With unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Bonus Addition to Pensions under The War Pensions Act, 1922.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Bonus Additions to Pensions under The War Pensions Act, 1922'"

⁵² "Hon. Secretary of State stated that it was customary to put them through every year and usual to put them through the same day. Accordingly, a Bill was introduced giving effect to these resolutions and went through all stages without amendment." *Daily News*, May 20, 1933, p. 5.

was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting an Amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: This Bill ratifies the reductions made in September last by the Executive Government. And now, we ask the House to indemnify the Executive Government for their act in this respect. As will be seen by the Resolutions, the Government made no reductions in pensions under \$200 (*reads*). The reduction does not bring any pension lower than \$200: 248 pensioners suffered no reduction; 202 had 15 per cent taken off their pensions; 241 suffered a 20 per cent reduction; 55 were reduced 25 per cent; 18 pensions were reduced 30 per cent; 162 residing outside of the country had a 33 $\frac{1}{3}$ per cent reduction. Dependents of the soldiers, that is children and fathers and mothers of the men who died in the war, 503 of these were affected by a 20 per cent cut. The reduction in the first class affected a total saving of \$70,500. Those in the second class were reduced by \$26,500. Those in the third class by \$26,000. This makes a total saving effected of \$123,000. The reduction was not in force till October of last year, which accounts for the fact that the reduction did not effect the full saving of \$123,000 this year. But the reduction for next year will be \$123,000. Last year it amounted to about \$105,000 or \$110,000.

There is also another provision. Section 6 reads this way (*reads*).⁵³ That means that the 30th of June 1933 will see the peak of expenditures under war pensions. It cannot go any higher after the passing of the Act.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

⁵³ "The Bill also provides: Anything to the contrary in the War Pensions Act 1922 or amending Acts notwithstanding, no pension shall be payable to or in respect of any woman marrying an ex-member of the forces after the passing of this Act or any child born to an ex-member of the forces after the 30th day of June 1933." *Evening Telegram*, May 20, 1933.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Artificial Fertilizers."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Artificial Fertilizers" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it has passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively: "An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Hotel"; "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to the Customs"; "An Act to Confirm Certain Temporary Loans"; "An Act in Relation to the Ratification of a Guarantee of Certain Borrowings of the St. John's Municipal Council"; and "An Act in Relation to the Amendment of the Loan Act 1932 (22 Geo. B. Cap. 32)" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it has passed the Bill sent up entitled, respectively: "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging'"; "An Act Relating to Justices of the Peace" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it has passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act Relating to Corporations and Institutions Guaranteed or Subsidized by the Government," with some amendments.

The Amendments are as follows:

Section 2, Line 4:

Insert the words "cash payment by way of" between the words "any" and "subsidy."
 Section 8, Line 3:

Insert the words "cash payment by way of" between the words "any" and "subsidy."

The said Amendments having been read a first and second time, it was moved and seconded that they be agreed to, and 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 has received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it has passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Ratify Certain Agreements Relating to Mining Concessions in Labrador" with some amendments.

The Amendments are as follows:

First Schedule, Sections 5 and 10 of Agreement therein

Section 5, Line 4:

Strike out words "first day of October 1933" and insert in place thereof the words "15th day of May, 1934."

Section 5, Lines 4 and 5:

Strike out the words "first day of October 1934" and insert in place thereof the words "15th day of May, 1935."

Section 10, Lines 4 and 5:

Strike out the words "first of July" and insert in place thereof "30th day of September."

Insert as Section 2 of the Bill the following:

2. The Fifth paragraph of each and every of the Agreements shall be deemed to read as follows:

5. The Licensee shall pay to the Government upon the execution of this Agreement the sum of One thousand dollars, and shall pay a similar sum on or before the 15th day of May, A.D. 1934, and on or before the 15th day of May, A.D. 1935.

Insert as Section 3 of the Bill the following:

3. The tenth paragraph of each of the said Agreements shall be read as if the words "before the first of July 1933" were struck out and the words "before the 30th day of September 1933" substituted therefore.

Re-number Section 2 of the Bill as Section 1.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines the said Amendments were read a first time.

With unanimous consent, the said Amendments were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the Amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Ratify Certain Agreements Relating to Mining Concessions in Labrador" 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 it has passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to Forest Fires" with some amendments.

The Amendments are as follows:

Section 4 (1), second line:

Strike out the word "October" and insert in place thereof the word "December."

Section 9 (3), first line:

Strike out the word "Railway" where it appears as the second word in the line.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the said Amendments were read a first time.

With unanimous consent, the said Amendments were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the Amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to Forest Fires" had been agreed to without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, the 22nd day of May instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Monday, May 22, 1933

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

Sergeant-at-Arms: Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, there is a petition at the Bar of the House.

*A deputation from the Great War Veterans' Association appeared at the Bar of the House, presenting a petition, which being read by the Clerk was, on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, received and referred to the Department of the Secretary of State.*⁵⁴

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the petition be accepted and referred to the Department to which it relates. I should like also to say that the petition will be given sympathetic consideration.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It appears that there was a definite agreement made as between the Government of Newfoundland and the soldiery during the currency of the war, in respect to the amounts of pensions to be paid to the disabled men. I don't think that there is anybody in Newfoundland who will admit that the contract should be broken where it is at all possible of fulfillment. Cases have come under my notice, particularly in the last four or five months, possibly as a result of the position which, without merit, I happen to occupy in this House. And I recollect a story which was told me a few days ago by one returned soldier, which I shall not relate to the House – a harrowing tale of conditions on the battlefield and conditions which he has had to suffer since he came home, conditions resulting from wounds received, and lack of employment in the country since, and the inadequacy of the pension received to support himself and his family. It strikes me that in dealing with this matter, which I feel sure that the Government will handle with every consideration, the whole system of war pensions as it now exists should be gone into most carefully.

I have been talking to a number of returned soldiers, and they have pointed out to me many inequalities and injustices which ought to be remedied. It is a fact that there are men in this country to-day who lost their ability to work on the battlefields of Flanders, and are living in very poor circumstances and are finding life a burden. If I may suggest – I know of course that no suggestions for any increase in expenditure can come from this side of the House – I offer this suggestion, that whatever the scheme of pensions may be, that the Government take up the matter with the G.W.V.A. with a view to looking into and taking care of certain special cases which cannot be taken care of under the rigid rules existing to-day. It may be that the Government will find itself unable to apportion any further sums, but I do know that some adjustment can be made which will do justice to these men who are suffering untold hardships as a result of their service. I would like to see the Government take up this matter at once. We owe these men a duty, and if we leave them in continuous suffering they cannot help but think that their country has betrayed them, and surely, that

⁵⁴ The delegation consisted of "Dr. Paterson, President; Geo. Adams, Secretary; F. Marshall and C. Garland.... The content of the petition is a protest against certain sections of the Act passed in the House of Assembly last week." *Evening Telegram*, May 23, 1933.

is not a position that we would wish to occupy in their minds. I think the Government should make a great effort to remedy this evil. I don't know how far the funds will go. It may be argued that pensions of a specific amount may be worth anywhere from 10 to 15 per cent more to-day than when the Government made the agreement with these men when they enlisted to serve their country, but all these things should be taken into consideration, and I feel that some satisfactory arrangement or agreement could be made between the Government and the G.W.V.A.⁵⁵

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Render Certain Abandoned Lands Available for Agriculture."

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Ltd."

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to Consider Resolutions for the Amendment of the Act 15 George V., Chapter 28 (Livestock Pedigree Act).

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, Deceased, of a Licence to Cut Timber."

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited, of a Licence to Cut Timber."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

⁵⁵ "[Mr. Bradley] thought it opportune to suggest that the whole pension list of war veterans and dependents should form part of an inquiry and a necessary revision be adopted." *Evening Telegram*, May 23, 1933, p. 7.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited, of a Licence to Cut Timber" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. Acting Attorney General – To ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act relating to insolvency." [*Evening Telegram*, May 23, 1933, p. 7]

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Advantages to North West Products Company, Limited" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House for examination and report.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill covers the question of granting certain privileges in connection with the canning of scallops and other shellfish, and it asks for a certain territory over which they will have the exclusive right to take shellfish.⁵⁶ No privileges are granted as far as lobsters are concerned. These people are going in for the canning of shellfish of every description except lobsters. This is the type of small industry that I like to see flourishing in this country. I would like to see a lot of them scattered around the coastline, because in the aggregate they would supply a great deal of employment to our people. I would sooner see ten small industries employing from twenty to 100, than one industry employing 200. I think that in this way we could make our country a great deal more prosperous than it is to-day. Certain sections of the Bill specify that they shall have an output of 10,000 cases every year. If this is not done they will lose their privileges over this section of the coastline. Ten thousand cases of canned shellfish is quite a business, and in my opinion these concessions are well worth considering. I therefore ask that this Bill be now given second reading, and a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the details.

Mr. Bradley was opposed to corporations who seemed as if [they] were making a raid on the Treasury. He objected to any measure which had the semblance of a monopoly, and would await the report of the Select Committee which would be appointed to enquire into the matter.

Hon. the Secretary of State stated it was not a party measure. If the Bill was rejected it would be referred back to the solicitors. He also stated the government's policy was in all such measures to take the House of Assembly into their confidence in dealing with such matters. [*Evening Telegram*, May 23, 1933]

⁵⁶ "This company was seeking the exclusive right to catch shell fish (lobsters not included) in a certain section of St. George's district. The company also proposed to can berries and according to their agreement 10,000 cases would have to be prepared and sold annually. They also asked concessions relative to duty on new machinery and equipment which cannot be secured in Newfoundland." *Evening Telegram*, May 23, 1933.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Select Committee: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. Mr. Foote, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Abbott.

His Honour the Speaker announced that His Excellency the Governor would require the attendance of the members of the House of Assembly at the Legislative Council Chamber at 3:15 p.m. to-day [May 23] to give his assent to certain bills. [*Evening Telegram*, May 23, 1933]

Hon. the Prime Minister presented a Petition from the Municipal Council praying the passage of certain Amendments to the Municipal Acts 1921-1931.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Select Committee to report as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with as they apply to Private Bills: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Halley.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented a Petition from the Clarenville Light and Power Company, praying for certain concessions in aid of its undertaking.⁵⁷

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Select Committee to report as to whether the Rules of the House have been complied with as they relate to Private Bills: Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Bradley.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, the 23rd of May instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

⁵⁷ "The Hon. the Prime Minister presented a petition from the Clarenville Light and Power Company asking permission to install a hydro-electric plant at Shoal Harbour and moved that a Select Committee be appointed to ascertain if the rules of the House had been maintained." *Evening Telegram*, May 23, 1933.

Tuesday, May 23, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Mr. Stone from Deer Harbour, re Fisheries.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition which is largely signed by the residents of several settlements in the District of Trinity North on the culling, curing and standardization of codfish. I give the petition my heartiest support, and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, Deceased, of a Licence to Cut Timber" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

At quarter past 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 immediate attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber when His Excellency was pleased to assent to the following Bills:

An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1930.

An Act Relating to Forest Fires.

An Act Further to Amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Postal and Telegraph Services."

An Act Relating to Corporations and Institutions Guaranteed or Subsidized by the Government.

An Act Relating to Agricultural Societies.

An Act Further to Amend the Act 22 Geo. V., Chapter 25, entitled "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto."

An Act to Ratify Certain Agreements Relating to Mining Concessions in Labrador.

An Act Relating to the Newfoundland Hotel.

An Act to Amend the Act 18 Geo. V., Chapter 11, entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

An Act to Amend Chapter 111 of the Consolidated Statutes, 1916, entitled "Of the Registration of Deeds and Other Documents."

An Act to Amend the Act 22, Geo. V., Chapter 13, entitled "An Act Relating to Memorial University College, St. John's."

An Act in Relation to the Ratification of a Guarantee of Certain Borrowings by the St. John's Municipal Council.

An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Relating to Customs.
An Act Further to Amend "The Tourist Commission Act 1927."
An Act to Amend the Act 22, Geo. V. (First Session), Chapter 11, entitled "An Act Relating to the Keeping of Dogs."
An Act Respecting an Amendment to Chapter 195 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Accident Insurance Companies."
An Act Further to Amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Employment of Men Engaged in Logging."
An Act Relating to Justices of the Peace.
An Act to Confirm Certain Temporary Loans.
An Act in Relation to the Amendment of the Loan Act 1932 (22 Geo. V., Cap. 32).

The House thereupon resumed.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions for the Amendment of the Act 15 George V., Chapter 28 (Livestock Pedigree Act).

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: When the Act passed the House for the purpose of registration of purebred animals, there was no provision for charging a fee, which is contrary to the rules and regulations of every other country. There is considerable expense attached to the work, and the Government has decided that it is right that a small fee be charged to whoever has occasion to register purebred animals. The resolution for the amendment of Section 3 of sub-section (3) is as follows.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Hon. Minister if he has any idea as to the fee to be charged?

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: I have discussed the matter with the Secretary of Agriculture, and the fee will be different in different cases.⁵⁸ It will not be large.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

⁵⁸ "... the Minister stated that some animals will pay a larger fee than others. The grading of animals will be along the lines of what is done in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island." *Daily News*, May 25, 1933.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 28 (The Livestock Pedigree Act)" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 28 (The Livestock Pedigree Act)" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 28 (The Livestock Pedigree Act)."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 28 (The Livestock Pedigree Act)" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Ltd" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Render Certain Abandoned Lands Available for Agriculture" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" was introduced and read a first

time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, further provision will have to be made as Supplemental Supply. For the information of the House I beg to read (*reads*).

I may say that this looks rather miserable, that we are going to pay out money to the extent of \$29,448. Not one cent passes hands; it is purely a bookkeeping entry. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who is more conversant with the details, will perhaps be good enough to explain just how the action occurs.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Chairman, when we came into office in 1932, we found then an agitation existing for the purpose of further agricultural development. Consequently, the Department of Agriculture and Mines was besieged day after day by people looking for lands near the City of St. John's for the purpose of agricultural development. We found that [Reid] Lot No. 170, extending from St. John's above the Long Bridge nearly out to Petty Harbour, right along the Petty Harbour section contained a lot of valuable agricultural land. These lands were owned by the Reid Newfoundland Company as part of the fee simple lands received by them from former governments for railway development, part of the sections [were] owned by the government as Crown lands. Originally there was a very serious mistake made, with the result that we found that what the Crown Lands Department had been issuing in grants for land which we understood to be Crown lands, proved to be Reid lands.⁵⁹ In conjunction with the survey staff of the Reid Newfoundland Company we made an arrangement last year, whereby the Reid Company would stand half the cost of trying to straighten this matter out, and the Government would stand the other half. We had a survey going on during the greater part of last year. The interests of the Government were looked after by Mr. Hall, and the interests of the Reid Company by Mr. Vatcher. Considerable money was spent, and even after the expenditure was made we found that the tangle could not be straightened out. There was only one solution, and that was that the Reid Newfoundland Company had to acquire the Crown lands over which we had been issuing grants, and the Government had to

⁵⁹ "Originally when the lines were drawn there was a serious mistake made with the result that it was later found that the Reid Newfoundland Company had been issuing grants over what they considered to be their own lands, but in reality belonging to the Crown; and it turned out also that the Department had been issuing grants for lands which proved to be owned by the Reid Newfoundland Company." *Daily News*, May 25, 1933.

acquire the Reid lands. The proposition was put to the Government by the Reid Newfoundland Company, whereby, as the Prime Minister stated, there will be no money exchange hands. They were prepared to transfer to us the lot which contains in the vicinity of 30 square miles. We had our Mr. Hall make a report to the Government, in which he valued the land in the vicinity of \$30,000. An arrangement was immediately entered into between the Government and the Reid Newfoundland Company; they transferred the block to us and we would give them credit for the amount by giving them receipts for lands, so that there is actually no money changing hands.⁶⁰ It is a very wise move to make in the interest of the Government and in the interest of a large number of people who are daily coming to my office looking for land in the vicinity of St. John's. When this arrangement is finally completed, there will be a large amount of agricultural land which we hope to be able to allot to the people, and we will take care of as many people as we possibly can who intend to immediately avail of the opportunity for the cultivation of this land.

I may further say that the matter has been before a Select Committee, and they unanimously approved and accordingly reported to the Government. On that Select Committee was the Attorney General, who is now in London. The Acting Attorney General was not a member of the Committee, consequently he has not the same knowledge of the meeting. The Hon. Mr. Winter was a member of the Committee. I think this move will be a good deal in the interests of the country.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered that 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 on to-morrow.

With unanimous consent, the said Resolutions in Supply were read a first and second time and agreed to by the House, as follows:

Whereas it is necessary that immediate payment of the sum of \$29,448 be made in connection with the purchase by the Governor-in-Council from the Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited, and others, of certain land known as Reid Lot 170 and situate to the South of St. John's City (West);

And whereas there is no legislative authority for the expenditure of the said sum;

Be it resolved that:

1. The House do hereby authorize the Controller of the Treasury, pending the passing of the

⁶⁰ "... then the solution arrived at was that the Reid Company had to acquire the Crown lands for which no grants had been issued and the Government had to acquire the Reid lands for which no grants had been issued. The Reid Company put the proposition to the Government that there would be no money change hands in the transaction and they were prepared to transfer the block which contained about 30,000 acres. Mr. Hall reported on it for the Government and valued the land at \$30,000. An arrangement was immediately entered into transferring the block and the Government was to give the Reid Company credit for the amount by giving them receipts for the land." *Daily News*, May 25, 1933.

Act to grant Supply to His Majesty for the forthcoming fiscal year, to issue a Treasury cheque, chargeable to the Exchequer Account, in favour of the said Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited, and others, for the said sum of \$29,448.

2. The House do further authorize the Comptroller and Auditor General to pass the said cheque.

Whereupon with unanimous consent of the House, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Acquisition by the Government of Certain Lands" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon with the unanimous consent of the House, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, this Bill was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Acquisition by the Government of Certain Lands" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. the Secretary of State presented the Report of the Select Committee on the petition of the Clarendville Light and Power Co., Ltd., as follows:

May 23/33

Mr. Speaker,

Your Select Committee appointed to enquire into whether the Rules of the House had been observed in connection with the petition of the Clarendville Light and Power Co., Ltd., praying that their Bill be enacted into law, beg to report that the Rules have been complied with and recommend

that the Bill be introduced accordingly.

*(Sgd.) J. C. Puddester
W. J. Browne
J. G. Stone
H. W. Quinton*

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to the Clarenville Light and Power Co., Ltd." was introduced and read a first time and second time and it was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee for consideration and report.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Committee as follows: Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Quinton, Mr. Bradley.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Report of the Superintendent of Education, United Church, for the year 1931-32.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Report of the Superintendent of Education, Church of England, for the year 1931-32.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I wish to acquaint the House of the sad drowning accident that occurred at 11:30 a.m. to-day at Magic Cove, Bonavista Bay, when five men, through the swamping of their motor boat, lost their lives. Seven men were in the boat and two of them were saved. The names of the victims are: Lewis Samson, William Samson, Edward Samson, Maxwell Samson and Malcolm Kelligrew. All of them belonged to Flat Islands. As Minister of Marine and Fisheries I was personally acquainted with these men. I think it is my bounden duty to speak of that tragedy in this House, and to ask the House to pass the following resolution of sympathy: "Resolved: that the House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the tragic death of five fishermen of Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay, which occurred at Magic Cove, Bonavista Bay, this 23rd day of May."

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I feel that it is my duty to second the motion of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is always a sad occurrence in this country, and unfortunately it is as frequent as it is sad, to hear of the drowning accidents to our fishermen. Some of us represent fishing constituencies, and although I represent a constituency which is not wholly fishing in character, I quite well realize that our fisheries are the backbone of our country. This particular occurrence is particularly sad, in as much as it happened just at the beginning of the season's work, and it will be a particularly heavy burden on their loved ones who find themselves suddenly bereft of their breadwinners. I would like to take this opportunity, Sir, of expressing my sympathy to the relatives of the deceased men.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I desire to support the motion made by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and seconded by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I feel sure that our hearts

go out to all those bereaved. It is very easy to picture that little settlement to-day, and the gloom that hangs over it. We can realize what a catastrophe this is to them. These catastrophes happen only too often, and we should endeavour to have a fund created for these men who take their lives in their hands every hour of their working day.⁶¹ Some of these men I knew personally and some I know by name, and all I can do is support the motion so eloquently put by the gentlemen who have spoken before.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries moved, and Mr. Bradley seconded, the following Resolution, which was passed unanimously:

Resolved: that this House desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the tragic death of five fishermen of Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay, which occurred at Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay, this 23rd day of May.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday afternoon, June 6th, at 3 o'clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

⁶¹ “[The Prime Minister] often thought that a fund should be created for the benefit of families of those who paid the price of Admiralty.” *Evening Telegram*, May 25, 1933, p. 14.

Tuesday, June 6, 1933

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1930" and "An Act Respecting the Export of Marine Shells from Labrador and the Islands Adjacent Thereto" without amendment.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Quinton from Newman's Cove, re Fishery.

Mr. Quinton from Jamestown, re Agriculture.

Hon. Mr. Stone from Thoroughfare, re Fisheries.

Hon. Mr. Stone from Ivanhoe, re Fisheries.

Hon. Minister of Public Works: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Newman's Cove, in the constituency of Bonavista South, in reference to the system of culling and making of codfish. The subject of the petition can be epitomized in one sentence (*reads extract from petition*). There are several other matters which do not appear to be unreasonable, and I ask leave to have this petition received and referred to [the department to] which it relates.

I have also another petition from the electors of Jamestown, in the constituency of Bonavista South, on the subject of agriculture. I also ask that this petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Thoroughfare on fishery matters. There have been several petitions in connection with the same matter, that is grading and culling of fish. I wish to support the petition, and I ask that it be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines presented a petition from the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, praying for the passage of legislation protecting the Company's holdings, which was received and referred to a Select Committee to inquire as to whether the Rules of the House had been observed respecting such petitions.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company. The subject matter is of considerable importance, and I would suggest, Sir, that the petition be received and referred to a Select Committee, and they can report back to the House (*Clerk reads petition*).

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Hon. Acting Minister of Justice, Mr. Moore, Mr. Whiteley, Mr. Bradley.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce an

Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Auditing of Public Accounts."

Hon. Mr. Stone gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish."

Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries.'"

Mr. Starkes gave notice of question.

Supply was deferred as were also the following items on the Order Paper:

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act relating to Fire Insurance Companies."

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act respecting Local Government."

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act respecting an amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922."

Second Reading of a Bill entitled "An Act relating to Insolvency."

Second Reading of a Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, deceased, of a License to cut timber."

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to modify the conditions of the holding of certain Licences to cut Timber by the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited."

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to render certain abandoned lands available for Agriculture." [*Evening Telegram*, June 7, 1933]

Second Reading of an Act to amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I might say that it consists principally of an amendment of the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1930. In that Act, through inadvertence, there were some defects, some of which were remedied in the Act passed in 1931, and others are amended in the Act now before the House. For instance, there was no provision made for giving power to magistrates to try persons who committed offences in remote parts of the country, whereas, if such offences were committed in other sections of the country, the persons charged would have to stand trial before the Supreme Court. That is now being taken care of by Section 1 of the Bill. It is considered desirable that this Section should apply in connection with the Labrador coast, not that it is anticipated that there will be any serious outbreak of offences there, but by giving greater power to a magistrate there it would save very considerable expense by having to bring offenders from there to St. John's to be tried.⁶²

⁶² "The Bill provides that:

1. Whenever under the provisions of the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1930 or this Act any offence is triable summarily, an attempt to commit the said offence shall be triable summarily subject to the same conditions.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I object to this amendment on principle. I do not suppose that the matter is likely to assume the serious proportions as the Bill suggests, but, even if it did, why give to a man on the Labrador, who has no legal training whatever, and who is ignorant of the criminal law, the privilege and power of trying such cases, while a magistrate in St. John's, who is a trained experienced lawyer, has no such power? While I realize there is some justification for trying to save expense in bringing offenders to St. John's, at the same time the liberty of the subject is also a very important matter to be considered. It is the kind of principle that is wrong, and is out of all bounds of propriety altogether. Frankly, my whole mentality revolts at the idea, and the more I think of it, the more it appears to be glaringly outrageous. I do think that the Government should further seriously consider this Bill, before this Assembly is asked to enact it into law.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in acceding to the Hon. Member's request to defer the second reading of this measure. Evidently he sees great hardship and injustice to accrue by the enactment of it in its present form. After all, it is the only alternative. It is very easy to become sentimental, but, as every lawyer knows, the tendency of the times within late years throughout the British Empire and the United States has been to enlarge the jurisdiction of magistrates and justices, and to give greater power to them in the administration of justice, such as that proposed in the Bill now before the House, and it does not need any great argument to show that even in this country great development has taken place in that respect.

2. In Labrador only, the offences set forth in Part IV of the second Schedule to the said Act, as amended by the Act 22 George V., Cap. 16, shall be triable by a Stipendiary Magistrate or two Justices with the consent of the Minister of Justice but without the consent of the accused; and there shall be deemed to be added to the said Part IV of the said Schedule, for the purpose of the administration of law in Labrador only, the following offences: Burglary; Housebreaking; Perjury; Offences under Section 23 of the Larceny Offences Act 1916; Offences under Sections 51 and 62 of the Offences against the Person Act, 1961; Offenses under Section 11 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act 1885." *Evening Telegram*, June 7, 1933, p. 3.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Report of Public Schools under Roman Catholic Boards for the year 1932, and the Report of Public Schools under Salvation Army Boards for the year 1932.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 7th instant, at 3 p.m.

Wednesday, June 7, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

*Mr. Abbott from Port-aux-Basques, re Customs.*⁶³

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Licence to Cut Timber to Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co. Ltd."

Hon. the Secretary of State gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Financial Clauses of the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to the Clarendville Light and Power Company, Limited."

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. Acting Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act To Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, Deceased, of a Licence to Cut Timber" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I should like to make a short explanation. In 1909 a grant was issued to the late Mr. Parrell giving him the right to cut timber over a small area in Green Bay. At the time Mr. James, who is now attached to the Department of Agriculture and Mines, made a survey as required by the Crown Lands Act. It was thought later that there was some mistake made. In the meantime, Mr. Parrell transferred his interest to a third party, who made a transfer to the late William Ashbourne. Because of the faulty

⁶³ "... on the subject of an amendment to the Customs Act." *Daily News*, June 8, 1933.

survey, Mr. Ashbourne could never get a [licence to cut timber] for the area. All the rentals on the land have been paid up to the present time. But when a [later] survey of the granted area was made, it was discovered that there was no serious mistake in the original survey by Mr. James. Consequently, I feel that the estate of the late Mr. Ashbourne is now entitled to a lease.⁶⁴ In 1930 the Crown Lands Act was amended. Consequently under the present act it is impossible to give a lease. This is the reason why we have to ask for legislation to give the estate of Ashbourne a proper lease on land on which rentals have been paid since 1910. This is the only explanation there is to be made. I feel as head of the Department, that Mr. Ashbourne's estate is justly entitled to the proposed lease. Now that the survey has been rectified there is no longer any doubt. The information we have now shows there is no conflict at all. The Bill only proposes to give a regular lease, [and] that has been done in the case of companies in Newfoundland where much larger tracts of land were in question. I see no reason why the same should not be done for the estate of Ashbourne. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of this Bill.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Render Certain Abandoned Lands Available for Agriculture" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that some time ago, the suggestion was made by the Leader of the Opposition that some provision should be made to rectify a very great wrong that all felt was being done to various communities in regard to their being unable to acquire agricultural lands. I pointed out when an Act to amend the Crown Lands Act was going through this House, that it did not cover the situation, and that a special Act to cover the matter would be introduced later. The Bill now before the House deals with it. It was pointed out by me at the time, in reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that I had absolute knowledge of large tracts of land that were being held up by in some cases absentee landlords, and in not a few cases by local people who had acquired some kind of a title to those lands, and who did not set those lands and who did not allow their neighbour to go in on these lands to cultivate them. This situation exists throughout the whole country. I have had numerous complaints from all over the country, pointing out how the people see lands held up, not even under fence in some cases, and any attempt to go into these lands and set them by a man who needs the produce that he could grow on them, would be treated with a lawsuit for trespass.

We do not have to leave the City of St. John's for an example of this sort. Here in this city we have large areas of land held up by people who have not occupied them for 50 years. Yet we have people starving and driven from their homes. And these lands which are supposed to be Crown lands should be made available to these people.

We found on consulting the Department of Justice, which is the department from [which] we

⁶⁴ "When the survey was being made for the Gander proposition it was found that no serious mistake had been made originally in laying down the lines, as supposed, and that Mr. Ashbourne had every right to cut timber under his license." *Daily News*, June 8, 1933, p. 5.

have to seek advice on matters of this kind, that the matter would not be so easy to clear up as we had thought at first, that we could not go in and take possession immediately. When we go into Committee on this Bill, we will be glad to avail of any amendments that will help the Bill and that are necessary; but the matter has been gone into well by the Department of Justice. This legislation is absolutely necessary, and I think that the whole country and the House will welcome it. Each time I occupied office in the Department of Agriculture and Mines, I was faced with the same situation. But now the matter has become so critical. There are such great demands for agricultural land that the matter has been brought to a head, and I hope with the passing of legislation we will be able to have possession next year. It is too late this year, but perhaps by next year we will be able to bring the proper legal machinery into effect, and we will be able to hand over these lands to the people, which will be given back to the Crown. I have great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the particulars of this Bill are as yet, but I feel that such a Bill is of a substantial character, and that it will stamp out an evil which is causing great distress in the country to-day. Yesterday I had a letter from a constituent as to the same matter. In the community in which he resides, there is a large tract of land held up by a party who never goes near it; and this man who wrote me in the letter to which I refer has not got land enough in which to set a bucket of potatoes. Now, I want to see that state of affairs changed. I want to see to it that that man is enabled to go in on that land and cultivate it, so that he may obtain the wherewithal to exist.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill. There are many instances of the type which this Bill aims to remedy to be found right here in St. John's. I refer particularly (and I know my colleague Mr. Halley is also aware of the fact) to an area of land in my constituency which is almost 60 acres in extent, and which has been lying up for many years, and most probably the person interested has forgotten all about it long ago. Those who got the grant have passed and gone, and a large tract of land is now lying idle which could be put to good use by many people residing near it, if this Bill can be made operative.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines may well be congratulated on the introduction of this Bill.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: The other day there was an objection to some of the offences which were intended to be included in Part 4 of the Third Schedule of the Act. It was decided that two or three were to be eliminated.

... the power now granted to [Labrador magistrates], in addition to that granted other magistrates, had to do only with perjury and indecent offences.

Mr. Bradley had no objection to the Bill in its present form. [*Daily News*, June 8, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, the 8th of June instant, at 3 p.m.

Thursday, June 8, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Mr. Walsh from Flat Islands, re Ferry Service.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Flat Islands and Davis Island in the District of Placentia West, asking that the ferry service between these two islands be re-established. With your permission, Sir, I will read the petition for the information of the House (*reads petition*). I may point out that this is one of the most important ferry services in that section of the Island, and at the present time the people are badly handicapped. I give my strongest support to the petition and I ask that it be forwarded to the Department of Public Works, and I ask that it receive the sympathetic consideration of the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Walsh presented the Report of the Select Committee on the petition of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, as follows:

June 8/33

Mr. Speaker:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Petition of the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred and find that the Rules of the House regarding Private Bills have been complied with and recommend that the Bill, the subject matter of the petition, be introduced into the House.

*(Sgd.) W. J. Walsh
W. J. Browne
G. Whiteley
F. Gordon Bradley
Joseph Moore*

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited" was read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice tabled Report of H.M. Penitentiary, 1932.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Financial Clauses of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 59, Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Title of St. John's Gas and Light Co.'"

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill

entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Licence to Cut Timber to Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd." was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to Consider the Financial Clauses of the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to the Clarenville Light and Power Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Byrne took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: I would like to explain to the Committee that these financial clauses in the Bill are exactly similar to the financial clauses inserted in other Bills dealing with other Companies, such as the United Towns Electrical Company and other companies. There was no alteration whatever made. The same concessions that these people are asking for now have been given to other companies of like nature, such as the United Towns Electrical Company in operation in Conception Bay and the Avalon Peninsula. The Prime Minister draws attention to the fact that these people are satisfied to pay a 10 per cent duty on their importations, but other companies of like nature are allowed to have their importations free of duty.

In Clause 4, the last three words are to be deleted. It is thought that in a section where there is plenty of wood suitable for poles it should be used for that purpose instead of the Company being allowed to import cedar poles. It is proposed to delete these words and to cut the poles around the section where operations are carried on. There is a 10 per cent duty on importations whereas other companies are allowed admission of their importations free of duty.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: There is one matter of general interest to be observed when discussing poles. It is extraordinary the amount of poles used in this country. There are 40,000 cords used per year. Now the time is coming and the Government is discussing the advisability of initiating some particular line of activity in the lumber business, to creosote telegraph and telephone poles and railway sleepers, where the wood is exposed to the weather. The railroad is taking about 40,000 cords per year, and it is high time that we take some action so that we might be able to preserve these poles and sleepers, so that instead of the usual life of eight years, they may have a life of 30 years. It takes just as much to erect the untreated pole as it would to erect the treated pole. The treated pole saves labour. It requires only one erection in 30 years, whereas four of the untreated poles would have to be erected in that time.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the financial section with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Select Committee be instructed that these sections as passed by the Committee now form part of this Bill,

and that the said Committee make provision accordingly.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Winter, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Government."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Byrne took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Mr. Winter: Mr. Chairman, when the Committee last met there were a few sections deferred for consideration and amendment. We propose to add to Section 7 a sub-section (6) which reads as follows: (*reads sub-section*).

The next one refers to Section 11, which deals with the election of officers. The amendment proposes to delete the first three lines (*reads three lines*). These are now cut out and it should now read (*reads*). Finally, there is one other amendment that is rather important. Section 45; on consideration it was felt that it was best to omit sub-section (C) altogether, it has to do with the complicated question of rents and taxes. I move that sub-section (C) of Section 45 be stricken out.

(Clerk reads through Bill)

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: This Section is ordinarily a very fair one, but experiment has shown that when a public body is interested in an arbitration the decision is usually 2-1 against them. The Municipal Council has suffered very heavily though this, so much so that they are afraid to hold an arbitration. A public body is usually regarded as fair game, and usually turns out 2-1 against the corporation. I suggest that some change be made in this, why not let the Governor-in-Council appoint the third? They would then be able to get a fair show. The City Council cannot get it to-day, in an arbitration they are always roasted, so I think that the third member should be appointed by the Governor-in-Council.

Hon. Mr. Winter: That is the case in the Highroads Commission, that is how they got fair play, but I think that here the Executive Government are ex-officio members of the Board of Control, and I think they will look after that.

Mr. Chairman, before the final Section is passed I would ask to have another Section interposed there. It has reference to the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company and the American Smelters at Buchans. As it stands now, this Bill would seriously affect them as regards the land which they hold in and around these places, particularly Grand Falls, where the Company owns practically all the land. I think it would be a little anomalous if the residents of that area, living on private property,⁶⁵ would be entitled to appoint a council which would have power to tax the property. It is already set forth in the A.N.D. Co. Act of 1905 as well as [in the] Corner Brook

⁶⁵ "Grand Falls and other sections controlled by the company were really the property of the company and ... it was unfair that people living on this property should elect a council which would have the right to tax the property of the company." *Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933, p. 12.

[legislation] that the property is free from taxation. Now, this Act is largely in the nature of an experiment, and whatever may be said for or against these companies, the suggestion was that we insert a provision in Section 87, under the title of accepted areas, whereby Grand Falls and the areas of Millertown, Angle Brook, Bishop's Falls, and Botwood, and finally that the Buchans area, and lands held under grant from the Crown, including mines, minerals, timber and water-power, be outside the jurisdiction of this Bill.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I have to take exception to this particular clause being inserted in the Bill. The original Act which created a sort of town at Grand Falls passed 28 years ago. At that time, municipal enactments went through this House more easily than they would to-day. For instance, the clause dealing with the Corner Brook area is not nearly so wide as that given to Grand Falls. The Bill already provided that only areas set forth by proclamation of the Governor-in-Council should be within the jurisdiction of the Act, so why anticipate that the Governor-in-Council is going to do anything wrong? It is improper from that standpoint to have the clause in the Bill. I have a shrewd idea of the shrewdness and the particular care taken, whereby there is no possibility of any rights whatever of the A.N.D. Company being infringed upon, and I do not think that we should be called upon to exclude something that we ought not to have. Why exempt 30 miles in diameter from all possibility of taxation, simply because the A.N.D. Company may commit a wrong by trespassing upon these rights? This company has a Bill before this House now, asking us to modify [the] conditions of certain licenses to cut timber, and now they want us to take out of operation a statute that which is in the interests of the public of Newfoundland, simply because they want to have the right to cut timber over it. In no event, Sir, should clause 8 be considered at all, and the whole Section should be thrown out by this House. I am not prepared to assume that the Governor-in-Council is going to do anything wrong, nor am I going to vote for any measure that is an insult to the Governor-in-Council, and, therefore, I move that the Section be deleted from the Bill.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, might we not minimize the strength of the section? I think the Company has a strong case so far as Grand Falls is concerned. Surely there would be a great hardship inflicted if the people were given the right to take over all those assets, and then tax the Company. It is unlikely that any government would proclaim property of this nature as being within the jurisdiction of the Act, still, the future might bring any kind of a government, and the Company desires to be on the safe side.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it be recognized that this Company came into this country in 1905 when the interior was practically a wilderness, and set up a modern city, made modern improvements and created a real country, and I think that whatever exemptions are given to them by this Act, that it should not cast any shadow upon them. I think we should rise the Committee in order to compare the clauses they have submitted with exemptions under the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Winter: Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a good one, and I entirely agree with the principle embodied in his objection. This is a case in which the subjects must trust to the sense of honour of a government, but there are subjects in this as in

other countries who do not see the necessity of such trust if it can be avoided. If no government would think of proclaiming those areas, then surely no harm could be done in expressly excluding them from the Act. This would make sure that no unreasonable party or over-zealous official could do any harm without anybody being aware of it.

Now, taxation is one of the most serious elements of this Bill. Both the Grand Falls company and the Corner Brook company may own timber properties in certain parts of the country, though not within those areas under discussion. I think the Hon. Member can appreciate the potentialities for danger that exist, and if that area in which there is the objection raised happens to be proclaimed, it is easy to see the possibilities to which it would be subjected. However, I am only throwing that out by way of illustration of the possibilities there are in an Act of this sort. I agree in principle to the objection raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and regret that these companies have not exhibited that faith and confidence in the rulers of the country which it is desirable that they should do. As the Hon. Acting Minister of Justice has suggested, we shall endeavour to find a solution for the difficulty that has presented itself by adjourning the sitting of the Committee until to-morrow.⁶⁶

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 to leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Speaker, as introducer of this Bill, I feel as if the Government may be complimented on having the courage to bring in a Bill in relation to salt codfish. It is the first time, if I mistake not, that a Bill of this nature has been introduced, and I hope that if we can only steer the Bill through the House, with the cooperation of all the members present, I am of the opinion, I say, that we will have accomplished something that will be of inestimable benefit to the country, and a great credit to the Members of this House. This important measure now before the House should commend itself to all the Hon. Members. As a matter of fact, the Salt Codfish Bill has always been sidetracked. I see nothing of an objectionable nature in this Bill. We are now doing only what the fishermen throughout the country have been continually asking us to do, and I think that the Hon. Members are aware that the fishermen are only looking to try to get a measure through, with our help, that will serve the best interests of the country.

If you will remember, Mr. Speaker, since the House opened the fishermen have been

⁶⁶ " ... all but one Section has been passed." *Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933, p. 12.

presenting petitions to the House with regard to culling, standardization, and regulating shipments abroad. They want to put out a better article of commerce, and to give our customers something like that which they have been asking for. The Bill calls for inspection, grading and regulation of shipments. We have an inspection for salmon, turbot, herring, and indeed for cod liver oil. There is no reason why we should not have an inspection on salt codfish.

We have lost our markets. There was a time when we sent 200,000 quintals of fish to Italy. Last year we sent only about 5,000 quintals. We have lost the Italian markets. Whether this has been brought about by our own faults, or by those who have taken our markets from us, whether by the Icelanders or Norwegians, I am not prepared to say. But the fact remains that we have lost our markets, and it is up to us, whether we be merchants or fishermen, to try and bring about a better cure and a better grade, to try and regain the markets we have lost.

We even have, Mr. Speaker, an inspection on cod liver oil, and there was at one time a great demand for it. But demand began to fall off because inspection dropped below the level at which it should operate. There is no reason why there should not be an inspection on salt codfish. There is nothing in this Bill to which any person or persons can take exception. We don't expect to do everything in one year, but we shall try to do our best, and make an honest attempt to do something this year to improve the cure of our fish and regain our markets.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, if I mistake not, when C. and A. Dawe of Bay Roberts shipped on or about 300,000 quintals of fish from Labrador. This year the total catch on Labrador was about 317,636 quintals. This is including Labrador Salt Cure and Labrador Shore. Something has radically gone wrong when a firm a few years ago shipped 300,000 quintals of fish, which is as much as was shipped last year for [all] the various firms of the country. In 1908 we had about 1,433 schooners prosecuting the [Labrador] fishery. That number has dwindled down year by year, until in 1932 we had only 303 schooners. So it is easy to see whither we are drifting. In 1931 we had 55 more. Those 55 last year taken away from the Labrador, left us with 303. This year we have more than that number prosecuting the fishery. Upon the fishery the life of the country depends, and it is my earnest hope that every patriotic Newfoundlander, whether he be a fisherman or an exporter, will do all he possibly can to cooperate in bringing about a measure which I hope will not only be creditable to the House, but will confer a lasting benefit on the country. This Bill, to my mind, is asking the cooperation of the exporters. It is asking them to meet the Government or deal with the Board in order to [illegible] out something which will prove beneficial to the best interests of the country.

Therefore in moving the second reading, I shall repeat what I have already said, that I can see nothing of an objectionable nature in the Bill and I give it my hearty support. When the Bill goes into Committee stage, if there are any objections or amendments I hope that they will be brought forward, and they will be adopted if they are necessary to better the Bill. I ask the cooperation of all the Hon. Members of the House in steering the Bill through to-day.

Capt. Whiteley: Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House on the second reading of the Bill now before it, but before doing so I would offer to you, Sir, my congratulations on your election as Speaker, since it is the first opportunity I have had of addressing the House during the present Session. I well remember as a small boy, in company with older boys, coming before the Bar of this

House with a petition asking for a swimming pool, and I well remember your honourable father speaking to the boys, and rebuking the older ones for appearing before this House at such a youthful age asking for government relief. You are here, Sir, following in your father's footsteps, and if you will excuse a personal note, within a few feet of where I am standing my dear old dad sat as Deputy Speaker. These men have gone, they have passed, their work is finished. But we are here, and in acknowledging our obligation to men of the past, it is sometimes a relief to turn aside from the beaten paths of [*illegible*] and refer to some fabric or some work that they did by their self-denying efforts as a best monument to their work. And as I view this country to-day, thinking of the heritage they left, and as a fisherman and thinking of this country and the spectacle it presents to-day, I feel, Sir, that every word we utter in their praise condemns our own [*illegible*].

Unhappily, the fishermen of this country are in a state of distress [and] some of the causes of that distress are within the power of the Government to remedy. We all know what effects distress produces on people, how it makes even wise men irritable, incredulous, and eager for immediate relief, regardless of remote consequences, and therefore it is no reflection on the fishermen of this country, who are not [highly educated], if I say that they are in distress and that the natural causes of that distress will probably be reflected. It makes them prone to believe those who would flatter them, and prone to disbelieve, distrust, and view with suspicion those who would endeavour to serve them.

I remember well in 1920 and 1921, when we attempted to introduce the Salt Codfish Act. When it was introduced, I passed through Gibraltar with 50,000 quintals of fish afloat, and when I reached Valencia, the vessels were there tied to the pier with an offer of 65 shillings, but the law forbade us to sell. Unfortunately, the sponsors of that Bill were unenlightened enough to imagine that they could control the market without holding even a partial monopoly, and to attempt to fix the price of fish in a foreign market.⁶⁷ When I reached Genoa, the West Coast vessels had been there for three weeks, and I was there on the morning when the news came to break the Regulations and sell the cargo. Mr. Speaker, if I live a hundred years, I don't want to see anything like it again. Men on their hands and knees, offering their cargoes at any price, to be told that the requirements were filled while we were waiting and fooling. Iceland and Norwegian steamers were rushing in and filling requirements. I was in the office of an Italian merchant in Genoa. He said to me, "Do you know that the man who discovered your country came from Genoa?"⁶⁸ Before you were born we were in the fish business. Who are these people who are holding up fish markets? Are they fools or lunatics?" I could only say, "I know one of them was an ex-telegraph operator."⁶⁹ He was a man who was used to bluff the Government, and had evidently carried the bluff too far."

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk on the street about this Bill, and you cannot wonder that the

⁶⁷ "At the time the Spanish trade was offering 65 [shillings] per quintal.- which could have yielded a profit to the exporters – but the law forbade them to sell. Iceland and Norway immediately rushed to fill the requirements and before our exporters became desperate enough the break the law, had practically booked all orders." *Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933.

⁶⁸ Zuan Caboto, usually known as John Cabot, who sailed to Newfoundland in 1497.

⁶⁹ A reference to William F. Coaker, President of the Fishermen's Protective Union, and Minister of Fisheries, 1919-1923.

exporters are viewing any government legislation regarding the fish with suspicion. I do not blame exporters for viewing this thing with concern and suspicion, because it takes two generations before people will forget that type of [bureaucracy] which the Salt Codfish Act imposed on this country. Government dispatches, official reports and daily press have always attempted to disregard potent facts. I have made a collection of some of these statements, and for the benefit of this House I will read them.

The majority of firms suffered heavy losses, and many became bankrupt.... Newfoundlanders must realise that the resources of the colony are definitely limited, and that the island is geographically handicapped. Government reports of official dispatches in [the] daily press have always tended to disregard potent facts and look forward to a Utopian future. I have made a collection of such sentiments. At first I thought them true, and later I knew they were not. Briefly, this is an example:

1903 - The fisheries of Newfoundland are the greatest in the world.

1905 - We must look to the United States for our future markets. The success of our fishery depends on the millions of America.

1932 - The wealth of our vast fisheries remains almost untapped. [*Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933]

Such statements, Mr. Speaker, are the result of wild imagination. They are not based on facts, but to a large number of our people they are as true as [the] Gospel. The fisherman thinks of the war prices. Good times are coming again if the merchant will act as an honest man, and not as a profiteer. If all would act righteously, the fish business would automatically adjust itself. That is the opinion of a great many people. You have not far to go to find current pronouncements that the [recovery of the] business depends on a change of heart of the individual. That the business depends upon the interplay of economic forces does not enter into the picture at all. It must be clear to every man in this House that there is no one in this country who can give us definite, detailed, accurate information regarding the needs of the markets to-day, or what those needs will be in the future. Therefore it is time that somebody took a hand.

I would suggest that as the industry depends on the Mediterranean consumers' market, a survey should be made to ascertain:

1. The extent to which increased competition has influenced the sales of Newfoundland fish.
2. What feasible plan Newfoundland could initiate to meet or reduce this competition if such a course was found necessary. If our salt cure industry needs rehabilitating, the start must be made in the direction from the consumer back to the fisherman.

3. Whether the lower prices that Newfoundland fish is now fetching in comparison with Iceland or Norway is due to inferior cure, or is it due to a number of causes.

The Government of Newfoundland has not sponsored any advertising of fish either locally or abroad, nor have private firms undertaken anything but mere price announcements. The only exceptions have been a few products displayed at Wembley, and poster advertising of Newfoundland salmon by the Empire Marketing Board. It would be interesting to have some expert opinion on the

possible effects of increased publicity.

It is unnecessary to comment that only persons of ability could undertake such a survey. On several occasions in the past, fishermen and members of the legislature have visited the Mediterranean countries and Norway. Their reports have afterwards been published, but the industry was none the wiser. [*Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933]

A survey of the fishing industry, to my mind, will produce little evidence that the fishermen of this country lack self-reliance or that they lack initiative, but a survey of the fishing industry will produce ample evidence that the fishermen of this country lack, and have always lacked leadership. That is what we want for the fishermen of this country with the exception of the Research Station at Bay Bulls. It bulks largely in the economic world owing to the large number of people employed for the size of the industry. This is our industry.⁷⁰

The position, then, is of a complex industry depending upon the changing tastes of the consumers' market and [influencing] the welfare of a large number [of people]. The depressed state of our people at this present time is mainly due to the trade's inability to anticipate changes in the trend of the consumer demand, and to keep step with increased competition. Our average catch for the past 100 years, I have got statistics for them as far as I could, and I find that our average catch has been 1,300,000 [quintals]. We have not altered from that. Iceland since 1918 has improved her catch by just that amount. Moreover, she has improved the standard of cure, and so sells the improved product to the same markets as we are. She is driving Norway out of the market, or she will soon.

On the charges of lack of cooperation, ignorance of the fishermen, the evils of the credit system, opportunism, carelessness, indifference [and] general apathy, the fishermen of this country have been indicted so often that we may be said to be perpetually on bail. There are all kinds of reports, people talking about the fish business and the fish market who do not know what they are talking about. I began fishing as a boy of fourteen and I have been at it all my life, and in speaking of that I would recall to this House the names of some of the men that taught me my business. It will show the House how far we have gone back. Men like Michael Jackman, father of the Minister of Finance at one time, J. J. Cullian, Black Jack Murphy, Big John Hawco, all these men from the West End of Newfoundland. Not one of them here now, all splendid types of men. One can't imagine them on the dole, they would die first. They are gone. I don't know where their descendants are.

It is no doubt true that there is some truth in some of the charges. Until the establishment of the Research Bureau at Bay Bulls, no attempt was made, it was nobody's business to take an interest in the welfare of the trade as a unit, or to attempt to solve the problem or difficulty. The government Department of Fisheries has never in my life, or my father's life, has never committed itself to a definite fishery policy due to several causes, which I will not go into this afternoon. Many of the difficulties which the industry now suffers would have been removed long ago, had there been a comprehensive programme indicating how to work, each in its own interests, incidentally with the

⁷⁰ "The fishing industry in any country, with the possible exception of Japan, has rarely attained a reasonably prosperous and self-reliant status. Although as often as not it looks very largely in the economic life of the country owing to the large number of people employed relative to the size of the industry." *Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933.

best interest of the trade of the country as a whole. I refer to the station at Bay Bulls, Mr. Speaker, as the only attempt to deal with the problem in a systematic manner, and that was only made possible by the generosity of the Old Land who undertook to defray half the cost. As a fisherman speaking for thousands of my fellows, I may say I am the only fisherman in this House in the business to-day or in the other House, speaking for thousands of my fellow fishermen, I say, thank the Old Land for her generous act. In this case she has been most generous, and we thank her.⁷¹

Mr. Speaker, one cannot but be conscious of the undercurrent of criticism which one hears directed towards the movement. I would not pay any attention whatever to such criticism, were it not for the effects of such criticism in the past, and the consequences of such criticism. We all remember when Sir Robert Bond instituted his model farm, well-equipped, but because somebody did not sell a piece of land, or because somebody, through political spleen or political expediency, call it what you like, it was wrecked, and to-day the call is, "Back to the Land." Back to that good earth of ours. Who can tell this House the benefits of the information we would [have] derived from that model farm, had it been allowed to operate and continue up to this day? We would not have to be sending away to Canada for every bit of information. You can't get a pig now, or a package of seed, without sending to Canada. We had it there, we had paid for it, but we let it go because of ignorance and foolish criticism. Mr. Speaker, I would say more and I would ask the reporter to take my words down very carefully: Damn the man or the body who, by ignorance, criticism, or foolish criticism, or spleen or party politics, or call it what you like, interferes with that work that is going on at Bay Bulls.

Now, after years have gone, this Government with which I have the honour to be associated are trying with their limited means to inaugurate an agricultural policy. The L.D.A. is behind it, the country and the people are behind it. As I walked from this House yesterday, down by the old railway track I saw men ploughing and sowing seed. I have never seen it before, a group of men sowing seed because they realized that the earth will feed them if they work it. Therefore I say that valuable information would now be at our hands if that station had been allowed to continue. I have no knowledge beyond that of reading the latest work that is free for every man who can read, but I do not know that the trade of the world has been altered by science, and that the trade and commerce of the globe have been revolutionized by science.

... and in no sphere has it done more than in the case of the fishes of the sea.

This island can undoubtedly support her population by fishing and small farming, provided the people are willing to forego some public conveniences and services that are too costly for the limited resources of the country to support. Newfoundland cannot afford to be up to date in all things – she cannot afford to be.

In a normal economic world the Colony can never expect to be very wealthy. But for the excessive exploitation of the past there would not be any privileged class at all in this country. The people are truly represented by the fisherfolk – the obstinate, conservative, warm-hearted peasantry.

⁷¹ "Sometimes we have been inclined to think the Mother Land somewhat harsh to us, her oldest born – but in this case she has been most generous and timely in coming to our aid." *Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933.

To enable these people to have a medium of health and happiness and confidence in their ability to solve their problems in a reasonable way – this is the public duty. All Newfoundland peasantry can be self-supporting in the same way that many are to-day. It will take personal attention and direction, but it can be done. To bring this about is the country's chief task.

More public good will come from such a condition than from any other source to encourage this new resourcefulness. The educational system obviously needs adjusting. How and to what extent is plain to some of the educational leaders. The charges of corruption and mismanagement directed against governments, however true, are also relative. Newfoundland affairs have rarely been wisely administered. Many of the colonial governors, such as Cochrane, Harvey, LeMarchant, were men of tact and ability, but the people themselves have never created a legislature which as a body supported and carried into effect a policy of wise conscience and deliberate management of this country's affairs. Every inch of progress has been accompanied by acts of either ignorance, incompetence, or downright fraud. [*Evening Telegram*, June 9, 1933]

I would like, if the House will permit me, to speak a few words on the side of the fisherman as he looks at this thing. In 1930 we got for our fish from \$6.50 to \$3.50 and we made heavy losses. In 1931, we got from \$1.25 to \$1.50 and we met other heavy losses. In other words, every quintal of fish that we produced cost us from 50 cents to \$1.00 more than we received for it in the local market. People say now, you will meet them downtown everywhere, "Go fishing, get ready for the fishery." It takes money to catch fish. You can't fish with your bare hands, you have got to have a fitout, and an expensive fitout. The fishermen might say, "We have carried on this business for three years and have lost." The time is come that the fishermen of the country are in the mood to say to us, and we can't blame them, "Skipper George, our money is all gone, our gear is worn out and we are wearing ourselves out, and are not making a living." And the time will very soon come, gentlemen of this House, when the fishermen of this country may say, "We will catch no more fish. Feed us and be damned." It might come, therefore it is time that we did something to rehabilitate our business.

The fishing business is a great concern. It is a man's job, a worthy calling. Our Blessed Saviour, when he was on earth, picked twelve from our ranks. It is the oldest profession in the world. It is not a weakling's job, it is a man's job. I have traveled this country from end to end. I know every harbour in Newfoundland. I know hundreds of fishermen, and I want to tell this House there are some splendid men connected with our fishery, but they are hopeless and helpless to-day. They cannot see, the future looks black, and I don't believe in my own heart that there is any Member of this House who realizes to the full extent the state that our people are in in the outports to-day. I don't believe the people of St. John's realize what the people of the outports are faced with to-day. Here we have a man with two or three sons. He has a boat, [but] he has not got a line or a hogshead of salt, and he is wondering what is going to happen to him. I don't know whether it is possible for the Government to advance [omission], but I verily believe something will have to be done.⁷² Give us a fair price for our fish, and the people of this country can undoubtedly support themselves by

⁷² "He did not know if it will be wise for the Government to guarantee supplies, but something will have to be done, as with the present price the fishermen cannot support themselves." *Daily News*, June 9, 1933.

fishing in small quantities provided they are satisfied, and they are, I think, to do without many of the public conveniences we now enjoy. We cannot expect to be up to date in all things. We know the Government is trying to reduce expenditure, although we think the reduction has been too much in some directions and not enough in others, as in the case of the closing of the schools, because, like the Scotchman, most of our people would go barefooted and hungry, but they want the child to go to school, and I say to this House, and I say to the Government, that it is better to build schools than jails, because if you close the school you open the jail.

I would make it clear to every Member of this House that we have no desire to interfere [with] or interrupt the merchants in their work. We want to help them, cooperate with them. We want to live ourselves, and we want them to live too, and if they think by the passing of this Bill any of their ancient rights are interfered with, it is time that they sat down and considered the position. The old exploitation of the past has a lot to do with the psychology of the fish merchants, and it is time now that we forgot some of those old traditions and the old ways. The schoolmaster has been abroad, and the young men are not going to do the same as we did. They want a better show, they want to see the price of fish, they want to know what the fish is worth in the market. They want to know when they are selling fish somewhere near the value. They want to know also, if it is culled from them on the barrow into the store, that it is not taken out from that store and sold for a different grade. I speak warmly on this subject because I feel, I know, that it is by the fishery, say what you will, think what you will, it is by the fishery, coupled with the land, that the people of the country must depend for their existence for the next few years. There is no other remedy. Therefore it behoves us, if we are to try and rehabilitate the fisheries, and this Bill that is before us is a very good attempt to do so, I will [not] say that by passing this Bill that we are going to raise the price of fish. I don't anticipate anything of the kind. I do say [that] by passing this Bill we will introduce something that will in the future help us on our way, and put our business back on a sure, sound footing.

I will not at present express any opinion as to the details of the Bill, but having during the past 24 hours given it my most earnest and diligent consideration – because if the fishery fails, and I fail, those depending upon me fail, and they are not a few – I have given it my most earnest and diligent consideration, and I have no hesitation in pronouncing [it] a wise measure. I will point out one thing, and that is this, that the success of the Bill will depend on the cooperation of the merchants and the fishermen. We want them to view this Bill in the most lenient, favourable way they can. We want to work with them, and if my voice could travel beyond the walls of this House, I would say to every fisherman, “Back up the board, lend a hand. Listen to the cullers and inspectors that go about. Try your best to fall in line.”

You cannot compel a man by law to wash his fish clean, unless he wants to wash it clean. Therefore we must have the cooperation of the fishermen in order to bring this Bill to a successful conclusion, and in this respect I think we are fortunate in giving at the wheel of the Ship of State Mr. Alderdice, who is undoubtedly the people's choice. I know there are times when he is labouring in heavy seas, and I know that his job is not an easy one, but his long experience with the trade and commerce of the country, and with people generally, will help to carry this country out of its present state, and so I would say to him, [*illegible*].

Mr. Earle: Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my hearty support to this Salt Codfish Bill, because I

believe that such a Bill is absolutely necessary in the best interests of the country. For many years we have been told of the troubles in the markets over our fish, but during the past winter we have had an epidemic of letters calling our attention to it. We also had returned from a visit to the foreign markets, Capt. Oldford, Mr. Davies, and Mr. Cardini, and they all showed us that our markets are going from us rapidly, and that it is essential for the well-being of the industry that something should be done to improve the cure. The other day I read that in 1885 Iceland, a competitor of ours, shipped 96,000 quintals of fish to Portugal. To-day they are shipping 1,500,000. That competitor has a standardized article and has government control. We on this side of the water have no accurate statistics, but we know from the records of old firms here that as high as 300,000 quintals of Labrador fish in one year used to be sent to that market, whereas only 325,000 quintals of Labrador and Shore combined were shipped there last year. It goes to show that by our haphazard methods, and by shipping inferior fish, that we are losing ground and losing our sales as regards Labrador fish, and to a great extent this applies to our Shore fish also in [the] Portugal market. We hear a lot of complaints about bulk fish in Portugal. Since 1927, our sales in that market have dropped by 200,000 quintals. Our friends and customers in different markets have been impressing these facts on us every year concerning Labrador fish, but nothing has been done to improve the cure, and that is the reason I am speaking to-day in support of this Bill. Two years ago a standardization Bill went through this House but was never acted upon, and I have a letter here now from a gentleman in Conception Bay emphasizing the need for the standardization of Labrador fish. As the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries pointed out, since the inspection on cod liver oil, more has been shipped because it is subject to government control and inspection, and this goes to penalize the man who does not fall in line.

Cases have been known where men pressed fish with dirty boots, and used large stones to pound fish into packages. We must consider that our fish is an article of food, and this Bill is meant to improve the quality and to assist the merchants in marketing their products. Some merchants think we are encroaching on their domain, because they had been shipping really good fish for which they had a market, and that standardizing fish would kill that market on them. Well, I happen to be dealing in a few commodities, which are house-marked, and it is usually the recognition and the reputation of that house-mark that commands a better price. The same applies to putting a trademark on codfish.

There is a cyclonic effect among Labrador fishermen regarding their spirit of dependency. They say they cannot catch, cure, and get a price for their product to enable them to meet what it costs them to produce. We, therefore, have a big problem there, and it will be necessary to devote most of our attention to the Labrador fishery this year. It will mean the establishment of curing stations so that floaters can come home and land their fish in a salt bulk state and with no risk to them, and the cooperative method will reduce the cost to improve the quality. There is a curing station already at Badger's Quay and there is need for a half-dozen more, and they are going to be established because I would give up a great deal before I would see the scheme we have in mind upset, owing to lack of funds. I am assisting this legislation, I am supporting this Bill to-day because I believe it will be beneficial to the fishermen and to the trade as a whole. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Bill.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, the subject now before this House is probably the most important one likely to come before the Legislature during this or any session in the near future. And it is for this reason that all of us who occupy seats in this House must expend all our energy and intelligence towards evolving some measure to save the fishing industry in this country. I use the word "save" advisedly, because what I have to say on the fishing situation of this country is not of my own knowledge. I am not a fisherman or an exporter, but what I hear on all sides of me is that unless something of a radical character is soon done, the fishing industry is doomed to extinction. For that reason I desire to voice something of the sentiments I hear freely expressed every day from all sides. As the member for St. Barbe has said, this is no occasion for the playing of party politics. It is not my intention to play party politics. My intention is to benefit a now-dying industry known as the codfish industry.

Doubtless, Sir, you and many other members of the House have been reading in the newspapers during the last few days a series of articles by one of the largest fish exporters in St. John's.⁷³ With many of the statements therein expressed I have to agree as to their truth. I will say that many of the statements in those articles are correct. With many others of these statements I fear I have to take exception. One outstanding statement there was, which is beyond the possibility of contradiction. In the expending by past governments of the various sums of money that now form the burden of the country's debt, a very, very small portion was devoted to the fisheries. Large sums of the borrowed money were spent on the building of highroads. Much of it was expended in building railroads. But the percentage devoted to the betterment of the fishing industry of this country was, comparatively speaking, insignificant. As the Hon. Member for St. Barbe has pointed out, the only substantial measure ever made was the inauguration of the Experimental Station at Bay Bulls, and that was made possible, as he points out, by the assistance of the British government. We, Sir, on this side of the House are entitled to a meed of praise, in that it was the late Liberal government who interested the British government in this project and got it started.

But I am not seeking praise this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. The fact still remains that our fishing industry is dying; our markets are lost to us, with possibly the exception of Brazil. In connection with this particular market, some of our exporters have formed a semi-cooperative system which has redounded to their benefit. But as far as concerns the Greek and Mediterranean markets generally, we have practically lost them, and our position is getting worse and worse each year. I am told (and this again, as much of what I am going to say this afternoon, has been told me by others) that the quality of fish sent forward is growing worse and worse every year, and various personages have been blamed. I remember talking to the late Hon. Philip Templeman in the Speaker's room some years ago, and we were then discussing the fishery situation at that time. The late Hon. Philip Templeman conducted a fishery at Bonavista. He was a fisherman himself and his father before him also. He told me that in the days of his early youth, in September when the fish would be beginning to be shipped, there was a period of excitement in Bonavista. He told me that the carts used to come up the road with the fish, and the roadway was blocked. One could not get up or down Catalina Road with the carts at that time. And when his father went home in the evening,

⁷³ A. H. Murray.

having got slips of the receipts for the fish shipped on that day, if out of twelve of fourteen quintals shipped there was a half a quintal of cullage, his mother cried her eyes out all day Sunday. But the carts go up, and instead of a half quintal of cullage out of fourteen quintals of fish, there are two, three, or four or five quintals of cullage, and nobody seems to care very much.

What is the cause of this situation? Is it that the fisherman is fool enough to make his fish badly instead of properly? Doesn't he realize that if he makes good fish, he ought to command better prices in the market than if his fish were bad? Doesn't he realise that the better prices he will get for his fish, the more money he will have for himself and his family for the coming winter? No, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid we can't blame the fishermen for the quality of the fish that is being turned out to-day. I'm afraid the tal qual system introduced by whoever it was has been at the root of our evils, and the reason why we get bad fish to-day. I've heard scores of fishermen talking about it, because I know the town of Bonavista. I've talked with hundreds of fishermen, and constantly I've heard the remark made to me time after time, "What's the use of making good fish, when you can get no more for it than the fellow next door who doesn't make it half as well as you?" If that is the case, somebody other than the fishermen is to blame, and for that system the blame lies at a door other than that of the fishermen or the exporter himself.

Let me illustrate. Some years ago, a friend of mine was appointed to act as an agent for a fish buyer on a large scale, and he received instructions that he need not be too strict on the cull. He bought 1,500 quintals of fish, out of which there were 150 quintals of cullage, and he had not erred on the liberal side. He thought he had been pretty strict on the cull. He came into St. John's and was here when the fish was culled on the premises of the principal. He watched the culling, and instead of 150 quintals of cullage there were 405 quintals, and he said to his principal that he thought it rather strange. He said, "I thought I was pretty strict, but you got three times as much cullage out of it as I got. You will lose money on that." "No I won't," he said, "lose money on that, nothing of the kind." "Well, how do you figure that out?" said his agent. "Well, this is how it is," said the principal, "I am not looking to cull out bad fish. I am looking for the good fish. I will get for the bad fish more than I will get for the good fish." Perhaps this is symptomatic of the system which seems to be tending to ruin the codfish industry of this country.

I am rather confused by some of the arguments used in connection with our markets. We were told a few moments ago by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe that we have to deal with the changing tastes of the consumers. By that I suppose he means that their taste changes from time to time, and we have to determine what type of fish will suit a given market in a given year. If there is any thing in that, the exporters will have a difficult time. The remarks of Mr. Earle do not seem to coincide with that statement. The Icelanders have standardized their fish, and have driven us out of the markets with a standardized brand. The two statements do not coincide. I am rather inclined to think that standardization by Iceland of their fish has caused our troubles.

Another trouble – and this is entirely the fault of the exporter himself – is that it appears these gentlemen, doubtless worthy citizens in other respects, cannot entertain any confidence in each other. I have no sympathy with them. They realize, they must realize, it must be driven home to them, that [the] constant dumping of huge quantities of fish into the markets is disastrous. They continue to do so because they think it is to their own interests in the long run, but because of the short-sighted policy of most of them in rushing to the markets with as large a quantity as possible,

and as soon as possible, to get the benefits of an early market. A gentleman here tells me, and so far as I am concerned it is only what I have been told, he tells me that fish is being sent over which is not up to specifications, about a very poor grade of fish being sent over. If that is so, we have to come to the conclusion that there is an element of dishonesty at work, and clearly that must be stopped.

It seems that the method of handling fish in these days is altogether wrong. I have been speaking to the older men who were foreign-going captains in former days, and they have told me that when they were out at sea, on fine days the hatches were taken off and the packages were taken out and scraped, so that each package got into the market in a right condition. But to-day not only has that not been done, but fish which in former days would not be put on board a vessel except during the very best of weather, is to-day dumped in the ship even in snowstorms. I was talking to a small merchant in St. John's, who told me of a case where fish was shipped out of St. John's, where the casks had to be dug out of the ice to be put aboard the steamer. This gentleman assured me of the fact, and said that he saw the carmen wet through from handling these casks.

Now to come down to the Bill before the House, it is clear that something must be done to better this situation which exists to-day in the fishing industry. An effort was made in 1931 by the late Liberal government to get the exporting merchants to act cooperatively. The Bill failed because of one particular section in it, which gave the exporters in any particular district the right to legislate themselves out of the operation of the Bill, if they cared to do so. I agree with the exporters. They were perfectly right. I was disappointed at the inclusion of that section in the Bill at the time, but I was powerless to do anything about it. However, I agree with the attitude of the exporters. The exporters in the East End were not going to operate under the Bill when those in the West End could do as they pleased. I knew that the exporters were not going to accept the situation at the time, and I would have gladly voted for the Bill, taking that section out of the Act altogether.

Apparently the exporters have taken a more or less supine attitude. They appear to be content to go along in their own way, and to see the markets continually disappearing. Now one reads the report of Captain Oldford, who has recently been visiting the markets on the part of the Government. I don't think he has told us anything new. In fact, if you go to the back files of the *Fishermen's Advocate*, you will find that it is what Sir William Coaker told us ten years ago, and he predicted that to-day's situation in the fishing industry was going to happen. Nobody heeded the warning then, and now that it has happened nobody seems to worry about it.

I want to draw to the attention of the Members of this House, and to any who may be within the sound of my voice, one or two features in this Bill which need careful attention. We are in this Bill attempting to regulate the cull as between the fisherman and the merchant, and the cull as between the merchant and the buyer on the other side. That is perhaps not correct. It is trying to regulate the cull as between the fisherman and the merchant, and to cull the brand of fish shipped out to foreign ports. Does that mean a dual cull? Does it mean that the Board would set up certain regulations, and send around cullers to see the fish pass from the fisherman to the merchant as Number One, Two, Three, Four or Five, and to see that the fish is to go out of the country branded as it is culled from the fishermen, or are to be different grades when it is being shipped out to foreign ports? Is it to be Number One, Two or Three Italian, or One, Two or Three Spanish when it is going out? Because it seems to me that the original cull should be the cull for export. That would give this

advantage, that the fisherman knows what he is selling, and that what he has sold goes to the consumer as he sold it, and that there has been no further cull on the product after he sold it to the merchant or fish exporter as the case may be.

A more serious point occurs in my mind, and it is this in particular [to] which I wish to draw attention of the House, and of those others who may be within the sound of my voice, because upon the cooperation between the Government and its Board (which will have the supervision of the carrying out of the provisions contained in the Act) and the exporters of fish in this country, will depend its success, in my mind. Apart altogether from the matter of the cull and the inspection, to which nobody can take exception, there is the question of the regulation of shipments. I agree that bloating of the markets has been disastrous to the codfish industry of Newfoundland [and] that in future small cargoes must be sent from time to time as required. It doesn't seem open to debate at all that this course should be pursued. Dumping of our fish in the foreign markets operates in exactly the same way as would the dumping of 20,000 cases of oranges in the City of St. John's in one week. As there are a number of exporters, and as each one of them will be trying to ship his fish first to the market, it is not very easy to hit on a satisfactory method by which dumping may be prevented. To me it seems that some system should be evolved whereby a determined quota would be assigned from time to time to the different firms exporting fish. The firm of Bowring Brothers, let us say, would be permitted to export so much this week to Oporto, the Board to determine the amount. The firm of Templeman's would be allowed to export a given quantity next week to Brazil, and so on. Or will one firm be given the control of a particular port, and another firm the control of another particular port? How is it to be worked out? In any case there will be vast complications, and [a] vast clamour arising if at any time a particular firm does not happen to have its quota ready at the time assigned to it for shipment, and can't ship at the time specified by the Board, there will be a scramble by the other fish exporters to take that firm's place.

I am trying to visualize the Bill as it will work out, and not as we would like to see it work. I am not trying to kill the Bill, but I desire to put in advance all possible doubt in the minds of the Members of this House, so that they can use their intelligences upon the prevention of even the remotest possibilities of friction.

While the Government, or the Board set up under the Act, will have control of the official sending out of fish, they will have no control of its production while it is in this country. Thus it will be controlled by the various persons and firms who have got it. We propose to interfere with the right of the individual to sell his product when, where, and how he likes. We can reasonably impose a restriction upon the quality of fish that is to go from our shores, but when we dictate as to the time it will go, we are dealing with divergent interests and we are very likely to be led into difficulties. There is room left open there for discrimination. That sort of thing has happened in the past, and it is possible that it may happen again. Isn't it possible (I throw out the suggestion here) to carry the idea a step further? Is it not possible to get the merchants to go into a pool? Isn't that possible? Because that will be the salvation of the Bill. Get the merchant to cooperate instead of competing, then success is assured.

We are told that "Competition is the life of Trade." That may have been true in the days of Adam Smith, who I think it was first crystallized the principle. It is an unutterable lie to-day. Economic conditions have entirely changed, and competition is one of the causes of the present

depression, as anyone who begins to think will realise. Take, for instance, one item, take the cost of advertising imposed upon industry – fancy the idea of advertising a production like gasoline. It is notoriously admitted to-day that the Sherman anti-trust law was one of the greatest farces that was passed through American halls. Competition is not the life of trade; it is the death of trade. Cooperation is the only thing that can save trade, and in particular the only thing that can save the fishing industry of Newfoundland, and with the death of the fishing industry this country and its people die also.

I do support the principle of this Bill. I feel that the time is long since passed when we ought to have acted in this connection. Ten, twelve years ago the matter should have been taken up. Now with the fishery at its last gasp, it is the least we can do. We can take no credit for it. We must make a desperate effort, we must make any sacrifice if there is any hope of saving the fisheries of this country. I am going to support this Bill. Whatever small intelligence I have is going to be offered to improve it, if I can. I trust the exporting merchants are in exactly the same frame of mind, and that the citizens generally will be prepared to offer either to the Prime Minister or any of his councillors or to any members of this House, any idea which they have in mind which may be of value, and which may assist us in the improvement of this most necessary measure.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has just stated, this legislation now going through the House is probably one of the most important [measures] that we have to put through this Session. It is to a large extent, in fact I might say wholly, the redemption of a pre-election pledge. When we went to the country we promised that we would take a real interest in the fisheries. The people used to say, "We are used to hearing that; we have heard that before." They would shrug their shoulders and say, "We will believe it when we see it." We were determined, and with your permission I would like to read the exact words I used in our manifesto last year; this is referring to markets (*reads*).

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill that is now before us is a fair indication of the fact that we are determined to carry out our pre-election promise, insofar as the fisheries at least are concerned, and that we are going to follow this up in every way possible, so that we may get the fisheries back to their old position when they occupied such a commanding position in the world, and where we had to a large extent the control of these foreign markets. If I were to call this Bill by any other name than the Salt Codfish Bill, I would say [the] Enabling Bill, to enable the merchants to get a fair price for their production, with the reaction of a fair price to the fishermen. Whatever we may say, the fisheries and agriculture are the mainstay of this country. They are the real producers of wealth insofar as we are concerned. Whatever other lines of industry we may take up, newsprint mills, mines, they are nothing more or less to a large extent than labour givers, and the profits leave the country, but in the fisheries or agriculture, whatever we catch or grow, we not only get the labour returns, but in addition we get the profits.

According to Mr. Murray in his admirable series of articles in the paper, the other day he stated that in eight years Iceland increased her exports by 50 per cent, from 1,000,000 quintals in 1924 to 1,500,000 in 1932. That should cause us to give very considerable thought. Why should Iceland be able to increase her catch by 30 per cent in three years, when the Hon. Member for St. Barbe stated that we had not increased our catch in 100 years by one quintal? There is something

radically wrong. It is our duty to work with the exporters and with the fishermen and try and solve this problem. It is a very serious one, and we must be very earnest about it. No politics must enter into it. The servants of the Salt Fish Board must be free of all political position. Political affiliations must have no consideration in appointing them. Fitness for their position must be the sole reason for appointing them. I want to assure the House, that is going to be the sole object in appointing them. Efficiency is the sole consideration. It is our desire that we may induce the exporting merchants to help us. We want to help them, and we want them to help us in solving a very difficult problem. I would like to feel that there were three partners: the fishermen, the merchants and the Government. We want to see the fishermen getting a fair return, because they will have a large purchasing power that will react in favour of the Exchequer. Last year the fishing returns were only around \$5,000,000; the year before that it was \$7,500,000, and it has gone as high as \$12,000,000. What a difference in the purchasing power when we exported \$12,000,000 worth of fish, and last year when we exported \$5,000,000. It gave very little opportunity for the fishermen to purchase, with a consequent reduction of the revenue.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition was talking about a pool. We have it in the section about the regulation of exports. Frankly, we can't regulate, but we can do our best to try and dissuade large shipments of fish [going] into the same market within too short a time period. We have had that exhibition on two or three occasions. I think last year or the year before, we saw a shipment of 13,000 quintals go into one port, and within less than ten days the same quantity went in by another steamer. We can't compel. We can try to dissuade people from acting so ruinously, not only to themselves but to the fishery. After all, to my mind, if the merchant pays a good price and gives the fisherman a fair return for his fish, I don't think it is any of our business if the merchant gives it away. It is our business to try and rehabilitate the industry, so that the fisherman may get fair returns for his labours and be able to live in comparative comfort. I said before, unless we have the producer, no matter what he produces, fairly happy and contented and fairly prosperous, we can't have a prosperous country. Prosperity springs from the producer, not from the merchants or manufacturers; it springs from the man who produces. These are the men whom we must look after. No industry can hope to get on unless that is the motto of the government, to look after the working man and see that he gets a fair return for his labours.

The first thing we have got to do is improve the catch, and we have got to have a uniform cure. I know certain men, some who are interested in the Labrador fishery who take infinite pains with the curing of their fish – would it be fair to ask them to pool with the men by buying fish that is very indifferently cured? Before we think of pooling we must get uniformity of cure. Perhaps we can get exporters to have sufficient faith to feel that they are doing it not only for the benefit of the fishermen, but of the merchants, and perhaps step-by-step we will reach the point where we can have a pool that will really control the export of fish. With the merchants with us in our Bill – I would like to read that section (*reads*) – and I wish to assure you that so far as the present Government is concerned, that if the exporters put forward strong reasons why a certain course should not be pursued by the Board, you can rest assured that it will receive very grave consideration.

Now, it is really interesting to those who know something of the past history of Iceland to remember that 25 years ago the conditions in Iceland were very much the same as they are here today. We had fishermen getting supplies by means of credit, hopelessly in debt, the merchants were

making no money – the merchants happened to be the Danes; they are not trading there now to the same extent. Conditions were very largely the same as they are here to-day. What a change now! Men get their supplies practically on a cash basis; they settle in six months; 7 per cent interest is charged, bank rate; they are able to give security; they have a very successful fishery, the cost of catching fish being sufficiently low to give them a margin on what they paid, what it cost. When times get better they will reap the benefit.

They pay \$1.75 for a hogshead of salt. We must strive to do something like that for our fishery. We must aim to get our men salt for \$2.00. We hear of this profiteering made in salt. I don't believe the importers are profiteering. I believe it is the foolish way of handling salt, it is handled too often. I think these charges of profiteering are not because any particular individual is making any unfair amount, but simply the salt is handled too often. My idea is that it should be taken off the steamer into schooners and shipped to Labrador without any further cost. It may be necessary next year; perhaps we may find it so this year, to make salt a government monopoly.

I do not think the merchants [*omission*] more. There will be fewer bad accounts and the fishery will be conducted on safe and sound methods. It will be a straight business proposition. Why should there be any objection to standardization? After all, the old saying is, "once bitten, twice shy." As has been pointed out already, when the Coaker Regulations of 1920 were enforced, several evils existed such as the fixing of prices, and the feeling that the Regulations were not carried out impartially, and for that reason there was a great deal of uneasiness and distrust. Then the Bill brought in by the last administration did not go far enough. In the 1931 Bill, the House witnessed the sad spectacle of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries introduce a section in the Bill so that it might be killed. What could the Prime Minister of those of any government do in a case like that? That was the local option section of it, and we had that objectionable section removed last year. All the Government of to-day asks is cooperation, and, if it gets that cooperation in the carrying out of the provisions of this Bill now before the House, it will be possible to drop government control altogether, so great will be the benefits derived.

I might say I do not know of any worthwhile commodity anywhere that has not standardization, and where government control has not the last say. Take the Nova Scotia Apple Company last April, that had practically two-thirds of their apples blown off the trees by a storm. They lost last year, but it is not going to be a continual loss because people have faith in their pack of apples. The one thing struck me in reading through Mr. Davies' report was (*reads*). In other words, in all merchandising the real secret is to create confidence in the mind of your customer, and then you have gone a long way towards keeping him your customer. When Mr. Davies was visiting the foreign markets he told [them] that there were going to be great changes in Newfoundland such as were never heard of before, and that there was a determined effort being made by the Newfoundland Government to help exporters with regard to standardization and cull of codfish, so far as purchasing fish from fishermen was concerned. If we have been shipping an average of 1,500,000 quintals of fish for the past century and never improved matters, it is up to the merchants themselves, I think, to make an effort to do it. This done, we feel that the government should give them the lead; but we cannot succeed if the merchants do not work with us, though I feel sure that the better sense of the merchants will prevail. The importers will select three or four men to sit down at their table and discuss prices and probabilities of the future, and how the markets stand. They will

have the strength of the government behind them, and that will be a great asset to them in their undertaking. I believe that the merchants will see the benefits of cooperation, and the fishermen will generally take control of their industry. I want to see this cooperation in evidence so that shipments can be regulated properly. If there is any deliberate underselling, the person who does it will not be given a licence [the] next year. An agreement is an agreement, and every exporter must have faith in their fellow exporters. I think this is their only chance, to get together and work in conjunction with the government. If not, then we will have to throw our hands up and say goodbye to Newfoundland. We want the fisheries, and when the fishermen come here next fall, I hope they will be able to come together and discuss in a confiding way the problems of this much-vexed fish business in a dispassionate manner with a view to remedying the prevailing evils. As Mr. Whiteley has stated, we are not going to improve the price immediately. We are going to have one of the most difficult years that we have experienced for a long time, as Iceland has a large catch of fish and is going to strain every effort to market it, and we will have to make a special effort too in order to get our fish to markets.

People have told me that Newfoundland fish is better in flavour, but that it does not look as good as that of Iceland. Some Italian importers said although Iceland fish was more attractive-looking, that they always ate Newfoundland fish; but that their customers buy by the eye. It only means that our fishermen make up their minds to make a clean-looking article, and it will be necessary to [see] what can be done for the fisheries by inspection. Only two years ago our oil was looked upon with suspicion, but after inspection came on it, the quality of vitamins was found to be the best in the world. With inspection and control applied to the codfishery, and with an efficient Board operating, whereby we can get our shipments regulated and products standardized, I believe that we will regain our lost markets. Then again, there are many markets we have not touched, and no exporter has the means to fight the markets of our competitors. In selling to those markets we have to a great extent to deal with the Spanish language. Now, I would like to see the Spanish language brought into the syllabus of our schools, as there is no language more important for our young men, who are going to take up the commercial life of the country so far as the fish industry is concerned, than Spanish.

Many possibly will consider that the Board will have too much control. No doubt there is a risk, but I would say that if any board or any government do anything detrimental to the fishing industry of this country, they will soon be put in their places. The fear in my mind is that if a board has no more control than some people suggest, that we would have a repetition of what has gone on for many years in the past. I am prepared to take the chance of having government interference, because I believe [that] if we are allowed to drift as we have been drifting, that it will be more disadvantageous to us. The fishermen are looking to the government to bring in legislation that will be beneficial to the country as a whole, and if this is not done the fishermen will be greatly discouraged. Many of the fishermen think they have been wrongly treated in the past with regard to the cull. Whether that is so, I am not prepared to say, but there is a spirit of suspicion and unrest among them, and their morale is shaken. The fishermen have to be convinced that they are getting a fair show, and once convinced they will stand with their backs to the wall and take as many hard knocks as anyone else and fight on.

Now, whether standardization can be applied this year remains to be seen. To my mind the

Labrador industry is the essential thing to concentrate on now, although the Shore fishermen are clamouring for standardization and cull. The reason for the decline in the Labrador fishery, more so than the Shore, is because it is subject to more competition from Iceland. Stress has been laid on the necessity of Labrador fish being washed clean and properly salted. That, in my opinion, is only a minor matter and can be easily adjusted by our fishermen. With regard to the price of salt, which seems to be a much-vexed question on the Labrador, the Board will have some control in that, and will be able to see that the fishermen get a lower price for their salt so that they can compete with Iceland. We have in this country a young generation of people who cannot emigrate, and on that account are anticipating development in our fisheries and agriculture.

I would finish by thanking the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for the way in which he has looked with favour on this Bill. I thank him still further because of the cooperation he has shown in his discussion of every Bill. Every time he has criticized, he has been constructive. There may be some snags in the Bill, but when we go into Committee, we will be able to straighten them out. I think it is going to pass this House on principle by a unanimous vote. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill on its second reading.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 22 George V., Chapter 12 (The Health and Public Welfare Act, 1931)" without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the 9th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Friday, June 9, 1933⁷⁴

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

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the financial clauses of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 59, Victoria Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Co.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, the Select Committee which has considered the petition of this Company,⁷⁵ with reference to their request for exemption from certain import taxes on their materials, has gone into the matter very carefully, and they feel that the requirements are too general and they have decided to restrict them so that there will be no possibility of, perhaps, materials of general use coming in duty-free. They ask in their petition (*reads*). The Select Committee has considered that is too wide, and they suggest the following amendment (*reads*). What prompted the Select Committee to have the items [specified], which the Company might get in duty-free, was the fact that when they got the report on what came in, it was found that they had got in roofing and nails, which was never intended. It was never intended that they should have such wide free entry, and the list as suggested now by the Select Committee comprises technical requirements and two-inch or larger pipes, which means trunk lines. They feel that the Company should not have the right to import pipes for houses free of duty. As I said, the list has been narrowed down, and I think that when such concessions are asked for in the future, that the petitioners should be asked to be very specific in their requests for free entries.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Financial Clauses with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Select Committee be instructed that these Sections as passed by the Committee now form part of this Bill, and that the said Committee make provision accordingly.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the next six orders stand deferred until

⁷⁴ The transcript for June 9 is particularly confusing.

⁷⁵ "... two years ago a Bill had been passed in the House exempting the company from paying duty on equipment, machinery, and materials and now the company requests an extension of a further two years." *Daily News*, June 10, 1933, p. 5.

later, so that we can take up the Salt Codfish Bill.

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 discuss the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay this Committee in reference to this Salt Codfish Bill. I have a few remarks to make, Sir, and with your permission I will read them. I have been in this House on and off since 1904, and this is the first occasion I have asked for permission to read any remarks.

I have been a fisherman ever since I was ten years old, and while I do not claim to be an authority on packing or shipping fish, I claim that I know as much about catching fish as any man in this country. Being a fisherman and representing a fishing constituency, it is only natural that I should be interested in this Salt Codfish Bill.

There have been many things which have led up to the Bill which we have before us to-day, and chief of which perhaps is the Coaker Bill of 1920. Now, I am not a supporter of that Bill, it had its good points and it had many bad points. That Bill was the cause of a great deal of suffering at that day. At the time we had something like the same condition of affairs as we have to-day, but depression is sometimes something of a blessing, and I am quite confident that when this country pulls out of the present depression, that it will be a great blessing. So too the Coaker Bill had some good points, [and] ever since that Bill was passed, agitation has been going on all the time until we have the result of that agitation here to-day in this Bill, and Sir, I would like to extend my congratulations to the Prime Minister in bringing in this Bill.⁷⁶

We have been termed a merchant government, but I say that merchants and fishermen must pull together or we will all go down in failure. Bad feeling between the merchants and the fishermen is not so bad to-day as it was several years ago. I have always mixed with fishermen and five years ago the majority of [fishermen] did not want to see fish culled, they wanted to ship it tal qual, and in that respect the merchants were equally as bad. But the past two years have brought a return of the culling of fish, and it was not until last Fall that the fishermen agreed with this cull. Consequently, now that the fishermen have fallen in line, I think this is an opportune time to have this Bill put in force, having for its object the strict inspection of fish and the improvement of the cure. I think, Sir, it is a good sign when you find that fishermen realize that they are to blame themselves, as well as the merchants, for the existing conditions in this country to-day. I have always found fishermen fair enough to admit to their faults. That being the case, and if they are satisfied to have their fish properly culled so that it may go to market under the standard, then I hope exporters will be prepared

⁷⁶ "Referring to the old Coaker Fish Bill he stated that there were some good points in it and some that were not so good, but one thing it had done was to begin an agitation for change which has been going on ever since and the present bill is the result of such agitation." *Daily News*, June 10, 1933.

to back up the Bill now before the House.

Take the Hon. Member for Fogo, who has been a fish shipper abroad for years, and like his father before him stood on the floors of the House yesterday and gave his whole-souled cooperation to this Bill. Well, if Mr. Earle thinks there is something that should be done to protect the greatest industry of this Colony, he is not going to support anything that will injure his business, as well as the fishermen, and I feel sure that there are a great many other merchants who believe that this Bill will be a great thing for the country.

A few days ago, I am sorry to say, I heard a certain gentleman remark that the fisheries were no longer the mainstay of this country, and that the pulp and paper mills were the bright hope for the future of this country. I heard that remark before, on an election campaign in 1919. Now, I hope any utterance I make will not be taken as political because, as I told my constituents, times are too serious at the present time to allow politics to interfere. I think, however, it has been proven conclusively during the past couple of years that, if the fisheries are a thing of the past, then this Colony is doomed to failure, because so far as the paper mills at Grand Falls and Corner Brook are concerned, they were unable to take care of their own people, let alone give employment to outsiders. Therefore, my opinion is that you can go back to the land and go back to your paper mills, but if the fisheries do not become more profitable than they have been for the past few years, there is no power on earth can save Newfoundland. I think it is the duty of every person in this country to do his utmost to try and bring about a better condition of fishery matters.

I have gone through enough during the past fortnight for any one man for 25 years. Fishermen, as good as were ever produced, have come from my District looking for supplies, and they cannot get even \$30 or \$40 worth, because the supplier undoubtedly thinks it's a losing game.

We have been told during the past two years that we have been losing our markets. There is not a word of truth in that statement; but if there is, then the records of the Marine and Fisheries Department for this year are a pack of falsehoods. I have heard it said that we had lost our markets altogether in Greece. According to the Marine and Fisheries report, we shipped more fish to Greece last year than for the previous eight or ten years. The same applied to Brazil, where more fish was shipped within the past two years than for many years previous, so that what was lost in the Spanish and Italian markets was made up for in the others. The great trouble with the fish problem is not with what markets we have lost, but with not having extended our markets, as well as with the fact that we have got too careless over the quality of fish we cured. Another important factor that will have to be remembered, is that an effort will have to be made to either lessen the cost of making fish, or increase the value of it.

The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who spoke yesterday, stated that whereas formerly there were 1,400 schooners prosecuting the [Labrador] fishery, last year there were only 303. If that is correct, and I know that it is, then that is a large reduction in the number of fishing schooners. You could go down to the Labrador around 25 years ago and there were some 50 or 60 crews down there; come further up to Cape [omission]. In Bay de Verde District, where there were about 50 or 60 crews, and these crews averaged four, five or six men to a crew – where are they to-day, those men who carried on the fishery in those places in former times? At the present time there is not one solitary fishing vessel catching fish on that shore. We come further up to Indian Harbour, where formerly there were 70 or 80 crews, to-day there are four or five. That goes to show that the

motor boat used by the fishermen of this country has increased the catch at least 50 per cent. If we had no motor boats operating in the fishing industry, the total annual catch of fish would be around 600,000 to 700,000 thousand quintals. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I am going to read part of my speech (*reads*).

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not altogether say that a good number of fishermen have not tried their best last year to make their fish as good as possible; but conditions in this country, especially among the northern fishermen, have changed considerably during the last fifteen years in regard to getting their fish made. When I first took a vessel as master 25 years ago, I came off the Labrador with 10,000 quintals of fish. I tied my vessel to my own wharf. I cleaned and spread 300 quintals of waterhorse fish at one time. It was all made under my supervision. It was caught under my supervision and made for market under my supervision. I watched it at every step. I saw it as it was being spread, and I watched as it was taken up. I watched it carefully all the time then, but what did I do during the last three or four years I was fishing? I came home with 100 quintals of fish, and I had no flake but I had to put my fish out [to] between 25 and 30 people to make it. I had to put it around in different hands, and a good many never had a store to put it into; and the same thing that affected me affects 99 per cent of the fishermen in the outports at the present time. And even back as far as Lord Morris's time, in the last four years of his administration I predicted it. If he were here to-day, he would tell you that I told him then, that the fish cure of this country was going to decline as years went by. I told him the reason why, and I said that the day was coming when the only chance to make good fish to send to the markets of the world would be by curing stations. And I am glad to say in one respect that I have lived long enough to see the story that I told Lord Morris come true. You can teach the fisherman, and pray to him to make good fish, but he has no more to do with making it than a man who has never seen it.

I was in contact three years ago with some fishermen in a schooner, and they took the same care as formerly of the fish from the time it came out of the trap, but they are not to blame for the making of bad fish, because the making of it is in the hands of other people. These people had no flakes, they had to spread it on rocks, sometimes on grass with mud over it. What we want in the country among Labrador fishermen is curing stations. I am glad to see that Mr. Monroe had the energy to start one in Bonavista Bay. It probably cost a lot of money, but it turns out good fish. If he has not already been paid for his energy and initiative, it will not be long before he will be paid twofold for taking up the proposition of trying to make good fish. This Bill has my hearty support, and if anyone sees some flaw in it, or something that's not up to his expectations, let him consult with the Prime Minister and the Government. All are prepared on this side, and I feel sure that the two Hon. Members on the other side are equally prepared, to give their best effort to try to make it as perfect as possible. Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman, for these few remarks of mine.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: For the information of the Honorable Members, I might say that certificates will be issued to the exporters, and they shall be governed according to the regulations made out by the Chairman of the Board. Before they can export any fish to foreign markets, they will have first to have their fish inspected, as will be seen in the following section.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There's no principle in the Act that lays down that the fish must

be inspected before it goes out.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It's in Section 4, sub-section (d).

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The Bill contains no provision whatsoever for the prohibition of the export of uninspected fish. Isn't this section a provision merely to give the exporter the benefit of government inspection if he wants it?

Rt. Hon Prime Minister: There will be no inspection tax this year. It is our hope that some of the exporters will be induced to submit their fish to inspection. And when the inspected fish goes over, they will be so pleased with the result that they will be convinced that it is to their own interests to submit their fish to government inspection.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: We hope to apply more or less all our attention to Labrador fish this year.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If you can do that, you will be doing a great thing.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: It is our intention to send down assorters to travel the Labrador coast, to go among the planters and see that they are going to take more care of their fish, and see it going aboard of the schooners. I have had considerable experience in making fish. During the last six or seven years I have made thousands of quintals. It was under my own supervision, and it always turned out to be a genuine article. I never had a complaint. There was always a demand for Monroe's fish. That brings me to the point where I say that we want somebody down there watching it, and if we don't have somebody down there, there is likely to be all kinds of dirt going aboard.⁷⁷

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: S[ection] 4, what does that mean?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The idea is that the government mark will be on the cask of fish, and if the exporter wishes to get a certificate of inspection, he can get it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That section I am afraid is going to cause a lot of trouble. It appears that it will prevent any man who has not got a premises, including stores and wharves suitable for storage, handling, packing, and shipping of fish, being a member of the Association. In other words, he is not allowed to export. Perhaps the Minister will give us an explanation of the reasons behind that.

⁷⁷ "On the matter of salt he pointed out that the Department had a scientific test taken of all the salt, and it was found that the Hamburg salt was the strongest and most suitable for Labrador fish. Torreveija salt was next, then Cadiz. Salt that had come from Port Said, he had not received any report of yet. It was of the Malagash salt that complaints are sometimes heard of as being dirty." *Daily News*, June 10, 1933.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: (*Reads communication from the Board of Trade.*)

We are not going to use any of our power to appoint members of this Board. The members of the Association will meet and they will discuss the most competent persons to occupy these positions. It will be absolutely free from all political influence. Whoever obtains an appointment on this Board will be there solely on his merits as a man who understands fish and everything in connection with the fisheries. A very estimable man might be suggested by the Association who might not be very keen on this Act at all; he might not be actually hostile, but he might not be as helpful as he could be. The appointment stands in the hands of the Government. We invite the cooperation of the Association by their suggesting whom they would like to see occupy these positions. The Minister feels the same as I do in this matter. I thought it would give greater influence to our statement if I made it as the Prime Minister and in the presence of the Minister, that we are prepared to consider only merit in the appointment of these men. The position is that we have already invited the members of the Board, and we are going to invite them again officially to suggest whom they would like to see there, but we cannot give them the power that they shall be appointed on nomination of the Association, subject to the approval of the Governor-in-Council. A situation of [*omission*] might be created. We are just as much entitled to that fear, as the Association are entitled to the fear that we might appoint inappropriate persons to the Board.⁷⁸

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: As I understand it, we have the small man going around underselling in some cases, not in all cases, and perhaps who have not got suitable premises for packing fish. That may or may not be the case, but I know of cases. I would not for a moment penalize the small man from getting a living. Every man is justly entitled to a living and to do business; yet that small man can become a member of the Association provided he can get somebody else's wharf or store for packing fish.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: There is great difficulty here that is going to inflict a hardship on the man doing a very useful business. As a matter of fact, I have a section to be added here to 81. It is too wide. I will read it (*reads*).

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and

⁷⁸ "... the Government will consult the members of the association and ... Mr. Stone and Mr. Davies will discuss with the association, the most competent men for the Board.... An amendment was inserted in section 8 of the bill which gives the right to the Board to license brokers." *Daily News*, June 10, 1933.

Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. Secretary of State presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Clarenville Light and Power Bill as follows:

9 June, 1933

Mr. Speaker:

Your Select Committee appointed to consider the merits of the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to Clarenville Light and Power Co. Ltd." beg to report that they have considered same and recommend that the Bill be proceeded with, and that it be submitted forthwith to a Committee of the Whole House:

(Sgd.) J.C. Puddester

W.J. Browne

H.W. Quinton

J.G. Stone

F. Gordon Bradley

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to the Clarenville Light and Power Co. Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to the Clarenville Light and Power Co. Ltd." was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Secretary of State, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea 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.⁷⁹

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Secretary of State, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, Deceased, of a Licence to Cut Timber."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture of Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, Deceased, of a Licence to Cut Timber" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Render Certain Abandoned Lands Available for Agriculture."

⁷⁹ "Some amendments to [the War Pensions Act] had been made in accordance with the wishes of the G.W.V.A." *Daily News*, June 10, 1933, p. 5.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I had not examined the provisions of this Bill up to the present reading. I suppose the Bill can be regarded [in] some respect as a step in advance, but I am very disappointed in it. It is not the Bill I expected it to be. I was looking for a Bill that would render available to persons who want land to use and live off it, land in places where it was at the present time held by persons who are lying upon it like a dog in the manger.

Hon. Acting Attorney General: Confiscation.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Confiscation, yes, that's, you will remember, justifiable confiscation. I saw an article in the paper the other day where a person was selling some 60 acres of land on the Topsail Road for \$1,000. I don't know where the land was. It was not cultivated land, probably it was land to which the axe had never been put, except to cut down wood for firing. The owner of that land has acquired it for next to nothing, he has never done anything with it, he never intends to do anything with it, but it has increased in value covering a period of years by reason of the fact that a town has grown up around it. There are many such cases even worse in my District, a man can't even get a square of land to grow a barrel of potatoes, while there are large tracts of land lying idle in the hands of people who are holding on to them in the hope they will become valuable. It is regrettable that the Government has seen fit in its wisdom to restrict this Bill. As it stands now, it may help possibly a few, but there is [a] complicated legal procedure to be gone through. It refers only to abandoned lands owned by people out of the country, and fails to measure up to the necessity of the times. Any interference in the vested interests is considered objectionable, but the community has a vested interest in every asset of the country, and these people should be compelled to give up these lands unless they intend to utilize them, not as it is now, let them hold on to them in order to mulct some citizen in years to come. I am sorry that the Bill falls so far short of the necessities of the times, it is like the step of an infant in swaddling clothes, and not of a sovereign legislature.

Hon. Acting Attorney General: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that I cannot subscribe to the sentiments of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he advocates confiscation of lands not used for agriculture. He speaks of unearned increment. Upon whom is he going to blame that? Take the case he speaks about on Topsail Road; that condition of affairs exists in every part of the world to-day. I remember reading a short time ago a satire of Hilaire Belloc about a loss over a will, and it was only two acres situated at the south of The Strand, and he said: [*omission*].

It is the same in New York. In fact, the same applies to any commodity to which an increment is attached, for example, take the case of money in a bank. I agree, however, that land given out for agriculture should be used for agriculture. That such is not the case is the fault of previous governments, but I do think that a certain percentage should be developed every year. I agree also that the same hold for timber lands, but I do not agree that the people who gave these lands out were not as patriotic as my learned friend opposite. They thought that what they were doing was in the best interests of the country, they thought that was the best way to develop the

country. They did not reckon with the unscrupulous into whose hands these lands fell. This Bill is only a beginning, and I think that we should not be too hasty. I know a man who has a quarter of a mile of land, and he is developing it gradually and he hopes that his sons will carry on and develop the whole of it. There are plenty of lands still held by the Crown which are available for those interested in agriculture, and I think that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines can vouch for the fact that in some sections of the country, there are large tracts of land which are valuable for farming in one of its branches. There are many branches yet untried in this country; we don't want to grow all potatoes, we should be able to export our potatoes instead of importing them. There is no need of confiscation. We have 6,000,000 acres of land in this country taking out water and mountains, etc., and there are millions of acres still suitable for agriculture. Why take people's land from them? If a man gets \$1,000 for a piece of land it indicates the value of the land at the present time. If my learned friend purchased any article and the price rose the next day, suppose he were fortunate enough to buy Lake stock a couple of years ago when it rose from \$5 to \$40, would he not feel that he was justified in taking the price offered for it?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There is just one word I would like to say. People holding large tracts of land at or near settlements should be compelled to work them or give them up. The Hon. Minister shies at 'confiscation' but the principle is in use in England to-day. Take the case of large tracts kept for shooting grounds; the people owning them are forced to give them [up] owing to the heavy taxation. I am not suggesting that the same can be done in Newfoundland, but if the land is worth anything at all we can tax him and force him to work it. This idea of confiscation is put in force by the most conservative government on earth.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: I myself am a bit disappointed in this Bill. The idea [was] to make these lands available to the people for agriculture. I am socialistic in my ideas in this respect, but I do think that agricultural lands which are not utilized by the owners should be taken from them, and passed over to someone who can do something with them. However, we must be grateful for small contributions, and I promise this House that next year I will have an amendment to this Bill which will go nearer the idea we have in mind. I am hoping to get from the Government a small grant for a purpose of sending a couple of competent surveyors throughout the country to find out what lands are held up. I don't agree with the idea of a man holding a mile of land and cultivating an acre. At least 25 per cent should be cultivated. In the first two years 10 per cent should be done, and in five years, 25 per cent should be done. That should be the principal with regard to large tracts of land which are now held up. This practice of a man holding large tracts of land and not setting even one potato patch should not be allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Render Certain Abandoned Lands Available for Agriculture" was read a third time, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20, Geo. V, Chapter 9, entitled "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public" with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Amendments are as follows:

Section 1, Sub-section 11 (1) (a)

Insert words "fair and reasonable" between the words "fixing" and "maximum."

Section 1, Sub-section 11 (1) (b)

Insert words "fair and reasonable" between the words "fixing" and "maximum."

Insert as Section 12 of the Bill the following:

"No decision of the Commission fixing maximum tolls, rates, fares, premiums, prices or other charges shall become effective until two months after details of same have been published in the Royal Gazette."

Re-number Section 12 of the Bill as Section 13.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Amendments are as follows:

Schedule "A":

At the end of paragraph 1 (dealing with vessels from 20 to 30 tons) insert the following words "Timber framing not less than 5 inches."

At the end of paragraph 2 (dealing with vessels from 30 to 40 tons) insert the following words: "Timber framing not less than 5 ½ inches."

At the end of paragraph 3 (dealing with vessels from 40 to 60 tons) insert the following words: "Timber framing not less than 6 inches."

At the end of paragraph 4 (dealing with vessels from 60 to 90 tons) insert the following words: "Timber framing not less than 6 ½ inches."

At the end of paragraph 5 (dealing with vessels from 90 tons upwards) insert the following words: "Timber framing not less than 7 inches."

Paragraph 19, second line. Delete the word "highwater" and substitute therefor the words "light water."

Schedule "B":

Paragraph 10 (dealing with "the frame"). At the end of paragraph 10 insert the words "and of sizes as per schedule 'A'."

Schedule "C":

Paragraph 7 (dealing with "the frame"). At the end of paragraph 7 insert the words "and of sizes as per Schedule 'A'."

Schedule "D" - Second Line:

Strike out the words "and not more than 150 tons gross" and substitute therefor the words "and the Government shall not be called upon to pay bounty on more than 150 tons gross".

On motion, consideration of the foregoing amendments was deferred until to-morrow.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Annual Report of the Bureau of Education 1931-1932.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, the 12th of June instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Notes on Codfish Bill⁸⁰

A former Minister of Marine and Fisheries remarked in his report that it was probable that the fresh fish business was capable of great developments, and that we ought to look to that for our future markets. Apparently he was under the impression that salt codfish was going out of favour. This is not so. Our salt codfish business has been established since the first discovery of this country, and there has been no substantial diminution in the quantity exported during our long history. It must be recognized that salt codfish is much easier to handle than fresh fish and, in addition, it is more valuable as a food, as the flesh of the fish is retained in a concentrated form. The trouble with our fish business is not so much that we have lost our markets, but that we have not extended them, and due to high prices in some years, fisherman and merchant have in succeeding years become more or less indifferent to the quality. If our table of codfish exports for the past ten years is examined, and analysed, the most striking feature to be observed is the tremendous drop in the value in 1932 over the average for the preceding years. For example, the value of fish in 1932 was less than 50 per cent of the value in 1930. Taking into allowance the unfortunate exchange situation, it must be admitted that the quality of our fish, and the superior quality of the fish of our competitors as regards appearance and manner of packing, are largely responsible for our losses. If, however, we have lost ground in certain markets, we have gained them in others. We have lost very considerably during that period of ten years in Portugal, but we gained in Greece where we were supposed to be excluded altogether long before this time. In Spain we have also lost considerably, and in Italy to a large

⁸⁰ These "Notes" appear at the end of the transcript. This seems to be an addition to the remarks of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, above, p. 255.

extent. We have, however, increased our exports to Brazil 100 per cent more than what they were ten years ago. What we are all concerned with is making the fishermen prosperous, and that can be done in two ways, by lessening the cost of making fish, or increasing the returns when it is sold. The first method is very important and can be brought about in many directions, particularly in regard to the supply of salt. It cannot be said that the salt has reached the fishermen who intends to use it in a direct way, so as to make it reasonably cheap for him to buy, and there seems to be as much reason, if not more, for the Government to take over or to grant to some person a monopoly in this commodity. By development of that other industry to which the Prime Minister has referred, in which all the returns of profit are retained within the country, namely, agriculture, it is not impossible that within the next few years the fishermen will be able to purchase his pork and his beef, and a good deal of his other supplies, much larger than he has hitherto done from the products or our own country.

In regard to the sale [of] fish, the effect of a steamer taking a large cargo, such as 20,000 quintals, to one market must be a bad effect upon the general prices, and I trust it will be one of the duties of the Board to eliminate as far as possible large bulk cargoes of this kind being rushed to market, for it must be recognized too that several cargoes leaving about the same time for the same market is as serious as a very large cargo going there.

Now, one feature of the development of the Iceland export trade in codfish is to show us in a most convincing manner that a much larger market has existed in Europe for the sale of codfish than perhaps we ever recognized or realized, and if what we are continually being told is true, that our fish has a better flavour and is more desired, then the problem is very simple. The demand for the fish is there without a doubt, and what we have to do is simply this: Take care of our fish in the making, the curing, the packing, and as far as we are able see to it, that when we sell our customers fish supposed to be of a certain quality, we will stand behind that fish and, if he has any complaint to make, satisfy his complaint.

The purpose of this Bill is first of all to improve the quality of our fish, so that we may get a better price and increase our sales. It only means that we intend in the future to give our customers better treatment and cater to their tastes.

We are all anxious to see the codfish business regain its former importance. I do not think that it is hard for us to do this, provided that we all cooperate, and this year, as it is too late now for us to do anything else, I trust the merchants who have made their wealth out of the fish business will not be too hard-hearted in supplying men with whom they have been dealing for years, and who have hitherto acted honestly in their dealings. If they do not curtail their supplies to the fishermen, they will win the confidence of the fishermen before the voyage has begun. The fisherman will respond to this treatment, and I feel every confidence that he will do his part to make good fish, and to bring about the success of the cause that we have at heart.

Notwithstanding anything that may have been said by other Honourable Members, I am convinced that Newfoundland is recognized the world over as the greatest codfishing country, and if we lose that reputation it will be entirely due to our own neglect.

This Bill has the greatest possibilities. It is a pity that former governments neglected to bring such a Bill into force, but now that we have it before us, let us give it careful study and attention, and when it is passed let us all unite in a common effort and see to it that this year's fishery will see the

beginning of an upward trend. It will mean more than prosperous fishermen and prosperous merchants. It will mean a prosperous country.

Monday, June 12, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Mr. Browne from Bell Island, re Customs Duty.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the miners at Bell Island on the question of duty on seed potatoes which they are paying this year. I might say that last year the crop of potatoes at Bell Island, like in other parts of the country, was very much affected by blight, and this year, despite the very hard times and the very short period of employment they have been receiving – two days a week – they formed a branch of the Land Development Association, and through that Association purchased over 1,000 barrels of potatoes for seed. Other parts of the country, however, did not purchase on the same plan, but promised to give back some in the Fall of the year. The miners consider this is placing a great hardship on them and they now ask that the question of a remission of duty be taken up. I might say that I am very much pleased, and I am sure people all over the country are [too], to realize how the miners are responding in view of the pressing times we are passing through. Last year over \$20,000 was given out for poor relief by the last administration at Bell Island, and this year the total amount under that head will not exceed \$5,000, and a great deal of that is attributable to the strike that took place last summer there. At the present time there are very few families on the dole at Bell Island, and it would be a source of much encouragement to those men, and help them out in other ways, if the prayer of this petition is given favourable consideration.

Committee of the Whole on Supply, deferred.

Council's Amendments to Shipbuilding Bill, deferred until later in the Session.

The amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 20 Geo. V., Chapter 9, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public'" were read a first time, and the second reading of same was ordered to be deferred until to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, in so far as the insertion of the words "for" and "reasonable" between "fixed" (*reads section*). We take that by inference that the Commission will do nothing but fix a fair and reasonable price, but I do think that the postponement of the action where unfair prices are found to be charged to two months is too long. Two weeks is ample, and I move that Section 6, or the words where it states two months be altered to two weeks.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am not familiar with the conduct of trade ordinarily in this country, being a lawyer and not a merchant, and though I have every respect for the honourable gentlemen who sit in the other Chamber, I have to reserve my opinion, however, as to their views on this particular Bill.

I take it the idea behind the whole Bill is to fix prices so that the public will not be mulcted, and I do not know what idea is behind the amendment. Where the Commission finds that dishonest prices are being charged and that the fair limit is exceeded, that such corporation or individual should be given a further two months to continue cheating is beyond my understanding. I think that the provisions of the Act should come into effect immediately after the Commission makes its findings. What justification is there to permit it to continue after it has been discovered? I submit that the amendment is wholly unreasonable and that the Bill as drafted is correct, and I am not able at the moment to improve on its form. I do think that the very instant it is found that any corporation, firm, or person is charging the public more than a fair profit upon some article supplied, that it should be stopped instanter. There is no justification to permit such corporation or person to continue the robbing of the people for an instant. The Prime Minister is inclined to compromise and there is possibly some reason behind his attitude. Maybe he expects that two weeks will be accepted by the Upper House, and he will get the Bill through. If he should insist that it go through as it left this Chamber, the Upper House might fail to let it go through. While I can't agree in principle with the idea that these corporations, firms, or individuals should have two weeks longer to rob the public, yet I suppose that much compromise is necessary to get the Bill through, and in view of the fact that the gentlemen in the Upper House are prepared to permit it to go on for two months I suppose that it is necessary that this House should agree to two weeks, and the gentlemen in the Upper House will probably be prepared to let the amendment be made to two weeks.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: I am not aware of the motives behind the amendment, but it seems to me that if the Commission sitting to investigate the prices of commodities hearing evidence will take some time to come to a decision, therefore how are they going to make it known to the public immediately? How long should that take to do? It is impossible to give force to the suggestion of my honourable friend that it should come into action immediately.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Sub-section (3) tells when it comes into effect. It's the Commission which decides that, and they know best.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: However, it's quite conceivable that if a merchant is dealing with some commodity in other parts of the country, he wouldn't be as quickly notified of the findings of the Commission as those residing in St. John's, so some time should be fixed. Does not my honourable friend think that the period of two weeks is not unreasonable? Although it seems as if it is looking for further time to defraud the people, that is not the meaning of it at all. There might be great inefficiency in the sale of a commodity, and the Commission might say that although the corporation or individual is not dishonest, yet [it] should be able to sell for less. For these reasons I think that my honourable friend will be able to see the position of some definite time being fixed; although the Commission have power to set a time.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I presume the idea is that as soon as the Commission has reached its findings that they will be published immediately, and two weeks after that they will come into effect. Surely then, after the Commission has published a notice that certain prices are too high, there is no

need of the public buying. The reason I viewed the amendments in a spirit of compromise was that I thought a half loaf was better than no bread.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: According to sub-section (3), if you are going to fix the time to two weeks you take it out of the hands of the Commission altogether, and, under the circumstances, dealing with commodities or services rendered the public, two weeks might be too little or too much time. We are not surely going on the basis that the Commission is going to deal partially with either consumer or seller. We must go on the basis that they are going to be fair and reasonable, and, as the time when regulations are going to be brought into effect will vary considerably, I think the matter of time should be left entirely to the Commission to decide.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Take fire insurance, for instance, it would be absurd to say that rates would be altered within a fortnight.⁸¹

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House for report. Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. Mr. Walsh, Hon. Acting Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Winter, Mr. Bradley, Dr. Mosdell.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, that Bill has been on the Order Paper for some time. It will be remembered that it was referred to a Select Committee who reported favourably upon it back to the House. The Bill is merely the matter of taking authority to issue a licence to the A.N.D. Company for two areas of lands in White Bay. One was formerly controlled by Dr. Mooney, and the other formerly owned and controlled by Dr. Stafford. The A.N.D. Company bought those areas a year ago, and they now ask to have a license issued to them, but they ask to be exempted the clause in the licences regarding the erection of saw mills, as the purpose they want the area for is to secure raw material for their mill at Grand Falls. I do not think that any Hon. Member can have any objection to this Bill, and I therefore move the second reading of it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: This is just the point. There may be no objection occur to any

⁸¹ "Hon. the Prime Minister dealing with amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Public Utilities Bill which recommended a period of two months' delay be granted after it became known that the seller of an article was overcharging for goods.

"Hon. the Prime Minister stated such an amendment was contrary to the views of the Government but he would consider a delay of action for two weeks.

"Mr. Bradley supported the Bill because he believed the Government brought it in to prevent the people from being mulcted and was of the opinion that no time should be considered. There was no justification for robbing the people for one instant, even for two weeks, but if a stated time must be considered he would support the Prime Minister's amendment to the Legislative Council amendment. The matter will be dealt with to-day." *Evening Telegram*, June 13, 1933.

Member of the House, but the question is why [should] it be done? These licences were issued in the ordinary way to the holders, binding them to pay certain rentals and to comply with certain provisions of the Act. Then the A.N.D. Company acquired the licences as they then stood, and they now ask free gratis to be relieved of the obligations contained in the licences which they purchased. Why? What do we get in return? Why relieve them of the obligations? They knew what they bought when they bought it, so why relieve them of their obligations any more than you would any other person? If the Company had shown that they needed the timber for their paper mills at Grand Falls there would be some justification, but I think it is another case of land grabbing.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: It must be remembered that all lands acquired since the original grants were issued to the A.N.D. Company were on condition that saw mills were to be erected on them, but no saw mills were ever built on them. The licencees just held the lands and paid their rental of \$2 a mile each, and the first opportunity they got to benefit themselves by transferring their lands they did so. The A.N.D. Company in the past increased the capacity of their mill and it is not unlikely that in the very near future they will further increase their output. Consequently, as business people, they are continually looking around for raw material to feed their mills. So far as the Department is concerned, we are anxious to collect all the revenue we can and by the A.N. D. Company taking over these licences the department will benefit to the extent of \$2,000 a year.

I think, so far as I am concerned, in dealing with the A.N.D. Company we have found them always an honest and decent company. This company has not made any unreasonable demands on the Government. The A.N.D. Company are only trying to provide for the operations of their own mills. They are a bona fide company. If the A.N.D. Company wants to cut a couple of thousand cords of wood in White Bay, I feel it is far better to tell them to go ahead. Now that we have acquired that thousand miles in White Bay, we should see that the company or companies cutting there should cut for their own mills. I am glad to see that we have acquired that piece of land in White Bay, because it will be a lever to curtail the indiscriminate cutting going on for the past 30 years in the so-called fishermen's limit.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts'" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This is all new legislation. I wonder might the Hon. Leader of the Opposition cares to have the second reading postponed?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Can you give me an idea of what is behind it?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Section 33 is much too narrow. Practically every government went beyond its scope. The present section reads as follows (*reads*). I understand that the words here "required for the public good" are read within the narrow confines of repairs to public buildings. We had a case in point when we thought it a matter of great urgency to get the men to the fishery and had

to make the usual guarantee, but we found from the Department of Justice when application was made to pay those who would give supplies to reimburse them for their loss, that it was not within the confines of Section 33. As a matter of fact, when we were paying it, we were not living within the limits of Section 33. We would be making illegal payments. The idea is not to make it easier to get money, but to make it so that we will be acting within legal limits. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition prefers to delay this legislation, although I would much prefer to go ahead with it, I don't want to rush the matter. I am informed by the Justice Department as to the words of the present section, that where a legal phrase of a general nature follows a phrase of a particular and definite nature, the general phrase is confined and delimited by the definite phrase. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition and the legal gentlemen on this side of the House know much more than I do about legal phraseology. Our idea is not to make it easier to spend money between sessions, but to make legal what expenditure happens to be necessary and which was formerly done illegally, so that there may be no possibility of illegality in this government. We have now a better safeguard than ever before in the Controller of the Treasury, and he has to sanction any expenditure before it is made.

The first section refers to borrowing money to pay previous borrowings. That does not apply now because floating loans have been converted into statutory demand loans.

The next section deals with the case where expenditure has been authorised by the Legislature but sufficient funds have not been provided (*reads section*). That is to provide for a case where no sufficient funds have been voted. Section 2 refers to the subject of expenditure where there is no legalizing provision made (*reads*). I myself, and my colleagues, and I am sure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, do not like to do anything to open the door to give increased authority to spend money. But there are times when the spending of money without the authorization of the House is necessary. If there is any suggestion forthcoming from the House which will still give the Bill this elasticity which we are looking for without risking the undue spending of money, I assure the Hon. Members that I will be glad to consider any such suggestion. It has taken considerable time to draft this Bill, and the Justice Department feels that it has got it down to the narrowest limits.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult naturally for me to assimilate the provisions of the Bill in the few moments I have had to examine it. Under other circumstances I would fight it most bitterly, but we have an official now who is legally independent of the government in the Controller of the Treasury, and am I correct if I say that any expenditure of this kind can be prevented by the Controller of the Treasury?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Yes.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If I have that assurance, I am quite willing to let the second reading go.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill has the approval of the Controller of the Treasury and of the Auditor General.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of

Lotteries” was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: This is an amendment to the Lottery Act which was asked for by the Committee in charge of the Regatta. I am sure the Hon. Members realize the great benefits in relaxation and a holiday for the poor man which the Regatta gives, and as there's no one who would like to see this ancient pastime discontinued or hampered in any way, I am sure this Bill will have the support of the Members of this House.

The difficulties of financing the Regatta by public subscription last year compelled the Regatta Committee to enlist the assistance of the Great War Veterans' Association, from which contribution a certain percentage went to the boat clubs. In former years the boat clubs were financed by the various athletic clubs and charitable institutions in the City, and there was far more enthusiasm manifested then by the younger and older generations. Competition was keen from year to year; so was the interest of the public in this event. This had an effect on the generosity of the public asked to contribute. The Regatta Committee feels this year that it is justified to ask the House to make an amendment to enable them to operate wheels of fortune at the Regatta, which will be devoted to paying expenses at that day. The boat clubs are not able to operate unless this is done. The amendment has been drawn up very carefully to give a permit to the Committee in charge of festivities on that day. They have made a provision for the payment of persons who operate those games of chance, but there will not be permission given to the Committee to take money from persons to allow them to run wheels of fortune on their own; and when we go into committee I am going to suggest a slight amendment to the Section which will cover that, if it should be found necessary. It is not intended as a reflection on the good faith of the Committee in charge, but because we have heard so many reports of people operating wheels of fortune on their own. I was speaking to the President of the Regatta Committee a little while ago, and he assured me that the Committee was anxious to prevent gambling on a large scale. There will be a maximum of so much per spin, and it is not likely to exceed a shilling. There is no one here I am sure, whose objections to gambling are so pronounced that he will object to wheels of fortune run on that small scale when he realises the great good that is done and so little harm. This is the only amendment now proposed to be made, and I trust the Hon. Members will be able to support it. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I take it every member of this House who has been residing in St. John's for a number of years has every possible sympathy with the Regatta Committee. In years gone by, the citizens were in a position to contribute. They took a great interest in it, but those days have since passed and I have no objection to the Bill before the House authorizing the Regatta Committee to operate wheels of fortune on Regatta Day.

But in connection with lotteries, I wish to draw a matter to the attention of the House and to the Acting Minister of Justice, in the hope that something will be done. I speak of the game known as housie-housie. It isn't a moral question with me at the present moment. It's a financial question, and I have been told by people who know, of instances in this town during the past two or three years where persons who could ill-afford to spend money have been visiting these cursed halls

where the game is conducted and have of course lost money: 99 out of 100 lose. You can't beat a machine. The machine always wins. People who have asked for money to buy food have been followed down town after they got the money, and have been found in these halls playing housie-housie, and I think that it is high time that that particular game should be stopped. Is there any possibility, I ask through you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, is there any possibility of getting a section inserted in the Act to stop the game of housie-housie altogether? Unfortunately it's the poor people who engage in it, and I think that it is in the interests of the community that the game should be put a stop to at once. I propose that the Acting Minister of Justice should put some section in the Bill which would destroy the game of housie-housie altogether. Nobody has any objection to wheels of fortune on Regatta Day. That is our annual Derby Day. But the poor people of the City are attending these housie-housie games six nights a week, week in and week out, month in and month out. It is time that this House took cognizance of it, and attempted at any rate to prevent it, particularly in times like these.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill. It is unfortunate that the Regatta authorities have to have recourse to gambling to defray their expenses, but perhaps it is excusable. I think it would be lamentable if we had to discontinue the Regatta. It is the poor man's Derby, we might say, and I repeat it would be most lamentable if it had to be discontinued. The only reason for the Bill is that those who have been given charge of the operating of the Regatta say they are unable to carry on it this Bill is not passed.

I quite agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in so far as housie-housie is concerned. I have never played it, and I have often wondered why it exercised such a peculiar fascination over the minds of so many people. It is not like the Regatta where the wheels of fortune are running from seven o'clock in the evening til twelve o'clock at night. I have heard of a case of a man who lost as much as \$5 in one night, and he could ill afford it. I don't know if it is necessary to introduce legislation to ban housie-housie, but it seems that it should be in the power of those who give authority to those men who are raising money by this game to say "No" if they think it is detrimental to the best interests of the community to run the game.

*Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of the Select Committee on Gas Light Bill, as follows:
Mr. Speaker*

Your Select Committee appointed to consider the merits of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Co.'" beg to recommend that the Bill be proceeded with and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole forthwith.

*(Sgd.) F. C. Alderdice
W. J. Browne
P. F. Halley
G. G. Byrne
F. Gordon Bradley*

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a

Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 59, Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Co.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I think that the House generally understands that the St. John's Gas Company are asking for exception from duty of certain articles. The Committee says they should state definitely and categorically the articles which are to be free from duty.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Co.'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion, the Amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" were read a first time.

On the second reading, the said Amendments were agreed to with an amendment, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the concurrence of that body in the said Amendment.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: The Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked me to deal with the question of Legislative Council amendments to the Shipbuilding Act.

(Amendments read by Clerk.)

The principal amendments in point of view of number are not of very great consequence. To Schedule A they have inserted another specification dealing with the size of planking that is used in vessels of various classes and in connection with the quality of timber used outside. The Act as it went to Council read: (*reads*). The nautical experts have altered that to "light water line" instead of "high water." I understand that when a ship is laden the Plimsoll mark is sometimes referred to as highwater; when light the mark is sometimes known as light water line.

Schedules B and C they have made corresponding changes in the specifications dealing with the freight as I referred to in the first. The most important amendment that they have suggested is incorrectly, inadvertently I presume, set down. Dealing with the Schedule D which refers to vessels of not less than 100 and not more than 150 tons gross, they suggest that these words "not more than 150 tons" be stricken out, and that there be substituted therefor: (*reads*). That would be incorrect to put that in Schedule D, because it would not then be part of the Act, and therefore that would have to be inserted in Section 3, sub-section (8). It is the intention of the Government and of the Department of Marine and Fisheries that they would not prevent a man from building a vessel of greater tonnage than 150, but if he does so, he does so at his own risk and the Government will not pay a bounty. I suggest that the amendment be stricken out and that Section 3(e) should be made an amendment (*reads*). Then in Schedule D cross out "not more than 150 tons gross."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Financial Clauses of the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Advantages to the North West Products Company, Limited."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: On the motion to adjourn, I would like to refer to a matter which has given rise to a good deal of disquietude in one of our northern outports, towns, I should say.⁸² Some people, perhaps through ignorance or perhaps through malice, have been spreading the report that it is the intention of the Government to seize the people's savings in the banks to meet the interest at the end of June. I have been warned by the officials of one bank that they have had several of the depositors come to them to them to withdraw their deposits. It is hardly necessary for me to contradict this wild statement. It is not within our power to seize these savings. We have no intention of making a capital levy to pay the interest on our bonds. I think we have given very ample proof of the fact that we are more solicitous of the welfare of our people than we are of the bond holders, and I must give credit to where it is due, that in every instance where we asked the banks to relinquish some of the Special Customs Act that was established from the beginning of July for the bond interest, every time we made application to the bank for the return of that money so that we might apply it to the payment of dole orders, they have given it to us. Not once have they refused us. In every case we got the money and got it promptly. A few days ago we got \$200,000. It seems too bad that people either through ignorance or through malice should be spreading such reports. It creates uneasiness in the minds of people about their money in the Savings Bank, because naturally every man if he has \$100 thinks it is his \$100 that the government is going to take to pay the interest on the bonds. I mention it here; it is almost too absurd to require contradiction. If we let that report go abroad without contradiction people may say there is some truth in it – our silence gives credence to the statement. Here is what I received from a reliable party from one of the northern towns (*reads*).

⁸² *The Evening Telegram*, June 13, 1933, identifies the town as Bonavista.

Therefore, I am informing the House in particular and the people of this country [in] general that it has never even entered our minds that we could attempt to take the savings of the people. I would not do it in any case, even if we had authority. I think the bond interest must be met out of current receipts; if not, somebody must go short. As for taking the deposits of the people, this Government has never considered it, and I am speaking in this way from my place here so that my statement may get the widest publicity. I was going to ask the person in charge of the public messages that he would incorporate a few words to that effect to-morrow morning.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, the 13th of June instant, at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday June 13, 1933

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries."

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 in relation to the Royal Bank of Canada Loan of 1931.

The Legislative Council's amendments in the Public Utilities Bill were read a second time and agreed to with an amendment in which the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, yesterday we considered these amendments made by the Legislative Council to the Utilities Commission Bill, and I now move that Section 6 be deleted and that in its place Section 3 read as follows: *(reads amendment)*.⁸³

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines presented the Report of the Select Committee on Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company's Bill, as follows:

Mr. Speaker,

The Select Committee appointed to consider the merits of the private Bill entitled "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited" beg to recommend that the Bill be proceeded with and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider same presently.

(Sgd.) W. J. Walsh

W. J. Browne

H. M. Mosdell

H. A. Winter

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

⁸³ "Hon. the Prime Minister dealing with the proposed amendment to the Legislative Council's amendments to the Public Utilities Bill, moved that Section 6 of the Bill be deleted and that in its place the following be added to Section 3: 'Not less than two weeks after the date such rule, regulation, or order is made by the Commission.'" *Daily News*, June 14, 1933, p. 5.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I have not had as much time as I would have liked to examine further into the subject matter of Section 2 of this Bill. I can quite see the idea behind the section itself, and it is probably a proper one up to a certain point, because from the cursory investigation I have made, Section 2 is an infringement of the rights of this House of Assembly. It is a basic principle of constitutional government under the British Crown that the control of financial expenditure is vested in the House of Assembly alone. Under Section 33(b) of the Audit Act, exception is made when emergency cases arise in connection with the public service demanding immediate attention and when public expenditure can be made, such as repairs to public buildings and the like. But the voting of moneys is the clear undisputed privilege of the Commons and should not be infringed upon, except in cases of absolute necessity.

Under sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 2, we find that the Governor-in-Council, with the minister of a department and the Controller of the Treasury have the right to make any expenditure they like whether it came before the House or not. This gives to the Governor-in-Council the right to make any expenditure they wish whether it has come before the House or not and to any amount, if in their opinion it is in the public interest. It is a clear infraction of the rights of the House. It's for the House to say what moneys shall be expended and how much, and only in cases of particular emergency has this Assembly permitted any handling of that duty by the government. The government is left the remedy of coming into the House in an after Session and stating what they have done and have it legalized by a vote of the House. But they always take the risk of maybe not obtaining the approval of the House afterwards. There was always that check on the right of the

government to expend.

Let us look for a moment at the wording of sub-section (2). If the subject of the expenditure is one for which there is no legal provision made, the House will never consider the matter at all – there is no expenditure even contemplated in any way. (*Reads sub-section (2)*). Now there we have a situation where a matter may come before the government which never was in the contemplation of the House at all, and which for passage or putting into action requires only the vote of the government, the Controller of the Treasury and the minister in charge of the department to which the matter relates, to make an entirely new expenditure for which the House made no provision.

I venture to state an opinion on the situation created by this new Bill (and I do not stake my reputation on it). I am not sure that that is not capable of keeping the House closed forever. I will state it again. I am not sure but that the legal interpretation which may be placed on this Bill now before the House is not capable of keeping the House closed forever. Does this House propose to hand over all its rights to the Governor-in-Council in that way? I don't say that the Governor-in-Council intends to keep the House closed. I don't say the Governor-in-Council is going to do it. I don't say that this or any government would dare to do it. It's the principle of the thing which I uphold.

This Bill is handing over to the Crown one right which this House has always demanded for itself, namely the authorization of money to be expended out of the revenues. I have to take exception to this Bill, and I do not take it in a spirit of animosity. I don't think the Government can regard my attitude during this session as antagonistic. I have always endeavoured to give fair and just criticism and be helpful in the promotion of the business of the House. And I want to impress upon the House the seriousness of the proposed invasion of the inviolable, inalienable rights of the Commons, and I suggest to the Prime Minister and to the Government that it might be advisable to have the Committee rise and further consider the matter, and see if they cannot put some clause in the Bill which will not legalise the taking away from the Commons its sole right.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, when I proposed the Bill yesterday, I said it was a dangerous measure, and that it might open the door too wide. We ourselves have not that intention, but as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, if we open the door too wide we might give future governments the chance to make an unwarranted expenditure of the money of the country. When we were discussing the introduction of this Bill, my colleagues and I were of that opinion too. The Justice Department found it extremely difficult to draft these sections so that the door might be opened, but not too wide.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Make it an annual Act, and you will cover the situation. It can, and will have to be enacted every year.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The honourable gentleman will understand that we sit here for two months out of twelve, and often things happen which make it necessary to make unauthorized expenditures. And as a matter of fact, so far as able-bodied relief is concerned, every government was spending that money illegally. I might say in passing that nobody, not even the honourable gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, is more jealous of the rights of the House of Assembly than

I am.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I realize the correctness of the view outlined by the Prime Minister himself. On many occasions in my ten years of experience we have been compelled to go outside the law, but as I pointed out we always had to come in and face the Assembly with the illegality on our shoulders. Now as for this Bill, as I stated before, it may do away with the right of the House of Assembly to meet any more. I suggest that it be made like the Army Act of England – an annual Act. If it is made an annual Act it will do this much. It will compel the Governor-in-Council to open the Legislature every year. The Bill is now proposed to give the Government an opportunity of doing things properly. If the Act is made an annual Act, the rights of the House of Assembly will be protected.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I am much obliged to the honourable gentleman for his suggestion and I ask one of my legal friends to give the verbiage required to make it necessary to pass the Bill every year.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If I can give any assistance, I shall be only too glad to help.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It is not necessary to have the Bill pass this afternoon. I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On 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 Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, since our last meeting I have had a number of conversations with different people, particularly in connection with the debate here yesterday on the game of housie-housie, and I have had related to me some terrible stories in connection with the conduct of this game in the City.⁸⁴ People relate instances which show the strange unaccountable

⁸⁴ "Mr. Bradley said he would vote for the Bill, but reiterated his objection to the housie-housie game ..." *Daily*

fascination which this, to my mind, foolish game exercises over the minds of some people. One story was to the effect that a person had actually sold some of the home furniture to get money to go down to play this foolish game. Another story is told about a woman who went to her grocer and got a dozen eggs on credit for which she was charged 40 cents, and she sold them to a next-door neighbour for 30 cents to get money to go down and play the game of housie-housie. There are scores and scores of stories of a similar character. I know these games are conducted for the most part in the interests of charitable institutions. It is the only excuse that can be offered for their existence. It is not a reason. I believe that the bulk of the citizens of St. John's to-day would welcome the abolition of this game of housie-housie. The community are obtaining money for charitable purposes from people who are themselves much more in need of charity than these institutions; and in submitting this amendment I trust it will go far to rid this City of the menace of housie-housie. I realize that some games of this kind are going on in the City to-day, and that fact gives them a certain vested interest which we cannot ignore. For that reason my amendment will be postponed in its effect until the first day of December. It reads thus (*reads amendment*).⁸⁵

Mr. Chairman, I move that it be Section 2 of the Bill now before the House.

Mr. Starkes: I second that, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: I know my honourable friend is feeling pretty badly about the question of housie-housie, and I believe there is something in what he says. I have heard of similar circumstances – of one man in particular who mortgaged his furniture to procure money to buy tickets for housie-housie. But I don't think that human nature has changed much since that game came into our midst, and I am not ignorant of the story of the merchant some years ago who sold his furniture to engage in gambling. I don't see how my learned friend is going to stop gambling by cutting out this game of housie-housie. After all, one game of chance is not very different than another. Wherein lies the difference? Surely the man who can't afford to take a ticket on a wheel of fortune at the Regatta does deserves the same amount of consideration from my learned friend as the one who goes into a game of housie-housie. Surely there is no distinction. Surely my learned friend's heart is not softened to the habitue of the roulette wheel, and hardened to those who engage in the game of housie-housie.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: My objection is taken solely on economic grounds and not on moral grounds.

News, June 14, 1933, p. 5.

⁸⁵ "On and after the first day of December, 1933, it shall be an offence against the Lotteries Act to conduct or engage in any form of the game commonly known as housie-housie. Any such offence shall be tried summarily before a magistrate upon the complaint of any person, and upon conviction the offender shall, for each offence, be liable to a fine of not less than \$50 and not more than \$200, and in default of payment to imprisonment for a period of not less than one month and not more than six months." *Daily News*, June 14, 1933.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Neither have I seen any reason or any statistics showing the economic loss resulting from the abuse of this game. I must say that I cannot see where the difference is morally, economically or in any other way, between one form of gambling and another. As far as I am concerned I cannot agree with the amendment. I might say that there is nothing at stake in this Bill as far as this Government is concerned. I have been asked to introduce this Bill on behalf of the Regatta Committee. When it comes to gambling I might say that I enjoy gambling in some forms and not in others. My distaste to it is because of the same reason as my learned friend gives, it is economically bad. I might at the same time ruin myself at playing poker or in the stock market. But because we don't enjoy that form of amusement, why interfere with others who do? If it's not drinking, then it's gambling. We are always interfering with the rights of others. A while ago we had a discussion on the right to search motor cars. I am not going to bring that up again, but at that time we listened to a lot of tosh about the liberty of the subject. Well, is there anything more intolerable than interfering with the pleasures of the person? Surely the limited number of people who drive motor cars in this country cannot be compared with the large number of people who amuse themselves at the game of housie-housie. It is not dangerous. Is it wise or just (and we should always try to combine wisdom with justice) to make a specialty of this form of gambling? I noticed by the papers a few days ago that the report of the committee appointed by the British House of Commons to investigate into gambling was to the effect that they did not favour the taking of any steps by the government; and, the report continued, if there are going to be any steps taken, let there be a state lottery.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't know but that I would agree with that.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: My honourable friend is of the same opinion as myself on that point. But if he is in favour of a state lottery, he is not consistent with the opinions he has expressed in favour of the abolition of the harmless game of housie-housie.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, nobody has heard me in this House say a word against gambling. As I said a few moments ago, it is not my part to force my ideas on religion or morals upon the people. If a man chooses gambling, that is his business providing that it does not affect the economic stability of the state. But when it is to the detriment of the state an entirely new position arises. It is not to gambling itself that I am objecting. It is the effect upon the community – the economic effect on the community – upon which my objection is based and that of 75 per cent of the people of this City to-day. If you were to take a plebiscite upon it, I venture to say that you would get 75 per cent of the people to vote to kill the game of housie-housie in this City. My learned friend suggests a comparison between poker and housie-housie. It is entirely different. The unfortunate woman who comes down with the last cent she has in the world to play housie-housie would never waste that money on poker. It's the picking up of the few pennies of the poor that I am objecting to, and the result is to throw them on the dole. I know instances of persons who are on the dole playing the game of housie-housie in this City. These institutions who receive the proceeds of these games have doubtless a good intention in taking this money, and are undoubtedly accomplishing much good with it, but they are taking this money from the very people who can least

afford it, and as a result they are throwing the expenditure on the government of this country. And God knows, we cannot afford any additional expenditure.

Regarding the liberty of the subject, a man is welcome to engage in any pleasure so far as I am concerned. If he chooses to view gambling as a sin, and frankly I don't know that it is, he may do so without interference. As long as the other man's opinions are right, he is right as far as I am concerned. My point is that these games of housie-housie are taking the money from the poor, and should be stopped considering the economic situation. If there were plenty of money flowing and there was nobody on the dole, as far as I am concerned they could play that game until the cows come home. It's because of the peculiar fascination that this senseless game, as I see it, exercises over them that I object to it, and that is the reason why I want to see it stopped. If you destroy the game there is nothing in the city that can take its place. There was never anything like it here before. There is no game like it to pick the pennies out of the pockets of the poor.

I wish it to be understood, Mr. Chairman, that I am objecting solely on economic grounds. My opinions on that subject are the same as they are on the liquor subject. The only question which can rightly be taken into consideration when discussing either of these subjects is the economic question. The only thing which gives me, or any other man, a right to interfere with another man's pleasures, is when he is causing himself to be a nuisance to the rest of the community. These people who are deprived of their pennies by this senseless game are thrown in a large measure on the state for support. I don't know if you gentlemen have listened to some of the stories I have heard. Due to the position which without merit I occupy, I have had the opportunity to know what goes on. I have heard of children of eight or ten years of age walking into these halls at 11 o'clock in the night to ask their mothers to go home. These unfortunate people go in to those halls with the last cent they have in the world, and which they owe to the grocery on the corner. I heard of one woman who had \$5 to pay her grocery bill, and she went into one of those halls on her way downtown, and played housie-housie and when she left she had no money at all. Those persons are a burden on the Government of Newfoundland, and I want to take that burden off. I have no axe to grind. I am not hitting anybody. I am not trying to prevent anybody gambling. I think I shall gamble if I want to do so, and if the law allows me, or I won't go to any church at all, if I like. I would like to see this game stopped, and that is why I promote this amendment. I intend to support this Bill itself in order to give the Regatta an opportunity to finance its proceedings. But these wheels of fortune at the Regatta are only for one day. But these games of housie-housie are going on night after night, ever since those scoundrels from the United States of America introduced the infernal game into the country. I would like to see it destroyed and once and for all.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Chairman, I was not in the House when the Hon. Member moved the amendment to the Bill yesterday; but I have since heard what he said in connection with the same, and I entirely endorse all he has said as far as the game of housie-housie is concerned. Money is taken out of the pockets of those who cannot very well afford it when they go into these halls to play housie-housie. I have never played it, but I have heard quite a lot about it. And I have heard of people selling loaves of bread and borrowing money from clergymen, and they were caught in the halls afterward playing housie-housie. I think this game should be stopped so as to help the economic affairs of the country. And I ask the Chairman of the Committee to prepare an

amendment, and come down to-morrow and see what can be done.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, frankly I had no idea that it was such a serious game. But as it is explained by the Leader of the Opposition, if it is anything like what he states the sooner we abolish it the better. If it is not so serious, I don't like to take away the pleasure of a poor man if he can afford to gamble. For a different reason, I suggest now that we rise not solely for the purpose of passing an amendment, but to find out if the game is as damaging as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition states, and if it is, to provide an effective remedy for it.

Hon. Mr. Winter: Mr. Chairman, I see an objection to the amendment whether rightly taken or not. It was touched on by the Hon. Acting Minister of Justice slightly, but he did not go into it fully. The Lotteries Act is general in its terms, providing for all forms of gambling, whereas the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition is specific. This amendment goes out of the way to do a special thing. The prohibition is made for a special particular form of gambling. It will be impossible to replace that game, says the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but I am sceptical on that point. I would almost undertake to myself replace just as attractive a game, which would be just as capable of taking the pennies out of the pockets of the people as housie-housie. I am afraid if there is that tendency to the gambling spirit in the people that they would look for some other object to satisfy their crav[ing] for gambling. What would be easier to substitute [than] the ordinary wheel of fortune?

I would like to know how could the abominable state of affairs be stopped. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his belief that the evil is widespread. The economic state of the people as described by him is also beyond question.

I understand that very wide discretion is left to the Board, and is it not to the magistrate or to this Board appointed under the Act that this protest should be addressed, and not to the House of Assembly which has general powers?

If this game is carried to such lengths in the sacred name of charity, it is no charity to take money away from people who need it far worse than anybody else. I think the House should be informed a little more, as the Prime Minister suggested, as to the facts of this matter. I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has done a good service in intimating the House of the matter. Before the House closes we may be able to put a section in to prevent this game, but that is the right procedure. I agree with the Hon. Secretary of State when he says that this game should not find favour with the churches. I don't think that, primarily at least, this House should take cognizance of the matter until we see how far the present Act is in force, and [how] far the proposed amendment needs to go.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The general Act is prohibitive in character of all gambling, and the Act of 1921 permits gambling under certain circumstances. What I want is to take the game of housie-housie out if its operation altogether and prohibit this game altogether. The Hon. Member who has just sat down suggests that were housie-housie abolished, another form of gambling would be found to take its place. Let us cross that bridge when we come to it. Let us kill the game first, and when we meet the other let us kill it too. Of course, when conditions get better there will not be

the same objection to it as there is to-day.

I wish it to be understood that my objections are based on economic grounds only. In the words of a friend of mine, so far as I am concerned every man can go to Hell in his own particular fashion. I want to stop the people from going down there and losing their pennies, and then going down to the Relief Department and throwing themselves on the dole.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Since it seems to be the request of several members of the House that the Committee rise, I have no objection to it; but I can't see any reason in the arguments of my learned friend. The argument is advanced that on purely economic grounds we should pass the amendment without any proof that the economic state of our people is affected. We should have figures to show [how] far our economic state is affected by this game, not merely a number of cases where people have misspent their money. It is the same argument as that which is advanced in favour of Prohibition. Would that vice could be wiped out by legislation. Then we would have a perfect world.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Thursday, the 15th day of June instant, at three o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Thursday, June 15, 1933

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 Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.⁸⁶

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 in relation to the Royal Bank of Canada Loan of 1931.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Finance: Mr. Chairman, these Resolutions are a copy of the resolutions introduced in connection with the other banks, and the intention of them is to give legislative confirmation of a loan made in November, 1931.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Resolutions with some amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Royal Bank of Canada Loan of 1931" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Royal Bank of Canada Loan of 1931" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Royal Bank of Canada Loan of 1931."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

⁸⁶ "This Bill provides the re-establishment of the governmental departments on the same grounds prior to the Act passed by the previous government in 1930, when the Departments of Agriculture and Mines and Marine and Fisheries were amalgamated ..." *Evening Telegram*, June 16, 1933, p. 11.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to the Royal Bank of Canada Loan of 1931" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up, entitled, respectively: "An Act Respecting a Bonus Addition to Pensions under The War Pensions Act, 1922"; "An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company Limited, of a Licence to Cut Timber"; and "An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1930" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it has passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors" with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Amendments are as follows:

Section 2 (12), last line:

Strike out the word "three" and substitute therefor the word "five."

Section 3 (3):

Strike out the words "House of Assembly" and substitute therefor the word "Legislature."

Section 14 (3), first line:

Strike out the words "and in such places" and substitute therefor the words "in St. John's."

Section 24 (1) (a):

Insert the word "guests" between the words "to" and "travellers."

Section 24 (1) (c), fourth line:

After the word "satisfied" insert the following words: "after report from the police."

Section 24 (5):

Add to this sub-section the words "Provided that on Sundays no sale shall be made except between the hours of 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. and the hours of 6 p.m. and 8 p.m."

Section 49 (2):

Add to this sub-section the words "Provided that the Court may, in its discretion, release

such vehicle on bonds pending its decision."

On motion these 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 it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to the Sale of Fertilizers" with some amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Amendments are as follows:

Section 9:

Strike out sub-section (a) of Section 9.

Re-letter sub-section (b) as sub-section (a).

Re-letter sub-section (c) as sub-section (b).

Section 10:

Strike out the first line of Section 10.

Section 11:

Strike out Section 11 of the Bill.

Re-number Section 12 of the Bill as Section 11.

Re-number Section 13 of the Bill as Section 12.

Re-number Section 14 of the Bill as Section 13.

Re-number Section 15 of the Bill as Section 14.

On motion these 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. Mr. Winter, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to Consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Government."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Mr. Winter: When the Committee last rose, it was to consider certain proposals at the end of the Bill excepting certain areas in the operation of the Act. Before we take up these, I have another amendment which was suggested to me by the Hon. Member for Fortune, Dr. Mosdell. It is a purely technical matter. Section 66 now reads (*reads*). The Hon. Member pointed out that under the Public Welfare Act passed a few years ago, a matter of that sort should really be in the hands of the Bureau of Public Health and not the Governor-in-Council, and he suggests after the words Governor-in-Council that we insert the words "or Bureau of Public Health."

Now, we have finished consideration of the Bill and passed all sections up to Section 86, and it is proposed that a Section 87 be inserted which I now ask leave to read (*reads*).

Then follows an enumeration of the areas: First, Grand Falls; second, [Millertown]; third, Badger; fourth, Angle Brook; fifth, Bishop's Falls; sixth, Botwood; seventh, Buchans; eighth, General (*reads*). The Hon. Leader of the Opposition and other Members objected to these exceptions and we have had the matter under consideration, and it is now proposed that 1, 2, 3, and 4 of them will not be allowed, that is to say, Grand Falls, Millertown, Badger and Angle Brook, but it was felt that Bishop's Falls and Corner Brook, where it is true the Company holds a great deal of property and possibly might be subjected to taxation, is not sufficient reason to deprive the other places of municipal government. Five and 6 will then come out. With regard to 7, the Buchans area, it was felt that a diameter of 30 miles was absurd. If you look at the map you will see that it includes nearly the whole of Deer Lake, and it is now proposed to give them a diameter of 10 miles.⁸⁷

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Why give them [*omission*] miles, just enough to free them from any possible taxation they may be subjected to? I can't see the sense of this thing at all. What do we get out of it? Is it because the lands belong to the A.N.D. Co. rather than to John Jones? I am opposed to the whole thing.

Hon. Mr. Winter: I don't see any overriding necessity as to the Buchans particular matter in this ten miles. It is not so much that the radius of twenty miles might be said to be a large area. Within that area there might conceivably grow up another community, whereas outside that radius such a contingency is not very likely to occur. Section 8, sub-section (8), in the schedule we propose to take out as being unreasonable.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Do they own fee simple those territories that are now included?

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: No.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Whatever excuse there may be for making ...

Hon. Mr. Winter: I don't know whether the Hon. Leader of the Opposition bears in mind that they are already exempted from a large part of this. I have not attempted to reconcile the two under the 1905 Act. Exploits River is specifically exempted from municipal taxation. Let the experiment go for this year. In the course of the working out of that experiment, the beneficial effects that we hope will follow might suggest to the inhabitants of these areas that they were also in error, [and] some way may be found to amend the Act, but I think I am at liberty to inform the Leader of the Opposition that this schedule as we now have abridged it by no means satisfies.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am willing to admit that I doubt very much whether any

⁸⁷ "Hon. Mr. Winter pointed out that consideration had been given to the objections raised by Mr. Bradley and other members to the sweeping nature of the exemptions of certain areas in the operation of the Act, and that it was decided that Grand Falls, Millertown, Badger and Angle Brook would be outside the jurisdiction of the Bill; but that Bishop Falls and Botwood would not be exempted." *Daily News*, June 16, 1933.

municipal corporation created in any of these sections is likely to govern itself better, or have public utilities handled better in these places, than they are to-day by the A.N.D. Company. I would go further with that company than I would with a good many corporations in Newfoundland, one of which happens to be in my own District. The A.N.D. Company has always been reasonably fair, in view of the fact that it is a corporation and naturally a grasping institution, because of its very character, without a soul except soles to its boots, and it takes good care to have very good soles there at the expense of the Colony. They never come to this House with any proposition that has for its object merely the betterment of the condition of the people of our country. They are looking for something for themselves. Anything which the Bill may have which may be for the good of the country is merely incidental. We have gained something by the discussion: we got three out of seven cut down.⁸⁸

Hon. Minister of Labour: I might say for the information of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I opposed certain exceptions of that Bill, particularly those dealing with giving the company exemption from all [*omission*]. I do not mind Grand Falls so much. Grand Falls is owned almost entirely by the Company. Buchans is owned by the Company, nobody else got a shack. Millertown [is] in the same class. Badger is very much the same, but Bishop's Falls and Botwood, I say, "No." The A.N.D. Company only owns a very small amount of the buildings and property in Botwood compared with that owned by the people. The Company at Bishop's Falls owns very little property compared with the people of the place. Therefore I claim I oppose the Company being exempted in the case of Bishop's Falls and Botwood as far as the 30 miles that they want, and I might say that I would rather see them get 5 miles than 10. The Leader of the Opposition in my opinion is quite right in his remarks.

On the other hand, I have a great respect for the A.N.D. Company and for what they have done, because in my opinion they are the best company that ever located in the interior of this country. They have treated the working man fair and above board, and they have been fairly decent with the people of the country. I hold no brief for the A.N.D. Company. I have fought them harder than any man in Newfoundland. I have been through all kinds of trouble in connection with labour matters in the Grand Falls area, but I must say that a lot of the trouble was caused by one man who is to-day clear of the company. The Grand Falls company, as far as companies go, have been fairly decent when others have been indecent, as far as treatment to the working man is concerned. The A.N.D. Company to-day are running full-time, despite the fact that the men are not getting extra pay for overtime. They are running full-time trying to give the men six days a week.

⁸⁸ "Mr. Bradley said it seemed to him that an effort had been made to free the A.N.D. Company from any taxation from which they might be subjected. He regarded it a piece of impudence, as the previous day they had a bill to relieve them from their obligations under the Crown Lands grant, and it appeared to him that the Company wanted in the Local Government bill to be relieved of a further obligation in connection with the same grant. He did not see why citizens of this country should be deprived from a right because they happened to live on land belonging to the A.N.D. Company. He said he spoke on principle as he had nothing against the company and added that he doubted whether any municipal corporation created in any of the places mentioned would govern itself better than the A.N.D. Company and that he for one would go further with that company than he would with other corporations in Newfoundland, as he had known them to be always reasonable." *Daily News*, June 16, 1933.

I am very much pleased in supporting the sections of the Bill as outlined by Mr. Winter, but I am opposed to exemption from Botwood and Bishop's Falls, and I would rather see five miles than ten, and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in the statement he has made pertaining thereto.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Does this Grand Falls Section include the Grand Falls Station?⁸⁹

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: No.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Winter, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Government" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The Committee was raised the last day that we might approve of the section suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. I do think it would be better that Section 33(b) as it now stands should be from year to year. If the government of the preceding twelve months have behaved themselves in the way of conserving expenditure, then the Legislature would grant them another twelve months. If not, disapproval of their conduct will be shown. Consequently I would suggest that we have Section (*reads*).⁹⁰ I presume this Bill will be certified as a money bill; it pertains to finance.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them

⁸⁹ Later called Windsor.

⁹⁰ "Hon. the Prime Minister moved the following amendment as Section 3 to the Bill: 'That the Bill shall have effect for one year only from July 1st, 1933, to June 30th, 1934.'" *Daily News*, June 16, 1933, p. 5.

referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Authorize the Issue of a Licence to Cut Timber to Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill pretty well explains itself. In 1903 a licence was issued in the name of W. E. Wood for 296 square miles. In 1904 Mr. Wood assigned his licence to the late Hon. John Harvey. In 1904 Mr. Harvey assigned to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company his right to a portion of land comprising of a timber licence the exact boundaries of which are not known. From the year 1904 up to date, the Nova Scotia Steel Company has annually paid to the Crown rent on an area of 50 square miles, the same being accepted notwithstanding that the company has no license therefor. In 1923 the whole timber licence originally granted to Mr. Wood was cancelled for non-payment of rent on the part of the company to which the remainder of the licence had been [omission].

On the 12th November 1924 (*reads*).

There has been no such exchange made, but I have been in communication with the Nova Scotia Steel Company and they assure me that they are prepared to make an exchange if their area of 50 square miles should be required for the Gander development. They have already made that promise during the last administration. I am just asking [for] the second reading now. We need not go any further until we are assured that they are prepared to do that. It might not be advisable to do anything that might jeopardize a Gander proposition, not that 50 square miles would be likely to stop it; but it might in a way embarrass the company because I understand a good deal of this 50 is watershed, and for that reason it would be very desirable that it should be under the control of the Gander proposition which we all so ardently hope for.

I shall read the correspondence in relation to this proposition. Perhaps I might read the letter, I think this is the one (*reads*).

With this definite promise that in the event of a Gander development they are prepared to make a fair exchange, [and] I can see no reason why we should not give the required licence, that the Legislature should not authorize the Department to issue a license.

In other words the 30 years of the license has expired, and I understand at that time the ordinary terms of the licence was about 50 years. It was about 1924 that we began issuing licences

up to 99 years. We are not giving them very much more than they are entitled to.⁹¹

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: One point strikes me which is rather amusing. A few moments ago, we had a case where a corporation was not prepared to trust the government. Another corporation is now coming in, in the same form of mind. This particular corporation now asks us to give them their title and thereby [we] lose the whiphand which we at the present time have over them, for the purpose of enforcing an exchange of the land, if it has to be done. In this case the corporation is in out-hands. They had a licence and they paid rentals upon it since 1904. The government has never disputed their right to the 50 miles of land. No government has done so. Nor is the Government now disputing their right to it. Why give them the absolute title to that land? In the event of there being a Gander, they may ask an extortionate price for the land or an impossible exchange, very much more valuable than the land they at present hold. I don't think that this or any other government is going to take the land from them. Why not let matters stand as they are? Why should we put them in a safe position, in a position in which they can hold up any Gander development company for a price which is unfair? They may demand a location far more valuable than the location which they have to give, but which by reason of its situation is more valuable than any other for the purposes of a Gander development. They have paid rentals and had a free use of the land, let them continue to do so for the next twenty years, [and] then their licence expires. They

⁹¹ "The Hon. the Prime Minister moved the second reading of a bill to authorize the issue of a license to cut timber to Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd., stating that a 1903 license was issued in the name of W. E. Wood for 296 square miles near Gander Bay. In 1904 that license was assigned to the late Hon. John Harvey, who in the same year assigned to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company Limited his rights to a portion of the lands comprised in the said timber licenses, the exact boundaries of which are not known; but from 1904 to the present date the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company annually paid to the Crown rent on an area of 50 square miles, and the same had been accepted, notwithstanding that the company had no license therefor. In 1923 the whole timber license originally granted to W. E. Wood was cancelled for non-payment of rents on the part of a company to which the remainder of the license had been conveyed by the late Hon. John Harvey. On the 12th of November, 1924, the Governor-in-Council approved the issue of a license to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company for 50 square miles being the area upon which they had paid rents up to that date. It was subsequently discovered that the area so licensed to the company was essential for the purpose of a timber development scheme then contemplated in the Gander area. Therefore, it was arranged that the licenses to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company should be withheld and that the companies contemplating the said timber developments in the Gander area should transfer to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company by way of exchange 50 square miles held under timber license in some other area. No such exchange of timber lands had as yet been carried out but, having been in communication with the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, he had their assurance that they are prepared to make an exchange if their area of 50 square miles should be required for Gander development. They made that promise during the last administration. He (the Prime Minister) merely asked for the second reading of the Bill until the Government was assured that the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company were prepared to do anything as the Government was not prepared to do anything that would jeopardize the chances of a Gander proposition. He understood a great deal of the 50 square miles was watershed which would be very desirable to have if there was to be a Gander proposition that everybody hoped for. He then read some correspondence that was sent to him in connection with the property and stated that with the definite promise contained therein in the event of a Gander development, he saw no reason why the Legislature should not authorize the Department to issue a license to that company as if it had been issued in 1903. In other words 30 years of the license had expired, so that they would be getting only what they were justly entitled to." *Daily News*, June 16, 1933.

can't expect more than that. We have no timber in this country to give away. The Prime Minister knows that is true, and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines can tell him that it is. The timber in this country owned by Newfoundlanders to-day amounts to practically nothing.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I am afraid the type of corporation that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to have encountered must have been very bad. He sees red when he hears the word "corporation." I have known corporations which are ready to do the right thing. It doesn't follow that because it is a corporation it is unfair. I know of plenty of private individuals who, if the corporations had done half as much as them, they would never be allowed to exist. I am afraid my learned friend has the mind of a corporation. These people have been paying rents for 29 years. They have paid \$2,900. I have no doubt but that they will be willing to make a fair settlement when the Gander comes. Besides, we must look at the matter in this light: they have paid money in rentals and they are entitled to a licence. I want to hear still further from the Manager to the effect that they are not going to act in an extortionate way if there is a Gander. It is not the timber they want, but the watershed. They would like to hold control of the watershed. These people have been paying the rentals of \$100 a year for 29 years, and we want to do the right thing by them.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I know I am out of order; but as a personal element has entered into the discussion, may I be permitted to reply? I haven't got the mind of a corporation, but it is not right, it is not proper to give these people that [to] which they are not legally entitled. There is no obligation on the Government to do so. They bought that timber limit, and that title should come from the person from whom they bought it. There is no obligation on the Government to give them a title. It is not proper to give them a title they can utilize to stop a Gander development.

The Hon. Prime Minister has probably had more experience with corporations than I have had. I have gained most of my knowledge of them by reading about them. I have had some experience with them, and I am bound to admit that my experience was rather sickly, and what I read has been confirmed. A corporation is a soulless body responsible to its shareholders and it has got to make profits. Consequently, when it has the gun it will use it. It is proper to give these people nothing more than their legal rights. It is not proper to give them a title to the land when they should have gotten it from the owner. May I be permitted to advise the Prime Minister to allow these people to retain possession of the property and nothing more, and then in the event of a Gander company being formed these people will not be able to interfere with the Gander operations or [any] other development that the company may undertake.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I am more convinced than ever that the Hon. Member has the mind of a corporation, because he is willing that the government take \$100 a year for 29 years from these people, and then when they come for their rights tell them they have no rights.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would not be taking their legal rights away from them. They have no legal rights.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I am afraid there's a question for lawyers entering the discussion now.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, the 19th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Monday, June 19, 1933

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

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Culling of Codfish."

The Minister of Public Works gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works Act, 1932."

Hon. the Acting Attorney General gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 135 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees.'"

On the second reading of the Legislative Council amendments to the Alcoholic Liquors Act, the following amendments were made to those sent down from the Council, namely:

Section 3 (3):

The House of Assembly disagrees with this amendment.⁹²

Section 24 (5):

Strike out the words "between the hours of 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. and the hours of 6 p.m. and 8 p.m." and substitute the words "from 12 o'clock noon, to 10 p.m."

Otherwise the Council's amendments were agreed to, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council so informing that body.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: The following amendments have been suggested. The first amendment is really not necessary because the alteration was made as the Bill was going through the committee stage in this House. It relates to the definition of the word "area," and is intended to enlarge the population from 3,000 to 5,000. The correction was made when the Bill was going through this House. Apparently a copy of the Bill as it was before the discussion took place went to the Upper House.

The next amendment is to sub-section (3) of Section 3, in which the Legislative Council apparently made a mistake. The Section reads (*reads section*). It is identical with a similar Section in the Act of 1924. The Upper Chamber wishes to make the words "House of Assembly" to read "the Legislature." I don't agree with that. This House cannot agree with this amendment. I think the House holds the right to fix salaries. I don't think we can give up any of our rights in this respect. There is no question of voting supplies. It is only a question of salaries fixed by the Governor-in-Council.

⁹² "The amendment ... which states that salaries fixed by the Governor-in-Council shall be approved by the House of Assembly and which the Legislative Council desired to have altered to 'Legislature' was not approved." *Daily News*, June 20, 1933, p. 4.

The next amendment is to Section 14 sub-section (3) (*reads*). In sub-section (3) the words are to be left out in each place, so that it would read "such number of branches in St. John's as the Governor-in-Council may appoint," etc. It would mean that the Governor-in-Council would have no authority to open up branches in the outports without petitions from the residents.

The next amendment is to Section 24(1a). It deals with permits to keep and sell beer and wines, and is intended to cover an oversight on the part of ourselves (*reads section*). There is such a thing as permanent guests, and it is thought that they should be included. I think that is an amendment that we can agree to.

24(c). They wish us to insert after "satisfy," "after report by the police." I see no great objection to inserting such a phrase, as it is the duty of policemen to see that restaurants are not frequented by drunken persons. The next amendment is to section 5 of the same Section (*reads*). The amendment reads (*reads*). This is a matter upon which there may be some expression of opinion, as at the present time it is not on the statute book and is a new feature. I can see a great deal of difficulty in getting this amendment respected by the generality of keepers of tourist hotels, particularly in localities where there are no policemen and evasion is very easy. However, the amendment is there for consideration. The next is Section 49, sub-section (2), dealing with confiscation. Hon. Members will probably remember that when a vehicle used for transporting liquor was seized, it was taken to the Court House and remained there until a decision was given. The idea now is to release the vehicle on bonds. I think that is a very wise provision. These are the amendments.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: With reference to the hours for closing, it seems to me that we should strike a happy medium. This is by no means a party measure, and for my part I would like to see the suggestion lengthened.⁹³

(*Amendments read.*)

Mr. Bradley could not see the necessity for the amendment at all. The act provided that beer and wine shall be consumed at meals only and does not permit people to drink it all day. He could not see the difference between restricting drinking on Sunday and any other day. If it was wrong in one case, it was wrong in the other.

Hon. Secretary of State could see no hardship done. There is none under the present law as beer and wines can only be drunk at meals and under the new law there was no more hardship. [*Daily News*, June 20, 1933]

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: I would like to point out that the majority of tourist hotels do most of their business on Sunday, and I think that this would be a severe blow affecting their trade. They have to pay a licence of \$50 per year, and if this amendment were put into effect it would

⁹³ "The amendment which limited the sale of beer and wines at hotels on Sundays to the hours of 1 to 3 p.m. and 6 to 8 p.m. came in for considerable discussion. Hon. the Prime Minister felt that whilst the hours on Sundays were too long, the amendments were restricting business too much and he thought a happy medium might be struck." *Daily News*, June 20, 1933.

affect these hotel keepers seriously. Personally I don't care, but I think it would be a hardship on the operators and it will be evaded, and I don't believe in putting laws on the statute book that will not be carried out. I think the hours should be lengthened, dinner is served before 1 o'clock and I don't think 12 o'clock would be unreasonable. I think it might be 12 o'clock to 3, and 5 to 8.

Mr. Byrne: My objection [is] to the short hours on Sunday, when the great majority of people have the opportunity of leaving St. John's and travelling over the highways on the Peninsula of Avalon. As it stands, with meals you can be served with wines. The amendment limits the time to between the hours of 1 and 3 or between 6 and 8. I think it is altogether too short.⁹⁴

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the amendment of Section 24, sub-section (6); the amendment to read (*reads*).⁹⁵

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: We reached the stage when this Bill was deferred the last day, when the Leader of the Opposition introduced an amendment. I will read it again for the benefit of honourable members who have forgotten its terms: (*reads*).

I investigated since we last met into the, not so much into the working of the game of housie-housie, but into the history of lotteries, and I found that about 1914 an act was passed abolishing lotteries altogether, and that act was enforced until 1921, when an amendment was introduced which permitted lotteries and other games of chance for the purpose of raising money to assist charity. The next alteration to the law was in 1932, because quite a large number of promoters came here and formed companies and operated sweepstakes. In some cases they sold their permits. Quite a number were issued in the name of charity, and power to issue these permits was very general. Now the power is placed in a licensing board comprised of the Secretary of the Bureau of Public Welfare, the Inspector General, and the Judge of the Central District Court at St. John's. The effect of the appointment as a licensing board has been so great that not one permit has been issued since their appointment. Side by side with that, the magistrates still have power but it is very limited, and applies only to charitable bazaars and things of that kind.

⁹⁴ "Mr. Byrne thought something should be done about the limitation of hours. If the amendment goes through and people go out in the country and arrive at a hotel after eight o'clock in the night they cannot get a drink. He thought that was unfair." *Daily News*, June 20, 1933.

⁹⁵ "Hon. the Prime Minister suggested an amendment providing that on Sundays the sale of beer and wines shall be restricted from noon to 10 p.m. This amendment passed." *Daily News*, June 20, 1933.

The wording of the section is very interesting. The Leader of the Opposition says the Act has not been carried out. If he will listen he will see that such a state of affairs could not exist, if the law was carried out (*reads*). I would like the Leader of the Opposition not to press his amendment to-day. If the matter can be cleared up it would be much simpler. It means the law is not being carried out, and all that is necessary is to enforce the Act strictly.⁹⁶

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I do not know if the various organizations operating housie-housie require legal permits or not, and I am not particularly interested, but the game is going on and it ought to be stopped in the interest of the public and the public revenues. I can quite realise the unscientific method I adopted to stop this curse, but I took the most available way to bring it before the House. This Bill was brought in in the interests of the Regatta Committee, and it is not the correct way to put in an amendment. However, my point is that I want that amendment passed, if I can get it passed, either here or in the Public Service Act, and I want to see this game stopped. I think the Minister of Justice might introduce a Bill making my amendment an amendment to the Lotteries Act itself, or I will introduce a Bill myself.⁹⁷

Hon. Acting Attorney General: Why not introduce a Bill yourself?

Mr. Bradley: I will do that. [*Daily News*, June 20, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

*On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.*⁹⁸

⁹⁶ "In 1932 because of large companies getting permits to operate lotteries here, some of whom were crooked and sold the permits they had obtained, an act was introduced which gave the right to issue permits to a licensing board.... In addition certain powers were given to the magistrates to issue permits in connection with sales, bazaars, etc., but the powers were limited. He understood that so far as the board was concerned they had not issued one permit during the year. It was apparent, then, that if what the Leader of the Opposition had said was true, there had been breaches of the Act, and he asked the Leader of the Opposition to report such breaches so that action could be taken. So far as he could see all that is necessary, under the present Act, is to see that its provisions are enforced." *Daily News*, June 20, 1933.

⁹⁷ "Mr. Bradley did not know if those operating housie-housie in the city at present have permits in a legal way or not, and he was not concerned; all he wanted was to have a stop put to the game which is being played by people who cannot afford to do so. He wanted his amendment passed and he did not care how it was passed. He was prepared to allow the present Bill to go through if he could get an assurance that another Bill would be introduced putting a stop to this housie-housie game. He did not want to restrict people from playing the game in their houses or in clubs, for the members of such clubs, but he did want to have it stopped for the general public." *Daily News*, June 20, 1933.

⁹⁸ "Under its present form the Bill merely gives power to the Regatta Committee to have permission to issue permits for the operation of wheels of fortune at the annual regatta, under the supervision of the Licensing Board." *Daily*

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 Authorize the Issue of a Licence to Cut Timber to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has received an assurance from these people satisfactory to him since we last considered this Bill.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, at the time we last considered this Bill, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated that their idea of a reasonable exchange might not be what the ordinary person considered reasonable. Sir Newton Moore⁹⁹ gave the last administration an assurance in this respect. I have not heard from these people yet. My idea is to go through the Committee of the Whole and then hold up the third reading until we have that assurance.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The object of this Bill is to bring back the Department of Marine and Fisheries to where it formerly was. You will recollect from motives of economy – false economy, I am afraid – the late Government united the Departments of Agriculture and Mines and Marine and Fisheries. At that time we who were in Opposition objected to it strongly. We stated that it was going to impair the usefulness of both Departments. It was impossible to expect any man to be sufficiently versatile to take care of both Departments. We felt sure that his real love would be Agriculture and Mines or Marine and Fisheries. If the two were working together under the one roof, the Minister would naturally take more interest in one Department to the neglect of the other. Besides, we had a man particularly qualified to take care of Agriculture and Mines and another to

News, June 20, 1933.

⁹⁹ President of the company.

take care of Marine and Fisheries. Divided, the Departments can run with little or no expense over what was incurred when the two were under one roof. It is felt now that the Government is launching out on a particular fisheries policy, it is more important than ever. The Bill is really the same Bill that was in existence before the two Departments were joined together, and as we go through it in Committee we will be enabled to examine it section by section, and if we require an amendment we will be assisted by the gentleman who is now in charge of the present Department. We have in these two Departments the two most important in the Government. They are the producers. The others are to a large extent spenders. Those two are the ones that are going to create revenue for us. Farming and fishing are more important than sawmills or paper mills. The extent to which they create labour is very much more than any other line of industry. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill.

The Amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to the Sale of Artificial Fertilizers" were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I am going to explain the amendments by the Council to the Artificial Fertilizer Act. Section 9 dealt with the sale of fertilizers and required certain conditions to be fulfilled, and certain information to be placed on each package of fertilizer – the name and address of the manufacturer and importer. The Legislative Council have struck out that and the remaining sub-section. Section 11 has been struck out and Section 10 altered. Section 11 is (*reads section*).

I am afraid the legal members of the House must have failed to consider that Section. It is very peculiar and I don't think there is any objection to having it struck out. There is a provision in that Act in any case which covers the same ground. There is no need to insert that provision. I am informed that the Secretary of Agriculture is satisfied with these amendments.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Bradley gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries.'"

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, the 20th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday, June 20, 1933

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 28 (The Livestock Pedigree Act)"; "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the War Pensions Act, 1922"; "An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, Deceased, of a Licence to Cut Timber"; "An Act to Render Certain Abandoned Lands Available for Agriculture"; and "An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to the Clarendville Light and Power Company, Limited" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to Salt Codfish" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had agreed to the Amendment sent up in and upon the amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding"; and also to the Amendments sent up in and upon the Amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public."

Petitions were presented by:

Hon. Mr. Mitchell from New Perlican, re Fisheries.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of [omission] Cove¹⁰⁰ and New Perlican with respect to the catching of caplin. There appears to be some little trouble there due to the fact that others are coming in catching caplin within a short distance of the shore. As there is falling ground, they feel that it is doing damage to that section, and they pray that the House listen to them in their request that no caplin be permitted to be caught within 300 yards of the shore.

Pursuant to Notice, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Financial Clauses of the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Advantages to the North West Products Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

¹⁰⁰ Bitters Cove. *Daily News*, June 22, 1933, p. 5.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: (Re Section 6).¹⁰¹ I do not think that these people are entitled to free entry of cartons, labels and other things that are in common use, and it never was the intention of the Government when considering this Section that they should obtain free entry. It was discussed by the Minister of Justice and the members of the Executive. We had in mind a duty of 15 per cent net. I would move that the words "Free of import duty" be deleted, and be replaced by the words "15 per cent net."

Hon. Minister of Justice: I entirely agree. The matter was discussed between the Prime Minister and members of the Executive, and I think it was agreed that they should not be entitled to free entry of these commodities, and that there should be a duty of 15 per cent.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I think that in the past this country has been too fond of giving concessions, and I am very glad to see the amendment introduced.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I entirely agree.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered they matter to them referred, and had passed the said Financial Clauses with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Select Committee be instructed that these Sections as passed by the Committee now form part of the Bill, and that the said Committee make provision accordingly.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works Act, 1932" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 135 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and

¹⁰¹ ... which reads as follows: "Cartons, labels, and burlap or brin sacks (printed with the Company's name, with or without other printed matter) imported into the Dominion by the Company during the term of ten years from the date of the passing of this Act and to be used as containers for the products of the Company, not being manufactured in Newfoundland and purchasable at prices equal to those at which the Company can import the same shall be admitted into the Dominion free of import duties and taxes." *Evening Telegram*, June 22, 1933.

Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Culling of Codfish" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

On the request of Mr. Bradley, his notice of motion respecting the "Lotteries Bill" was stricken from the Order Paper.¹⁰²

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Tuesday, the 22nd of June instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

102

¹⁰³ "Mr. Bradley, who at the previous sitting asked leave to introduce a Bill respecting "Lotteries" asked to have the matter stricken from the order paper as he had an assurance that the Bill now before the House would consider his proposals and the contents of his Bill would be entertained by the mover of the original Bill already before the House. It was ordered accordingly and in consequence the third reading of the Bill in question was deferred." *Evening Telegram*, June 22, 1933, p. 8.

"Mr. Bradley asked to have his motion for the introduction of a bill dealing with the game of Housie-Housie stricken from the order paper, as he had come to the conclusion that it would be much better to have the matter included in the bill respecting Lotteries already before the House. He, therefore, asked to have this bill re-committed to have one particular phase of the bill considered and discussed. This was agreed to by the Government." *Daily News*, June 22, 1933.

Thursday, June 22, 1933

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Whiteley from Norris Point, re Roads.

Captain Whiteley: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the District of St. Barbe asking for a road, or the beginnings of a road, from Port Saunders to Bonne Bay or to Lomond. The District of St. Barbe has been very much neglected. We have no roads. We have long stretches of coastline from Port Saunders to Bonne Bay, nearly 100 miles without a harbour, and even a small boat arriving at night, they must haul her up for safety. We have asked for supplies for the fishery and we could not get them; there is fish on certain portions of the coast, and salmon, and the fishermen are there helpless and hopeless. Therefore we are asking for this road to make a way to get back to the land whereby they can plant their gardens. I am told – I am not an old politician – but I am told that petitions such as this presented to the House are treated more or less as a joke. I would respectfully ask the Department to which this belongs to not treat it as a joke. It is gone beyond a joke; it is a very serious situation that I am faced with as representative of the District of St. Barbe. I do not pretend to utter any melodramatic statement that the people will starve. I don't think they will starve, but you and I and the Members of this House and the Royal Commission, including Mr. Trentham, would starve if placed in the same position. To illustrate my point I will refer to that well-known place [*omission*] with which you are all familiar, no doubt; in that sense we would starve, but the people who are used to living in the outports would survive. I almost wish they would starve rather than see them in the position they are in to-day; they are degenerating into animals; better they did starve, than to see them so helpless, depending on the dole all the winter. I would rather feed the men while they are working to produce something now, than in the winter when they are idle. I would rather give them food now, when they can get work and produce some fish.

I would therefore ask the Department to which this petition rightly belongs to consider it very carefully and not to throw it aside. The way conditions are to-day we are simply destroying the character of the people. If we don't help them to get a living, I don't know how it is going to be done. I admit the Government is rather short of money, and I contend if there were any fishery supplies given out it should not be done through the Relieving Officer. It should be done through some independent committee of the people who would be responsible for the payment. It can be done. However, I am not dictating to the Government. I am here as a representative of the District of St. Barbe which expects me to do certain things. As long as I am here, I will do the best in my power. I would beg leave to present the petition and respectfully ask the consideration of the Government.

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the following report:

22/6/33

Mr. Speaker,

Your Select Committee appointed to report on the merits of the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant

Certain Advantages to North West Products Co., Ltd.” beg to recommend that the Bill be proceeded with and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider same presently.

Respectfully submitted,

*(Sgd.) F. C. Alderdice
F. Gordon Bradley
J. G. Stone
W. H. Abbott*

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 Grant Certain Advantages to North West Products Company, Limited.”

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman I move that in Section 2, the words “25 miles” be deleted and the words “20 miles” be substituted.

I move that in Section 3 in the fourth line after the word “than,” there be inserted the words “7,000 cases for the first year, thereafter 10,000 cases annually.” In the second last line where the words “cases shall be cases of 48 one pound tins” to read “cases shall be cases of 48 seven ounce tins. Delete the words “96 one-half pound tins” leaving “or tins of any other number of size equivalent to the foregoing.”

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Hon. Mr. Browne presented the following report:

June 20/33

The Select Committee appointed on May 22nd to consider a Bill to amend the Municipal Acts 1921-31 beg to report that they have considered the matter to them referred, and find that the Rules of the House have been complied with (save in one matter of detail which the Select Committee recommend should be waived), and that leave be granted to introduce the Bill.

*(Sgd.) W. J. Browne
F. Gordon Bradley
G. G. Byrne
P. F. Halley
F. C. Alderdice*

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Acts, 1921-31" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding further with the Orders of the Day, I wish to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of great public importance. And I do this in justice to the Members of this House. I have before me here a copy of *The Daily News*, a newspaper in which appears an article which is supposed to be an official report of a speech made by a gentleman in another place, which deals with legislation which passed this House some time ago for the purpose of granting a licence to the A.N.D. Company. For the purpose of enlightening the Members of the House, may I be permitted to read the article referred (*reads article from The Daily News, June 22*).

I would like to point out that I have read with regret the report which is supposed to be a correct report of the gentleman's speech. It is absolutely incorrect. The Bill which passed the House the other day in confirmation of a licence to the A.N.D. Company had nothing to do with the property of the Sulphite Company. That property passed to the A.N.D. Company in 1925. Consequently the legislation now before another Chamber has nothing whatsoever to do with it. I trust the gentleman who made the speech will take the first opportunity available to correct the misleading statements contained therein. The article goes on to say (*reads article further*).

The only area held by the A.N.D. Company on which they hold the exclusive right to minerals is 2,000 square miles which was originally granted by the Bond Government in 1905. All the lands they have acquired since were purchased from the owners or acquired from the government; they have no right to the minerals.

I am not going to weary the House with reading any more, than point out that I think this House should take some action with regard to the statements made outside the House with regard to the activities of Members – while another gentleman got up and said that the whole matter should be referred to the Royal Commission. I am surprised that he did not suggest that it be referred to the Land Development Association as to whether the obligations that are ours in this Chamber should be passed over to somebody else. I have no objection to being fairly criticized, but I think we all object to be absolutely misrepresented to the public, that the people should be given the kind of a story that appears in the paper that I now refer to. I think it is of sufficient importance to move the adjournment of the House. Other members who have just as much obligation as I have, although I happen to be Head of a Department, I hope will take some notice of the matter I have brought before you.

I might also point out that from the day that Dr. Mooney came here in 1923 and acquired the areas referred to, roughly 1,000 square miles, 1,109 square miles to be accurate, the rentals have been paid up to date and the Mooney properties have never been in arrears. When taken over by Mines and Forests the rentals were fully paid, and they have paid fully \$20,000. This money has gone into the Treasury, and it has gone to pay some of our legal bills.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I take it the Minister of Agriculture has the facts in connection with these various matters, and that he is correct in what he says with reference to the Hon. Members of the Upper House who engaged in this debate on the day of June 20th. I do not want to enter into

the merits of the controversy, because this House is aware that I was not at all friendly to the granting of this particular concession to the A.N.D. Company when the Bill was before this House. I could see no reason then why we should give these people a concession of that kind for nothing, and I see no reason why we should do it, but apart from that he has raised a rather serious question, and that is as to the manner of handling a subject which was sent up to them from this House as a Bill which has passed this House. The ordinary constitution of the procedure would have been for them to deal with the Bill in the ordinary way in accordance with the rules and regulations of the House. They could refer it to what committees of their own House they so desired, but the objection seems to be that they referred this particular Bill to a committee which has no status at all so far as this Legislature is concerned. I must say that it is an odd sort of procedure to me; doubtless the gentlemen who determined to make this reference were well-intentioned. We must assume that, but as to the correctness of their procedure, that is an entirely different matter.

Now, other questions arise; in fact it rather bristles with difficulties. The first one strikes me, and this has come on me rather as a surprise, because I knew nothing of it until a few moments ago when the Minister of Justice took me into his confidence. The first matter that strikes me is just how far we have a right to criticize the procedure of the Upper House. I don't think we have a right to criticize the Legislative Council at all. I know it has been a matter of convention – I don't know of law – that we should not discuss the Upper House in any way. Waiving that for a moment, we come down to the question as to whether they have done right or not. I am entirely dependent on what has been stated in the *News*, as is the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. Clearly the present Legislative Council had a right to say what it did say, apart from a consideration of the accuracy of the statement, because in a Chamber of this kind debate is open and free, provided one keeps within reasonable distance of the truth. If it was the opinion of the honourable gentleman that a particular body of men should give consideration to this matter before it should be passed by the Upper House, that is an opinion that he has a perfect legal right to hold and to express. What we have to discuss is whether the Upper House had a right to refer it to them or not. That seems to be the burden of the Minister's objection; did they refer it to them or not. It says here: (*reads*).

Newspaper reporters are not always strictly correct; they are not always critically correct, and I think that perhaps we ought to know exactly what that resolution was before we discuss it at all. If I may be permitted to say so – I may be out of order – it seems to me that if the Upper House undertook to hold up the passage of a Bill and refer that Bill to some other body composed of men not members of their own body, they thereby admitted their own inability to deal with matters that came before them from this House. In other words, it is about time they resigned. I have no brief for the Upper House and I hold no animus against them. That strikes me as the most logical feature about the whole matter; if the Upper House admits as clearly as it does admit its inability to deal with this matter, I think it is about time that they gave place to some other gentlemen who would handle the matter without the assistance of outsiders.

I presume that it is not the intention of the House to take any action in the matter. I am not quite sure that the Upper House did refer the matter to the Royal Commission. If they merely adjourned without any further provision than a motion, it being understood that someone would perhaps get the views of the Royal Commission and communicate them to the Upper House when they had got them, there can't be very much wrong about that, because I admit that here this

afternoon I asked that the particular stage of a Bill be deferred until I could get some information on it. Judging from the whole tenor of the article it is clear that the reporter was under the impression, rightly or wrongly, that the Upper House intended to get the opinions of the Royal Commission. It was to be submitted to their judgement, and their own decision would probably be guided to a considerable extent by what the Royal Commission has to say. Well, if the Upper House wants to do business by proxy, I don't know of any legal way. I do think it is in order that these gentlemen should consider their resignation.

Hon. the Speaker: I don't wish to interrupt the debate on the motion to adjourn. I think before any further discussion takes place, this House ought to be definitely informed as to whether it is a correct report of the proceedings. I think it would perhaps be in order to get an official copy of the minutes of the House. I think the other point raised by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is a point well taken, that this body has no right to discuss the debates of the Upper House. The motion is that this House adjourn until we know definitely what has been done by the other body. It seems to me that the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines was complaining possibly of a breach of privilege of either this House or the Upper House, but if it is a matter of breach of privilege, I don't think this is the proper way to raise it on a motion to adjourn. It should be a question of privilege to be raised. I think we should have an official report of the proceedings before discussing it further. After all, this is a statement made by the President of the Legislative Council. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines said it was supposed to be an official report. Until we know definitely whether it is official or accurate I don't think we ought to adjourn or discuss it further.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I don't wish to intervene, but I perceive there is grave doubt in your mind. I was not in the House when the Minister of Agriculture and Mines made the motion. I take it, it was a motion to adjourn the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of grave public importance. I do not see why we should not take an adjournment of the House to discuss the privileges of the House. I think that would be in order, and speaking from experience, it has been done many times. Motions of this kind have not always been carried with strict regularity. I think we have a precedent in this House for a motion to adjourn for the purpose of discussing a question of privilege. On the other hand, one has to bear in mind that even a paper of the high standing of *The Daily News* may have obtained a wrong report of what occurred in the other House. The difficulty is that the minutes which are official may not be sufficiently clear as to what was said or done by the House. This is no reflection upon the person who is responsible, but as you all know, minutes are a very bald outline of the mere motions made. The reasons for the motions are not given; consequently one is not in a position to deal with the statements made by those who make the motion. Hansard is not official. There is no official report of debates recognized by the House. It is true that the Internal Economy Commission has provided for the appointment of reporters who will take down the debates, and has provided for printers to print them, but they have no real official and legal standing, and the quotations from them are not to be taken as accurate. This is a matter of grave importance. If the report in *The Daily News* even approaches accuracy, and if the motion made by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is now withdrawn, as he will doubtless withdraw it if you hold that he is premature, then he will have to seek another opportunity to bring the matter before the

House. If it is in your mind that he should not press the point at this stage, then I think an early opportunity should be sought to obtain as accurate a report as one can get from the Hansard reporters, and that should be laid on the table of the House, and that an opportunity for debate should be granted if the report is any way accurate. Then I submit to you, Sir, that it is a gross breach of the privilege not merely of this House, but of the Parliament as a whole, that one branch, having received a Bill passed by the other, should refer it, not to a committee of its own which would call evidence, which would consider whether the Bill should be passed or not, but refer it to some outside body which has nothing to do with Parliament, and to [do] what – report back and criticize. Are we going to have an outside body referred to by this Parliament criticizing our actions while in session, and asked to do so by the other part of Parliament? That to me is utterly absurd. Suppose the Bill originated in the Upper House, would we for one moment suggest that we should refer this to the Board of Trade, to the Fire Insurance Board, to, as my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Mines very properly said, to the Land Development Association, to the Law Society, to the Medical Society, and ask them to make a report criticising the action of the Upper House? Surely they would resent that.

If this report is correct, that is exactly what the Upper House has done, asked a body unconnected with Parliament to make a report criticising our action. I don't think that is correct. Let them appoint a committee of their own to take evidence on the matter and look into it, and then act on the report of their own committee, but not ask some outside body that has no connection with the House to make a report on what the House had done. That, I submit, is a very grave breach of the privilege of the House. It is possibly a matter for passing comment, and then the motion was made by a man whose professional career has been that of the obtainer of concessions. In any event, Sir, I don't wish to carry the matter further at the present moment, but I do think if it is your view, and I feel sure that the Minister in the same spirit will accept even an intimation from you, that the present motion might better be dealt with at a later stage, that he withdraw. I do think that an opportunity should be given the House to debate the matter of privilege.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: My purpose in moving the adjournment was merely to bring this important matter before the attention of the House. Having done so, I have no desire to further press the matter, but in withdrawing the motion I would like to point out that I interviewed the official of the Chamber referred to, to try and have this report verified as being correct, and I found the reporter who wrote the report as the gentleman referred to was delivering his speech. The reporter is most reliable. I don't think he made any mistake. The speech is correctly reported. What I object to is the misrepresentation in the speech. The area referred to is 1,109 square miles; the speech refers to an area of 2,076 square miles. It is absolutely a misrepresentation. I think the House acted wisely in recording our objection to such a glaring misrepresentation. I have no desire to press the matter further at the present moment, and I would withdraw the motion for adjournment.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Licence to Cut Timber to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., Ltd." was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The third reading of this Bill was held up pending receiving a communication from the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, and I have had a letter from them, from the management, which I submitted to those most likely to be interested in a development of the Gander area, and I quote a paragraph from them which reads: (*reads*). I take it that is sufficient.¹⁰⁴

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works Act, 1932"¹⁰⁵ was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Acting Attorney General, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Culling of Codfish" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Speaker, I may say that this Bill is to replace Chapter

¹⁰⁴ "Hon. the Prime Minister informed the House that he had received an assurance from the executive of the company that in the event of the property being sought for the purpose of a paper manufacturing company the N. S. S. Co. would submit to a reasonable exchange or offer if requested. Accordingly the bill was passed and sent to the Legislative Council." *Evening Telegram*, June 23, 1933.

¹⁰⁵ "... relating to sign-boards on the highroads and other public places ..." *Evening Telegram*, June 23, 1933, p. 13.

116 of the Consolidated Statutes, Third Series. It will bring cullers under the jurisdiction of the Board. Formerly cullers were under no one's jurisdiction. Section 1 of the Bill deals with the licence of the cullers. Section 3 deals with the form of the licence – it is made liable to cancellation when necessary. Section 4 of the Bill deals with culling without licence and the penalty therefor. Section 5 is a provision against the acceptance of bribes by cullers. There is a penalty provided in case of the acceptance of a bribe. Section 6 deals with cases of a dispute between culler and shipper. Section 7 (*reads*).

Section 8 deals with the power to administer the oath. Section 9 sets out the procedure. Section 10 relates to appeal if necessary. Schedule A sets out the culler's oath; the form is there. Schedule B sets out the culler's licence. I don't [know] if there is any further explanation necessary. Therefore I move the second reading.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is capable of being a most salutary one. I have been associated with fishermen to a greater or less degree for a period of 25 to 27 years, and no complaint is more frequently heard than that of the unfairness of the cull they are subjected to. No doubt in some cases this complaint is made without justification, but it is hardly conceivable that in all cases that is so. I think on the whole there have been many, many instances in which the men were unfairly treated by the culler, who was wholly in the pay of the purchaser of the fish. I suppose a study of psychology would be helpful here, which is a subject I don't know a great deal [about], but perhaps one or two simple principles of that subject can be appreciated by those who, like myself, have no scientific knowledge on the subject.

If the shipper employs the culler and he is paid by him, the culler will feel more friendly to the man who is paying him his wage than to a man he doesn't know at all. And when one adds to that the fact that the culling of codfish occupies a short season of the year only, and most of those men are depending on the merchants whose cullers they are for employment for the rest of the year, it is apparent that the thought uppermost in the mind of the culler is that he should not antagonise the man on whom he is depending for the remaining part of the year to get his livelihood. I am not saying that the man is necessarily dishonest. The man need not be dishonest because he culls unfairly. He unconsciously culls unfairly. Neither need the merchant be dishonest because he grumbles at the culler for his cull of the fish.

I think I am safe in saying that this Bill, if it is made to operate properly (for which we have to trust the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and I think he has association enough with fishermen to have some sympathy with them), there will be great good done in the interests of the fishermen, and in the long run in the interests of the merchants. Both buyer and owner will have confidence in the man who is culling, for he will be bound to neither and his only interest will be to do the fair thing, because if he is not fair either party may complain. If it is found he has done wrong, even though he does not come within the penal sections of the Act, he will probably lose his license.

Mr. Speaker, I have glanced cursorily over the Bill and I don't see any provision for the payment of these cullers. It doesn't seem to prevent regular payments being made by the merchants or the fishermen. (*Reads Section 5*). It strikes me from that, that the Board simply fixes the payment and the merchants pay the culler. I think the Bill should go a little further than that. The culler

should be taken out of the employment of the merchant altogether. The Board controls the appointment but doesn't control the payment. The point is still the same; it is actually the merchant who does the employing. All the Board does is to issue the licence.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The Board is to name the culler and the merchant will apply to the Board. The culler will not work for any length of time in one room.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The idea is this: the merchant applies to the Board for a culler, [and] he hasn't the faintest idea who is coming there. When that man has finished culling that particular amount, he will be gone from there. The idea is to shift these men around all the time.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: He will not be under the control of the merchant.

Mr. Moore: This Bill as far as I can see only applies to St. John's. It doesn't apply to the outports. How can an outport man get in touch with the Board when he wants to buy his fish, if he has to make application to the Board for a culler. This Act, as far as I can see, can only apply to St. John's.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: This is only a matter of detail. There will be lots of little things that won't be right up to the letter. It is going to take time to get it rightified [*sic*] and the question raised by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe is to my mind a matter of detail to be worked out by the Board.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: May I ask if there is to be any special requirements for the position of culler?

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: He's got to have the experience.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the 23rd of June instant, at three o'clock, p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Friday, June 23, 1933

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

Hon. Mr. Winter presented a petition from the Continental Distilleries praying for the introduction of a Private Bill to secure certain tariff concessions.

Mr. Winter: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Continental Distilleries Limited, a company incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland. The petition deals with the subject of the construction and operation of a factory at St. John's to manufacture alcoholic liquor, and asks leave to introduce a private bill, which Bill deals with the manufacture of alcoholic liquor. I move that the petition be received and referred to a select committee.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following Select Committee to examine and report as to whether the Rules of the House had been observed in connection with the petition, viz: Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Mr. Starkes.

Mr. Bradley 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 a Select Committee had been appointed to consider the Amendments sent up in and upon the Amendments sent down in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors," and requests that a Select Committee of the House of Assembly be appointed to confer with the Committee of the Legislative Council on the said Amendments. The Committee is as follows: The Hons. J. S. Currie, Sir T. K. Cook, F. McNamara, D. A. Ryan, C. P. Ayre.

On motion a Select Committee was appointed to confer with the Committee from the Legislative Council.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. Attorney General, Hon. W. J. Browne, Mr. Halley, Mr Bradley.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice it was ordered that the Select Committee have leave to sit during Sessions.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I move that this Committee be empowered to sit during the session of this House. The Session is drawing to a close and it is very desirable that while the House is in session the Committee be allowed to sit. This motion is in accordance with the Rules of the House if the House agrees to it. Under ordinary circumstances the Committee would not be allowed to sit while the House is in session.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the "Lotteries Bill" was recommitted.

Hon. Mr. Browne: Mr. Speaker, I move that this order be deferred.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That is hardly in accordance with the undertaking which was given me that this Bill would be recommitted. There was a definite undertaking given me that the Bill would be recommitted.

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, I gave an undertaking to that effect to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I move in amendment to my learned friend's motion that the Bill be now recommitted.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: My understanding of the matter was that we divided these two amendments, so that the one dealing with the Regatta should come through as a Bill first, and the one the Hon. Leader of the Opposition proposed should come through in the form of another Bill.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That was the original idea suggested by Mr. Browne. I agreed to introduce a Bill dealing with the subject matter of the amendment, which it was then, and the amendment to the Lotteries Act passed the committee stage on that understanding. Subsequently, as His Honour the Speaker is aware, I had a conference with him and the question arose as to whether it would be proper to have two Bills amending the Lotteries Act in the present Session. I told the Speaker I was in his hands and that I was willing to do anything reasonable. There was a conference between myself and [the] Secretary of State in connection with the matter, and he agreed that this matter should be referred back to the committee stage and that I should withdraw my notice, which I did.

Mr. Shea: Mr. Speaker, I would ask if my understanding of this matter be correct – that once a Bill goes out of committee stage it cannot be recommitted without the unanimous consent of the House.

Hon. the Speaker: By consent of the House the Bill can be recommitted.

I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has stated the position quite fairly. I did call to his notice that there was already a bill to amend the Lotteries Act, and I suggested that the Bill might be recommitted instead of having two orders on the Order Paper dealing with the Lotteries Act, and as I understand it, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition withdrew his motion to introduce that Bill on the understanding that the first Bill would be recommitted.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The idea is to incorporate the second amendment with the first.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The Minister in charge of the Bill could not move the amendment. Is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition at present prepared with his amendment?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: My amendment is in the hands of the Clerk now. We will be in Committee in a moment, and we will be able to discuss it. I move, Sir, that the Bill be now recommitted.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I understand from the Clerk that he has not got the amendment. I gave it to him, but when the matter was dropped, he must have mislaid it, and he is not able to locate it now. I am satisfied to have the Bill go through now, and I will introduce my motion later. It is all the same to me. One point made seems very solemn, and that is that this Bill deals specifically with the Regatta Committee, and other matters should not be dealt with here. All the Lotteries Acts are dumped together under Section 3, however any scheme that will facilitate matters is satisfactory to me.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I would like to assure my honourable friend that it is not our intention to escape the debate on this matter, and we are quite willing to give the Hon. Leader of the Opposition an opportunity to express his views. This is not a party matter. It is purely personal. I was not here when the Bill was introduced and I am not thoroughly familiar with the details, but I understand that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition objected to housie-housie and proposed to introduce an amendment dealing with the matter. After some discussion he undertook to introduce a bill, and then the amended Bill was recommitted, and now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is ready with his amendment. I would like to point out that you should really have copies for yourselves. When the Prime Minister and myself were in Opposition, we always had copies of amendments. Of course, I would like you to realize that I am only saying this in a jocose way, but I would suggest that if you are prepared to have your amendment ready on Monday, we will now rise the Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Grant Certain Advantages to North West Products Company, Limited" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Public Works, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works Act, 1932."¹⁰⁶

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works Act, 1932" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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. Mr. Browne, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees.'"'

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ "The amended section deals with the placing of advertising signs on the highroads and other public places." *Evening Telegram*, June 24, 1933.

¹⁰⁷ "Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to amend Chap. 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series)" passed the Bill after it was amended to read that trustees could only invest or reinvest monies on first mortgages of land." *Evening Telegram*, June 24, 1933.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Browne, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Culling of Codfish."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to the Culling of Codfish" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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. Mr. Browne, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Council Acts, 1921-31" was read a second time.

Hon. Mr. Browne: Mr. Speaker, I have been authorized to move the second reading of this Bill, which is for the purpose of making certain amendments to the Act dealing with the St. John's Municipal Council. The main purpose, it seems to me, of this Bill, is dealing with the Court of Revision which, they say, falls at an awkward time of the year and happens to coincide every four years with the date of the municipal elections. The provision contained in the present Bill would have the effect of annulling the Court of Revision's work for this year, and have it regarded as a general appraisalment under another section, and the Court of Revision would resume its duties next year, 1934, as before, and would never clash with the time of holding an election.

I cannot admit having some sympathy with the provision that would put off the Court of Revision's work for this year, for this reason. It is a well-known fact that the values of properties

have dwindled considerably during the past two years since the last Court of Revision; that tenants have not been paying the rents; that they have not been able to pay the rents at which the houses were valued at that time, and so landlords are under a great burden to pay taxes on rents which they were receiving two years ago, but which they certainly are not receiving to-day, and there seems to be no facility for getting the Council to reduce the appraisement within the intervening two years, although they have power to increase, and do exercise their power to increase taxation where they find that the rent has gone up. The alternative which the Municipal Council had before them was to defer the election, but I do not think they gave very serious consideration to that alternative.

At the same time, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to say a word of praise for the Municipal Council. Four years ago this fall, Dr. Howlett and a new Council were elected to administer the affairs of St. John's, and I think it will be an everlasting tribute to the memory of Dr. Howlett's sagacity and industry on behalf of the citizens of this city, the work that he has accomplished, not only that he paved Duckworth Street, but that he struck out in a new direction. He showed the citizens of St. John's what could be done by enterprise, and by giving thought to the beauty and welfare of the city. Dr. Howlett was a most remarkable man in many ways. He was admirably and eminently ahead of anyone, I think, who held the position that he held before him, and I think it will be a long time before we have a man of his capacity, because not only was he as a professional man familiar with the needs of a healthy city, but a man of aesthetic sense who admired beauty, and he visualised not only for himself, but for the citizens, a city of which we must all be proud. He intended to take advantage of the beauties which nature had placed at our disposal, and in time, I feel sure, if he had lived, we would have had a city that would rank with any one of its size for beauty on this side of the Atlantic. His Council were very much handicapped by his loss, his death, and I think they have done very well by carrying on in his absence. At the same time, I don't think they would wish to carry on for a year beyond the time when an election is due.

The next section of the Act deals with the conduct of the elections. Anyone who has had much to do with a municipal election will recall that on each occasion that it takes place, the terrible press of people that haunts City Hall in order to secure certificates from the Clerk of the Council for the right to vote. Now, that should not be. There used to be a provision in the 1902 Act providing that the same conditions would apply as apply to the election of members of the House of Assembly. In other words, a voters' list would be taken and a supplementary list taken in the booth room. But in the municipal election, if anyone takes an interest in the matter he has two weeks to go to the Municipal Council and see if his name appears on the list. It is only in rare cases that people leave their names off. I suppose a great many people have been induced as friends of candidates to go and pay their taxes at the last minute. Probably the Council may lose out by striking out that provision that entitles a man to get a certificate.

The next section deals with the question of [the] street line of the city boundaries. The Act at the present time gives the Council power to set a minimum distance at which a man must place a building upon the street line, but if the Council only has that power, they will say to the man, "You must not put your building within 12 or 15 feet." "Very well," he says, "I will move back 25 feet." The result is that on certain streets we have one house 25 feet, another 15, another 12. It is not any more beautiful than when the houses were out on the sidewalk. This is intended to improve that state of affairs.

The next provision is to deal with the question, which was a very vexed question, connected with improvements made by tenants on land leased for building purposes. The object of this is to place beyond doubt what the meaning of improvement is, and to give the tenant credit for building houses on the land, and also to settle the meaning of the word "freehold." You will also remember, Sir, that in that section in which that provision occurs, a tenant has the right to purchase the freehold or to take a lease. For a tenant that lease shall not exceed 99 years.

Another provision in the Bill is to deal with the question that has given rise to some vexation on the part of occupiers of premises on the corner of streets, New Gower Street. Under the Act as it stands at the present time, the Council has been advised that the tenant is liable for frontage not only in front of his house on both streets, but also for the little piece that would come in between those frontages, in other words at the very corner of the street. The Council admits that a hardship has been imposed on those people, and is now making provision to rectify it.

The next provision is to deal with the question of impounding animals that are loose. If a goat happens to wander over the street it can be taken by the impounder, impounded, and can be sold to pay the expenses. But if a goat happens to go into Bannerman Park and eat a couple of dozen tulips or chew the bark off some beautiful plant or tree, the Council has no power to sell that animal to compensate the city for the damage done. It is intended that they will have [that] power.

The next section is rather an important alteration in the provision of the present Act, from the point of view of the small landlords, or small tenants too, for that matter. Under the present Act, if a person has a house that brings a rental value of less than \$120 a year, he is entitled to have a reduction of one-third off the amount of taxes ordinarily paid by him. The city tax is now 16 per cent on the rental, so that if he were receiving \$125 he is liable for 16 per cent of that amount. If he were receiving \$115 they would take 16 per cent of that amount, and the deduction one-third. The Council may make a reduction in taxation. I trust they will do that. It seems to me that there are many places in the City where the Council does not provide all the usual facilities, and it is a hardship to impose the ordinary rate of taxation on the owners of land in these sections, which they have been paying for a great number of years.

The next amendment doesn't concern the generality of citizens. Where a house is let to a tenant and sublet to another, it makes him liable to a tax as well as the other. The next section is not liable to be of interest to the people generally (*reads section*). It concerns a tax on vacant lands. The next section is one to be considered by most patrons of movie pictures and talkie pictures. It gives to the Municipal Council that power which everyone considers should have been given to it long ago – the right to make an entertainment tax. At the present time we have some sort of a tax in connection with forms of entertainment, under which the owners of theatres have to go to the City Hall every morning after the performances the night before, and sign a declaration as to the money they took in the preceding night and pay a tax on that amount. I am of the opinion myself that such a tax should be more in the nature of a national tax, and should govern all theatres in the country. The Municipal Council are now seeking power to place a tax on entertainments of all kinds in the City, with power if they are so pleased, to except charitable entertainments such as housie-housie from the tax. I don't know whether there will be any difficulties, but I feel sure that where there are exceptions there are bound to be difficulties, and they are going to have some difficulty in connection with that. However, it will give a very desirable source of revenue to the Municipal Council whose sources of

revenue are not very many at the present time. There has been a tax on entertainments in the various [omission] in Canada since the early days of the war to the extent of from 15 to 20 and 25 per cent. (*Reads next section*). Under the old Act there was no definition of what a "hawker" meant. The definition is taken from the English Dictionary. When we get into Committee, I am sure the honourable members of the House will give it careful attention. Another provision is giving the Council the right to inspect buildings other than dwellings.

The final provision gives the Municipal Council a great power than they ever had before – that is the power to make rules and regulations governing the employment of labour in St. John's. That provision, which most of the Councillors might well advocate, and which the members representing constituencies part of which are situate within the Municipality of St. John's might be prepared to support, does not seem to me to be strictly proper. We might think that it is very good at first sight. I think that there is much to be said in favour of it, but I see much to be said against giving the Municipal Council a blank chart, so to speak, with regard to the powers they might have over outside labour. It is generally recognized that the World Economic Conference is trying to delete the attitude which this provision in the Bill portrays. The provision does not show the spirit which the World Economic Conference is trying to spread, on a very much larger scale of course. It is generally known that the World Economic Conference is trying to break down the barriers created by one nation against the other, and the Imperial Economic Conference of last year attempted to break down the barriers which the Dominions within the Empire had created against each other. This doesn't seem to be the time to create barriers between persons living in the City and those outside it. We will take up this phase of the Bill when we go into Committee, and the members who have advocated the reform should consider that point. The people who live near the city, such as those in Kelligrews, Petty Harbour and nearby settlements, should have the right to go to any part of the country to work. And then there is always bound to be the question of retaliation. I am sorry that no members representing the districts in St. John's with the exception of the Prime Minister are here while we are speaking on this important matter. I think it is wrong because there is danger of retaliation, and when the men of St. John's want to go to Corner Brook or to Bell Island or other places outside of St. John's, they will be told, "No, you refused to give us work in St. John's, why should we give it to you?" I trust I have not bored the Honourable Members with going through the various sections of this Bill. It is a really important Bill. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. the Speaker: Private bills must be referred to a Select Committee after the second reading.

It was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House. Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. the Attorney General, Mr. Starkes.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, the 26th day of June instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Monday, June 26, 1933

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

*Petitions were presented by
Mr. Moore from White Bay, re Hospital.*

Mr. Moore: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition, or rather a series of petitions, from the District of White Bay. These petitions cover the territory from La Scie to Cook's Harbour asking that the grant taken away from the Grenfell Mission be restored. I will read the first petition. They all cover the same subject matter (*reads petition*).

I beg leave to present these petitions and I ask that they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I might say that I have every sympathy with the subject matter of the petitions presented by the Member for White Bay. But as Minister of Finance, I must say that it would be impossible to put back the full grant formerly given to the Grenfell Mission. We must bear in mind that we have very little money at our disposal, and none from which we could make a contribution such as this. However, in view of the fact that, as Sir Wilfred Grenfell points out, the absolute cutting out of all assistance on the part of the Government seems like a censure on the work of the Grenfell Mission, [and] in view of the fact that these petitions have been presented and at the request of others besides, the Government have decided to contribute the sum of \$2,500, which will be included in the Estimates for 1933-34. This is done partly to show no desire on the part of the Government to censure the work of the Grenfell Mission, the work of which organization we all recognize as being of much value to the people of our coast where it operates.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled a Report on Economic Consultation and Cooperation.

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

*Mr. Speaker left the Chair.
Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.*

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister:¹⁰⁸ Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Estimates for the ensuing year, I would like to make a few prefatory remarks. Afterwards, if it is suitable to the honorable gentlemen of the other side, we can take up the Estimates in detail. If the honorable gentlemen prefer having time to study them before we go into them in detail, I shall be very pleased to make a postponement.

We have tried to make the averages out in the Estimates this year, that is to say, so that it will

¹⁰⁸ The newspaper reports of this speech are transcribed below.

not be necessary to the finances of the country to introduce supplementary supply next year. In the matter of finances perhaps it will be better to refer to the public debt first. Since we last met, the Government of the United Kingdom have been good enough to offer us a sufficient amount to make up the interest falling due on the first of July. According to the present figures, it will require about \$1,850,000 to make up the deficiency in our interest payments. I regret to say that it is necessary to have recourse in this generous offer to meet our interest payments, but it was the only course available. We are not quite sure yet that the amount will be forthcoming. The reason is that when the United Kingdom Government made the suggestion that they would supply us with the needed amount, and wanted to know immediately the amount that was necessary because they would have to incorporate it in their Estimates, these Estimates had not then been passed in the British House of Commons, nor are these Estimates passed yet. But I take it that the Government with the majority they have, if they indicate a desire to supply the necessary interest to the Newfoundland Government, will certainly have the power to put it through the British House of Commons.

I am sure that the Honourable Members will appreciate how reluctant I have been that we should incur any more indebtedness as far as the public debt is concerned. I have had the feeling all the time that by borrowing to pay our indebtedness we were throwing good money after bad, that by borrowing more we would be creating a liability which would be bequeathed to those coming after us. However, the situation has been very difficult. Last December the United Kingdom Government offered to make up any shortage there might be between our interest which was due at the time, and the amount which we would have to pay. Eventually the Canadian Government and the United Kingdom Government made up the amount between them, by advancing \$625,000 each. They stated then that they were prepared to advance the desired amount if we were prepared to agree to the appointment of a Royal Commission which would meet here and take evidence and enquire into our future.

This year the situation is even more important. The Economic Conference is sitting at London, and it would be distinctly awkward for the British Government if some of the dominions should default at this particular time. The Royal Commission have not yet handed in their report, but I am sure that we will find in that report a great deal of consolation and support when we appeal to our bondholders to reduce the bond interest. It would be deplorable indeed if, when the Royal Commission had come out here to inquire into our affairs, and before they had yet handed in their report, we should have to default. I am myself, and I am sure every Newfoundlander is grateful to the Home Government for the offer, and for their desire to help us. We must bear in mind that it was the only thing that could be done if we are to maintain our integrity. After all, the report of the Royal Commission is sure to justify us in the economies we have put in force. It is impossible to reduce the public services any further. We have had to reduce them to [the] required minimum.

Our condition is due to the circumstances brought about by the depressed markets and the depressed purchasing power of the people. We can hardly be blamed, because we have done our best; but our best will not meet our bond interest. Consequently, I look forward with a good deal of confidence to the hope that the report of the Royal Commission will justify us in looking for a considerable abatement on interest on our public debt. I feel sure that this is the last time that we shall have to look for outside help to pay our interest. As we felt – I and my colleagues – that we could not in justice to those coming after us incur any further debt, and if there was going to be a

default we were prepared to take that odium on our own shoulders. But now this amount is going to be advanced by the United Kingdom Government. Of course, we are not absolutely sure of it yet, but they have not gone into Supplementary Supply in the House of Commons, and I am certain that it will go through when the time comes.

There will be some opposition I know, because last year there was a great deal of criticism. Then the line of criticism was, "Why help Newfoundland when we need the money so badly at home? Why don't they look after themselves? Our own island could do very well with that \$600,000." I am sure when it is introduced the Government will have to give very concise and strong reasons why they should advance us this money again. They are advancing it on the same terms, and the same security as the first loan of \$625,000 advanced last December.

The Estimates for 1933-34 are practically the same as for 1932-33. When we add the supplementary supply and the original Estimates of last year, we get about the same as for the coming year. In the Secretary of State's department there is a considerable surplus. In the Department of Public Welfare, the increase there is accounted for by the fact that we made provision for casual able-bodied relief. In the Estimates of last year the amount of \$50,000 was taken. That \$50,000 was more than absorbed in the first month. I am afraid that we can't hope to keep it down to \$500,000, but we are going to do our best. At the present time we are endeavouring to get every one to go fishing, and it will cost us no more than if we kept these men home doing nothing. At the same time, the money advanced to them to go fishing will help to support themselves and their families, and the amount will be no more than if they were fed on the dole. In addition, it is demoralising to anyone to sit in idleness and draw government relief.

My colleague, Mr. Moore, presented a petition in connection with the Grenfell Mission. We are unable to give them the full vote that was formerly given, and which amounted to \$10,000. But we are prepared and indeed anxious to do our best, and we have resolved to vote \$2,500 annually to Sir Wilfred Grenfell's undertaking. It was pointed out by Sir Wilfred Grenfell that the cutting out of this vote altogether might be taken to cast some reflection on his activities. This vote that we now give will at least have the effect of disabusing the minds of those who think that we don't appreciate the very great work that he is doing at St. Anthony.

On page 28, this vote has been reduced. It has taken a good deal of moral courage and perhaps in some cases it is wanted. In 1931-32 the vote there for general public health was \$443,000 expenditure. Last year the expenditure was \$266,804, and then there was carried over from the previous year a deficit of some \$71,000. That made the total expenditure \$337,804. There has been a very great reduction from the previous year. We hope to do better this year. Anyway, it won't be for the want of trying if we don't. We find that there was formerly a lot of looseness in this Department, and I am afraid that the doctors did not always play the game by the people of the country as they might have done. Their bills have been very large and the country has suffered accordingly.

The vote in the Justice Department is rather higher, by reason of the fact that the Minister of Justice deemed it advisable to increase the police force. The increase of the police force more than accounts for the increase of the coming year over last year.

Then there is the Bureau of Education. I know there is no inducement for the young prospective teachers to come into the field. I am afraid we would find that a good many of the

teachers would not be with us if they had anywhere else to go. They can't go to the United States, nor is there any inducement for them to go to Canada. There is no work for them at home. I am quite ready to admit that the vote is by no means creditable to us. I will venture to say that we are paying less for education than any other country where the English language is spoken. I have an idea that our system at the present time is not in keeping with the requirements of our young people. I speak with the backing of the opinions of a great number of people who know more about this subject than I do. The curriculum of our schools should be more in keeping with the after-school careers of our boys and girls than it is at present.

In Agriculture and Mines there is an increase, which is accounted for by the fact that Agriculture and Mines cost \$5,000 more than the vote of last year. Then we dropped last year for logging camp expenses \$8,000. These additional amounts more than account for the increase of \$60,000 over \$50,000 for last year.

In the Department of Posts and Telegraphs there has been a considerable reduction without any impairment of the service. The Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not here at present, but he believes that the day is not very far distant when the Postal Department will balance. He hopes that next year the deficit will be no more than \$70,000. The Commission, assisting the Minister, have been indefatigable in their activities towards making reductions. Where salaries are so small – \$500 and \$600 is very little – it is very difficult to make any reduction that will make any showing. The correct total for the postal telegraphs is \$741,000 against \$839,000 of last year. The Minister hopes that when he gets a more general wireless service he will be able to obviate the necessity of maintaining line repairs and keeping up poles and wires, and he will be able to effect still further economies.

Customs Department. The vote this year is practically \$415,000 against \$431,000 of last year. Looking down the Preventive Service, there has been a particular increase of \$12,000. Last year, if I remember correctly as regards the Preventive Service, we made provision for, I think, six months only. We had to make up the difference when asking for supplemental supply. This year we shall require for that service \$34,000. The West Coast Preventive Service will amount to \$30,000, but I feel that we are going to get very adequate returns for this expenditure. If I remember correctly, the average cost of running the *Daisy* was \$32,000 for a year. We now can run four small revenue cutters for \$30,000. They will be much more effective. They will be able to act as coastguards right along the coast. I feel they will be the means of reducing a great deal of the smuggling that is now going on from St. Pierre.

Department of Public Works. We found it necessary, the Minister found it necessary in submitting the Estimates, to make an application for an increase in the vote for roads and bridges. The vote last year was totally inadequate. It is necessary to increase it because it would be penny wise and pound foolish to allow our roads and bridges to go too far. Consequently we are asking for the small amount of an additional \$10,000.

Public Charities. The vote has been reduced considerably, namely \$31,000. We are buying supplies, hospital supplies in particular, at a much lower rate than heretofore. I think last year the Minister told me he had been able to save on drugs alone about 40 per cent, partly in price and partly by stopping a great deal of waste that was going on in some of the public institutions.

Another increase is in page 84, section J, Repairs and Maintenance of Public Buildings. Last

year the estimate was \$30,000, this year it is \$55,000. That is really an investment. In some cases we have to get renewals, and in other cases the Minister is putting up more up to date systems. While the first cost is \$20,000 [more] this year than last year, that will be a very considerable saving in the consumption of coal, light and power. We put a few of them the same as last year. I understand the Minister will have more efficient services and will be able to save something on this \$70,000.

Pensions. The main saving there is military pensions. Wherever there is any case of hardship we are having a commission, with the authority of the Government, to enquire into any of these cases. Where justifiable the pension will be increased and in some cases brought back to the original pension.

Department of Labour. This is a new department and which, by the way, is relieving the different members of the Government of a great deal of detail work. The Bureau of Labour is keeping in close touch with all sources of employment that are in the Island, and have a list of the men with their capabilities as to whether they are fitted for any particular position. The Bureau is also keeping in touch with these industrial centres, so that when they want a man or a lot of men, they can apply to the Bureau and the Minister of Labour can supply. Now, that is all gentlemen, and as we go through the detail if there are any points to be raised ...

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, we would prefer to have a few hours to look through the Estimates before we would be in a position to discuss them.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Browne, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The amendment which I have to offer to this Bill consists in the addition of a new section to be known as Section 3 (*reads*). I move that that section be added.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: I am afraid I don't agree with this amendment (*reads*). Now, that means that this game must have some dangers and evil characteristics. It must be far more demoralising than stockbroking or poker or the good old game of forty-fives, or any other game,

wheel of fortune or anything else that we practise in this country. I must say that I can't see the force of that argument at all. In fact, until this amendment was brought in here to the Lotteries Act to enable the Regatta Committee to run a gambling system, and which my honourable learned friend supported, the evils of this game of housie-housie never seemed to occur to him. It is true that he deplored it. He was the Acting Solicitor General for four years. His eyes were open and he was able to see if there were any irregularities in connection with the operation of this sort of game, and I might point out to my honourable learned friend that the magistrate now has power to see that these games of chance are properly conducted, and I believe that if any complaint was made to the magistrate that there was anything of the nature of which he complains going on, that the magistrate would exercise his powers, discontinue permits and would not grant such again, but it seems to me to be a wrong thing to place this game of housie-housie in so low a category as he does.

If we were going through good times my learned friend would not object to it, but he says we are going through difficult times; that people who can't afford it are spending their money on this game. Therefore we should not allow anyone to play. We only have his word for it. I am not saying it is untrue, I am saying that he is acting upon hearsay himself. I don't expect that he goes down and inspects these games when in operation, or that he knows the names of people engaged in practicing it. Surely there should be some investigation and report before we should destroy this game that, after all, must provide a great deal of amusement to some people. I have made enquiries myself, and I have been informed that this game is not subject to the abuses to anything like the extent that my learned friend has said. In fact, those who have informed me have said that there are no abuses. That it is not the poor so much as the well-to-do who engage in this form of amusement. It is not a very intellectual form of amusement, but apparently very entertaining, and if the people are on the dole and so poor, how do they play? Where do they get the money to play? If they get the dole they are not supposed to be earning money; if they are earning money they don't get any dole. The names of all labourers in St. John's, all that are receiving dole who receive employment, go back and forth between the employers and the department administering relief, so that when a man earns a certain amount of money the record goes to the Charity Branch and he is stricken off the dole. Whether these people escape the vigilance of those in authority I don't know, but it certainly seems a sound argument that people on the dole can't have any money to spend on this game, and I very much doubt if there are any more than a very small percentage of people who are in receipt of relief who engage in this game.

As we all know, this game of housie-housie has been used by charitable organizations for the purpose of giving charity, and the money has been well distributed and we have no doubt about it, in the majority of cases has been well administered. I know of one particular case where a certain settlement has been in receipt of no poor relief, and it is largely attributed to the fact that money was raised in some manner connected with the operation of this game, so that it is not an entirely evil thing, and very frequently has operated to the advantage of the poor people rather than to their disadvantage. The person in charge of the operation of that game of chance has informed me that the very best people engage in it, who have more money than even my honourable learned friend or myself, so I would ask him to reconsider seriously the step which he wants us to take in connection with this game in making it a penal offence. If he would reflect again, I feel quite sure he would realise that the evils are not so serious as he at first thought, and that there is no need at the present

juncture to introduce any amendment to this Bill now before the Committee, so that all that is necessary is to see that there is no abuse of the privilege granted to societies, and to see that they carry out the law as it stands to-day.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't suppose there is an individual within the sound of my voice who has broader views on the question of gambling than I have myself. Gambling, after all, is a matter of degree. What would be gambling for me, doubtless would not be gambling for my honourable learned friend who is in charge of the Bill. He could afford it, and I could not. It would be gambling for me, but not for him. No one would suffer if he lost, no one would be a breakfast the shorter if he lost, but if I were to gamble to the same extent somebody might be short, and that is my objection to gambling in the main. I do not arrogate to myself the right to dictate to anyone as to what is morally right or what is morally wrong. I am not the keeper of any man's conscience. There is not a more tolerant individual along these lines in this House this afternoon than I am, but when any particular practice affects the general community of which I form an insignificant part, I feel that I have a right to object, and I want to tell my honourable friend that I thought at the time I first introduced the amendment to this Bill, that I had the support of a substantial portion of the citizens of St. John's. I want to tell him now that I am absolutely sure of it. It is not a question of guesswork any longer. Dozens of men of all classes and creeds have spoken to me about this matter, and said that the thing should be stopped. It is generally recognized in the city to-day that it is an evil, despite the fact that someone who seems to be closely identified with some of these housie-housie games, and therefore incidentally has some interest in painting it in as mild colours as possible, seems to have conveyed [the opposite] to my honourable learned friend. He says that this amendment, in effect, will prevent the ordinary citizen from engaging in housie-housie in his own home. In the form in which the amendment now stands, I think there will be very, very few games of housie-housie in homes stopped as a result of this amendment, because it is not played there now.

The number of homes you will find the game played in, in St. John's, may be counted on the fingers of your two hands. Nobody plays the game among half a dozen. It is no good among a few. It is played among a crowd, and the bigger the crowd the better the chances of winning a prize. The Hon. Member refers to the fact that I did nothing in connection with this matter while the government of which I was a member was in power. Of course, that is a standard chestnut thrown out to an Opposition man who has ever been in a past Government. But I feel sure that my honourable friend from time to time observes new facts and assimilates new ideas, so also I claim the right to develop my brain, should it be capable of development as well as he. Everything I have done in my life has not been right. Some of them have been wrong, as have been some of the acts of the Hon. Member. But when I find that I have been wrong, surely I have the right to change my opinion. Surely, when I find that situation I have the right to have a new view as the result of information and of mental development. I never paid a great deal of attention to this form of gambling, but it has during the past few months been borne in upon me that this particular form of gambling has brought considerable demands upon the community and it has cost the Colony a considerable number of dollars, and this is the time when, as I say, I have the right to speak and object.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: May I ask my honourable friend if he would show how these things have been done?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Yes. This game is played by people who are in want. A certain proportion of their 10-cent pieces or their nickels goes to the organization that is running the game. A certain proportion goes to the winner. Let us put it at a 50-50 division for the sake of argument. I don't know the proportion as it actually exists.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: It is certainly not that. It's a 20-80 division.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The actual proportion doesn't make any difference for the sake of argument. The point I wish to make, is that the winner beyond all doubt loses. If he engages in the game, he certainly will lose. If he puts in 100 per cent, and as my honourable learned friend suggests, 20 per cent goes to the organization and the result is that the players lose. Now that other 20 per cent we may say goes to charity.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: It is just the opposite that I meant. Only about 20 per cent goes to the players and 80 per cent goes to charity.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The charity is not always of the type that brings back to individual in need the money collected. I know something of what I am talking about. The money goes to charities of a particular type. Some goes to proper charities. Some goes back, perhaps, to the type of people who I am complaining are playing the game of housie-housie. The bulk of it doesn't go to these people, and the people are left without it. They get back 20 cents on the dollar, and if my honourable friend has ever attended these games, he must know himself that the class of people playing that game is not able to afford it, and when the ordinary player of the game loses he suffers. In the long run he can't beat the game. There is no doubt about that. He will come out of it a loser. I am not a regular attendant at these games. I never attended one in my life, but I know a number of people who have been there, people who are gamblers themselves and who don't object to it on moral grounds, but who are wholly opposed to the game on the grounds that it is taking away the money from the poor, and it is the poor who generally play the game. The mere fact that a man is on the dole doesn't debar his playing housie-housie, and a man on the dole is not prevented from taking part in the game by those in charge. And even if it is played by those who are not on the dole, they are losing, they suffer. It is bringing them so much nearer to dole, and eventually some of these will go over the ledge.

My honourable friend said that the magistrate has power to see that these games are properly conducted. I never said that the games were not properly conducted. I am not accusing any of the organizations conducting these games of doing anything improper. I take it for granted that the games they run are honestly conducted, and that the understood proportion is handed into the hands of the winner. Nobody suggests that they are cheating the people. It's the playing of the game that I am objecting to for economic reasons. These organizations are conducting the game honestly enough, as far as I am concerned. But people are playing the game who can't afford it. And after

all, no organisation is going to have a man to stand at the door of the hall where this game is being played and say who can or who cannot afford to play it. I am not accusing any of these organizations of dishonesty. They are conducting the game in a perfectly legal way, and nobody suggests anything dishonest or the presence of any fraud. As far as the magistrate's interference is concerned, he knows nothing at all about it. He could only ascertain as far as anyone could do so that it was being conducted honestly, and that is all he could do.

Now, I don't want to labour this point any longer. I am satisfied, as I said before, that in the view I take on this question I have the backing of the citizens of St. John's. This game to-day is taking the pennies of many people who can't afford to lose them, and they are thereby brought nearer to the dole. It is to that I object – the taking in the sacred name of charity of money from people who cannot afford to part with it, from the very people who ought to be the recipients of charity themselves, and it is that I want to stop. If my honourable friend wants to leave the game to the people who can afford to play it, I have no objection to that.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: You were going to show how this game costs money to the Colony.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I haven't got statistics here with me showing the actual figures. I didn't stand at the doors of these halls and see each man who lost and each one who won; but I have the evidence of prominent [men] who know something about the game, and they say that people who can't afford it, who are on the dole, have been seen coming out of those places. That they played this game of housie-housie and were down to the Relief Department the next day for their dole ration.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Hearsay.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I might not be in a position at the present time to say that I saw these things myself, or to take an affidavit to that effect. My learned friend speaks with the state of mind of a lawyer now; but I know a few decent people in the City of St. John's to-day who do not need the compulsion of an oath to tell the truth. They tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. Ask the opinion of the citizens of St. John's to-day, and you will find at least 70 per cent of this town to-day who would be glad to see that game cut out altogether, and that is my only reason for wanting it done away with. I don't ask that all forms of gambling be done away with. I am not trying to prevent a man from playing a game of poker or any other gambling game. It is this game of housie-housie to which I object, and which seems to have gotten the crowd obsessed in some way.

As far as I can gather this is how the game is played, and I am going to outline it for the benefit of the Members of the House who may not be as familiar as I am with the manner in which the game is played. You are given a card, and on the card there are a number of squares, and on each of these squares there is a number. You are also given some corn. You put the corn down on the table and you put the card down in front of you. Some fellow up front has a box of metal or wooden discs on which there are numbers. He puts his hand in the box, and calls out the number on the disc which he draws out. If you have that number on your card you put a piece of corn down on it. Then the fellow up front draws the next number. Perhaps you haven't got it. The next number is called,

and if you have it you put it down on the number on your card, and so on to the end of the game. When you get a row of corn diagonally, vertically, or horizontally you have won that game.

I suppose lack of necessity for brain exercise in the case of some individuals gives a relish for that game in some types of mentality. That game hasn't the virtue of poker or forty-fives or bridge. After all poker and those other games are games of skill, those games have that saving virtue. But the game of housie-housie calls for the exercise of no skill whatsoever. Yet people are going down to play it night after night and week after week, because it is intriguing and so fascinating, and because it consequently draws in the money of the people who can't afford to lose their money. They must lose because they can't win in the long run.

Because of the financial conditions in the City to-day I am desirous of stopping it, and because of that reason I move the amendment. It is not my desire to interfere in vested rights. I have no desire to upset any organization or number of organizations who are issuing sweepstakes tickets by way of prizes for these games of housie-housie. I don't want to disorganize these institutions or to make trouble for them, and because of that reason I have so framed the amendment so that the Board will have no further power to issue permits, and these games will cease on the first of December. That will give these organizations time to clear up any sweep tickets that are already issued.

Captain Byrne: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the amendment which is introduced by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, it seems to me, Sir, that we are taking up this matter from the wrong angle entirely. I must object to the amendment in so far as to me it seems most absurd that we have to legislate on this innocent amusement of housie-housie and make it a criminal offense. It seems to me that the remedy for the evil does not lie in putting the game of housie-housie on the statute books as a criminal offence. As to what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says about the evils which result from the abuse of this game, I am sure that every Member in this House of Assembly, and the great bulk of the citizens of St. John's, will agree that the game as operated for the past couple of years has become a disgrace; but we must remember that we have the machinery right in the Lotteries Act to deal fully with that matter. It is not that there is anything wrong with the innocent game of housie-housie; but the evil arises from the fact that the authorities have enabled certain bodies to carry on the game unrestrictedly and the result is, as the honourable introducer says, the game is played night in and night out, week in and week out; and therein the whole evil lies.

We have heard a lot about the abuses of the game: about poor women selling their bread, and others selling eggs to get money to play the game, and about people who are on the dole spending the few coppers they get to play the game. But that doesn't come into the argument. The same people may be seen at the nickels.¹⁰⁹ We can point to cases of people on the dole and otherwise who are going to shows, and yet we are not going to stop all shows because of that. We know of people who leave their starving children home in order to attend raffles. Are we going to stop all raffles because people are gambling? Are we going to stop wheels of fortune at the garden parties because people spend 10 cents there who can't afford it? The great evil lies in the fact that this game is

¹⁰⁹ Movies.

permitted by the authorities to be run unrestrictedly, and no steps are taken to see that the game is not abused, and after the permit is issued there is no further supervision. In so far as that goes, I am in accord: this game should not be abused. This game, as pointed out the other day by an Honorable Member, is nothing but a simple amusement where a crowd gathers, and as proof of that fact it was the only game of chance permitted in the army during the war. As the Honorable Members are probably aware, it was crime in the army to gamble, but the game of "House," as it was then known, was allowed to be played. And where there were from 1,000 to 2,000 men on a ship for many days, this game gave simple amusement to the soldiers during the war.

The idea of the game is that a large number of people put a small amount down as a stake and they get a large and substantial prize if they win. I don't see anything wrong with that, and that is the way it should operate – as an amusement at a garden party or a regatta. The Regatta Committee in running these wheels of fortune will, and no doubt do intend to have games of housie-housie. A great many people who visit the Regatta, and who sit and play these games, will not gamble at the wheels of fortune. And are we to say that that is a crime? That's the objectionable feature to me – putting this game down as a crime to play it. As I say, surely we ought to be able to bring about some remedy for the abuse of this game, without having recourse to the Legislature. The Justice Department should be in a position, and it surely has the authority to say that neither the License Board nor the magistrate should grant permits where there will be an abuse of the game. There seems to me to be no reason whatever why this game should not be permitted at garden parties, regattas or other like entertainments, and after all, that is the main idea behind the game; and where the game is so used, the right to hold the game at a garden party or other like entertainment should not be taken away because people will go there and spend more money than they can afford to spend on the game. If you or I go to a garden party, and if we have something to spend, we are going out there to spend that amount of money. What matter it to the Government how we are going to spend that money? I know that the game is run at all the garden parties. People have 50 cents or more or less to spend there. Isn't it up to them how they will spend it? But when the garden party or other like entertainment is over, the game should end there.

When the gambling concession was made originally, the legislators never intended that this game was to be played incessantly in our city. That is the strenuous objection throughout the City – the fact that the game is played constantly throughout every season of the year. But I question very seriously if there is anything like a majority of the people in the city who want to have us put the foolish game on the statute books as a crime. Mr. Chairman, that's ridiculous in my mind. But I will say that I would agree heartily with any measure that would be taken by the Justice Department to stop the granting of permits to organizations which run the game endlessly throughout the year. I think that the amendment proposed is unnecessary to accomplish this. Unquestionably there is a great deal of harm being done throughout the community by the continual running of these games, and by permits being issued indiscriminately to organizations to play housie-housie. But the game itself is only a simple amusement and nobody is going to say that we should put it on the statute books as a criminal offence. I would recommend that we go the other way about it, and make strict rules as to the granting of permits to play this game, and ensure that permission is granted only in the case of garden parties and regattas and similar entertainments which are run for one day only.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring the attention of my honorable friend the Leader of the Opposition the remarks of the speaker who has just sat down, to the effect that all that is necessary is to exercise the proper supervision in regard to the issue of permits; that the trouble, as been as pointed out, [is] that the game has been allowed to continue night after night instead of being confined to garden parties or entertainments of that kind. There are two ways in which the licence may be granted – one by the magistrate, in which case the purpose of the game must be for charitable objects connected with bazaars, sales or entertainments of that sort, and the total number of chances sold cannot exceed \$500. The permit in that case may be issued by the Stipendiary Magistrate alone. Then there is the Lottery Licence Board which has to do with anything outside of the power given to the magistrate. There is a general provision as regards the distribution of the money, and if the conditions are not carried out the organization to whom the licence is issued is liable to have its licence cancelled and is also liable to a fine.

If there is any other necessary provision needed to strengthen the powers of the magistrate in regard to the particular game which it is stated is being abused, it can be easily inserted. But, Sir, I don't see why we need the amendment which my learned friend proposes and which he has drawn up. If we were to accept that amendment, as intimated by the speaker who has just sat down, we will be making garden parties even more boring than they are now.

I never played wheel of fortune, and if I had my way I think I would abolish wheel of fortune and every kind of gambling. I simply can't see why my learned friend should pick out this particular game in an act which is enabling the Regatta Committee to engage in this game. My only suggestion is, now that he has studied the Act very carefully and will see that the magistrate certainly has all the powers, if he thinks that more power is needed I will be quite agreeable. I certainly don't think it is necessary to make this simple childish game a criminal offence.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't want to delay this matter, Mr. Speaker. The House has possession of all the facts and the arguments of other speakers, and the House is competent to decide for itself what it wants to do. The only thing that I have to say about it is this, that you have given powers to magistrates and they have, in accordance with the regulations laid down, issued permits. There has been nothing of an unfair or improper character taking place in the conduct of these games as I understand it, upon which any legal objection could be founded, and if you are going to reproduce regulations which will govern the Licensing Board you are getting into pretty deep water. If you have to draft regulations which will cover each particular case, I am afraid you won't have a simple amendment such as I have here. This game is of no consequence as a game. Its objectionable feature is its continuous character. Nobody plays wheel of fortune night after night, day after day, month in and month out; nobody buys a ticket every time a man meets him on the street with one in a lottery. It is the continuous character of this. I have no objection to a Christmas raffle which takes place a week or two before Christmas, when a man goes down and risks a chance of ten cents on getting a turkey, but it is the wholesale character of this thing that I am objecting to. Get the idea out of your minds altogether that I am objecting to it on moral grounds. I am not a moralist in the sense of trying to enforce my views. After all, if you are going to philosophize, life is a gamble anyway. The very fisherman who incurs an obligation for his supplies in the spring, he throws that money in the pool on the chance that he will catch fish, on the chance that he will have

weather to cure the fish and on the chance that the markets will give him a decent price. The only man who does not gamble is the man who has got a salary, and he gambles to a certain extent. If you want to carry the thing right to a philosophical conclusion, life is a gamble.

It is not the question of the gamble. It is the question that this game has in effect taken money out of the pockets of people who cannot afford it, and placed nothing in these pockets. In times such as we are passing through now, that is a thing which ought not to be permitted. If they were earning wages such as they were earning four or five years ago, I have no objection to their playing housie-housie – that is their own business. When it affects the community and causes expenditure to the state, I object.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Does my learned friend think that this section has been carried out (*reads*)? Do you think that the game of housie-housie has been run contrary to that provision?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't know if permits have been issued on that basis. I can't tell you. I am told that when these games are played it is usual to run a sweepstake of, we will say, \$500 total value, or \$1,000 total value. If they go to the Board and get permits, do they sell these tickets by means of running a game of housie-housie? I know of people who go to a hall and sit down and they contribute 5 or 10 cents, as the case may be. That money is put in a pool by the conductor of the game. When the prize is won, a certain proportion of the pool is given to the winner, representing 30 or 40 per cent. Another proportion is given, not in cash, but in tickets in this lottery, and the balance in cash is utilized for the purpose of expenses and profits. Not only does a man not get his winnings in cash, but part in cash and part in another chance. I understand that every now and then at these games they give you what they call a free ride or something of that kind, a free ticket. Everyone in the hall is handed out a free ticket. How many of these are in existence?

By how much does that reduce the chances of the man who has a ticket? If the sweepstake is \$1,000, that would give 10,000 10-cent tickets. From what I am told, there are 50,000 to 100,000 floating around town on that sweepstake. I don't think there is anything wrong about it. It is not a question of legality. I am not interested in the question as to whether it is legal or not, but I want to stop that kind of thing under existing conditions.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: This has nothing to do with the Lotteries Board. This comes within the jurisdiction of the magistrate. If the magistrate issued it, the total number of tickets sold under the sweepstake will not be allowed to exceed 500. The total receipts in a game of chance may be \$500 – not what they give out, but the total including what they give out, so that if they were wrong of that principle I don't imagine very great harm would be done by one or two or three of these in the course of the year. If the Board issues a permit, then it comes within Section 6: they must receive a licence signed by the Board. If they are operating without a licence, then they are liable to a \$1,000 fine. (*Reads section of the Act*). I think my honourable friend has made this amendment without sufficient information.

Hon. Secretary of State: I have been very sympathetic with the stand taken by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition from the time he introduced the first amendment to this Bill now before the House,

and I thought there would have been an amendment along the lines of allowing clubs and garden parties certain mild games of housie-housie without drawing in from the general public the people to whom he refers who cannot afford to play housie-housie, or any other kind of game with the economic situation as it is at the present time. He and I wrestled for a while trying to get the amendment to the Act along these lines. He, being a lawyer, did not think that I could get an amendment that would be acceptable and get an amendment that would cover the point, that is to keep the game restricted to bona fide members of the clubs or societies on the roll of that society.

I have to confess that the amendment now before the Chair is a little extreme. My principle, as far as that is concerned, leads me to vote in this House against anything that could be thought of as gambling in any way. I don't believe in gambling. I don't believe in housie-housie, but I am satisfied always to allow that another man has a mind of his own as well as I have, and has a principle to profess as well as I have, and every man's mind is a kingdom. I am very much impressed with the speech that the Member for St. John's East delivered. I think it is a fair and reasonable presentation of the case. I don't think much harm would [come] to a club engaged playing a game of housie-housie, but when it comes to a society or club, perhaps because short of funds themselves, and [they] cannot get the members to pay up their dues as they paid them when times were good. and they perhaps carry on the game for no other reason, it is not quite legitimate, and not quite along the lines for which that club or society was incorporated in the first place. When that happens, I hold that continuing that game night after night, day after day, all year round for such purpose, I think that continual game of gambling should be stopped. I have no fault to find with a club or garden party who have a little passing game, but when the hall is thrown open to the public, and the public and the poor public dragged in night after night – I went into one place, peeped in through the door one night and in a room about 120 people were playing that game, and I can say conscientiously that there were numbers, according to their dress and according to their looks, who could not afford to be there, and 70 per cent of them were the women of the town. That is what I object to, and I think myself that the administration of the Act should be in the hands of the Minister of Justice. He has some control over the Licensing Board, he has some control over the permits after they are issued to see that they are carried out in a legitimate way.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: Absolutely no control.

Hon. Secretary of State: The Member in charge of the Bill says that the Act can be administered so that that would not arise.

Hon. Minister of Justice: By those who have the licensing in their hands.

Hon. Secretary of State: I think the Justice Department controls the magistrates. They have to take [the] advice, legal interpretation sometimes, of the Justice Department. I think myself, with the Hon. Member for St. John's East, that somehow we as a Legislature should stop that kind of thing, that continuous game carried on day in and day out by societies who were formed for the purpose of fraternalism, and not for the purpose of carrying on a gambling den whenever they can get an opportunity to do so, and whenever they can find loopholes in the Act. I think the Leader of the

Opposition has done a service to bring conditions before the House. He and I tried to get an amendment to the Act whereby it would operate, not so harshly as the amendment he has introduced, but that would prevent the poor people of St. John's going into the houses or clubs and continuously playing this game. We failed to do it, and he thought the best way would be to introduce an amendment to the Bill that would absolutely prohibit the game of housie-housie. Whether that is the best procedure I am not so sure. I have a [omission] garden party or club doing it; I have doubts on that question; think some other way should be found.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: I don't know how popular the game is at the present time. I have made no enquiry, but I feel pretty certain that if the debates are given proper publicity in the papers to-morrow, instead of having housie-housie played in one or two halls, it will be played all over the country. I have recollections of listening to speeches in this House of Assembly [in] years gone by, when we were making preparations to give every man, woman and child a set of wings and send them on their way to heaven when they were talking about the pitfalls found around liquor saloons, when they were working on a programme of prohibition, when they were going to make every person sober; when they were going to close up the lunatic asylums and all the gaols and finally put through legislation that would carry into effect these splendid ideas. I ask you to visualize what happened after. Was it not a fact that shortly after we put that legislation into effect we had people throughout the length and breadth of Newfoundland, who had never tasted liquor, [who] were selling rubber collars and boiling them out and using boot polish that was supposed to contain alcohol? Was not our history here repeated in the United States? It is a reflection on the House of Assembly to have us sitting here for two hours, very intelligent lawyers, wasting valuable time in discussing such a silly subject as to whether people should be allowed to go into a hall and play housie-housie that may cost them a quarter, or whether they should be in gaol. Not only would they go and play housie-housie in these particular halls, they would have it spread throughout the country.

In my District it has not appeared yet. I have on my desk sheafs of telegrams from people wondering whether they are going to get supplies for the fishery, and they would far sooner have their representative down in his office attending to that business. I regret that the Leader of the Opposition who has such talent – I don't dispute the honesty of his purpose in bringing this matter before the House, but I do think that all these laws should be left to father and mother, to the police and the schoolmaster. These are the people who should advise the children whether they should go and play housie-housie.

It is not here that it should be done, and any House of Assembly in any part of the world that undertakes this kind of legislation is bound to meet with the same failure that has been met with in the past. I have no desire to hamper the honourable gentleman in his attempt, if I felt that he was going to accomplish it, but I know that he won't. If that amendment goes through, we will have people writing in from all over the country. As soon as you tell a human being, more especially is this true of a British subject, that there is something they cannot have, that is what they want. I propose voting against the amendment. I propose that the House will take the amendment, vote for or against it, and let us get down to business and talk something sensible.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received.

On motion for adoption of this Report, Mr. Bradley moved an amendment to the Bill, and Mr. Starkes seconded, the following amendment:

3.(1) After the passing of this Act the powers of the Lotteries Licensing Board and of Magistrates to grant permission or licences to organize, conduct and engage in lotteries and other schemes of chance under Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Lotteries" and any amendments thereof shall not apply or extend to any form of the game commonly known as Housie-Housie.

(2) On and after the first day of December, 1933, it shall be an offense against the Lotteries Act to conduct or engage in any form of the game of chance commonly known as Housie-Housie. Any such offense shall be tried summarily before a magistrate upon the complaint of any person, and upon conviction the offender shall for each offence be liable to a fine of not less than \$50 and not more than \$200, and in default of payment to imprisonment for a period of not less than one month and not more than six months.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favour of the amendment: Mr. Bradley; Mr. Starkes, and against it: Hon. the Prime Minister; Hon. Minister of Justice; Hon. Secretary of State; Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries; Hon. W. J. Browne; Mr. Quinton; Dr. Mosdell; Mr. Halley; Mr. Moore; Mr. Byrne; Mr. Gray; Mr. Shea; Mr. Abbott; Mr. Furey; Mr. Whiteley, so it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Browne, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, the 27th day of June instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Financial Estimates: Newspaper Reports

The Daily News, June 27, 1933

Hon. Minister Finance and Customs [the Prime Minister] introduced the estimates and explained that his year an effort was made to make the figures a sort of pre-audit. He desired to make a statement regarding the interest on the public debt, and stated that the Government of the United Kingdom had offered to make up the balance due on July 1. He figured the amount required would be about \$1,850,000. He was not sure the money would be forthcoming as the Government of the United Kingdom had to include it in their additional estimates which he understood were to be introduced in the House on Saturday last. He felt, however, that having offered to pay the balance the government would be able to negotiate it in the House. Our government was reluctant to increase the indebtedness as it felt that borrowing was only throwing good money after bad. But the situation now is different. Last December when the governments of the United Kingdom and Canada offered to pay our interest they did so on condition that we would consent to the appointment of a Royal Commission. This year it is even more important; owing to the Economic Conference being on at present it would be distinctly awkward if any of the British Dominions defaulted in their interest and especially before the Royal Commission had handed in its report. He felt certain that when that report is handed in that it will justify the country in looking to the bondholders for a reduction in the rate of interest on the public debt.

He was grateful to the Home Government for its offered assistance and he felt that at present to accept was the only thing to maintain our integrity. It was impossible to reduce expenditure further. The public services were cut to the limit and our income was down because of the depressed state of the markets and the decreased earning power of our people. He felt certain that this is the last time that outside help will have to be accepted. He wished to state that the government was prepared to take the odium of default on its shoulders but it was not necessary at the present time.

The estimates for the coming year were about the same as last year when the original estimates and supplementary estimates for last year were added. The total estimates for last year were: original \$10,170,101 and supplementary \$1,961,482. The estimates for 1933-34 were \$10,660,005.

In the Finance Department provision had been made for the deficit of \$200,000 on the Railway. This is the first time that provision of this kind has been made in the estimates.

In the Department of Secretary of State a reduction had been made from \$8,093.85 to \$57,270.80. The vote for casual able-bodied relief which last year was \$50,000 had been increased to \$500,000 though he was afraid that it would not be possible to keep even within this limit. At present the Government is doing everything possible to get men fishing, believing it was cheaper to have them fishing than to keep them at home on the dole. The vote for General Public Health is \$269,300 against \$266,804 last year, though that figure was greatly exceeded. It may not be possible to keep within the estimate this year though it would not be for the want of trying that failure will be met. Many abuses had been discovered and it was found that in some cases doctors were not playing the game by the country. In the Justice Department the vote was \$459,971.62 as against \$449,939.67 for the preceding period. This increase was chiefly due to the enlargement of

the police force. The vote for education was decreased from \$700,000 to \$500,000 and it concerned him very much to have to cut down this department. At present teachers were very poorly paid and he was afraid that many teachers will leave if it is possible to obtain other employment. The vote is by no means creditable and we are paying less for our education than any other English-speaking country. He was of the opinion that our system is not in accordance with our requirements and that the curriculum in our schools should tend more to be in keeping with after school periods than at present.

The vote for the Department of Agriculture and Mines is \$60,542.12 as against \$50,002.43. The increase is brought about by the encouragement of agriculture. In the Marine and Fisheries Department there is a decrease from \$271,164.32 to \$261,826.04. In the Posts and Telegraphs Department there is also a decrease from \$839,486.87 to \$741,063.38. The Minister hopes that next year it will be possible to bring the expenditure within \$70,000 of balancing. Everything possible is being done in this respect. The Commission is working in conjunction with the Minister but it is difficult to cut salaries where they are so small.

There is also a reduction in the Customs Department from \$431,768.95 to \$414,840.88. The preventative service is increased to \$34,000 but it is felt that adequate returns will be obtained. Formerly it cost about \$32,000 to operate *S.S. Daisy*, now it is believed that four cutters can be operated for \$30,000 and better results can be got, in preventing much of the smuggling that is going on.

There is a reduction in the Public Works Department from \$602,246.80 to \$588,612.08. The vote for roads and bridges is increased by \$10,000 as it was thought penny wise and pound foolish to allow these to go into disrepair. Supplies are now being bought cheaper than heretofore and on drugs alone there is a saving of about 40 per cent brought about partly by reduced prices and by economies in the institutions. There is also an increase in the vote for repairs to public buildings. In the Pensions Department the reduction is from \$665,290.00 to \$548,690.80. In the Department of Assessor the vote is \$13,687.40 against \$16,956.00. The vote for the new Department of Labour is \$1,540. This Department is taking much detail work from members of the House. The Department is keeping in touch with all industrial centres and finding out every available means of labour.

The Evening Telegram, June 27, 1933

Hon. the Prime Minister presented the estimates for 1933-34 and informed the House regarding the offer of the willingness of the United Kingdom Government to advance Newfoundland the required amount to meet all financial obligations due June 30th this year. This amount would be approximately \$1,800,000. Whilst he had the assurance from the British Government this amount would be provided yet the matter was one which will surely be debated in the House of commons as was the last advance made by Mother Parliament when the sum of \$625,000 was advanced to Newfoundland as the MacDonal Government was strong numerically and the amount stated was included in the additional estimates presented by Hon. Mr. Chamberlain in the House on Saturday last.

He and those associated with him were indeed reluctant to increase the indebtedness of Newfoundland as the borrowing of money was throwing good money after bad.

Last December when the Government of the United Kingdom and Canada agreed to pay the required sum to meet the interest on bonds due Dec. 31, 1932, they did so with the understanding that a Royal Commission would be appointed to enquire into the financial affairs of the country and report accordingly. This Royal Commission has now concluded the enquiry and he was hopeful that when they handed in their report Newfoundland would be justified in appealing to the bondholders for a reduction in the rate of interest. Whilst Newfoundland was grateful to the Home Government for the assistance it must be borne in mind that we must maintain our integrity. It is impossible to reduce our expenditure further. We are the victims of circumstances. Depressed markets and decrease in our earning power of our people were the chief causes of our present position. He felt sure the report of the Royal Commission would result in a considerable abatement in our public debt, and accordingly this would be the last time we should have to seek help to meet our obligations.

The Prime Minister then referred directly to the estimates and stated the amount to be advanced by the Home Government would have to be included. The total estimates for the year 1933-34 were \$10,660,005, whilst the total for the fiscal year 1932-33 were \$12,131,583. The Railway deficit was \$200,000. Hon. the Prime Minister then referred to the original votes, the following is a summary:

Department	Original Estimates 1932-33	Supty. Supply 1932-33	Estimates 1933-34
Finance	\$435,256	233,600	\$637,302
Secretary of State	89,092	4,440	57,270
Public Welfare	407,188	405,362
Able-Bodied Relief	50,000	400,000	500,000
Public Health	266,804	30,000	269,300
Justice	449,939	36,578	459,971
Education	700,000	700,000
Agriculture & Mines	50,002	121,952	60,542
Marine and Fisheries	271,164	38,200	261,826
Post and Telegraphs	839,486	6,480	741,063
Customs	431,678	181,025	414,840
Public Works	602,246	16,000	588,612
War Pensions	665,290	1,567	548,690
Assessor	16,956	13,687

Included in the 1932-33 estimates is a sum of \$747,000 charged to expenditure under Section 33(b) of the Audit Act, Able-Bodied Relief and Justice Department which was voted in Supplementary Estimates. The late government voted \$50,000 for able-bodied relief and over \$780,000 was expended.

The interest on the Public Debt now is \$5,200,000.

While the total current expenditure for 1932-33 (excluding interest on Public Debt) voted by the Legislative amounts to \$7,091,943, the actual expenditure will probably not exceed \$6,280,000, a saving of \$811,943.

In the Department of Secretary of State a reduction has been made from \$89,093.85 to \$57,270.80. The vote for casual able-bodied relief which last year was \$50,000 had been increased to \$500,000 though he was afraid it would not be possible to keep even within this limit. At present the Government is doing everything possible to get men fishing, believing that it was cheaper to have them fishing than to keep them at home on the dole. The vote for General Public Health is \$269,300 against \$266,804 last year, though that figure was greatly exceeded, it may not be possible to keep within the estimate this year though it would not be for the want of trying that failure would be met. Many abuses had been discovered and it was found that in some cases doctors were not playing the game by the country. In the Justice Department the vote was \$459,971.62 as against \$449,939.67 for the preceding period. This increase was chiefly due to the enlargement of the police force. The vote for education was decreased from \$700,000 to \$500,000 and it concerned him very much to have to cut down this department. At present teachers were very poorly paid and he was afraid that many teachers will leave if it is possible to obtain other employment. The vote is by no means creditable and we are paying less for our education than in any other English-speaking country. He was of the opinion that our system is not in accordance with our requirements and that the curriculum in our schools should tend more to be in keeping with after school periods than at present. The vote for the Department of Agriculture and Mines is \$60,542.12 as against \$50,002.42. The increase is brought about by the encouragement of agriculture. In the Marine and Fisheries Department there is a decrease from \$271,164.32 to \$261,826.04. In the Posts and Telegraph Department there is also a decrease from \$839,486.87 to \$741,063.38. The Minister hopes that next year it will be possible to bring the expenditure to within \$70,000 of balancing. Everything possible is being done in this respect. The Commission is working in conjunction with the Minister but it is difficult to cut salaries where they are so small.

There is also a reduction in the Customs Department from \$431,768.95 to \$414,840.88. The preventative service is increasing to \$34,000 but it is felt that adequate returns will be obtained. Formerly it cost about \$32,000 to operate the *S.S. Daisy*, now it is believed that four cutters can be operated for \$30,000 and better results can be got, in preventing much of the smuggling that is going on.

There is a reduction in the Public Works Department from \$602,246.80 to \$588,612.08. The vote for roads and bridges is increased by \$10,000 as it was thought penny wise and pound foolish to allow these to go into disrepair. Supplies are now being bought cheaper than heretofore and on drugs alone there is a saving of about 45 per cent brought about partly by reduced prices and by economies in the institutions. There is also an increase in the vote for repairs to public buildings. In the Pensions Department the reduction is from \$665,290.00 to \$548,609.80. In the Department of Assessor the vote is \$13,687.40 against \$16,956.00. The vote for the new Department of Labour is \$1,540. This Department is taking much detail work from members of the House. The Department is keeping in touch with all industrial centres and finding out every available means of labour.

Tuesday, June 27, 1933

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

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. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: So far as exchange is concerned, we are rather worse this year than last December, although United States exchange has gone down from about 22 or 23 to about 11 or 12, sterling has gone up from about \$3.70 to \$4.50. In addition it will be necessary to make a supplement for the interest on the new loan for the interest July to May. We need to make up the full interest, which will be in the vicinity of \$2,600,000. We require about \$1,850,000 from the United Kingdom, that at 5 per cent will be about \$90,000. We will have to make provision for that in Supplemental Supply. There are several other items to be added. One in particular is in connection with the supplying of the fishermen, so that they may prosecute the voyage. So I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if you go ahead now with the items, and I will explain those of Finance as we go along, and the other Ministers will explain their departments.¹¹⁰

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't want to delay the Committee, and I frankly confess that I have not had very much opportunity of going into these Estimates in detail, as I only got them 24 hours ago. It strikes me that there are some directions in which the Government is making a great mistake, and that is in cutting salaries too far. If you cut a man to a point where he feels that he has been unjustly dealt with, it takes a pretty conscientious, strong-souled individual not [to] resent and to put his resentment into action. It tends to hamper the service. It tends to make the men of the weaker fibre careless. It will tend to make some positively dishonest according to our viewpoint, although from his own viewpoint he may consider himself justified. I don't know who the individual

¹¹⁰ "Hon. the Prime Minister, explaining votes in the Finance Department stated that the interest charges on the public debt were estimated at \$5,200,000. The exchange rates would be increased for whilst the rate of U. S. exchange had decreased since last year, sterling has increased. The interest charges on the loan to be obtained from the government of the United Kingdom to meet the debt on June 30 will have to be provided for in Supplementary estimates. In these too, provision for supplying the fishery will also be made.

"Explaining the increase in steamship subsidies he stated that it had been found necessary to replace the *Sagona* on the Battle Harbour service at a subsidy cost of \$22,000. The Northern Labrador service had to be replaced at a cost of \$5,000, and the replacing of the *Argyle* by the *Malakoff* on the Placentia Bay service cost an additional \$5,000. Hitherto the Railway deficit had been paid out of loans. This year provision for a deficit of \$200,000 had been made in the estimates." *Daily News*, June 28, 1933.

is, who is Chief Accountant of the Dominion, but he has been reduced from \$2,700 down to \$2,300; that is one-seventh of his salary gone. He will be more than an ordinary man if he does not resent that.

I feel that in the long run a good many of these cuts are going to react to the detriment of the Government, and at least from the standpoint of the men themselves, unquestionably the cuts are not going to redound to the benefit of the Government. I ask the Government to take this matter seriously into consideration. I am not trying to drive up the Estimates. I honestly feel if the cut is made, it is not going to show to our credit on the balance sheet if you could translate it into dollars and cents. You can't of course, because it is not estimable. No employee is as profitable as the satisfied employee. Every man in the civil service to-day realizes that he must take some cut. When he is cut severely, and when I say he knows that others are not cut nearly so severely, it reflects on his mental attitude. It is liable to be reflected in his efficiency and honesty. It is a serious thing to do, to give a cut. The chief bookkeeper in the Colony is cut from \$2,700 to \$2,300, and \$2,700 means his whole salary, because that represents a cut salary as well. I suggest to the Government that they use the utmost consideration in dealing with this case. After all, the man is the chief accountant of the Colony, and accountant is no small matter. I have no brief for him. I don't know who he is. But I feel that they are liable to fall into grave error to the detriment of the country if they cut the civil servants too far. It is better to dismiss him and throw his work on another man. He will take more work cheerfully if there is no cut.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I would be only too glad to dispense with the services of an unnecessary official. The Hon. [Member] must know that the cuts to officials in office were much greater all over the country than those effected in the civil service. I saw the cuts compared, and I was surprised at the difference. The gentleman here referred to is largely concerned with routine work.

I understand the feeling of the honourable gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition. A contented employee is much better than one coming to work day after day with a grouch. I know that, those who have had experience in employing clerks and officials know that it is true. But we must also take into consideration the fact that we are compelled to cut down our Estimates as much as we can. We might in many cases have dismissed men with families and put them on the parish, as it were, and have kept the others on drawing a full salary, but that would have been unjust. We have to keep as many on as we can, and although there was a serious cut made before the present administration assumed office, we had to do more cutting. We have to show our bondholders by making an honest effort to meet the situation. If we keep salaries at the highest level, higher than men are being paid in ordinary commercial life, our debtors will say, and justly so, that we are not putting into effect the practical economy that is so necessary these days.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I agree that the salaries should not be higher than those in ordinary commercial life.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: When Sir William Stavert came here the principal employers conferred with him on the matter, and cuts were made. But I know that Sir William Stavert is of the opinion that we have gone as far as we can in cutting. I have every sympathy with the case of the gentlemen

mentioned here, but I am afraid we can do nothing in the matter.¹¹¹

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I just want to draw your attention to this Department of Public Welfare. You have got a Commissioner, accountant, cashier, bookkeeper, they are all there apparently for the purpose of expending about \$180,000 or \$190,000 a year. Four men in that Department spending that amount of money, with the exception of the Commissioner himself who, I think, has a general supervisory duty over the whole of the relief expenditures, although he does not do very much in connection with it. Now, I notice that each of these three officials there, who are not employed overtime, are getting \$1,215 a year each, and then the Clerk, Relief, and Old Age Pensions, is only getting the same salary. He is the man who handles the accounting for \$1,500,000 and is working not only all day, but on many occasions late into the night and on Sundays. In connection with that, I want to draw your attention also to a vote which you have already passed. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if these salaries as set down here as estimated for 1933-34, actually represent the salaries being paid to these officials?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: They do. I want to draw attention now to the Department of the Auditor General. That is under Finance. I think it is the fifth clerk, I know his name, [and] there is no reason why I should not – Mr. Howley. His salary is supposed to be \$1,368 a year. I happen to know it is \$108 a month. You have got a man of his capacity auditing \$1,500,000 expenditure drawing \$108 a month, and you have got three clerks next door in an office who spend half their time reading the newspapers and looking out the windows, drawing as much money as he is. How can you justify paying a salary like that to an expert accountant auditing \$1,500,000 a year, and pay the same salary to others who spend most of their time doing nothing? Mr. Howley is doing more work in a month than these three do in twelve months. I know a little about that Department, probably not so much as [omission], but I was a member of a commission who enquired into the conditions of affairs there and I know something about it, and I think it is time you rectified that. It is an injustice to these two men, Howley and Ebsary. One of them attends to shipwrecked crews; another, I think, twice a month for the most part, doles \$2 each to the widows when they come up.

The point I want to make is this, that you are asking men looking after the expenditure of \$1,500,000 a year to do that work for \$100 and \$108 a month, and I claim it is unfair and unjustifiable, and these men should certainly get more than that. You have got officials on the public service all through the Estimates who are not nearly as important as these men, who are not engaged half the time as these men are. I know the men work night and day. I know some of them take their work home to do it, and yet they are down to that small salary, and the men working next door to them are getting just as much salary as they. Ebsary went in there at \$2,000. There is no distinction drawn between what he got as a clerk of the Charity Department and as an Old Age Pension clerk.

¹¹¹ “Continuing, he stated that some of the members of the Legislative Council had returned their sessional indemnity. He explained that no salary was being paid to the Nfld. High Commissioner in London, who will be here shortly and when he comes the entire office is to be reorganized.” *Daily News*, June 28, 1933.

The two were put together. That was supposed to be his salary, [and] he loses the whole of that and part of the rest as well. He has been out between \$700 and \$800 on a \$2,000 salary, while next door to him you have men who have not half the responsibility nor half the work that he has, getting just as much salary as he is getting. I contend that it is utterly unjustifiable, and that both Ebsary and Howley should get a fairer treatment than that. Both are known as expert accountants. I know nothing about the other three men, [but] everyone here knows that neither of these men can compare in efficiency or ability with either Howley or Ebsary, and the men should have fairer treatment than they are getting. You have accountants in other departments handling much less expenditure than these men getting more salary: clerks getting \$1,500 and \$1,600 a year, and those two men handling huge sums of money getting far less, it is not justifiable, and I suggest to the Government that they should reconsider both these salaries.

Hon. Acting Minister of Justice: I don't wish to delay, but I think that several statements made by the Leader of the Opposition should be refuted. In the first place, the clerks in the Auditor General's department do not handle one single copper. You said that these two gentlemen whose names you mentioned were handling large sums of money, and that various other members of the civil service were being paid similar salaries. They are not handling sums of money, they are auditing accounts.

Point number 2 is that what I interrupted to say to my friend, that he cast a reflection upon the work being done by these two men in the division of Public Welfare. He referred to it two or three times, he said they spend half their time reading the newspapers and doing no work. If that is so, which I don't believe, if that is so, then it is your duty to move for a reduction in their salaries. As a Member of this House you are just as much responsible for the expenditure of public money as anyone on this side. If you feel that a civil servant is being paid too much, or that an office ought to be cut out, then it is your duty to make a motion. Frankly, I don't believe it should be made. The Hon. Member said that there were many other members of the civil service receiving salaries similar who were not performing onerous work. I notice he is prepared to pick out members of the service for the purpose of paying them compliments, but I would like him to pick out members of the civil service where he has the courage to criticize and say which of them individually are not performing their work or are being overpaid, or whose salaries should be reduced so that the salaries of these two gentlemen should be increased. And may I point out that he himself sat on the Commission that made a cut in these salaries within the last eighteen months, and that those men then had the same proportion of salaries in connection with those whom he criticizes to-day as they have now, and they had the same proportion in relation to the other civil servants about whom he now speaks.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: In reply to the honourable gentleman, I have to say that I did sit on the Commission that made these cuts last year. That Commission made certain recommendations that, as a member, I had to stand by [whatever] the majority said. I could not get my way in the executive government, any more than the honourable gentleman can do to-day. And the mere fact that I was on a Commission that made a cut is no argument and no proof that it was justifiable then, or is that another cut is justifiable.

I am going to say that the other three men don't do between them half as much work as Howley or Ebsary in one month. I am not going to cast any reflection on the individuals themselves.

The work is not there for them to do, and Howley or Ebsary could do the work of the three of them. What the Hon. Minister of Justice says on the question of handling money is perfectly true. Ebsary or Howley handle no cash. I suppose nobody in the department with the exception of the man who doles out a \$2 bill to the widows once a month handles any cash. Civil servants as a rule don't handle cash, but they have to handle the accounts. Howley and Ebsary have to handle accounts, and either is a responsible man. From the viewpoint of responsibility there is no comparison between these two men and the three others, there is a no comparison whatsoever. I say again, Sir, that these two men I have mentioned, whose salary is down so low, deserve more pay. They are giving more value to the Government than they are getting back in salary. On the other hand, the Department where there are three additional men is overstaffed. They are all there, and there is not enough work for all three. They are too many to be in that Department. Two men could handle it, and a man like Ebsary could handle it himself or Howley could handle it himself. The men doing the work up there in that Department are the two men mentioned, and they deserve better treatment.

Hon. Secretary of State: The clerk's salary is \$450 because Mr. Ebsary does not do that work. There is another young chap who gets paid from able-bodied relief work. The detailed work is done by a young chap by the name of Butler, and he is doing it very well indeed. As regards Mr. Ebsary, I must say that he is doing a very large amount of work and he is responsible for the total of able-bodied relief, and nobody could dispute the fact that he is underpaid. As regards Mr. Haley, he was formerly in the Post Office, and the last administration changed him from the Post Office to the Relief Department and by one fell swoop took the amount he was getting from the War Financial Board, and that is why he is getting less money than he was getting before. We are trying to iron out the difficulties in the Estimates but we can't do everything at the one time. And we are surely going to see what we can do to make the civil service better than it is at the present time.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Surely you can do a little tardy justice to these two men. I notice the unfortunate and impecunious gentlemen in the Legislative Council have got a raise of \$25. I know these two men are hard-working, and don't you think it's but reasonable to do them justice? Assuming if you will that the administration of which I was a member dealt unfairly with Mr. Haley, my position now is to try to do fairly by all the civil servants. Don't you think you ought to do justice to these two men? They are worth more than you are paying them. Why not give them a little tardy justice?

Hon. Secretary of State: We have to deal with these things as we find them and according to the economic conditions of the country. We are responsible to the great body of the people who have to pay taxes, and if we can't collect money to pay the salaries there is no other way to pay them. And when we increase the salaries of any man, the man on the street must find the money to pay him, and we are responsible to the man on the street to deal fairly with all the civil servants.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Why not deal fairly with everyone? Ebsary gets a big cut; everybody did not get that cut. Why not give the others a similar cut? Some of the men getting a bigger salary than these men have not been cut as severely as these two men. And here is a man who gives

more hours in the government service than any official there to-day. These men are not grumbling about it, and they are doing their work. I don't say that they don't feel badly about it. They must, and the probabilities are that if things were better and jobs were easier to get than they are now, you would not hold them very long. And I think it is bad policy to discriminate against a man of that type. You are discriminating against them. You give them a huge cut. Why cut them and not the others, who certainly don't work any harder and don't give any more service?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: There are many inequalities in the civil service. I fully realise it and it is our intention when the House closes to appoint a Commission to enquire into these matters to set out standards and to have grades for civil servants. We are going to have it so that a stenographer in one department doing similar work will get the same as another doing that work in another department. We are not going to have it so that one stenographer will be getting, say \$900, and another doing the same work [is] getting only \$720. All classes of people have been put into the civil service. The greatest sins of this sort were committed from 1929 to May 1930. I am not blaming the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, but I am going to speak from what I know. Many officials in the civil service have had to be put out. They have not been able to measure up to their jobs. And before a man will be taken into the civil service in the future he will have to qualify for his job by an examination. That these sorts of men are in the civil service is not our fault. They were there before we came into power, and I will promise this much: I will inquire into the salaries and the rates of payments to these two gentlemen mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I thank the Prime Minister for considering my request that something would be done for these men, for his promise to enquire into the matter. He is in a position to see that these men are not treated unfairly. As to the abuses in the civil service, that kind of thing has been going on for a number of years, and it has been going on in every government since I was old enough to know anything about governments. It was always going on, and we have men in positions to-day in the civil service occupying comparatively prominent positions, who learned their business at the expense of the Colony. Men were put there who were unqualified and they caused a loss to the Colony. I welcome the attitude of the Prime Minister in his idea of organizing the civil service.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: In the future, no person can obtain a position in the civil service unless he has passed a qualifying examination.¹¹²

Hon. Secretary of State explaining the vote of \$500,000 for poor relief stated that it was hoped to pay the bills for that amount, though whether or not that would be possible depended on

¹¹² "Hon the Prime Minister stated that as soon as the House closes, a commission will be appointed to enquire in this matter. It is the idea to create grades and to have inequalities adjusted. In the past all sorts of people had been put in the civil service and he stated that in the period between 1929 and 1932, men had been put in the Customs Department as tidewaiters, and some of them were unable to write out a report. To-day, no person can enter the civil service unless he passes an examination. It was not a very strict examination, he admitted, but it tested a man's intelligence." *Daily News*, June 28, 1933.

conditions this fall. If the conditions this year were the same as last, when men returned from the fishery and had to go on the dole immediately, it would be impossible to get out of the trouble for the amount voted, but it was hoped that there would be a good fishery this year and that there would be a better price for the fish, and if men were enabled to provide for themselves for the whole or a part of the winter, the expenditure for poor relief would be lower than last year, and perhaps it would be possible to keep within the amount voted.

Referring to the vote of \$210,000 for treatment of hospital cases etc., he explained that in this respect an improvement was being made too. An effort is being made now to concentrate poor relief cases at the General Hospital and to have them turned over in that institution as soon as possible. [*Daily News*, June 28, 1933]

Hon. Secretary of State: One hospital that I have in mind cost \$67,000 last year, \$61,000 for looking after the poor and \$6,000 for a gratuity for looking after poor maternity cases. We began to concentrate on the General Hospital last September, and we have been able to accommodate all the sick poor and keep the other hospitals empty. We did not pay any money to them for looking after the sick poor because there were no patients to go in, and from September to the end of May we have saved approximately \$25,000, simply because we have asked the staff of the General Hospital to turn over patients quicker than before. They have worked might and main during the past eight months to accommodate the Government, and to try and save money for the country, by trying to accommodate patients and not scatter them over. We have saved \$25,000 to \$35,000 on the hospitals during these months. We are concentrating on the General Hospital, asking the staff to turn over the patients as quickly as possible. Eighty per cent of the patients who came to the General Hospital from the first of January until last May, there was absolutely no necessity whatever for them to come. One man was there 86 days, they just had him on a [*illegible*] diet. If he had stayed home, he could have been looked after by the resident doctor. We have been getting numerous patients for similar treatment, and the doctors in the outports could attend to these patients and administer a diet to them, just as well as it was done in the General Hospital. Dr. Policoff gave me statistics showing that there were numerous patients sent in by doctors who could have treated them in their own homes. We are trying to stop that, trying to tell them that they should look after patients who do not need surgical treatment. We have ample accommodation in the General Hospital to turn over patients, and if we get fair treatment from the doctors who practise in the outports, and if they will try to perform minor operations in the outports, there will be no necessity whatever, for example, for sending patients into St. John's to have tonsils removed from a child. One case comes to my mind now. From one district about a dozen patients were sent in to have their tonsils removed, when it could have been done in the district. There was a nursing system in the district, and the doctor could have removed the tonsils just as well as it was done in the Grace Hospital. We are asking the doctors to help the Government instead of being a hindrance, and to do small operations in their own districts. We have done our best in the past year. We have saved \$25,000 to \$35,000 and we are going to try and do better in the coming year.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I was wondering if the Minister of Justice won't consider an idea that has been in my mind for a number of years, and that is reduce the number of magistrates around

the country. Take, for instance, Trinity; there is no necessity for a magistrate in Trinity. St. George's; I don't think there is any necessity for anyone there. Brigus, Old Perlican, no necessity for a man there. Carbonear, Bay de Verde is a new one, there is absolutely no necessity for anyone there. If you have a good man at Harbour Grace he can handle all of Conception Bay and the south side of Trinity Bay. It is a fact, whether Members of the House are prepared to believe me or not, the more law you bring to people the more litigation there is going to be. Here in the City of St. John's you have a magistrate who handles 40,000 or 50,000. There is no reason why these magistrates should not be cut down, and if any matter of any concern arise the Justice Department could instruct a couple of Justices of the Peace to do what may be necessary in similar matters, and so far as civil law is concerned, let them go and look for law to the nearest magistrate or wait until he comes on his rounds. The work of the man at Trinity can be done by the man in Bonavista, there is no question about that. I know both places well. I think the man at St. George's can be dispensed with and his work done by the man at Channel. Brigus, Old Perlican, Carbonear, and Holyrood – these four can be cut out, and the man at Harbour Grace can do the lot. I am satisfied that is correct and I am satisfied that it can be done by one man, particularly nowadays when the means of travel are so available. We have got not only the railway, but roads all over Conception Bay.

Magistrate Thompson is at Brigus, I understand, now. I don't fancy that he will be there much longer. I don't suggest that you should dismiss him, but I think he might be pensioned. The mere fact that anyone objects doesn't justify refusing to make the cut. The magistrate at Old Perlican is a medical man, I understand, and unless the magistracy there is justified on public health grounds he should be dispensed with. I know when the Liberal government was in power during 1928-32 we appointed a doctor at Lewisporte as magistrate. We gave him a grant of \$500, not because we needed a magistrate there, but because of the justification on medical grounds, because we thought it advisable to have a doctor there. If the same applies to Old Perlican the same thing would hold. But the Carbonear grant is a new one. Why do you want one at Carbonear? I don't think it is justifiable. If you want to bring about a retrenchment there are six magistrates which can be destroyed in a short time. I admit my government did not do it, because I wanted them to do it. These five positions can be done away with and the new one should not be put there at all. You can do it without any impairment of the magistracy in the country.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I assure my honourable friend that this has been a subject of considerable discussion in my Department from time to time. The major proposal he has put up this afternoon has to do with Conception Bay. He suggests that the work of this large territory ought to be done by one man. I don't agree with him on that point. It is impossible to do Conception Bay with less than two. With less than that it would be absolutely unmanageable, and I think that probably it would be found that the area could not be properly served unless there are three. At the present time, the old age of the incumbents of several of the magistracies makes it impossible to make the experiment to find out whether what the Hon. Member suggests is correct. There are no new magistracies. A plan was under discussion with the members of the Law Society a few years ago to make a county court in Conception Bay and appoint there a lawyer as judge of the court, and to give the court jurisdiction almost similar to that of the Supreme Court. The scheme fell through because politics intervened.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That would be too expensive to-day.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I mean to say to make one court only, and to abolish magistrates. It was once under the discussion of the Law Society. The idea was to put a court there with a clerk and a bailiff, and to have the county court travelling. I have forgotten why it was not carried out, but probably like a lot of these things politics intervened, and it was impossible to carry it out. I remember discussing the question of the magistracies in Conception Bay with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he was Solicitor General, and when I became Minister of Justice I took it up and went into it very thoroughly. I don't think it is possible to deal with Conception Bay with one magistrate or with one district court judge.

It was said by my honourable friend a moment ago that the more law you bring to the people of the country, the more litigation there will be. There is far more to be considered than the question of litigation. The local magistrate is the guide, philosopher and a friend of the people among whom he lives, and were it not for the fact of the stress of circumstances and the depressed times in which we are living, I would be inclined to increase the number of magistrates because of the beneficial effect they have on the people among whom they dwell. Because they live in their districts with the prestige of their position, and they assist in keeping law and order without the assistance of the police, by advising the people against lawlessness and litigation. Magistrates are not men who want litigation. It means more work for them, and in many cases the magistrate acts as a deterrent on the individual litigants who come to him for advice or the issue of process.

There are certain cases where it is impossible to get the necessary medical attendance required over the long stretches of our coast. There is one area down the Southern Shore running to Trepassy, where it is difficult to get a doctor. In order to overcome that difficulty, the practice has been to make a grant out of the magistrates' vote and appoint a doctor who will act as magistrate as well. Otherwise you could not get a doctor to go there, because the people being so scattered cannot afford to support him in the proper state.

In regard to the reference made by my honourable friend to the fact that Judge Morris with the assistance of Magistrate McCarthy attends to the 50,000 or 60,000 people in St. John's, there you have entirely different conditions, a different state of affairs entirely. The population is concentrated. There are a number of police and lawyers who advise the people.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: They increase the work.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Would you abolish the lawyers?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't know but it would be a good idea.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Chairman, I don't mean to deal with more than that point now because it is desirable to adjourn now, and if there is any other point arising we can go into it to-morrow.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't want to delay the matter at all. I merely wish to lay my

views before the Committee. In spite of my honourable friend's reasons, I am satisfied that these men can be done without. I await with interest the explanation on to-morrow why a new magistrate was created.

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 on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season."

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled, respectively, "An Act to Amend the Act 59, Victoria, Chapter 39 entitled 'An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas and Light Co.'"; "An Act for the Ratification of a Temporary Loan from the Royal Bank of Canada"; "An Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Auditing of Public Accounts'"; and "An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Co., Ltd." without amendment.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I would like to acquaint the House that the Budget Speech will be delivered on Thursday.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 28th day of June instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

The Evening Telegram, June 28, 1933

(Report of sections of Mr. Alderdice's speech on the Estimates)

... the following votes were passed:

Interest on the Public Debt, \$5,200,000 to which must be added \$90,000, the interest on the \$1,850,000 to be received from the United Kingdom Government to meet our obligation June 30 this year. There is also an amount to be charged for limited supplies which will be granted to fishermen for this season.

In the Finance Department, the various votes were explained by Hon. the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance. Under the head Civil Government the vote \$3,000, Chairman of Board of Health, is dispensed with and the salary of Minister of Labour \$2,700 is included making the vote less than last year. The Department of Finance vote is \$3,000 less than 1932-33, and the total vote including \$200,000 for the Newfoundland Railway is \$5,000 less than last year.

The Administration of Justice vote which was \$35,039.20 in the last Estimates, is now \$28,599.

In the Legislation column the House of Assembly vote is \$12,687 less than 1932-33. The salaries of the members of the House of Assembly which was \$30,000 is now \$16,700, and the total vote is \$37,952 compared with \$51,437 the previous year.

The Recapitulation vote of the Department of the Secretary of State for 1933-34 is \$57,240, in 1932-33 it was \$89,093.35. This is due to reduction in salaries and the votes under various sections.

Because of the small amount voted by the late government for Relief for the Able-Bodied Poor, the amount of Casual Able-Bodied Relief is set down for \$500,000. In 1932-33 only \$50,000 was voted. The salaries of all officials and expenses have been reduced.

Because of the increase in the number of constables in the Police Force, the Administration of Justice vote is considerably increased. In 1932-33 it stood at \$218,508.50. This year it is estimated at \$243,309.50 will be needed. But not withstanding this extraordinary increase, several reductions in other sections have been made and the total vote shows an increase slightly less than \$5,000, as will be seen by the following figures:

1932-33	1933-34
\$449,939.67	\$459,971.62

Hon. the Prime Minister, referring to the steamship subsidies vote of \$91,750 compared with \$59,500 the previous year, stated it was necessary to replace the *S.S. Sagona* on the Battle Harbour service at a cost of \$22,000, and the *S.S. Argyle* replaced on the Placentia Bay service cost \$5,000. The custom of paying the Railway deficit out of loans will be discontinued and in the Estimates this year provision to the extent of \$200,000 is made.

Wednesday, June 28, 1933

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

Hon. Secretary of State: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Joint Committee of Both Houses in connection with the amendment to the Alcoholic Liquors Act. Also, I beg to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to enquire as to whether the rules of the House had been complied with in relation to the Continental Distilleries Bill.

Hon. the Secretary of State presented the following Report:

The Joint Committee of Both Houses of the Legislature appointed to consider the Amendment to the Alcoholic Liquors Act made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up by the House of Assembly report that they have given full consideration to the said Amendment, and have also considered representations made to the Committee, and request that Section 24, Sub-section (5) be amended to read as follows:

(5) "A holder of a permit shall not sell or allow to be sold wine or beer between midnight and nine o'clock in the morning of the next day on week days, but on Sundays the hours of sale will be within noon and 3 p.m. and between 5 and 8 p.m. "

*Sgd. J. C. Puddester
L. E. Emerson
P. F. Halley
F. Gordon Bradley
F. McNamara
Tasker Cook
Chas. P. Ayre
John S. Currie
W.J. Browne*

Hon. the Secretary of State presented the following Report:

Mr. Speaker,

Your Committee appointed to consider whether the Rules of the House had been complied with in relation to the petition of the Continental Distilleries, Limited, beg to report that they find that the Rules have been complied with in all particulars.

*Respectfully Submitted,
Sgd. J. C. Puddester
R. G. Starkes
W. J. Browne*

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage and Assist the Construction and Operation of a Distillery at St. John's" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting

Fishery Supplies for the Current Season" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was asking for an explanation in connection with the extra vote suggested to be taken for a magistrate for Carbonear-Bay de Verde-Trinity South. For some time there has been a dearth of medical assistance covering the upper part of Conception Bay and some portions of Trinity Bay. It has cost the government a considerable amount of money to send a doctor, say from Brigus or Port de Grave districts, and it is impossible to get a doctor to locate himself in an area where the practice is small unless some payment is made to him for some service otherwise. Consequently, it is now hoped to abolish the magistracy at Old Perlican and have the magistrate at Carbonear deal with the whole North Shore and the south side of Trinity Bay. This will relieve the strain of the work of the magistrate at Brigus and save considerable money. I may say we also contemplate a complete reorganization of the magistracy in Conception Bay, so that before the next session of the Legislature economies will be effected whereby the actual total expenditure during the year will not be any higher than if the vote now asking for a new magistrate was not taken.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I can quite understand the desirability of having a doctor located at Whitbourne, as I have some knowledge of that territory, having represented it for four years, but why not take in that section instead of Carbonear with Trinity South? I maintain that a magistracy at Carbonear is not necessary, for the reason that there is one at Harbour Grace, and one who, although not overburdened with work at the present, knows his job. With regard to having a doctor for the area referred to, there are doctors in Harbour Grace, Bay Roberts, and in Brigus, so that if you are going to have a doctor-magistrate appointed, why not call it Whitbourne itself? Unfortunately, owing to the depression which overtook us in 1931, I was prevented completing a project, namely, repairing the Spaniard's Bay-New Harbour Road, a distance of thirteen or fourteen miles, whereas at the present the doctor has to travel over 40 miles. I think it would be advisable for the Government to complete that road. It is half done now and an expenditure of \$2,000 or \$3,000 would make that road passable for a motor car. I think that the Hon. Member for Trinity South at the present time will bear out what I say in that connection, and I would suggest to the Government to go ahead and complete this road, as it will save money for them in the long run.¹¹³

¹¹³ The transcript contains another version of this speech: "You can do without this additional magistrate altogether. I know the New Harbour road, and I know the condition it was in before we began repairs on it. It was utterly impossible even for a horse and cart to pass over it. To-day half of it is quite passable by motor car, and the money would be well spent if you would complete that road and avoid the necessity of spending money by paying a doctor-magistrate at Whitbourne. One or the other has to be done to save money. I know the tremendous expense a doctor is put to go from

Hon. Minister of Justice: The Old Perlican magistrate is a doctor. It is not proposed to appoint a doctor-magistrate at Carbonear. This will be a straight magistrate area, and it is going to be very large.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't think it is necessary. The doctor at Old Perlican is not getting paid as a district surgeon. The man in Carbonear will only be a magistrate. Is that correct?

Hon. Minister of Justice: If a doctor is appointed there, I don't disagree to pay him that salary out of my department.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: A magistrate there is entirely unnecessary. You have five magistrates there all in a bunch. It is altogether too much, and I don't consider that the expenditure is called for. However, you are the government and I presume you have duly considered this matter. There are too many for that section. There's no necessity for as many magistrates on the north side of Conception Bay as that. If it were not for the fact that Bell Island is an island, there would be no necessity for one there. It is a mining section and the population is comparatively thick, but the main reason is that it is an island. You can't do away with a magistrate there, but I don't see how we need more than two magistrates in Conception Bay.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in connection with my District. When Mr. Bradley was speaking of this District, he apparently overlooked the fact that there is another section and he did not refer to it. This is from Whitbourne, Blaketown and down through Bellevue, which section would not be served by the road and which has no medical attention. It has been suggested that by completing the road to New Harbour it would enable the doctor to get over many sections of the District. It is a very bad road in a car, and equally bad for walking over. I have been over it during the year. One idea put forward was that the doctor could come over this thirteen miles of the road. That would still leave the doctor from 45 to 50 minutes from Bellevue to Chance Cove. So that there would be very little done by having that a road. It would save about seven miles.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am speaking of a man coming up from Bay Roberts.

Mr. Mitchell: But you would still have the section from Blaketown and down the other shore which would be just as far away as ever. As far as New Harbour is concerned, you would save a certain distance, but that is the only section that there would be a saving on. I consider it far better to appoint a doctor. It would be impossible to get the money to repair the road. I don't see how we

Bay Roberts, a distance of 40 miles to attend a patient in Dildo or New Harbour. Instead of adding a magistrate with an annual charge of \$1,215 here, repair that road. In three years at the most you will expend in the magistrate's salary the amount required to make the road passable. I don't know whether you have a man in mind for this or not, and whether he is expensive or not, but it strikes me that the better course would be to repair that road." *Evening Telegram*, 29 June, 1933: "... a magistrate at Carbonear was not necessary ... He was of the opinion that if the road to New Harbour was completed the magistrate-doctor could be located at Whitbourne, thereby saving a lot of time and expense."

could expect this year to put a road there. If we could get a magistrate-doctor there it would be better. At the time the road was built the Monroe administration was in power, and they put the road through to New Harbour and up through, instead of going through from Brigus to Whitbourne. If that had been done it would be great for the people of these sections. The mistake was made, and there it is. However, I think, Mr. Speaker, that that explains the situation as far as I am concerned and I would like to see that medical man in my section.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have to agree with a good deal of what the Hon. Member has said, and it must be remembered that he is not to gather from my remarks that I am opposed to the appointment of a medical man in New Harbour. As a matter of fact, I did succeed in getting a man in Whitbourne. Unfortunately he did not measure up very well, and before we could succeed in getting another, you gentlemen occupied the seats. If we had that road across there, it would mean that a doctor would only have to travel nine or ten miles to get to New Harbour, and the road would serve all places with the exception of the section going up to Bellevue. He has got to go there by motor boat anyhow. It appears that the magistrate at Carbonear will be a medical man. I don't see the necessity for his appointment there at all. I agree with the appointment of a medical man at Whitbourne or New Harbour, but at Carbonear I don't think it is necessary at all. It is a waste of money because there is a man there now who can do the work.

Hon. Secretary of State: As far as my view goes, one of the things that made me advocate a doctor-magistrate is keeping the roads open in winter time to allow the doctor to go over them. It costs money to keep these roads open in the winter season, and we have spent hundreds of dollars sending men out to keep the roads open. We have had to send out time and time again men to shovel the road to get a doctor over. What other changes are to be made I can't say at the present time. The Minister of Justice has in mind a recasting of that whole section.¹¹⁴

Mr. Starkes: Mr. Chairman, I received the privilege last year of having some experience with these officials. I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Justice can tell me if they are all truly qualified.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Personally I can't vouch for the qualifications of each single man in the [police] force. The Inspector General has the picking of the men under his care.

Mr. Starkes: Here we vote \$250,000 for them. They are not all qualified for their positions. I am going to make a statement. Speaking frankly, I was treated pretty indecently by the man in my District. I am not going to name him. I am confident because I am going to prove the statement I am going to make, that that man made liars, rogues and lunatics out of the hard-working fishermen of the District. He went into houses where people had no connection with the dole. He told them that their names were on the list for receiving the dole, and as a consequence of his acts men were

¹¹⁴ "Hon. Secretary of State said that it costs a lot of money to keep the Hodgewater Line open in the winter time for doctors to travel over." *Daily News*, June 29, 1933.

brought into the asylum in straight jackets. He made rogues of the honest, hard-working fishermen he met down there. I have a letter here from one of those men. I would like to read it for the Hon. Minister of Justice (*reads letter*). He says in this letter he can bring witnesses to prove this man told him to do this. The result of this is that thousands of dollars were lost by their acting on that advice. Those people should be put in their place, in my opinion. I can prove this statement. I feel that that man should be put in his place.¹¹⁵

Hon. Minister of Justice: I feel sure that the Hon. Member doesn't wish to suggest that if one policeman has misconducted himself, the whole force is open to condemnation. I do not think that because one member of the police force misconducts himself the whole force should be blamed. That would be an impossible situation to create. I have heard this charge made on one occasion where the Sergeant was on oath, and he flatly denied it. On the other hand, one of the other witnesses swore that it was true. Since then I have not heard a word about it. If a charge is made against a member of the police force, a Justice of the Peace or a magistrate, the practice of the Department is to conduct inquiries, and if the party charged is found guilty he will be dealt with in the proper way. We are now holding an enquiry into the conduct of a magistrate, and I would not be surprised if the conduct of another magistrate would not be enquired into in the same way, so that if my honourable friend from Green Bay will give me the names of those who will give evidence, I will have an [enquiry] instituted, and if Sergeant Russell is found guilty of a breach of his duty a report of the enquiry will be published and the necessary action will be taken, but surely the mere reading of an anonymous letter containing charges against a law officer is [in]sufficient evidence to warrant the embarking upon an expensive enquiry, which may turn out to be futile. It is extraordinary how shy people who write in letters imputing dishonesty, malpractice and bad conduct to members of the police force are, when they are asked to give evidence before a tribunal, and generally they are not willing.

Mr. Starkes: I would also like to remind the Hon. Minister of Justice that while the case was on last winter, and after I had come off the witness stand, this same individual remarked to a court official, "Isn't he a smart crook?" I gave my statement on oath. Afterwards, one of the witnesses upstairs in the courtroom was persuaded by this same man Russell to give evidence on oath contrary to what he had intended to give. Surely that is not the kind of law officer we should be voting salaries for here to-day. Rather should he be dismissed from the force.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The charge made against the member of the police force is a serious one. If the police cannot keep straight themselves, how can any respect for the law and order be expected? The charge made here this afternoon by the Hon. Member for Green Bay is that Sergeant Russell was in his District last fall advising people to cheat creditors in order that the government might escape a burden thrown upon them, and it does seem extraordinary that this man

¹¹⁵ "...This man had told people their names were on the dole list when they were not on the list, and he had told some people that if they had anything they had better barter this for food even if they did owe what [they] had to the storekeeper." *Daily News*, June 29, 1933.

had sufficient intelligence to qualify for a Sergeant at all. With regard to the matter commented on in the letter referred to by the Hon. Member for Green Bay, I know nothing of it. I do think an investigation should be held, despite the expense involved, and if Mr. Starkes can produce witnesses to corroborate his statement, the police officer concerned should be instantly dismissed.

Hon. Minister of Labour: In my opinion, it was not left to that officer to make any charge as to whether he was a smart crook, a clever crook, or any kind of a crook at all. I think when an officer takes it upon himself to go that far, he is going beyond the limit and beyond his duty. No man in this country to-day has more respect for the police, or law and order, than I have, [but] when an officer oversteps the bounds in that way, he should be brought to justice. Whether Starkes was guilty or not guilty, it was not his place to say he was a smart crook, and it was none of his damn business. A man who does not know himself, should be made know himself, whether it is me or a police officer. I know of a case last winter when a police officer went to a certain district in connection with dole, and cut off several men who were getting dole and at the same time they were in dire need. They were cut off the dole, because of the fact that they had a cow, or a sheep, or a pig, or a dog. They could not eat a dog, nor could they kill a cow or a sheep or a pig in mid-winter and eat it. These men were cut off the dole. That was not so bad, after all there was some redress. But 95 per cent of these men that were cut off were dealing with one man, and because of the fact that that man was the man that he was, his dealers were cut off, and I have proof of that. I like to see a square deal, and any police officer who goes out in connection with dole goes out to do his duty, is expected to do his duty, and every fair-minded man will give him credit to do his duty and be a man. Let him do it openly and above board. I agree with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Green Bay. If statements of that kind were made, they should not have been made, and the man who made them should be brought to justice.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I have no wish to delay the debate except for one or two references to Sergeant Russell. One would imagine that because the Member from Green Bay has read a letter from somebody who says such is so, and because he is supported by the Leader of the Opposition, and because he is supported by the Minister of Labour, therefore it is true. You have to bear in mind that a debate of this kind in this House is trying a man who cannot be heard. You are sending it forth that Sergeant Russell was guilty of this charge. If Sergeant Russell made this statement to an officer of the Supreme Court three or four months ago, I hear it now for the first time, and the time to bring this to my attention was three or four months ago in my office, and not now. Here you come into this House and make charges against a man who has risen to the rank of Sergeant, and blast his reputation on the statement of somebody in Green Bay. That is absolutely unfair. I protested against it when I was in the Opposition, when any members of the Government were making charges against civil servants. We come into this House and take advantage of our privileges to blast the reputation of someone who can't be heard. It is absolutely unfair. If an investigation is to be held, what evidence is there that Sergeant Russell made this remark to one of the Supreme Court officials? I have not heard it. Is it because one of the Supreme Court officials said so to Mr. Starkes? I would like to have these two men brought face to face, that official and Sergeant Russell. I would like to hear what each of them has to say. That is the only aspect of the matter I want to deal with now. I

think it is always unfair for Members of this House to take advantage of their privileges to blast the reputation of people who are unable to answer. Where is the evidence in connection with the statement that Sergeant Russell told these people in Green Bay to barter their fish instead of giving it to the merchant? The only evidence we have, apart from a letter, is the evidence of a man who is supposed to have stated it. He went into the witness box and swore it was not true. The only man who is supposed to have given instructions to counsel for the defence to ask Sergeant Russell on that subject, went into the box and on his oath said that Russell had never stated it. Yet it is repeated here, no names are given by the Member, no names are given to the Department.

Mr. Starkes: In reply to the Minister of Justice, I would like to say that I could produce names. If this man Russell is an honourable man in the estimation of the Minister of Justice, he is an ignorant man in my estimation and others besides. As far as I am concerned Russell can stay where he is, but what I have said, I can stand by it and I can prove it.

Hon. Secretary of State: Sergeant Russell has come directly under my Department for quite a while, since the time that I took charge of the Department on the 28th June last year until about three months ago. Sergeant Russell was actively identified with the Public Works Department. He was actively identified with that Department months before I took charge, and I have nothing but praise for the work that Sergeant Russell performed while in that Department. As a matter of fact, my fault with Sergeant Russell all the time was that he was too easy when he went out to enquire, and that he was too sympathetic – that he did things that another sergeant would not do if he had gone out, and if he cut dole recipients off the list he had good reason for doing so. I spoke to Sergeant Russell about the charge the Hon. Member for Green Bay made this afternoon, and he said that whatever he had done in that jurisdiction he had ample and good reason for doing so, and that he could defend himself anywhere. I have nothing bad to say about Sergeant Russell; I am sure that he did his duty as far as he saw it, and if he erred, he erred on the side of sympathy with those who were receiving the dole.

Hon. the Prime Minister, speaking on the vote for Education, in reply to Mr. Bradley, stated that the augmentation grant had been reduced because to cut the educational grants would mean that about 60 schools would have to be closed down, and the Government preferred to look after the children. He regretted having to cut the educational grant at all, and if it was at all possible the augmentation grant will be increased.¹¹⁶

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines, dealing with the vote for this Department, stated

¹¹⁶ "Hon. the Prime Minister, dealing with the Education vote, spoke very sympathetically in favour of the teachers. Questioned as to the reduction in the Augmentation vote, he stated that it was one of two things to do – cut the Augmentation vote or reduce the number of teachers. He was most concerned [about] the children and was glad to state that despite the reduction the teachers rendered yeoman service. He paid tribute to their work and assured the House that within the year the whole education system is going to be enquired into. On motion the inspection vote was cut from \$17,122 to \$15,000. The total vote, \$500,000, was passed. In 1932-33 estimates the vote was \$700,000." *Evening Telegram*, 29 June, 1933.

that in the eleven months the Department had collected about \$30,000 in revenue more than the previous year. Explaining the work of the government analyst, he stated that a system was being worked out whereby people who avail of the services of the analyst will pay fees, so that in time the Department will be self-supporting. He never heard of fees being charged by the officials there, and would make enquiries.¹¹⁷

Mr. Bradley, dealing with the vote for the Marine and Fisheries Department, stated that he was of the opinion that Mr. Davies was unsuitable for the position of Chairman of the Fish Exportation Board as he has no experience whatever in this work. [*Daily News*, June 29, 1933]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Davies seems to be a versatile man.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: He has already been ten years in the government service. Under the Act, or under the system we have and which pertains to every department in the civil service, a man employed for ten years is entitled to a pension.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Suppose he is entitled to a pension; does that make him a fish expert?

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: The fact that he has been in the markets gives him some idea as to what should be done for exporting, and the quality of fish needed in the markets.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I suppose the same thing could be said of Captain Oldford, who has also been to the markets this winter. It seems to me that the Chairman of the Fish Exportation Board, which after all is an experiment, should be a man who knows most about fish in this country. Mr. Davies' experience extends roughly about a year. Surely that doesn't qualify him to act as the chairman of the Board which is to look after the main industry in this country? I have no objections to employing him in some capacity, but it seems to me that this most important Board, which may mean the weal or woe of the major industry in this country, should be guided by a man who has years of experience in the fishery business, and not by a man who has come to the surface within the year. Must you take a man with a year's experience and make him head of the Fishery Board? It seems to me that you are inviting disaster. This is a matter which vitally concerns the people of this country. It is not a matter which one can lightly brush over and assume he will prove a safe man, and so gamble with the success of the most important industry in this country, and which all will admit is at the present time in its death throes. If it is to be saved, it will be saved by a man who knows the fishing game from the top to the bottom. Mr. Davies may have certain qualifications, but I would venture to say that he does not know a codfish from a haddock. But you can get a man in this country who does, and who knows the kind of fish produced in this country, who is familiar with the conditions, and who knows what is wrong with our products to-day, and who from vast experience

¹¹⁷ "Very little debate was offered to the Department of Agriculture and Mines estimates totalling \$60,542.12. The Department of Mines, for the first eleven months of this year, has an increased revenue of approximately \$30,000." *Evening Telegram*, June 29, 1933.

must know better than Davies how to improve the cure of the fish.

That board will have more to do than the marketing of fish. It will have to look after the grading of fish and the making of fish. It is absolutely necessary to have in charge of that Board a man who knows the fishing business from the beginning to the end, as far as it is humanly possible to know it. I do not regard Davies as a competent man in that position. He has not had the experience. He has not been connected with the business, and it is not humanly possible for him to have the details and the ramifications of the various aspects of the fishery and the types of fish required for the markets, which he would have if he had spent a reasonable number of years in the fishing industry. I trust you will have a supervisory man on the board with the qualifications he has not got, who will be able to override his decisions.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Chairman, I might say, for the information of this House, that we have in Mr. Davies, while he is a man who has not the practical experience, he has learned a considerable amount since he has been abroad. He has worked with us in many ways. He has dealt with cod liver oil and other matters, and with a man to assist him he will prove quite an organizer, and man who will meet the requirements. He will be assisted by a man with practical knowledge pertaining to every detail of the fisheries of this country, and he will be ready to take all information that can be given him. As I say, with the experience he has and the knowledge he has gained this winter in the study of the markets, he will sooner or later know a great deal about the job to which he has been appointed.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Is that his total salary?

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: He is getting from the Department \$2,000. Whether he is getting more, I don't know. I have every belief that in our difficulties we have a man that we can depend upon, and with the assistance of a man with practical knowledge he will meet the requirements.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: May I ask the Hon. Minister what he means when he says that that is surely the salary as far as he knows?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: He is to get a percentage from the export tax.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That will be paid by the Government, surely. Won't the Board collect it? Surely the Government is going to determine what his salary is to be?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It is not to exceed \$5,000.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Frankly I did not think that you could get a competent man for \$5,000, and I don't think so yet.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: If the honourable gentleman who sat in the last government had put

through these Acts, whom would he have gotten? We had some difficulty with the exporters in choosing a man satisfactory to all. This name was put before them, and we found that he would be acceptable to them. He doesn't need to go down to cull fish. We can get a man to cull fish for a few dollars a day. We are getting a man who is absolutely free of all entanglement as far as the salt codfish industry is concerned. The honourable gentleman will remember that when Sir William Coaker brought in his machinery in connection with salt codfish, he was Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He was a large exporter himself and was Chairman of the Codfish Board. I won't attempt to say what happened under his management, but I do know that the exporters lost all faith. We are trying to have a man who has sound administrative abilities. He will get all the advice so far as the trade is concerned from those who are well able to give it to him. I remember when Judge Gary was appointed to take charge of the United States Steel. It was said he didn't know anything about steel. He himself said, "I don't know anything about steel." It needs to have a man who can take charge of the Department, who can take a long view and can analyze facts and figures, and that is what I believe Mr. Davies is well qualified to do.

The merchants could not agree among themselves whom they would select. There was one gentleman they had in view, and they were so long deciding whether they would take him or not, that he took another position. I am quite sure, no matter what decision they might have come to with respect to that gentleman, if he had accepted the position, somebody would say Mr. so-and-so is still tied up with such-and-such a firm. We have a man who is absolutely free of entanglement. He has done wonderful work in connection with cod liver oil. He has a very wide experience in meeting people who import our fish in London. He has had experience going through markets. I have faith in him. I believe if he gets the opportunity – it is a long tedious job, but he is going to succeed. I would like the Hon. Member to suggest whom we can get who will be acceptable to all parties, if we had taken a man from the firms in St. John's. It has been a very difficult task. We have run counter to the exporting merchants, but we have got them to agree that Mr. Davies is as good a man as it is possible to get, and that is quite an admission to get from the fish exporters of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Votes,¹¹⁸ and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, the 29th day of June instant, at 3.30 o'clock p.m.

¹¹⁸ For Justice, Education, and Agriculture and Mines.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Thursday, June 29, 1933

The House met at 3:30 o'clock in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

The Hon. the Prime Minister moved the following resolution re the Ottawa Trade Agreement, which was seconded by the Minister of Justice and carried:

BE IT RESOLVED that it is expedient that Parliament do approve of the Trade Agreement entered into at Ottawa the 22nd day of August, 1932, between representatives of His Majesty's Government in Newfoundland, and of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, and that this House do approve of the same, subject to the legislation required in order to give effect to the fiscal changes consequent thereto:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of the said agreement which is annexed hereto (See Appendix A) be entered into the minutes of this House.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following Resolutions in connection with the Trade Agreement at Ottawa, which I now present for the ratification of the House. The House is familiar with the details and I wish to express my thanks to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for his courtesy in agreeing to the motion on such short notice. The Resolutions are as follows: (*reads*).

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have already expressed myself as having great doubt as to the wisdom of this agreement, and in dealing with these Resolutions my views must necessarily coincide. The Ottawa conference last year was, in effect, an effort by representatives of different parts of the Empire to come to an agreement whereby trade which had been directed to foreign channels would be redirected to Empire channels. I do not know yet what was in the minds of the British statesmen who fathered this conference. It was one of two things that actuated it. The first may be the desire to keep the trade of the Empire within the Empire, but in view of the fact that the mother of the Empire has been for nearly a century a free trade country, I have considerable doubts that that was what was in their minds. I am inclined to think that it was more of a gesture to bring home to other nations of the world who were foremost in building up these tariff walls all over the world that they could not go on. I hope my views are correct and that is what was behind the British statesmen's minds when they called this conference. Otherwise, as I see it, it is only flying in the face of nature. I have [heard] the statement before that when the Almighty arranged this earth, He placed the various commodities in different parts of it, [and] He did so with the idea that all these commodities were for the use of all men throughout the world. No such political boundaries ever existed since the making of the world, and any effort to impede the natural flow of commodities throughout the world is bound to disaster. This agreement is simply a continuation of the tariff wall-building scheme. It has nothing in it that can justify it from an economic standpoint. It may perhaps be regarded as justifiable from a patriotic standpoint – keeping trade within the Empire – but in the long run it is not patriotism but the reverse. I admit freely that I am a free trader. I do not believe in creating artificial trade channels and taxing the people for it. I do not believe in diverting commodities by artificial means because in the long run it will be found to have been a mistake. If

there were other reasons in the minds of the British statesmen they did not succeed very far. The statesmen of the word to-day are not making much progress in their resumption of international trade. As I said, if this was a gesture, it was rather futile; if not, if it was an effort to keep trade within the Empire, it will lead as I say to disaster. Particularly so to-day in connection with this country. It is a notorious fact that we can't pay our bills. It is a notorious fact that many of our people are not earning enough to feed themselves and many are being supported by the Government, and yet here it is proposed to add a further burden to an already overburdened people in the nature of an economic preference in favour of the Empire. It will affect a considerable portion of our trade, the various items set forth in the various items require considerable time to digest. We are importing from the U.S.A. \$6,250,000 worth of goods, from Canada \$8,250,000 and from the homeland \$3,250,000. When you come to consider that eight years ago we were importing from the U.S.A. \$10,000,000, Canada \$13,750,000, and the United Kingdom \$11,500,000 you will realise the sorry pass that this unfortunate country has been brought, and anything which will impose a further burden on our people will end ultimately in disaster. The Government has been making desperate efforts to meet its obligations and it was only through the generosity of the United Kingdom and Canada that we could do so for the last twelve months. Of course we feel grateful, but why should we give them a preference when it will impose a burden on our people who already cannot pay their bills. I have grave doubts, Sir, that the result of this agreement and these resolutions is not going to be in the best interests of the people of this country.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: If this were flying in the face of nature, I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that this measure would never be introduced from this side of the House, and when the Rt. Hon. R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada, conceived the idea of an Imperial Conference, he had not the intention of flying in the face of nature. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition says that this measure will result in an increase of taxation on our people. I would like to say that it will not be increased 5 cents. As a matter of fact, we are reducing the present burden by giving the United Kingdom a preference of 10 per cent. This is not increasing our burden. If we have to pay 40 per cent and it [is] reduced to 30 per cent, it seems to me that we will be getting that particular article for less money. I glory in the fact that we will have closer relations within the Empire and it will bring other nations to their senses and show them what tariff walls will lead to. If the reason is to bring the Empire in closer relationship surely that would justify us, we all have English blood in our veins and I am sure we would rather trade with an Englishman than a Chinaman. The Mother Country came to our aid when we needed help without our asking her, as a matter of fact we didn't have the face to ask her, and now I don't think she would try to do anything to increase our burden, do you think that would be logical? We have not increased taxation one iota, we have reduced the tariff from 5 to 10 per cent in favour of the United Kingdom, and we will get in return very considerable benefits with regard to cod liver oil, salmon and iron ore. I believe that in two years we will be able to increase our cod liver oil export 50 per cent, and in addition to that, within three years we will probably be selling anything from 500,000 to 3,000,000 tons of ore to the United Kingdom. If nothing else, [it] is good business. I can't see why we should be flying in the face of God. I can't see where it is anything but good business to try and develop a reciprocal trade between ourselves and the United Kingdom, particularly as they have been so helpful to us during trying times, and are going to be still more

helpful to us. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I can't follow the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister:¹¹⁹ Mr. Chairman, in presenting the annual review of the public finances of Newfoundland, I propose to follow the accepted practice by dividing the statement into three parts. The first will deal with the financial results of the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1932; and the second with the expected results of the year now about to close. The third part will consist of the budget for the fiscal year from July 1, 1933, to June 30, 1934.

Before, however, entering upon my detailed statement, I would like to refer for a moment to the existing economic situation, particularly as it affects this Dominion. No improvement has become visible during the past year in the abnormal and unprecedented financial and economic conditions which showed themselves first some years ago, and have since extended over nearly every country in the world. It is true that some slight and hesitant return of business confidence was to be observed the summer and early fall of 1932. But the movement was short-lived, and in the year as a whole there has occurred a further general decrease in commodity prices and a continued diminution in business activity and in employment, accompanied in some countries by acute financial and banking difficulties which are not likely to facilitate the task of reconstruction. For Newfoundland in particular, the renewed decrease in the price of codfish, in the price of newsprint, and in the export of iron ore, combined with adverse exchange conditions has inevitably had its indirect effect on our Customs revenue, which, as is well known, forms the great proportion of the total revenue of the Dominion; while the payment of interest upon loans raised at very high rates in the past, which are out of all proportion to the existing price of money, has subjected the finances of the Dominion to an intolerable strain.

I am, however, no pessimist, and I do not wish to lay excessive stress on what directly concerns ourselves, or on the problems which confront Newfoundland in company with so many other countries. We began the season with some encouragement from our seal fishery, and as to the other problems which confront us, I would rather emphasize two factors which may give us special ground for hope in the future, and perhaps in the very near future. First, the World Economic and Monetary Conference is in session in London at the present time. Its terms of reference are of the widest; it is composed of men of high distinction in the world of statesmanship, economics and finance, and possessed alike of the ability and the will to propound solutions, political, commercial, and financial, for the restoration of international confidence and of business activity. Secondly, we have now in this country a Royal Commission studying thoroughly and sympathetically our local conditions and our financial and business prospects with a view to advising the Dominion as to the

¹¹⁹ The Budget speech is transcribed from *The Evening Telegram*, June 30, 1933, p. 5.

most satisfactory solution for meeting its present difficulties, and as to the most effective use which can be made of its immense potential resources.

I turn now to the first part of my financial statement, namely, revenue and expenditure for the year which ended on July 30, 1932, and I will compare the estimated revenue and expenditure with the actual results for the year.

The Estimates which were laid before this House at the beginning of the year 1931-32 show the following totals:

Revenue:	\$10,010,391.08
Expenditure:	11,467,146.06
Deficit:	1,456,754.98

The actual results, however, are given in the following figures:

Estimated Revenue:	\$10,010,391.08
Actual Revenue:	7,931,047.41
Deficit:	2,079,343.67
Estimated Expenditure:	11,467,146.06
Actual Expenditure:	11,960,386.63
Overspending:	493,240.57

The failure of revenue to reach the budgetary estimate was due to the fact that the Customs receipts amounted only to \$5,787,051 as compared with the estimate of \$7,750,000. These receipts were less by \$1,678,000 than the Customs receipts in the preceding year.

In regard to expenditure, the Estimates included no provision for able-bodied relief, and although they were reduced by some \$670,000 in the course of the year, partly by savings effected in the various Departments as a result of an Act which reduced most of the votes by 10 per cent, and partially by additional economies in the first stages of the financial reorganization during the fall of 1931, expenditure during the year of \$1,170,000 upon able-bodied relief produced an excess expenditure of nearly \$500,000 as I have shown.

The deficit for the year was accordingly \$4,029,339.22. Further details will be available in the tables which will be appended to the printed Budget Speech.

The figures of expenditure, however, which I have just given, cover current expenditure only; that is to say, they do not include items charged to Capital Account [which] amounted to \$1,675,892.56. The capital expenditure included sums of \$600,000 to meet the deficit on the management of the Railway for the year 1930-31, of \$221,141 for Railway capital expenditure, of \$448,661 for redemption of the Newfoundland Hotel Facilities bonds: together with \$152,581 as a loan to the Newfoundland Savings Bank, which has since been repaid.

The total expenditure of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1932 was, accordingly, \$13,636,279.19.

Apart from borrowing on behalf of the Railway and the Newfoundland Hotel, it was necessary for the then Government, in order to meet the interest on the public debt during the year, to borrow the sum of \$2,200,000 from the syndicate of Canadian banks composed of the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Bank of Canada, the Canadian Bank of Commerce, and the Bank of Nova

Scotia; and, in addition to this, to raise a loan of \$2,500,000, the interest and sinking fund of which are secured by an annual payment by the Imperial Oil Limited in return for a monopoly in the importation of gasoline, and other petroleum products.

There was, in addition, during the year 1931-32, a deficit of \$339,000 on the Railway administration for meeting which no provision was made.

For the current financial year, which ends on June 30 next, this Government, when it came into office in June 1932, found the budget already voted. Revenue was placed at \$10,180,000 and expenditure at \$10,150,107.28. The Budget accordingly showed a surplus of \$29,892.72.

Before, however, the year had well begun, it was abundantly clear that the estimates of revenue had been framed in an optimistic scale, and that it was most unlikely that the figures laid down in the Budget would be reached. For example, Customs revenue had been estimated at \$7,000,000 whereas it appeared impossible that the receipts would amount to more than \$6,000,000, and it is not now expected that they will reach even that figure. Again, receipts from Income Tax had been placed at \$1,000,000, while actual receipts are not likely to exceed \$700,000.

It appeared, similarly, that in the case of a number of important items, essential expenditure had been under-estimated. In particular, the sum of \$50,000 only had been set down as a provision for able-bodied relief during the year, while in the preceding year, as I have said, no less than \$1,170,000 had been spent under this heading; and, in addition, accounts were still owing which exceeded by a very large amount the provision made in the Estimates.

In these circumstances there was only one course which could be followed. The budget for the year had brought into effect considerable increases in taxation; and it was evident that further increases would impose an improper restriction upon industry and trade. It was necessary, therefore, to cut down budgetary expenditure, and to do so in the most drastic manner. Certain economies were carried out immediately upon the Government entering office, that is to say, in July; and in September, after the Imperial Conference in Ottawa had come to an end, a comprehensive programme of economies was undertaken as the only practicable means by which a balanced budget would be maintained.

I give in detail the principal of these economies, which were as follows:

Salaries, Pensions of Civil Servants	\$90,000 annual saving
War Pensions	100,000
Education	200,000
Post Office	120,000
Public Welfare	20,000
Public Health	30,000
Total	\$560,000

In addition, a number of minor economies were effected; for example, on the vote for Public Works, on the staff of the Customs Department and on lighthouse staff, and on many other miscellaneous items.

I feel that I must repeat here the tribute which I have already paid to the patriotism with which these reductions, all of them of a very far-reaching character, and many of them producing

considerable hardship, have been accepted. It was particularly repugnant for me to introduce a programme decreasing the payments for our Education Service which had already been so severely cut down in the Budget for the year; and to make a still further reduction in the salaries and pensions of the Civil Service. There was, however, in the view of the Government, no proper alternative to the course which was adopted, to cutting expenditure down to the bone, and indeed in some cases into the bone; in order that the Dominion might show its good faith in the sacrifices which it was determined to make with the object of maintaining its public finances on an honourable basis.

Even these sacrifices, however necessary as they were in the circumstances, were insufficient. Decline in revenues made Newfoundland unable to meet without assistance the payments for interest on the public debt due at the end of December 1932. It was only possible for these payments to be discharged in full by the loan of \$1,250,000 which, as the Committee will be aware, was made jointly by H.M. Government in the United Kingdom and H.M. Government in Canada. I have already expressed, and would like to express again formally to this House the gratitude of the Dominion and of my Government for the assistance which was given.

During the second six months of the financial year the decline in revenue has continued. Since January 1933, not only have our hopes of an increase sufficient to bring revenue within reasonable reach of expenditure come to nothing; but each month, from February onwards, Customs receipts have fallen seriously short both of the estimates and the receipts obtained in the corresponding months of 1932. In spite of the measures taken for the reduction of expenditure, and of certain additional reductions carried out in recent months, it has proved a matter of impossibility to carry through the second half of the year without a deficit greater in amount than that for the first six months.

Apart from the decline in revenues, there are, as has been shown by the Supplemental Estimates which have already been voted by the House, two special items on the expenditure side of the budget which have been responsible for a large and unavoidable outlay. The first is able-bodied relief, to which I have already made a passing reference. In the fall of 1931, far-reaching changes were made in the arrangements by which able-bodied relief had previously been administered. Formerly this relief had been confined with some strictness to cases of real and proved necessity, and expenditure had been maintained at a comparatively low level. The new arrangement, under which a network of special officers were extended throughout the country had the effect of encouraging applications for relief in, I am afraid, numerous cases where it was not deserved, and in great number of such cases there is no doubt that it was given. The present Government, when it came into office, was compelled to assume responsibility not merely for a large accumulation of accounts owed for relief given in the financial year of 1931-1932, but, even worse, for the system itself. Its first step was to terminate the appointments of the officers to whom I have just referred; but it was not possible within any short period, and especially during the severity of winter, to bring to an end the system which had been established or even to modify it to any marked degree. During this month and last, however, steps were taken by which expenditure on relief will be materially decreased; but that, unfortunately, is for the future only, and it has been necessary for the liabilities of the past to be met. This has greatly increased expenditure during the current financial year.

The second item of special expenditure is upon the Railway administration. I have said that no provision has been made for meeting the deficit incurred in the management of the Railway in the

preceding year, that is to say 1931-32; and this deficit was accordingly carried forward as a liability into the current year. In the past, deficits on the Railway administration had invariably been met by the raising of successive loans for the purpose, but the Government are determined that this course shall no longer be followed. Large reductions in Railway expenditure, including the closure of certain stretches of the line, have been made during the current year by the Commission which is charged with Railway administration under the Act of 1926; but as in the case of the country as a whole, revenue has fallen far short of expectations. In these circumstances, on the assumption that the Railway is to continue to function as an indispensable element in the life and industry of the community, there has been no alternative to meeting the minimum charges required for operating, materials, etc; but it has been impossible in the existing financial position to set aside any sums for depreciation or replacement.

Having regard then to the revenue position, as I have outlined it, and to inevitable expenditure for which no budgetary provision was made, I anticipate that the outturn for the current financial year will be approximately as follows. Revenue may be expected to reach the figure of \$8,050,000, of which \$5,700,000 will consist of Customs revenue; that is to say, revenue will be more than \$2,000,000 below the budget estimate of \$10,180,000. Expenditure, including the interest on the public debt, will amount to \$11,431,000. The deficit for this year [increased] by over \$600,000 compared with that for last year in spite of the continued decline in world prices and its effect upon the earning power of our people and on our Customs returns; and also of the fact that contributions to the Railway Administration have in this year been included in Current Account.

I spoke earlier of the deep appreciation felt by Government at the aid given to us by H.M. Governments in the United Kingdom and in Canada, in order that we might meet the deficit in the second half of the year, last December. I am happy to announce that H.M. Government in the United Kingdom propose for the second time to come to our assistance, so that the Government may be enabled to meet the deficit in the second half of the year, under similar arrangements for interest and security to those adopted in December. In ordinary circumstances it would not, I think, be proper for us to make any addition to our public debt; but the offer of H.M. Government in the United Kingdom and the presence of the Royal Commission in this country, with the hope that its recommendations will have the effect of placing the finances of the Dominion on a permanently stable basis, have caused the Government's acceptance, and grateful acceptance, of the assistance so placed at their disposal.

I proceed now to the budget for the financial year beginning on July 1 next, and I will first read to the Committee the figures which show the estimated expenditure of the different Departments of the Government for the year:

Finance	\$837,302
Secretary of State	57,270
Public Welfare	905,362
Public Health	271,800
Justice	459,971
Education	500,000

Agriculture and Mines	60,642
Marine and Fisheries	363,826
Posts and Telegraphs	741,063
Customs	414,840
Public Works	588,612
War Pensions	548,690
Assessor	13,687
Labour	1,540
Total	5,764,605
Interest on Public Debt	5,200,000
Total	10,964,605

I have certain comments to make on these figures, but will begin by saying that each item of expenditure, of which each of these totals is composed, has been scrutinized with the utmost care. I hope and believe that, apart from circumstances which it is impossible to foresee at the present time, it will not be necessary to ask for supplemental votes during the course of the year. On the other hand, it would be a matter of extreme difficulty, and indeed in my view impractical, to carry on the proper administration of the country, even at a minimal level as at present, by an expenditure less than that which is set down under the head of each Department.

In the case of interest on the Public Debt, the sum estimated is \$5,200,000. This total takes account of the premium in respect of those coupons which are payable to New York; and it also includes the additional amount comparable with the Estimates for the previous year which, on the present level of exchange, will be required to purchase sterling in order to cover coupons payable in London.

I have given particularly serious thought to the estimates for Public Welfare and Public Health. Great reductions have been made in the cost of these Services during the past twelve months. I have some hopes that further reductions can still be made; but the situation at the present time is somewhat complicated by the fact that this Government, at the beginning of the financial year 1932-33, took over large arrears of accounts from the previous administration; and although these have now been paid, this has only been done at the cost of certain postponements in the case of accounts since incurred. It is the object of the Government that there shall remain no accounts outstanding by the end of the year now under consideration.

In the estimate for Public Welfare is included the sum of \$500,000 for able-bodied relief. As I have said, the corresponding estimate for the year 1932-33 was of \$50,000 only, a sum by far too small to take care of accounts which had already been incurred, still less to provide for the continuance of the system of relief already established, which it was impossible to terminate at short notice. The great proportion of the sum of \$500,000 in the Estimates for this year is for the purpose of liquidating outstanding accounts incurred under this system; the remainder we shall use as poor relief in order to deal, on a minimum scale, with proved cases of necessity and destitution as they arise.

In connection not only with able-bodied relief, but with the Welfare and Health votes generally, I wish to emphasize in the strongest terms, the extreme necessity that for the future the

population of this country must be taught not to rely, as they have done for so long in the past, upon the expectation of financial assistance and subvention from the Government in the case of every difficulty, of however small a nature, which is liable to befall them. During the last decade, and indeed longer, this mistaken system of what I may call paternalism has, most unfortunately, done much to sap the initiative of our citizens and bring them to the frame of mind in which they look upon Governmental aid as not only available for them in nearly every circumstance of their daily life, but in addition as a right to which they are undoubtedly entitled. This is not merely an incorrect view of the functions of Government; it is a canker which is eating out the hearts of our people, and is a grave menace to the proud spirit of independence upon which Newfoundland has been brought up in the past. From the budgetary point of view it has only been possible for this aid to be provided at a cost of a continual excess of annual expenditure over annual revenue, and the resulting necessity for raising loans in order to cover those deficits. This practice cannot, and must not, be continued. The only possibility of a real and lasting revival of prosperity in this country depends upon the realization by every member of the population that the qualities of self-help and self-reliance are not only a very precious possession, but are indispensable qualities for ensuring the future welfare and independence both of the individual and of the Dominion.

During the last administration, two departments of the Government, namely that of Agriculture and Mines and that of Marine and Fisheries, were combined under one minister. This appeared to me at the time a retrograde measure, and I gave an undertaking that upon this Government coming into office they would proceed with the reconstitution of each of these Departments as a separate entity. This has now been done; and has also been done at a reduction in cost compared with that of the two departments when they were combined. It seems to me indisputable that, if the management of these departments is to be efficient, each one must have at its head a man of proved experience in the matter in which the department is concerned, who is capable of taking a direct and considerable personal share in the department's administration and in the constructive solution of the problems with which both our agricultural and fishery industries are confronted at the present time. Lines have now been laid for a constructive agricultural policy. Further, I have confidence that the provisions of the Salt Codfish Act, which has recently become law, will ensure the co-operation between every section of the fishing industry, which I am sorry to say has been sometimes lacking in the past, but is indispensable if we are to regain and maintain our position in the markets of the world. The Committee knows, I expect, how near to my heart is the satisfactory working of the provisions which the passing of this Act has brought into force. When all is said and done, it is upon the fishing industry that the prosperity of the Dominion primarily and nearly exclusively depends, and if I know our countrymen, I do not think that my appeal for willing and wholehearted support in the restoration and progressive improvement of this industry will fail.

With a view to furthering the fishing industry during the present season, I am arranging that a sum shall be included in the estimates for providing outfits and similar necessities for a number of men of reliable standing who would otherwise not be able to proceed to the fishery. These advances are to be paid, either by the transfer to the Government of fish, or in cash, at the end of the season. The Government also propose to award prizes in some cases for the fish of first-class curing, as to which further details will be issued later.

There appears in the Estimates for the first time a heading for the Bureau of Labour. As the

committee is aware, this Bureau was established upon my Government taking office a year ago, and its establishment was recently confirmed by the House. In the view of the Government, the results which are being achieved by the Bureau amply justify the small expenditure involved.

In regard to the Education Vote, it is unfortunately necessary that for this year, it should be maintained at a total not exceeding \$500,000, that is to say, the sum to which it was reduced last fall from the sum of \$700,000 voted in last year's budget. The necessity for maintaining this low figure is a most unpleasant one, but it is dictated by the present and immediately prospective financial situation. I am glad to acknowledge gratefully the services rendered in difficult circumstances by the fine body of men and women who constitute the teaching profession of this country, and to undertake that restoration in any part of the decreases in salaries, which have inevitably been made will be one of the first considerations to which the Government will apply themselves upon an improvement in the financial outlook. At the same time, however, I think it cannot be denied that the present system of teachers' pensions, as distinguished from salaries, is framed on somewhat too generous lines, and I ought to say that I have in mind, not just at the present time, but in the not too distant future, a decrease in the scale of contributions now supplied to the pension fund by the Exchequer, which it appears to me can properly be made. In this reference to Education I would like for a moment to speak in my other capacity as President of the Bureau of Education, and to take the opportunity of recording that I am by no means satisfied that the educational curriculum at present in force, combined with the present system of annual examinations, is entirely in accord with the needs of the children of the country and the employment in which it is hoped they will find themselves when their education is completed. I am hoping that changes will be introduced which will bring the system into more intimate relation with the country's requirements.

As will be seen, the estimate for War Pensions shows a decrease compared with that in the budget for 1932-33, and reflects the reductions in pensions carried into effect last autumn subject to a number of adjustments which have been made in cases of special disability. In addition to these adjustments, a large contribution will be made during the year under the heading of Compassionate Allowance to War Veterans. It is with regret that the Government made these reductions, for we well remember how the sons of Newfoundland responded to the nation's call in her hour of danger and the debt we owe them.

While I am on the subject of estimates of budgetary expenditure during the forthcoming year, I think that a special reference is desirable to the salaries, and the pensions, of the civil service. No one has been more concerned than myself at the severe reductions which have been made both in salaries and pensions in the emergency which has confronted the country in the last two years, and nobody appreciates more than myself the spirit in which they have been accepted. Apart altogether, however, from this emergency, I cannot help stating that in my view, there is a very great need for the reorganization of the civil service. The service has grown up over a considerable number of years and in a manner which has by no means been systematic. It will be the object of the Government during the coming financial year to bring into effect a reorganization which, among other things, will adjust more closely the substantive salaries payable to the actual duties carried out, will correlate posts of the same or similar standing in the different departments, and will modify the existing pension system in order to bring it into a more close correspondence with those systems in force in other countries. During the past year the Government have decided that no appointment to the civil

service, unless of a purely provisional and temporary nature, shall be made without an educational test, and this test will be maintained. For the future, the competence of the individual to carry out those duties to be entrusted to him will be his sole qualification for appointment; and promotion will in every case be based solely upon the individual's ability to undertake responsibilities commensurate with those of his new position.

My last reference to the expenditure side of the Budget concerns the Postal and Telegraph Department, and the Railway Service. Very large reductions have been made to the expenditure side of both these Services during the past year. In each of them expenditure has been very much below the figures estimated in July 1932, and I would like to say here how indebted the Government are to the efforts made by the Commissions, which are concerned with the Services, to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and the Manager of the Railway. It is, of course, axiomatic that commercial services of this kind should balance their revenue and expenditure with the necessary provision for depreciation, replacements, and interest on capital. But in present economic circumstances, with the serious decline in revenue which now has to be faced and the impossibility of reducing expenditure below a certain minimal level without discontinuing the services altogether, I cannot disguise from myself that apart from a revival in trade to an extent which I dare not anticipate, a certain deficit in services must still be expected in the coming year. It would be foolishness, and indeed dishonesty, to pretend otherwise, and to concoct a worthless equilibrium between revenue and expenditure. I have hopes than when more normal conditions are restored, both the Postal Telegraph Service and the Railway will not only balance their accounts but will produce an annual surplus, although for a time at least, I suppose, not one of any considerable amount. The present Estimates are based upon the most careful examination of the prospective situation and cover only the minimum payments necessary to keep the services in being.

So much, then, for the expenditure side of the Budget for the forthcoming year. The figures of estimated revenue for the year are as follows:

Customs	\$6,400,000
Petroleum Royalty	300,000
Income Tax	680,000
Posts and Telegraphs	597,000
Cable Tax	68,000
Revenue Stamps	42,000
Crown Lands	104,250
Death Duties	40,000
Insurance Assessments, Life Insurance Taxes	11,000
Fines	23,000
Fees and Receipts Public Institutions	63,588
Board of Liquor Control	200,000
Miscellaneous	170,500
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	120,000
	\$8,819,333

This total, namely \$8,819,333, is to be compared with the estimate of \$10,180,000 for the current year and the actual expected figure of \$8,050,000 for the year. As I stated earlier, the revenue figures for the current year were seriously overestimated, and they have fallen short of expectations by more than \$2,000,000. For the coming year the Government have been at pains to ensure that this overestimation shall not be repeated, and all sources of revenue have been most carefully examined with a view to as exact an estimate as possible being prepared. The tabular statements, which will be annexed to the printed Budget, will show in detail the Estimates under each head of revenue, compared with the expected revenue for the current year and the Estimates for the year which were laid before the Committee when the Budget for the year 1932-33 was introduced.

It will be seen from the figures which I have just read that out of the total estimated revenue of \$8,819,338, I anticipate that Customs duties will produce the sum of \$6,400,000. On the subject of these duties I must first refer first to the provisional agreement made with H.M. Government in the United Kingdom on August 20, 1932, as the result of the Imperial Economic Conference held in Ottawa last summer. I propose later to-day to bring forward a Resolution that this Agreement be approved by the House and that it be brought into effect to-morrow.

I think that the Committee is well aware of the general terms of the Agreement. It provides first for the continued free entry into the United Kingdom of Newfoundland goods, as compared with the duty, normally 10 per cent, which was imposed at the beginning of 1932 on a very wide range of imports into the United Kingdom. Further, in order to assist the trade of the Dominion, the Government of the United Kingdom have agreed to the imposition of a special duty on all foreign importations of cod liver oil and of chilled or frozen salmon. The Dominion is confirmed in all the privileges which we at present enjoy in the markets of the Colonies and Protectorates, including the preference on our codfish in the West Indies; and we shall receive, generally, any preference which may be granted by any Colony or Protectorate in any other part of the British Empire.

In return for these concessions, which will be of particular value to us in the building up of our cod liver oil and salmon industries, the Dominion has accorded to the Government of the United Kingdom a range of preferences which covers 61 items of the Customs tariff; these include for the most part articles of hardware, certain types of textiles, and a number of miscellaneous items. Generally speaking, the Colonies and Protectorates will also receive the preferences given to the United Kingdom, and in the case of five articles of interest to the Colonies, a special preference has been arranged.

Further, it was agreed that a general revision of the Customs tariff of the Dominion now in force is to be carried out. Resolutions will be submitted to-day, covering a number of items in the tariff, which are designed in the main to remove existing anomalies. The Government propose to complete the revision at a very early date, but I would like to take the present opportunity of giving an assurance that it is being undertaken with a view to simplification only, and not for the purpose of imposing any additional burden of taxation. The body of the present tariff has grown up by degrees, rather as circumstances dictated from time to time than in accordance with any scientific or systematic method. Its simplification is much needed, and will be systematically undertaken.

There is in addition the proviso in the Agreement that if and in so far as budgetary considerations permit, the Government will make provision for new and more favourable conditions in regard to the valuation of the pound sterling for Customs purposes. The Government have been in

some doubt whether it would be proper in the existing financial situation that this proviso should be carried into effect, but the clause, although it may be called optional in form, is an integral part of the agreement, and in all the circumstances the Government have decided to take legislative provision enabling the necessary action for revaluation to be taken, but to defer for the present the question of its application.

The Government have been much disappointed that the discussions which took place at the Ottawa Conference concerning the utilization of Wabana iron ore in the United Kingdom have, so far, had no practical result. It is true that an informal arrangement was made during the Conference that the treaty with the United Kingdom as a whole would not necessarily come into effect unless a satisfactory agreement with the United Kingdom iron importers as regards the use of iron ore from Newfoundland in the United Kingdom could be concluded. After careful consideration, however, it has appeared to the Government expedient that the agreement should be ratified nonetheless; but close negotiations are being continued with the view to the export of Wabana iron ore to the United Kingdom and I am still hopeful that they may come to a successful issue.

Apart from the Ottawa Agreement, there are certain other matters pertaining to Customs administration which I propose to pass in very brief review. In January last an Order-in-Council was issued giving authority to the Department of Customs to collect a special duty in the case of goods of which the value was expressed in depreciated currencies, together with the right to value goods at a figure equal to the value of similar goods manufactured in the British Empire. This course was necessary owing to the large depreciation in the value of certain currencies, with the result that foreign goods were being imported at very cheap rates, revenue was correspondingly affected and the United Kingdom and Canada and the West Indies were placed at a disadvantage. The Customs Act and the Revenue Act have been amended in accordance with this Order-in-Council, so that the Order to-day becomes law and retroactive to January 9 last. I ought to add that as a result of the Ottawa Agreement, this special duty is not applicable to depreciated currencies within the Empire.

In connection with the question of valuation, it is relevant to say that the Government are taking special steps for an improvement in the existing methods of appraisement at such settlements as Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls, Buchans, and Corner Brook.

New measures are also being taken to increase the efficiency of the Preventive Service. I would prefer not to go into details on this subject, but I expect as the result of these measures an increase in revenue which will by no means be negligible.

I said a few months ago that the Government had gone very carefully into the figures of prospective revenue with a view to any overestimation being avoided. I think it is reasonable to estimate receipts from Customs duties at \$6,400,000 for the year 1933-1934 as compared with the sum of \$5,700,000 expected in the year now current. At the present time it happens that we in this Dominion are living in a state of some uncertainty, not merely concerning the general prospective economic situation, but as to conditions which, it may be thought, are liable to affect the future of this country in particular. This double uncertainty has had the effect of diminishing for the time the volume of imports and the resulting amount of Customs revenue. I think, however, that I have good reason to anticipate that this uncertainty will be only of a temporary nature; and that it may reasonably be expected that in the coming year we shall obtain sufficient receipts from Customs duties to reach the figure of \$6,400,000 which I have estimated. Indeed, it is not impossible that this

figure may be exceeded. This estimate is, of course, exclusive of the minimum sum of \$300,000 which the Dominion will receive from the Imperial Oil Company under the provisions of the Act passed last year.

In regard to Income Tax, as I said earlier in this statement, the estimate of receipts from this source for the current year was placed at \$1,000,000, while the actual receipts will amount to some \$700,000. During this year it was necessary for business enterprises in Newfoundland to operate with a reduction of \$3,500,000 in earnings, together with losses amounting to \$1,500,000, this being reflected in a reduction in personal incomes of some \$2,000,000. For the present the Government propose to make no change in the Income Tax Act, except to correct an anomaly relating to capital profits and losses. Hitherto, losses on stocks and capital have been taken into consideration in the calculation of tax payable. From now onwards both profits and losses will be excluded from consideration in the calculation of tax payable. I believe that Newfoundland is the only country which has continued to recognise such losses, which are manifestly not primarily losses of income; and I think it is reasonable that the State should no longer shoulder a burden which it is ill able to afford by taking over from the individual a portion of such losses by way of relief from taxation. As to the estimated receipts from Income Tax for the coming year, I propose to take what I think is a conservative estimate of \$680,000. Similarly, in the case of other receipts, the Government have worked upon a conservative basis, and have not in general considered it desirable in their Estimates for the coming year to diverge materially from the expected receipts for the current year; comparative tables will be given in the printed Budget. I think, or at any rate I hope that the Committee will commend the spirit of caution in which the Estimates, both of revenue and expenditure, for 1933-1934 have been prepared.

I have estimated expenditure for the coming year at \$10,964,605, a total which includes sums as prospective contributions from the Exchequer to the Railway administration, which in former years were reckoned as belonging to Capital Account and financed by means of loans. It appears to me impossible for this total to be reduced if the administration of the country is to continue, even at a minimum level of subsistence. We must await more fortunate times before the total can be increased.

As against this figure of \$10,964,605 for expenditure, the revenue expected to be available is \$8,819,338 – a difference of \$2,145,267. I would repeat that, in the same way as each item of expenditure has been examined most carefully with a view to possible reduction, receipts from every source have been subjected to strict scrutiny in order to ensure that the maximum yield is obtained. It need hardly be said, I think, that in the past few months the Government have given anxious consideration to the question whether any increases in taxation could reasonably and profitably be imposed. They are convinced, however, that just as I have to say with regret that in existing circumstances no reduction in taxation would be justifiable, no net increase could be brought into force without such restriction upon trade and industry, and without such a burden upon all classes of the community, that the object in view would be defeated.

I forecast, therefore, a deficit of \$2,145,267 for the year 1933-34 as compared with the deficit of \$3,381,000 estimated for the current year and the deficit of \$4,029,339 for the year 1931-32. I think it will be understood that, especially in the existing economic position, it is impossible to transform, as it were, by some process of magic, the large deficits of past years into a surplus, or

even into a balance between revenue and expenditure, at least if the budget is to be presented with due regard to the realities of the situation.

Nevertheless, although we are suffering to-day from the folly of previous administrations in wasteful and reckless expenditure, it seems to me that we may approach the coming year with some measure of confidence.

Since they came into office, the Government have received not little encouragement in the efforts which they have made to correct the extravagance of the past and to place the finances of the Dominion on a basis which would give no ground for reproach, and would deserve the commendation of the Empire of which it forms a part. In the immediate future, we await the recommendations of the Royal Commission, certain that they will have given the most careful thought to the problems with which we have to deal, and will apply to them expert knowledge and full understanding of our situation, which they possess. I think, therefore, it will be both proper and acceptable to the Committee, that I should defer the proposals of the Government for reaching a balance between revenue and expenditure in the coming year until the Commission have come to their conclusions, which we may expect to be available before the fiscal year is well advanced. If we look a little further ahead than this, we cannot do otherwise than look forward to a time which I hope and believe is not far distant, when revived commercial confidence and credit, an increase in world prices, and a stable market for the commodities which we produce, will make possible the renewal of Newfoundland's prosperity.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank.'"

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 21 George V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act in Relation to an Agreement with the Great Lakes Newfoundland Atlantic Company, Limited.'"

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions which were read the first time as follows:

<i>Department of Justice</i>	<i>\$159,971.62</i>
<i>Department of Secretary of State</i>	<i>57,270.80</i>
<i>Department of Secretary of State:</i>	

<i>Division of Public Welfare</i>	905,362.00
<i>Division of Public Health</i>	271,800.00
<i>Department Education</i>	500,000.00
<i>Department Agriculture and Mines</i>	60,642.00

The said Resolutions being read the second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the 30th day of June instant, at three o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Friday, June 30, 1933

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 21, Geo. V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act in Relation to an Agreement with the Great Lakes Newfoundland Atlantic Company, Limited'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to 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 Relating to Fire Insurance Companies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, I move that the words "or association" be deleted in Section 5, as it would be very difficult to control Lloyds in placing a deposit here. They have not been able to do it in Canada.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I take it that you are satisfied with the responsibility of Lloyds?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Yes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Fire Insurance Companies" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I may say by way of brief explanation that it means nothing more than a means of protection for the Government, and gives them a lien on fish caught by fishermen, who, perhaps, might be inclined to sell or barter this fish. Any further information that is considered necessary I shall be only too ready to give as we go through Committee stage.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, I have just read the Bill for the first time, and perhaps I might reserve any comment on it until it goes to Committee stage.

Mr. Whiteley: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that copies of the Bill be distributed before we go into Committee. I and other members of the House haven't seen copies of the Bill.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Some copies have been lost, and we are waiting to get further ones printed so that they will be ready when we reach the Committee stage.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Winter, the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage and Assist the Construction and Operation of a Distillery in St. John's" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, in this connection may I be permitted to suggest that the Order be deferred. I haven't seen copies of the Bill.

Hon. the Speaker: All Bills should be distributed after the first reading.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Speaker, as this Bill clearly contains charges upon the revenue it must necessarily have the assent of His Majesty's Government, and there doesn't seem to be much object in delaying the second reading. I can still comment on the matter when we go into Committee, and I would like to withdraw my opposition to the second reading. But I would ask the Government to give us copies of the Bills on the first reading.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition can be assured that as soon as the Bills are on the Order Paper we will have them in the House for distribution; and if there is a bill in which there is any technical matter contained, it will be sent out in advance.

Mr. Winter: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of the Bill I do not feel that there is any extensive detailed explanation necessary. The Bill is extremely simple in character. The character of the objects of the measure is set out clearly enough in the preamble, which shows that the principle of the Bill is to assist in the construction of a factory at St. John's for the manufacture of alcoholic liquor for export.

The character of the objects of the Bill is a new departure in this country. However, it is a private bill, and in moving its second reading I don't know that it is necessary for me to go into that point just now. It seems to me that the only serious objection that can be raised, as it occurs to me, is in connection with the principle of it. If any one has any objections to an act encouraging the manufacture of alcoholic liquor in this country, that is the only thing it seems to me that can be seriously objected to. This objection I suppose may be raised on moral grounds. But looked at as a legal measure, it merely concerns matters of duty, and objects which are simple.

Section 1 gives the company the right to import, manufacture, and export alcoholic liquor for fifteen years from the date of its passing.¹²⁰

Section 2 deals with the familiar subject of duty on machinery and material in the original construction, and it will be noted in this connection that what the company asks is a modest request, and refreshing in comparison with the usual demands which are put forward by concession-seeking corporations. The company consents to pay 15 per cent duty on all machinery, and machinery does not include operating tools and materials of like nature. The country is not giving a very great concession.

Section 3 allows free entry for materials and ingredients required for the manufacture of liquor or the by-products thereof.

Section 4 allows for the refund of 98 per cent on the export of bottles on which duty has been paid. I am informed that the company intends, if the venture is a success, to make most of, or a good many of its bottles, and so give further employment in that direction.

Section 5 is a further protection of the country and does not allow purchase outside, and compels them to purchase any Newfoundland materials that can be bought in this country.

Section 6 is most important. It imposes an export tax on products of the company of 50 cents per case – a case to consist of twelve American quarts of 30 ounces each – and I think that if the expectations of the promoters are realized, the country will reap a very good revenue from this section.

Section 7 further protects the country. It provides that \$25,000 is to be deposited by the company in the Bank of Nova Scotia and credited to the Minister of Finance before the rights created under this Act go into operation. It was asked for and given as a guarantee of good faith. Besides, the company must first of all show that they are in a position to export and have their products ready to export, or the amount will be forfeited.

Section 8 ensures that only Newfoundlanders shall be employed by the company, except in the case of experts on the staff and in the case of technical assistance. I don't think that the company will have very great difficulty in obtaining such unskilled labour in this country as they want. In fact, I understand from the Minister of Labour that he has already received several applications for work in connection with the Continental Distilleries Limited.

Section 9 provides for the cancellation of the Act if the company does not begin operations within six months.

¹²⁰ "The first section gives the company the right to import materials for a period of 50 years." *Daily News*, July 3, 1933.

As far as the financial clauses of the Bill are concerned, the Act is not merely reasonable, but a distinct improvement on past concessions to other companies. I don't think it is necessary for me to say any more at this point, but to leave the detailed criticism for the Committee stage and to move the second reading. I may say that if the operations of this company come up to anything like the expectations of its promoters, it will give much-needed employment, and if I may say so, Sir, it will create a new spirit in this country. I move that a Select Committee be appointed to consider the Bill.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, Hon. H. A. Winter, Hon. Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Bradley and Mr. Halley.

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

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I beg to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries about these reductions as to lighthouse keepers. Take that lighthouse at Red Bay, there's a reduction there; then again at Gull Island lighthouse and alarm, there's a reduction to \$560. At Long Island there's a reduction from \$120 to \$20.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I might say that when we were adjusting the salaries of the various lighthouse keepers throughout the country, everything was taken into account and the adjustments were made accordingly. There has been a considerable reduction in some salaries. That is explainable. For instance, a man who formerly got \$300, \$400 or \$500 salary is now reduced to maybe \$80. That is due to the change in the system of the lights. We have changed a lot of lights throughout the country from kerosene to acetylene, and the acetylene light is much easier on the keeper. In the case of kerosene light the keeper has to visit every day. In the case of an acetylene light, when it is lighted he doesn't have to go near the light for some time, for a month perhaps. It is only when there is something wrong with the blinker that he would have to go there. If there is anything else the honourable gentleman wants explained as we go along, I will be glad to do so. I think I gave him a list of the salaries payable.¹²¹

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Does that explanation apply to Red Bay?

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: That's acetylene.

¹²¹ "The salary of lightkeepers is now \$563 per year plus whatever may have to be paid for extra assistance." *Daily News*, July 3, 1933.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Gull Island light and alarm is reduced to \$533.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Where some of the adjustments differ, it is in such cases where the lighthouse keeper is paid a salary, and he might be put down as being paid \$750 or \$800, but he has to pay an assistant out of that.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Every lighthouse keeper paid on the scale, as he has to pay an assistant.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: The salaries are smaller in the case of an acetylene light and larger in the case of a kerosene light.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There is one man I would like to make a plea for. He happens to be in my District. I refer to the lighthouse keeper on Frenchman's Cape. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows the locality, he will understand that the job of lighthouse keeper is no easy task and that it is not easy to get to the light. I take it that light is acetylene. His salary was formerly \$650, now it is \$135. The man must remain there, and I advise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to take him into consideration and enlarge his salary.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: I shall be glad to go into anything I see is not altogether right.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Will you try to do something for him?

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Yes. I would suggest that the Leader of the Opposition write me a letter in connection with the matter.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I shall be glad to do so.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: The Hon. Members will notice in connection with these Estimates going through, that the total amount saved this year is \$9,338.31. There has been a reduction in salaries of \$17,000.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I suppose that in some cases the reduction in salary has gone into additional public expenditure.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Last year under the last government, the cost in connection with installing these acetylene lights was something like \$75,000 or \$80,000.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The change has been going on all the time.

The Department is getting along very well, I understand, without the Deputy Minister. The so-called Assistant Deputy Minister is doing the Deputy Minister's work. Why not give him the job?

Why leave that blank there? It is shown clearly that the Assistant Deputy Minister is unnecessary. Why not cut out the post of Assistant Deputy Minister and give the other man the Deputy Minister's job? You are getting on with that man doing the extra work at \$1,900.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: The new man has been there only a short while. It would be safer to give him the job of Deputy Minister in a few months. Let him go on for a few months longer. He has carried on very well so far.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am not speaking on his behalf. He is not the type of man that is going to do any complaining where he considers the thing inevitable, but it does strike me that you have not shown any justification for the severe reduction you have made in his salary that was formerly \$3,600. I don't know of any other official receiving \$3,600 a year, who has been so severely cut as that. He has lost over one-third of his salary. I do think that is an unfair cut.

Mr. Mitchell: I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that in my own District there are dozens cut from 25, 50, and 75 per cent. The conditions around this country warrant it when we see people living on \$1.60 and \$1.80 a month.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That Money Order Department has the handling of somewhere in the neighbourhood of a couple of million dollars a year. As the Hon. Member knows, the history of this country during the past eight or ten years has not shown that it is an easy job. He also has to do the work of the Postmaster. Take the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He is getting \$2,700, but the Superintendent of the Money Order Department is reduced from \$3,600 to [omission].

Hon. Minister of Justice: I would like to point out to my honourable learned friend, as has been pointed out by the Prime Minister, that there are bound to be a certain amount of anomalies. It is hoped that the civil service will receive a general examination during the course of the next twelve months, where these anomalies will be straightened out. For instance, in my Department there is an accountant. He really holds the position of First Clerk, but he is not the First Clerk according to his title contained in his commission. The only help he gets is when he calls upon the stenographers to help him out. When we come to consider the position raised by my learned friend in connection with the Superintendent of the Money Order Department and Postmaster in St. John's, in the Customs Department you have a similar official, the Assistant Deputy Minister, that is Mr. [omission]. He is also Customs Officer for St. John's. He is also Assistant Deputy Minister and takes the duties of Mr. Hutchings when he is not there, and he gets \$2,300, whereas the Superintendent of the St. John's Post Office gets \$2,350. Surely the position of the Assistant Deputy Minister of Customs is a position of far more responsibility than that of Superintendent of the Post Office. I merely point out that, as I pointed out about Mr. Godden. There are a number of anomalies. One could go through the Estimates for days and discuss some of the absurdities. They are bound to exist until some effort is made over a period of months to place the civil service upon a proper footing. There is a case that the Hon. Member knows about, he knows the man, he knows his duties, consequently you are able to speak with interest and knowledge on the subject. There are many cases that the Hon. Member

knows nothing about where similar conditions exist; not a man in the House knows, and until the civil service is placed upon a proper footing I think it is almost idle debate to be calling attention to individual cases. The Prime Minister in his Budget speech announced that it is part of the policy of the Government that this commission will be appointed to deal with these various anomalies.

The work of that commission should not be made more burdensome by calling attention to individual cases in public debate. It is well known that if members of the civil service have it in their minds that their position is such that the House of Assembly will make their case a subject of comment, the idea of their value will very much rise. During the next twelve months that commission will have to deal with every case of the civil service, [and] there will be variations in the salaries. I appeal to my friend to bear in mind that the burden which that commission is going to bear will be a very heavy one, and it will make it very much heavier if there is a public debate upon individual cases. If, on the other hand, there are individual cases of hardship where he thinks the matter should be considered, I don't think he will find any Minister of the Crown will be unfair in considering his representations. I don't think he has any cause for complaint so far in connection with any matter dealt with, whether in the House or outside the House. If he has any complaints he can air it on the Estimates. There is no Minister who will not consider any case of particular hardship. If it is held while the House is sitting, then it can be dealt with outside or after the House closes. I am sure the Minister of Posts is one of the most generous men in that respect.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If your system had been involved and you had laid down some basis for the regulation of salaries, and as a result of your proposals along other lines, certain individuals had suffered by reason of the fact that after investigation of the importance or otherwise of their positions, you felt that the position should not receive a severe cut, well and good. But there has been no such effort as the commission has not yet begun its work, and as far as I can see you have simply made a cut in an effort to retrench. That may be laudable. The question that I make is there has been a spasmodic cutting of salaries. Some men have suffered severely, others have not suffered at all. That is my objection.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs compared conditions in the Post Office now with what they were when he took charge twelve months ago. When he went in there, he found a lot of men running around like sheep and much liquor was being consumed in the building. [*Daily News*, July 3, 1933]

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: And I bet if anybody goes in there to to-day and goes right through the Post Office any time, he will not see liquor there. No, if I find liquor or a part bottle of liquor in the Post Office, he goes out the next day or I go out, and I am not a teetotaller either, and I have no objection to the Postmaster drinking outside his office hours. That is none of my business.

In justice to the Post Office officials, no civil servants suffered worse cuts; they were cut worse even than they deserve. The first day I went up there after I had assumed control, I found no less than 27 men on the floors of the Assorting Department. These people could put what letters they liked in their pockets, and 90 chances out of 100 the officials there would not know. The officials there had no protection whatever. These people were waiting to get into the Customs Department to

get their parcels, and if they had to wait for six or ten hours to get their parcels, they would wait around the General Post Office sitting upon the tables where the mails were being assorted, and they did what they pleased. That state of affairs is now altered. That was the cause of a lot of trouble in the Post Office. I don't blame the officials. It was not their fault. It was like a ship without a master. The trouble was not cleared up by anything I have done up there, with the exception that I have created discipline. I am able to enforce discipline up there from the head man down to the lowest, and one thing I think the officials can say at the present time is that I will favour no man. I would give the Assistant Minister or the Postmaster his go-along if he is not right, as quickly as I would do so to a messenger. I am glad to say, Sir, that I have no need to do so.

When I took charge of that Post Office there were people coming in there as late as 10:30 [and 11 o'clock] and going out at 12:00 p.m., then coming back again at 3:00 and going away at 4:00 p.m. When I asked them to carry out the rules I wanted observed, I must say I did not have to tell them twice, and I did not have to speak to anybody about being late either in the morning or in the afternoon.

Now, Sir, I assure this House that the Post Office is understaffed at the present time whether you think it is true or not, and if you will come out I will show you. But we will do our best for the sake of this country and the people of this country, who have been starving for the past two years. I am prepared to spend 20 hours out of 24 up there, and I have officials who are prepared to do it, and they did it this year during Christmas. At that time we had men up there all night, and I myself left my house on Thursday morning at 8:00 and did not go back until Sunday morning. The only persons who asked anything extra this year were eight or nine Customs officials. Just before Christmas there were 3,000 parcels there which had to go out to the outports. Ordinarily they would be lying up in the Post Office until January or February before they would get to the outports. I rang up the Prime Minister and asked him if he was prepared to pay \$50 to the people who would do the work, if the parcels were disposed of on time and sent out instead of being left there until January or February, and all these parcels were sent out before Christmas. The Minister of State came up there on Christmas Eve and he was told by Mr. Coultas in charge of the foreign parcel department that it was the first time in nine years that every parcel went out of the Post Office for the outports on Christmas Eve.

I never struck a better type of men in my life than the Post Office officials. I have never been into offices very much, but I have been master of ships for 35 or 40 years and I never had a better class of men under my control than I have at the present time. They are prepared to do anything for the benefit of this country's business. They took their cut like men. I told them there had to be a reduction and they had to accept so much money. They went and made their own reduction and brought the list into me some time afterwards. I could speak all day and all night and all day tomorrow about the Post Office, but it is not my intention to do so.

Everybody seems in this country to have the Post Office to blame for anything that goes wrong. They might have had reason or they may have now, but all I can say is that if the public have a complaint to make let them make it to myself or those in charge of the Department, and not go on the street and shout about it, and not write to the paper until they have seen if their business can be attended by a direct complaint to the Department. If it is not, they may make all the complaint they like.

And I may say, Sir, that I feel sure that with the staff I have at the present time, if we are given a chance, before many months have gone over our heads the Post Office will be a paying proposition – which at one time, I think, cost the country over \$500,000. This year probably the deficit will be about \$58,000 or \$60,000, and that in spite of the decline of business during the year. I am glad to say that as for as the Post Office is concerned, business seems to be on an upward trend. Only this afternoon I find that the receipts collected will be \$79,000 this month. We estimated that we would collect \$70,000, and I am proud to say that business has increased and we will collect \$79,000 and some odd hundreds of dollars in the Post Office for the past month.

I am aware that the cut in salary of the men in the Post Office has been very severe, and not only in the General Post Office but in the post offices in the outports of this country. We hear very much about the cut in the General Post Office in St. John's but very little about the outports. Any man in town to-day getting \$2,300 of salary is getting full value. I received \$4,000 as Minister of Marine and Fisheries and now I get \$2,700 and I haven't got \$2,700 for my own use, but I have to pay half of that to my constituents. The head of the department has no expense like that. He never has to put his hands in his pocket and pay out 50 cents or \$1 to constituents. The Members of the House are doing it day in and day out. I am glad to say that without exception the men in my Department made no fuss about the cuts. The outports have been cut unmercifully. I had a man in my office to-day from Trinity Bay, and where he got \$600 a few years ago he is now getting \$50. Most of them, Sir, have had cuts like that but they have taken it for the sake of the country, and to try to get the country out of the hole, and I do admit that that is the duty of all concerned.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody in this House desires to take from the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs any meed of praise that is due him for the work he has accomplished in the Post Office during the past year. I only asked for an explanation of something I did not understand. Seriously, I did not know what the gentlemen to whom I referred was there for, and it has not been explained to my satisfaction. I know the Hon. [Minister] does not prepare the Estimates himself. That is put down as the duties of another official. He probably knew what the general man was and I did not, and I suppose no other man in the House knew it except the Minister himself, and it was because I wanted to know that I asked the question, and not to take from the Minister any meed of the praise he deserves for his work during the past twelve months.

I notice that in the grant of steamship subsidies for the year, my District seems to have been singled out for special unfairness. The steamship service at the Bay of Islands has been in operation for the past 25 years, and now you are going to take it away. I was speaking to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs about the matter some time ago, and he complained that he did not see why the Post Office should have the bear the burden of the expense necessary to put a steamship on Bay of Islands, when he could get the mail carried for a small figure. I agree with him. I don't see why the burden should be thrown on his Department and I think, as I pointed out here some time ago, it should come out of the Department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or from a special grant under the Finance Department. I think you are discriminating unfairly against the Bay of Islands by depriving them of that service. The mail is now carried in a motor boat. It will probably be able to carry it alright, but if the boat is not a substantial one I question if next Fall when the wind blows it will be able to get around Blomidon. However, I do think that the Government should reconsider its

action in depriving that large and important bay of the service which it has enjoyed for the past 25 or 30 years. I don't want to talk in this way, but I am not going to see my District treated in this manner. Few Districts are bearing their own burdens and paying their own way as mine is, where you have the dole list for last winter only amounting to about \$4,000 or \$5,000, and other Districts receiving government relief to the amount of some \$60,000 or \$70,000. We are not deserving of the consideration we have received. We still pay our proportion, and more than our proportion into the revenue of this country. Why seek us out for particular discrimination?

The Bay of Islands has no roads. When you get to Cooks Harbour it is impossible to get down the shore further by land with any sort of vehicle. Woods Island is entirely surrounded by water, and it is impossible to get a vehicle of any sort to the various settlements on the north side. There are no roads there at all, and no means for these people to get freight up or down. Neither is there any means of getting passengers up or down unless they have a motor boat or a schooner. There is no means to get their produce up to Corner Brook, except by a motor boat at considerable cost. After all, if they have a few codfish to carry from Lark Harbour up to Corner Brook, they have to carry it 50 miles, and in doing so their profit is entirely eaten up by the expense of getting it to the market. Another matter to which there has not been any serious consideration given in respect to these settlements, is the fact that there is no provision for getting a doctor or clergyman to the people of these parts. I have no brief for the *George L.* Maybe it is possible to get a cheaper service than the *George L.* The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is getting the mail carried for \$5,000 – actually \$6,500 – but you are depriving these people of that service to which they have been accustomed for the last 25 or 30 years. It has been built into the commerce and trade of the people, and especially into the life of the people of that bay.

You might be justified in cutting down the cost of that service, but you should give these people some boat to take the place of the *George L.* The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs knows that you can get a large substantial motor boat to carry freight and passengers much cheaper, and I appeal to the Government, and in all sympathy with their difficulties, to give us a boat that will be of some service in that bay. The Minister of Posts is justified in his complaint that his Department should not be called upon to bear all the expense of such a service, and I ask the Government to consider before they pass this vote, giving us some vote which may be passed over to the Minister of Posts to enable him to put a boat on that bay to get the people about that bay. In bad weather there are some of the worst stretches of coast in our Island there. Going round Blomidon is one of the stiffest places in Newfoundland whenever there is any wind, and I ask the Government to reconsider their action in entirely depriving us of our service. This as I said is not all the evil resultant upon cutting out this service. There is no means of getting a clergyman or doctor around there. There is a chance of getting down there now, but when the bad weather of the fall comes, I don't know how the people are going to get on there. I ask the Government if they will consider giving a couple of thousand dollars to have this service re-installed.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: As far as we are concerned we can't do anything with it. We have given a man a contract to carry the mails for eight months.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I haven't any brief for the *George L.* or for any particular boat, but

I think that large bay ought to receive some consideration at the hands of the Government, and to throw all economic saving on our District seems to be unjust. Why give subsidies to other Districts? I entirely disapprove of this move on the part of the Government. There are no roads there, or any means of communication whatsoever. It is actually unfair, and I think that the Government ought to reconsider this matter.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I think the motor boat that is there takes twelve passengers and 46 barrels of flour. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs sent a man up there to inspect the boats offered for contract and he picked out the best boat.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If you have a substantial boat able to do the work, I am perfectly satisfied for you to make a saving. As long as there are some means of getting the people up and down the bay, and the doctor, and the clergymen can get to and from their parishes, I am perfectly satisfied.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: There were several tenders made, and two or three by people who had schooners. One man made a tender who had a schooner that could carry more freight and passengers than the *George L*. He had only an eight-horsepower engine in a large schooner. We asked him to put an engine in the boat that would drive the schooner at eight knots; he could not do it. There was another tendered, but it would not be launched until August. The man who tendered her was prepared to put an engine in her that would drive her at eight knots. We considered that in another year that one would be ready, and we could get her for a small amount – practically the same amount that we are paying now. But she would not be ready in time and people were shouting about the mails. We sent a man over to see which of the boats tendered would be suitable for the work, and he said that the boat of Furlong would be the best boat there, barring the two schooners. But he would not advise getting a 50-ton schooner with an eight-horsepower engine. Therefore I consider that we made the best bargain possible as far as the Post Office is concerned.¹²²

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 it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors" with some amendment, in which it request the concurrence of the

¹²² "The work was now being done for \$45 a week, whereas formerly the subsidy cost \$8,750. Arrangements were being made for a schooner with an engine to drive it eight knots at a cost no greater than at present." *Daily News*, July 3, 1933.

House of Assembly.

The Amendment is as follows:

Section 21, sub-section (5), to read as follows:

(5) A holder of a permit shall not sell or allow to be sold wine or beer between midnight and nine o'clock in the morning of the next day on work days, but on Sundays the hours of sale shall be within noon and 3 p.m. and between 5 p.m. and 8 p.m.

The said amendment having been read a first time and second time and concurred in, it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that Body that the said amendment had been concurred in without amendment.

Hon. Minister of Justice 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 a Guarantee of a Loan to be Raised in Respect to the United Cold Storage Company, Limited.

Hon. Mr. Winter gave notice that he would ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider the financial provisions of the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage and Assist the Construction and Operation of a Distillery in St. John's."

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, July 3rd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

Monday, July 3, 1933

The House met at 3:30 of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act (No. 2 of 1933)."

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Winter, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the financial clauses of the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage and Assist in the Construction and Operation of a Distillery in St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

According to the Bill, the company have a nominal capital of \$800,000 and is asking for the right to import machinery and materials for the purpose of manufacturing for export alcoholic liquors for a period of 20 years, at a duty rate of 15 per cent, also that all materials and ingredients necessary to be used, but only in the manufacture of alcoholic liquors or of the by-products thereof, shall be admitted free of duty during the period mentioned in paragraph one hereof.¹²³

The company shall pay the rate of duty payable from time to time upon all bottles used in its operations but shall on export thereof be entitled to a refund of 98 per cent of the said duty.

The bill also provides that the Company shall pay an export tax upon its products at the time of application for an export entry of such products of 50 cents upon each case of 12 American quarts of 32 ounces each, or if in bulk, upon the equivalent of a case.

The Company shall, before the right to export shall arise, deposit in the Bank of Nova Scotia, at St. John's, to the credit of the Minister of Finance and Customs the sum of \$25,000, from which shall be deducted by the Minister the export tax or other taxes or duties payable by the Company as and when the same shall become due and payable, until the said sum is exhausted.

If the Company does not commence to operate its plant in a bona fide manner within six months from the date of the passing of this Act and continue to operate same for at least ten months in each succeeding calendar year, all rights and privileges hereby granted shall cease and determine. [Evening Telegram, July 4, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the financial clauses of the said Bill with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was moved and seconded that the

¹²³ "... a schedule setting out all the articles on which free duty will be imposed, will be added." *Daily News*, July 4, 1933.

Select Committee be instructed to see and note the said provisions accordingly.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:

<i>Department of Finance</i>	<i>\$5,822,302.00</i>
<i>Department of Marine and Fisheries.....</i>	<i>263,826.04</i>
<i>Department of Posts and Telegraphs (Postal Dept.).....</i>	<i>496,422.95</i>

The said Resolutions respecting the Departments of Finance, Marine and Fisheries and Posts and Telegraphs 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. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I may say here on behalf of the wardens of the penitentiary that these men have great responsibilities, and at the present time they exist on starvation wages, and if there are any additional estimates I would suggest that you put in some small addition for the wardens of the penitentiary.

Hon. Minister of Public Works: A slight increase is being considered.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The payment of this is not in my Department, but we are partly responsible for them. The payment for them comes, and rightly so, from the Department of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works is sympathetic towards a small increase for these men and some slight increase will be made.

Mr. Bradley referred at some length to the system of giving pensions to civil servants and contended that the Pensions Act sets out that pensions should only be given to those who had served for a certain period and who were retired for old age or incapacity. He did not believe that every civil servant who serves ten years in the service is entitled to a pension.

Hon. Minister of Justice pointed out that so far as pensions were concerned, things were in a state of chaos until 1926 when the Pensions Act was passed. Previous to that there were instances of men being taken in the civil service on one day and pensioned perhaps the next. It was generally found, though, that men in the civil service were paid less than men in commercial pursuits, and that was one of the reasons why the service did not have in it the best men. One of the compensations held out to those entering the service was that after years of service they would be entitled to a pension. [*Daily News*, July 4, 1933]

Hon. Minister of Justice: But the principle which the Act invokes is exactly the same as in England and in Canada, and the conditions under which the civil service is employed and is paid are similar in those two countries to those that exist here. Now, it would be idle, I think, to argue as to the payments made to civil servants in these times as being indicative of the poor pay which they receive, because in these times they are receiving far less than they were two years ago. But one can go back beyond the times of the depression, and I think it will be agreed that civil servants were then very much less paid than men holding similar positions in commercial offices, in banking institutions and in professional life.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There has been a scramble for government jobs.

Hon. Minister of Justice: There has been. The result has been that the civil service has not been properly staffed. We have not had the proper men, and that very fact points to what I said as being correct. The reason we did not have the proper men was because we did not offer them sufficient pay. In other countries they are offered proportionately better pay than we offer. In those countries, although there is no actual contributory scheme towards pensions as there is in banks and in institutions such as the C.P.R., in spite of the fact that in those governments there is no contributory scheme, it is realized that as part of the remuneration of a civil servant he is entitled as a matter of right, if my learned friend does not wish me to use that word, as a matter of justice, he is entitled to a pension unless he is dismissed. That pension is not put upon a high basis.

We will cast aside from our consideration for the moment the very serious cuts that have been made in civil pensions in recent years, but it is not in countries where there is a scheme such as we have under the Civil Service Act, it is not put on a very high scale, and if my learned friend will for a moment examine the list of pensions granted under the Civil Service Act in accordance with the Act, he will find that it is not only not generous, but parsimonious. I have in mind an instance of a man who served for a period of eleven or twelve years. The member for Fortune Bay, Dr. Mosdell, will probably recollect the one I mean. He was employed for eleven years and his salary was \$1,100. He was 57 or 58 years old when they decided to pension him, and he received a pension of \$300. Is that grossly inadequate? To take away a man's living at the instance of the government – I was going to use the word “whim,” that would be unfair – at the instance of the government. It did not suit to retain that particular man at that particular time. He was pensioned not at his own request, but at the instance of the government. He got \$300. Was it fair to have that man paid \$300 when he was more or less turned out of the service, and put upon the world at the age of 56 or 58?

In commercial life they have no right to the pension in most firms, but here, now that the matter has been put upon a proper footing, we have a right, as I said a moment ago, we are entitled to it as a matter of justice. Outside the Judges of the Supreme Court and the Auditor General, there is not a single civil servant to-day who cannot be dismissed without cause. Every commission in the government is held during pleasure, and to that extent he is right. There is nobody in the civil service entitled to a pension, because every single position could be withdrawn to-morrow but no government would think of doing it. That is why the Civil Service Act specifically states that the government may grant, but that they are entitled to it does not admit of debate. Those members of

the civil service, like the Judges of the Supreme Court, are appointed during good behaviour which necessitates redress to both Houses of Parliament before they are dismissed, and the reason for that is to raise them far beyond the possibility of political interference, because their positions are so important that it would be beyond the bounds of reasonableness to suggest that they should hold any other kind of commission. But outside of those, every civil servant holds his commission during pleasure, and the whim of any government could deprive him of that commission and of a pension. But it would be idle to think that any government, that any civil servant who had carried out his duties is not going to receive a pension according to the Act.

The other point raised by my learned friend was that it gives an opportunity to a man who would decide to take a pension, to retire at an early age, to leave the service and go into commercial life or any other business. That is quite true, but I say that his pay is based on the basis that he is going to get a pension. Does it make any difference to the government whether a civil servant receives a pension – whether he receives it through illness or in good health? What difference does it make to the government? Suppose he is ill. Does the government increase his pension and say, “We are sorry for you, you have given us good service, your health is broken down, and we will increase the amount provided”? No, it does not say that. Should they say to a man who decides to give up at 43, “We are going to deprive you of your pension because you are in good health”? That would be the obvious conclusion to be drawn from my learned friend’s argument. I can point to-day to a man in the civil service who is retired, who obtained his pension nearly 25 years ago. He was taken on again by the government, he received a pension and full pay, now he is retired on two pensions; I don’t see why he should not.¹²⁴

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The pension should be only for a man who is worn out in the service, not for a man working 20 or 25 years perhaps in good health, and well able to support himself. I do not think he ought to have a pension. I also think pensions ought to be contributory. Perhaps before next year we shall be in a position to put this before the House. Pensions are far too high. They have caused a great deal of dissatisfaction in the outports, as in the case of a man getting \$1,500 a year. When they were giving service to the country they got a much larger salary; when pensioned they got about \$1,200 or \$1,500 a year.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I was very much interested in the explanation which the Minister of Justice has given, but he spoke rather from a philosophical side than from the practical. It is not the idea of one citizen in a hundred in Newfoundland to-day, that a man is pensioned because he has rendered the country so much service, whether it is ten, eleven, or twelve years. The very basis of pensioning a man is either that he is incapacitated as a result of some illness overtaking him in early

¹²⁴ “The Act was based on the Canadian and English Acts, and in these countries civil servants are on a contributory scheme. He believed that the purpose of the Act here was somewhat similar in that actual wages were not as high, but was atoned for in the pensions offered. He did not think it was fair that every civil servant should hold office at pleasure and should be subject to dismissal at the whim of any government, and one of the protections for servants was in this pensions act which sets out that after ten years every civil servant was entitled to a pension, so that if they were dismissed without cause, they had something on which to depend.” *Daily News*, July 4, 1933.

middle age, or that he has become incapacitated through age from earning an ordinary living, and because he is a civil servant the government will now do what it can for him. The Act of 1926 was only intended to regulate that very scheme. I know the Act contains one or two things I don't think the framers of it were aware of. I know of a claim that was made upon [the] government by a man who was dismissed. It was referred to the Justice Department. Mr. Dunfield was there. We both looked rather blank when this claim was referred, we did not think there was anything in it. When we examined the Act, we found that we were both wrong and the government was liable. I propose to have a look at it now.

I would like to read this section of the Act. I am not going to put an interpretation on it now, but I want to read this Section to the House for its information. Under the heading "Eligibility for Superannuation," Section 6, sub-section (1): (*reads*). It strikes me offhand that it is rather difficult to get beyond that.

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.*¹²⁵

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

The House went into committee on the Act respecting fishery supplies for the current season. The Minister explained that the purpose of the Bill was to protect the government against possible loss on account of supplies. It reads as follows:

1. The cost of all goods and merchandise purchased for and supplied to any fisherman by the Minister for the purpose of the fishery season of 1933, and all costs and expenses incurred in connection therewith, shall constitute a debt due the Crown and shall have all incidents and priorities belonging by law to such debts.

2. As long as the said debt or any part thereof remains due and owing to the Minister, the amount so owing shall be a first charge upon all fish caught by the debtor during the current season in the same manner and to the same extent as if the said fish were presently in existence and a chattel mortgage thereof to the Minister to secure the repayment of the amount owing had been registered.

¹²⁵ "The votes for the Customs, Telegraphs, Public Works, Assessor's, Pensions and Labor Depts. were all passed." *Daily News*, July 4, 1933.

Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Minister shall be entitled to satisfy each charge by possession, sale or other lawful disposition of the said fish; and may follow the same or the proceeds thereof to the hands of third persons, whether such persons shall have had notice of such charge or not.

3. Any fisherman supplied as aforesaid shall, if the Minister so require, deliver all fish caught by him to the Minister or to such agent or agents, as the Minister may appoint for that purpose; and the Minister shall have power to sell or otherwise dispose of the said fish to satisfy the amount owing to him. Any balance remaining out of the proceeds of sale after deducting the debt due and all necessary expenses of collection and sale, shall be held by the Minister in trust for the debtor and shall be paid to him.

4. If any such fisherman debtor shall sell, barter, exchange or otherwise deal with the fish caught by him with intent to defeat the claim of the Minister or otherwise defraud the revenue, or if any person or persons shall buy, accept or otherwise handle such fish with the same intent, all persons so offending shall be guilty of obtaining money by false pretenses and shall be punishable accordingly.

5. This Act may be cited as "The Fishery Supplies Act, 1933."¹²⁶

Captain Whiteley thought the Bill was very plain and is a great safeguard. He was not a supplying man himself, but he observed many abuses and one thing that struck him forcibly was the degeneration of the people of to-day. In the old days the people had a big sense of honour. To-day there is great risk in the supplying business, and a man may honestly give supplies and take fish in return, and when that fish is ready to be shipped to market find some creditor come in and take it, and there is no redress. He had been informed nothing could be done about a thing like that, but the time had come when the fisherman must reconsider his position and take account of what he is doing. A certain amount of credit is necessary, but every man should try and pay his bills. Some days ago there had been a discussion in the House regarding the salary of the chairman of the Fish Exportation Board. Part of this salary will be paid out of the export tax of 2 cents a quintal. In the final analysis this tax will be paid by the fishermen, but he wanted to say on behalf of the fishermen that they will gladly pay this if they get service, but they expect every cent to be spent on the improvement of the fisheries. If the fishermen will produce an article of food that is fit for consumption, he had faith in the future, but if there is trickery and jugglery, the fishery will go down to ignominious failure. He instanced what could be done in holding markets by what had happened in south Sweden, where a market had been held for 400 years. He believed that the Bill before the House might go farther, and give protection to the suppliers as well as the government and the fishermen. [*Daily News*, July 4, 1933]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There is one point that strikes me and it is this: (*reads*).

It strikes me that that is extremely unfair. If that fish happens to come into the hands of a bona fide purchaser, why should he have to discard the proceeds for which he has actually given

¹²⁶ The text of the Act is transcribed from *The Daily News*, July 4, 1933.

value? If you are going to tie up fish in such a manner as that, it is going to have a nasty effect on trade generally. Nobody will know who to buy fish from. Nobody will be safe in buying fish. Say Mr. Starkes buys my fish. He may be honest about it or he may not. We will assume that he is not. He sells to some Water Street merchant in St. John's. That merchant does not know where that fish comes from – he got it from Starkes. Is the government entitled to follow that fish from Starkes, and take it from Jobs who paid cash for it?

Mr. Winter: I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will admit that it has been that very difficulty which has caused every government guarantee scheme to fail before, because it was so easy to evade it by disposing of the fish. If, for instance, everybody who supplies would give what is tantamount to a mortgage, then the confusion that the honourable gentleman speaks about might arise. This is only intended to be altogether exceptional, and the Bill, if I may say so, it is as much in prevention as in cure. How can anybody complain if he is merely put on enquiry when the fisherman sells his fish, to find out whether or not that fisherman has been supplied by the government? The whole purpose of the scheme is to keep government-supplied fishermen separate from the others. It would be very easy for Mr. Starkes to find out whether that man had been supplied by the government. I know he won't do it in ignorance, and we will provide later on for anything in the way of falsification. If a merchant knows that he is in danger of having to pay twice for fish, he will be certainly on his guard, and he will be a self-constituted policeman for the government.

I drafted this, and that is why I undertook to answer it. We will admit that this is an extreme measure. It is only an emergency measure. Unless it works exceptionally well, I don't think it would be a regular thing. The Government feels that it is far better to go to that extreme [*omission*] dispense with the one safeguard there is for protecting the government. The one thing in the carrying out of this scheme is that every cod's tail caught by this fisherman is earmarked by the government. Take the point raised by the Member for Green Bay. It is very easy for the fisherman who has got \$25 from the government, it is very easy for him to go to his merchant and give the department an order on that merchant which would be tantamount to paying cash. If it is properly done, then the mortgage is raised and the lien is discharged. The object of this Act is to put the merchant strictly on enquiry as to whether the man has been supplied by the government or not. The merchant should see that the account is paid, or if he pays for it that the man gets a discharge.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The Government is taking an extraordinary risk, a risk that has resulted in heavy losses when taken in the past. Mr. Starkes knows his dealers, and Mr. Bowring or Mr. Job know Mr. Starkes. If Bowring chooses to take a chance on buying fish and paying for it from Starkes he ought to know it, and if Starkes is not honest, that is between himself and Bowring. I think you are right.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 21, Geo. V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act in Relation to an Agreement with Great Lakes Newfoundland Atlantic Company, Limited'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole presently to consider the said Bill.

Hon. the Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would like to explain to my honourable friends opposite that this is a scheme promoted by Mr. Thompson, who has been interested in this country for a great number of years, and who has promoted a great number of schemes which have never done any harm to the country or to the community. He has never sought anything from the government, nor acted in any way that would reflect to his discredit. I don't intend to go into the details as to the nature of the scheme, but it appears in a general way an idea that Mr. Thompson has conceived, whereby freight will be gathered together in and around Burin Peninsula – perhaps Mortier Bay – which will be the subject of transshipment – freight coming to Canada and the United States to Europe, and from Europe to Canada and the States. The scheme has been on foot for a period of years, and it has not come to fruition. It was hoped by Mr. Thompson that he would be able to do something this year, and consequently when he asked the Government for an extension of his charter he thought he should be able to get it going by 1934. But a few months ago he approached the Government again, and asked that it be extended to 1935. Owing to the difficulties which now exist and the depression, it is hard to get the capital. I feel satisfied that even if the scheme fails, the country will not be injured in any way in its reputation or otherwise in this connection. It was in the minds of the last administration to introduce an amendment, but owing to the pressure of business it was not introduced. There is a provision in the amending Bill that the Act still be in force, although no proclamation was made.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I have no objection.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

Mr. Speaker took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Byrne took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them

referred, and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Act 21, Geo. V., Chapter 6, entitled 'An Act in Relation to an Agreement with Great Lakes Newfoundland Atlantic Company, Limited'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Further to Amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole presently to consider the said Bill.

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself in a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank.'" "

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill has for its purpose (*reads Section 5*). This was a tax that was levied at the request of the people of Grand Bank themselves to keep up the repair of the harbour wharves. Last year the last administration put a tax of 50 cents per ton on coal. Consequently the people of Grand Bank have been compelled to pay into the revenue the 20 cents already in force, and the additional 50 cents. Now the 50 cents only will be collected, and 20 cents will be returned to the Grand Bank Harbour Board.¹²⁷

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: My understanding of the Bill is that the people of Grand Bank will get 20 cents, and 30 cents will go to the government. Doesn't the 50 cents form part of the general revenue?

¹²⁷ "... previously a tax of 20 cents a ton had been levied on coal entering Grand Bank and the money was given for the improvement of the harbor. Last year a general tax of 50 cents a ton was imposed which meant that people in Grand Bank would have to pay 70 cents a ton. The present bill provides that from the 50 cents a ton collected 20 cents will be passed over to the committee in charge of the harbor. This was in line with what is being done in other towns where controlling committees are working and will eventually happen in all places where the local government bill is put into operation." *Daily News*, July 4, 1933.

Hon. Minister of Justice: It is in the Revenue Act. If not, it will be provided for.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Doesn't the 50 cents go into the General Account? Take in the other sections of the country, they are paying 50 cents on every ton of coal. That goes into the General Exchequer Account, and it is proposed to return 20 cents of the 50 collected in Grand Bank to the people there, for what purpose?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: For the repair of the harbour.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I don't see why they should have it for their harbour. Shouldn't it be returned to all the settlements in some way?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: If they have any utilities, they should get some of it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: We import a lot of coal into Corner Brook, but I don't know if we get any of that 50 cents back. But we need it.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: When these towns come to incorporate themselves into municipalities, they will get it all back.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up, entitled, respectively, "An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Licence to Cut Timber to the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited"; "An Act Respecting Local Government"; "An Act Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries"; and "An Act to Grant Certain Advantages to the North West Products Limited" without amendment.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, the 4th of July instant, at three o'clock p.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Tuesday, July 4, 1933

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for the Temporary Control of the Trade in Coal."

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to the Confirmation of a Loan made by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom with His Majesty's Government in Newfoundland on December 31st last.

Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Define the Rights of International Power and Paper Company, Limited, and Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, in Respect of Certain Timber Lands."

Mr. Bradley gave notice of question.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act (No. 2 of 1933)," was read a first time, and it was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time, as follows:

<i>Department of Customs</i>	<i>\$415,840.88</i>
<i>Department of Posts and Telegraphs.....</i>	<i>244,494.23</i>
<i>Department of Public Works.....</i>	<i>588,828.08</i>
<i>Department of Pension Commissioners.....</i>	<i>548,690.80</i>
<i>Department of Assessor</i>	<i>13,687.40</i>
<i>Department of Labour</i>	<i>1,540.00</i>

The said resolutions respecting the Departments of Finance and Customs, Posts and Telegraphs, Public Works, Pension Commissioners, Assessor and Labour, 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.

At the request of the Leader of the Opposition, the committee of the whole on Ways and Means was deferred until [July 5]. He stated he would be ready to go on [then], and that he would not take up much of the time of the House. [Daily News, July 5, 1933]

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative

Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up, entitled, respectively, "An Act Relating to the Culling of Codfish" and "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Lotteries'" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that it had passed the Bills sent up entitled "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Trustees'" with some amendment.

The amendment is as follows:

Section 6:

Strike out the word "Newfoundland" and substitute therefore the words "within the Municipal limits of the City of St. John's."

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the amendment was read a first and second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House had concurred in the said amendment without amendment.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the Municipal Bill and I now beg to move that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House for discussion.

Hon. the Minister of Justice presented the following report:

Mr. Speaker

Your Committee appointed to consider the proposed amendments to the Municipal Bill was appointed on June 23rd last past. Since that time no person has either appeared before your Committee or asked to be heard.

Your Committee has therefore nothing to report to this Hon. House, and recommend that the Bill be dealt with in the ordinary course in accordance with the Rules of the House.

(Sgd.) F. Gordon Bradley

P. F. Halley

H. A. Winter

Whereupon with the unanimous consent of the House, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Acts, 1921-31."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Section 1 of the Act provides for the postponement of the court of revision due this year, until 1934. The [Minister of Justice] explained that the purpose of the section was to avoid having a court of revision in the same year as an election was due. [*Daily News*, July 5, 1933]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It suggests itself to me – I'm not partisan to this particular municipal council, but my information is that the cost of a court of revision is \$708, and the cost of an election is \$8,000. Why not let this old council go on for another year?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: They don't want to stay there.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I am afraid a provision of that kind would be very unpopular.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It strikes me this is the time to save \$8,000 for the City. If they were going to run again it does not make any difference. Hold on to them.

Hon. Minister of Justice: You can't compel people to perform services they don't want to perform.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I have had conversations with members of the council, and if another year were thrust upon them they might be inclined to accept it. But they don't want to appear to take it upon themselves. If it will save money the council will probably be willing to take service for another year; but they don't want to appear to take it upon themselves. I think I would welcome the suggestion of the Hon. Member.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Would it be desirable to postpone this section? It might be well to take the views of the council on this matter.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The section we are discussing now has to do with voters' lists, but doesn't it refer to the question of obtaining certificates, which is regarded as a nuisance.

Hon. Minister of Justice: That's quite right. It's a perfect curse. In most cases if your tax is not paid before a certain date when this list is taken, your name will not be on the list. But at any time before election day you can pay them, and there are hundreds there on election day seeking certificates, and the council says it's a lot of trouble.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Still, don't they get a lot of taxes they would not otherwise get?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The council seems to look upon it unfavourably.

Hon. Minister of Justice: In view of the statements made by the Hon. Members, we might put it to the House.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would rather have something more definite from the council. Perhaps the council might be able to give us some more definite information.

Hon. Secretary of State: They certainly will have to see that they are going to conduct the taking of

voters' lists in a far more efficient manner than they have done in the past.

Hon. Minister of Justice: This section pertains to the right of a lessee to get an extension of his lease, or purchase his property with the improvements, or compel the landlord to pay for the improvements. The landlord will have to buy a building put up under the covenant in a lease. It says that the landlord will have to buy that building at the end of 99 years.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am inclined to agree with the council there.

Hon. Minister of Justice: What, to allow the landlord to be mulcted for the building? He lets the land with the agreement that at the end of 99 years he will have a building on it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: In the ordinary course of events it is probable that the building will have so deteriorated that its value will be nil.

Hon. Minister of Justice: If the building is of no value at the end of 99 years, why put it in here and make the landlord pay for it?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: [*illegible*] to keep the building in good repair.

Hon. Minister of Justice: [*illegible*].

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If it has market value the landlord can sell it. Frankly, I am not a landlord myself and neither have I got any sympathy with them. I must say I am inclined to favour it, and that's the tendency of the law.

Hon. Minister of Justice: It is not the tendency of parliamentary statutes.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have a much greater regard for the judgements of the courts than I have for those of parliaments.

Hon. the Speaker: Mr. Chairman, this I regarded as quite reactionary legislation – not now, but at the time when it was first made law. In 1921 this legislation was first introduced, which upset the preconceived ideas of the law as between landlord and tenant. Prior to 1921 it was conceived that at the expiry of a lease, the land with the property upon it reverted in the landlord or lessee. True, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition pointed out, at the end of 99 years the building is of no considerable value. But it was always regarded by the lessor as his property. The 1921 Act created furor on the part of landlords. It is twelve years since it was passed, and there is considerable doubt as to what it means, or as to what was in the minds of the legislators at the time when it was passed. Section 95 gives the lessee two actions in cases of land leased before 1921, either by an agreement to extend the lease beyond the original or further term agreed [*illegible*]; or if the extension is not agreed upon it is to be decided by an arbitrator or to purchase the freehold of the land. Now the

question [*illegible*] of the "freehold of the land" has given rise [to] controversy among various members of the profession. I speak with some knowledge of the matter because I had a case under that section. I think it was the only one that has arisen under the section mentioned. I had an arbitration between the landlord and the tenant to settle the value of the freehold of the land; and when it came to the question of taking evidence the lessee took the position that the freehold of the land did not include the buildings on it. The arbitration ended there. The arbitration was to state a case for the opinion of the Court, and this was never done. There has never been any interpretation of this section. This is of course a private Bill. It is not a Government measure, and I don't know whether the Government seeks to pass this section. I did hope it would be considered by a select committee, but apparently this was not done so the Committee of the Whole [has] to deal with the matter. But if Section 1 be allowed to stand over, I suggest that this section might also be allowed to stand over so that the House will have the opinion of the City Solicitor on the matter. He has given considerable thought to it, and I ask that this section be allowed to stand over. It is rather reactionary confiscatory legislation. It was so in 1921, and this section seeks to remove all doubt as to its character.¹²⁸

Hon. Minister of Justice: I have considerable sympathy with the Hon. Member who has just sat down, and I think it is a matter on which we might obtain the written opinion of the City Solicitor on the question. Like the Hon. Member Mr. Speaker, I would in 1921 look upon it with considerable fear and doubt. I saw the City Solicitor before I went away to England two months ago, and it was not until yesterday that Mr. Browne handed the matter over to me. There are other sections here which I think will appeal to the Committee, and which I feel satisfied should go through, but I think the section referred to by Mr. Speaker might stand over until we can get some further detail from the City Solicitor. In the meantime we might go ahead with the other sections.

This deals with the case where a person has a house under lease for, say, \$200 and subdemises the upstairs for \$150 and the downstairs for \$150. His superior landlord at the present time has to pay a tax on \$300 whereas he is only getting \$200 rental. Under these sections the intermediary tenant has to pay a tax on the difference (*reads section*).

Section 10 of the Act provides for an entertainment tax and repeals the former section dealing with that subject. Under the amendment the tax may be imposed either directly upon the persons or companies responsible for the conduct of the entertainment, etc., or upon the payments made for thereto and may be collected in such manner as the council may determine. The rate shall be fixed by the council from time to time and may be varied between local and foreign performers.

Section 11 of the Act defines the meaning of "peddlers and hawkers" and states that these

¹²⁸ "Hon. the Speaker asked that this section be also allowed to stand over until more information could be obtained. He stated that prior to 1921, at the expiry of a lease a building reverted to the landlord, but under Section 95 two options are given, one that the lease be extended for a further term or that the right be given to purchase the freehold of the land. He instanced a case in which arbitrators were appointed to set a value on the 'freehold of the land' and when evidence was being taken it was held that the freehold of the land did not include the building thereon. He desired to have the matter explained." *Daily News*, July 5, 1933.

expressions mean such person who within the city limits goes from place to place or to other men's houses carrying to sell or exposing for sale any goods, wares or merchandise of any description or otherwise exposing patterns or samples of goods, etc., to be afterwards delivered, but shall not include any person selling or seeking orders for goods, wares or merchandise to or for persons who are dealers therein and who buy and sell again, not any persons selling or exposing for sale goods or merchandise in any public mart, market, or fair legally established.

Section 13 gives the council power to make rules and regulations in relation to labour in the city and states "The council shall have power to make rules and regulations governing the employment of labour in the construction, alteration and repair of buildings, within the city limits so as to ensure as far as possible that such employment shall be to workers resident in the city in preference to non-residents, and such power shall include power to impose a tax or license fee on non-resident workers permitted to be employed on such construction, alteration, or repair."

Mr. Bradley was uncertain as to how this section should be treated. As a citizen he was in sympathy with the amendment but he feared for what might happen by placing restrictions on the free movement of labour. It has elements of danger in it.

Hon. Attorney General agreed that care should be taken in artificial restriction on labour or trade. However, he understood that the section was in line with what is being done elsewhere. Other countries are restricting the admission of emigrants and are repatriating natives of other countries. In one or two of the provinces of Canada acts have been passed restricting labour giving to people resident of other provinces.

Hon. the Prime Minister was in sympathy with the amendment and he could see the wisdom for it. There were many jobs done in the city which are being done by men from outside and the result is that taxpayers are being prevented from getting what is by right theirs. If work had to be done in various outports and men from St. John's were brought to do it there would be an outcry and it is very probable that the men would be prevented from carrying on. He could see no objection to giving the section a year's trial to see how it works out and if it was unsatisfactory the section could be repealed next year.

Mr. Halley thought the section in question was the most important of the whole act. He had experience over the past twelve months, where hundreds of men in the city were out of work; they were not seeking relief but wanted an opportunity to do honest work. Contractors in St. John's had the habit of bringing men to the city from outside when they had jobs to be done. These men were not paying 5 cents in city taxation, had none of the extra expenses which people living in the city have to meet and for that reason are able to undersell themselves in the labour market. He knew of instances where men were working for 10 and 15 cents an hour and had taken up what they earned in truck, whilst men belonging to the city had to stand by in idleness. Only in the past few days there was an instance of that on Signal Hill where the wireless station is being erected by men from the outside, who are living in tents near the work. He did not think it was good enough and he considered the amendment was long overdue.

Mr. Bradley did not oppose the section and agreed with the Prime Minister that it could be given a year's trial to see how it works. [*Daily News*, July 5, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, the 5th day of July instant, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

Wednesday, July 5, 1933

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

With the unanimous consent of the House, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Rules of the House with respect to all business now before, or to come before, the House for the remainder of the present session were suspended.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Resolutions relating to the Ratification of Certain Temporary Loans from the British Government.¹²⁹

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act for the Ratification of Certain Temporary Loans from the British Government" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Ratification of Certain Temporary Loans from the British Government."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

¹²⁹ June and December, 1932.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Ratification of Certain Temporary Loans from the British Government" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Certain Resolutions relating to an Act (No. 2, 1933) to Further Amend the Public Works Act, 1932.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, the object of these Resolutions¹³⁰ is that an import duty of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and kerosene will be imposed, and the receipts from this source will be earmarked for the purposes of keeping the highroads in some sort of repair. It will be collected by the Customs Department and paid by the Imperial Oil Company. One cent per gallon is the extent of this tax. It is expected that in a year \$35,000 or \$40,000 will be paid over to the Highroads Department and will be the means of keeping the highroads in some sort of repair. It is absolutely necessary that we have this money, and it was felt that this would be the fairest way of collecting it. We are making provision for this amount in Supplementary Supply.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There is only one objection that I can see, if it is an objection at all, and that is that under these resolutions this amount will be used exclusively for highroads purposes. There are many outport places where there is not the shadow of a highroad, and it seems unfair that these people, who receive absolutely no benefits whatever from the highroads, and who have now, especially at the present time, so little money to spare, should be taxed for the upkeep of highroads which in many cases they have never seen. I would rather see 2 cents on gasoline and leave out kerosene altogether, and thus we would be taxing only the people who get the benefits out of these highroads. I think that under existing conditions that tax is unfair. Take a fisherman in White Bay: in order to maintain a highroad around the Avalon Peninsula and perhaps across Trinity Bay, he has to pay a tax on his kerosene. I think that is unfair. We should not impose any further burdens on our fishermen. One cent is a good deal of money to-day with some of our people. I would suggest that we put the tax of 2 cents on gasoline and leave out the kerosene altogether.

¹³⁰ "WHEREAS by an Act passed in the present Session of the Legislature an import duty of 1 cent per gallon has been imposed upon kerosene oil and gasoline:

AND WHEREAS it is intended that the revenue collected from the said tax shall be used exclusively for highroads purposes:

BE IT THEREFOR RESOLVED THAT: 1. The Minister of Finance and Customs shall pay over to the Minister of Public Works as Chairman of the Roads Board the revenue collected from the tax of 1 cent per gallon imposed respectively on kerosene oil and gasoline as and when the same shall have been collected by the Minister of Finance and Customs." *Evening Telegram*, July 6, 1933, p. 12.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: We considered that very carefully from all angles, and it was felt that for this year it had better stand as it is, and we will take up this matter again next session. There is a 5 cent remission on gasoline to the fishermen, and we felt that if we added a further 2 cent tax it would be all the more incentive to defraud the revenue. We felt that it would be surer of collection if it were 1 cent a gallon generally. We paid some \$40,000 in rebates to supposed fishermen, and we feel that the fishermen did not get the benefit of this at all. We could only hope that this rebate was placed to their credit. I would rather see the price reduced and no rebate for fishermen. Certainly, the price of fish is so low and the cost of catching fish so high, that we hesitate to consider anything that would make it any more difficult for the fishermen.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Why not give it to the Department of Public Works to be used in part for highroads, and in sections where there are no highroads, let them give the people back a little money for the purposes of wharves or something of that kind.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The Minister of Public Work is Chairman of the Highroads Commission, and I suggested to him that as last year the importation of kerosene was \$738,679, on which we collected \$7,300, that \$3,000 or such proportion as he sees fit, should be given to the people who have no highroads.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act (No. 2, 1933) to Further Amend the Public Works Act, 1932" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act (No. 2, 1933) to Further Amend the Public Works Act, 1932."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act (No. 2, 1933) to Further Amend the Public Works Act 1932" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, 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 Temporary Control of the Trade in Coal" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, acting on behalf of the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Define the Rights of the International Power and Paper Company, Limited, in Respect of Certain Timber Lands" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Hon. Minister of Justice: In introducing the principle of this Bill to the House, I would like to explain on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines¹³¹ the object of this construction. It will be borne in mind that we have in this country two very large pulp and paper enterprises, the International and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, operating respectively at Corner Brook and Grand Falls. When the A.N.D. Company incorporated and started its operations, it obtained certain freehold lands from the Reid company and obtained licensed areas from the government. Upon the licensed areas they pay the usual \$2 per square mile by way of revenue over a period of years. They have from time to time been purchasing licences from various licence holders, until their holdings to-day amount to 5,305 square miles. Some question does arise as to whether that company's title to some of these holdings has not been voided, but in view of the judgement in the case of Jardine and Martin, it is probable that the licences are not voidable, but that there is a good title in the A.N.D. Company in connection with them, and for the purpose of putting it beyond question, especially as the Act is designed to limit their powers in future, it has been decided by the Government to put into this Bill that those licences which they have acquired are to be taken as being held by them properly and without further obligation, except in connection with the operation at Grand Falls under the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Act. After all, they were the pioneer company. It was not considered necessary by them, nor asked for by them, that they should have the right to purchase unlimited quantities of timber areas throughout the country.

¹³¹ The Minister of Agriculture and Mines "was absent owing to the forest fire." *Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

But when the International Power and Paper Company took over from the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company a few years ago, in the contract which was then prepared and submitted to the Legislature, provision was made under which any purchase which they made themselves of licensed areas could be accepted by them without obligation to erect mills as provided in the licence, and since the Act was passed they have accumulated a considerable number of licensed areas which amount to some 5,628 square miles.

It is held by the Government that the time has come when we should consider conservation of the timber areas of the country in the hope that some other mill will be erected, shall we say on the Gander. There is considerable danger that either of these companies in these depressed times might be in a position to purchase the major portion of the available timber lands of the country for the purpose of blocking the erection of a mill, as I said a moment ago, on the Gander. That is very undesirable. It is essential for the industrial welfare of the country that further operations such as Grand Falls and Corner Brook should be undertaken, and it would be a great injustice to the country if either or both of these companies was in a position to stifle a proposal of that kind. In these depressed times, when owners of timber licences are themselves not in sound financial position, there is a great temptation to sell out at a cheap rate and that would be very injurious to the interests of the country. Furthermore, it seems quite clear that both these companies have at the present time more than sufficient to meet their requirements in the way of timber limits, and consequently no injury can be done them insofar as their present enterprise is concerned. Should either of them contemplate at any time a substantial addition to their plant, then I think that there will be no government that will not give consideration to an amendment of this Act which will allow them to purchase areas, so that an addition to their plant can be supplied with the necessary raw material.

I do not propose this afternoon to ask the House to do more than accept a second reading. There are various reasons for this, the most important of which is that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines should be in charge of this Bill this afternoon, but as Hon. Members are aware, there is a very serious forest fire raging and he has been compelled to leave the House to attend to that. He will, I hope, be here to-morrow, but the Bill is committed to the Committee of the Whole, and I now ask the Speaker that the Members will permit the Bill to be read a second time and we will consider the details when it goes to the Committee to-morrow.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I have to support this measure, and the only criticism I have to make is that it is a little delayed. It is a pity that this Bill was not introduced before a Bill which passed this House some few days ago, permitting the A.N.D. Company to acquire several hundred square miles of territory on condition that they did not – in other words, [in] that particular portion of territory they were enabled to acquire from speculators, [they could] escape the necessary obligation under the licence as required by the Crown Lands Act. The Hon. Minister of Justice tells us that they have enough and more than enough for the purpose of their mill. That confirms a contention I made in the House the other day, when I advocated that this Bill should not be passed. It is time that we stopped these people from acquiring land in this country of which we have so little left at the present time. I am informed by men who at any rate should know what they are talking about, and who I believe do know, that the amount of available timber in the country to-day belonging to the colony is not worth talking about. We have got a little on the sea coast called the

“Three Mile Limit.” That exists on certain portions of the coast. Outside of that, we have got no timber belonging to this country. We have not any to give away, so that whatever small remnant may remain of our forest wealth is now in the possession of the Colony, I agree that we should conserve it. If there are any persons holding timber licences who propose selling to somebody else in order to make a profit, and who have any hopes of selling to one of these paper companies, and who may be enabled to sell by the ability of these companies to escape obligation under the Crown Lands Act, I welcome this Bill as being a measure which will prevent anything of the kind happening, if not now, when trade conditions warrant, the Government compelling these people to carry out the terms, or forfeit their licenses by proceedings in the Supreme Court under the Crown Lands Act.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, acting on behalf of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill “An Act to Define the Rights of the International Power and Paper Company, Limited” was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

*Additional Estimates*¹³²

Finance:

Newfoundland Railway:

Advance on Coal and Pit Prop Account\$200,000.00

Marine and Fisheries:

Fishery Encouragement150,000.00

Customs:

Refunds to Salt Codfish Exportation Board25,000.00

Refunds to Highroads Revenue40,000.00

Dept. of Justice:

Court Reporter115.55

Assistant Court Reporter.....115.55

Public Works Dept:

H. M. Penitentiary:

Chief Warden190.00

Second Warden171.00

Trades Warden42.00

One Turnkey95.00

¹³² Transcribed from *The Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

”	95.00
“	95.00
”	95.00
“	75.00
”	75.00
“	75.00
”	75.00
“	75.00
”	75.00
“	75.00
”	675.00

	\$417,214.10

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I would like to address to the Committee a few remarks¹³³ that were prompted by some small businessmen in some of our nearby outports yesterday afternoon. It appears that the Government is still regarded as fair game by these people, who ought to have better morals but unfortunately have not, and there have been cases, not merely one isolated case but a number, which have come to the attention of the gentlemen who were speaking to me, where men who had been already supplied to some extent by the local merchant have secured advances from the Government as well.

Now, I ask you to consider the desperate position that unfortunate supplier is placed in. He has advanced goods to the fisherman, or the alleged fisherman, as the case may be. That fisherman has then come to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and directly or indirectly or fraudulently has obtained an additional amount of supplies from the Department. Now, what is that poor unfortunate merchant to do? If he takes that man's fish in payment for the goods which he has supplied, he is going to have to hand it over to the Government, and that is a most unfortunate position to place any businessman in, particularly small businessmen, and that has happened on several occasions within the past few days, as these gentlemen who were talking to me relate.

There was another point. Yes, it was this. They claim that in some cases at any rate there were City merchants, who are not supplying merchants in any sense at all, who were clamouring at the Government to get these fishery supply orders. Now I don't know how it comes about, if it is so, or why the Government has permitted that to be done. Surely no person who is an ordinary grocer or supplier of the goods of life, and who is unconnected with the fishery business, should be permitted to supply these orders and get cash. I think it is entirely unfair to the man carrying the fishing trade, particularly the outport man. The particular cases drawn to my attention were cases where fishermen belonging to nearby outports were given orders to go to a St. John's grocer not connected with the fishery. They got these supplies from him. He gets the money from the Government, and the trade is taken from the man in the outport who is actually carrying on the

¹³³ On the vote for fishery supplies.

fishing business. That is not fair. I don't believe that the Government intended that any such practice should be permitted. I draw these facts to the attention of the Government as reported to me by these men. I believe what they are telling me is true, but I can't vouch for the statement. I draw that to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, so that he may guard against it on any other occasion. I believe he wants to do what is fair, and if necessary will put men on their oath when they are getting supplies, and he will see that orders of that kind are not made out in favour of men who are not in any way connected with the fishing business.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Leader of the Opposition, and there is a great deal in what he says. But nevertheless, I want to say this, that all the small merchants and all the bigger merchants are not what we can depend upon. A great many of the merchants want to be relieved to a certain extent of supplying, therefore we had to wish some of the orders on the smaller men.

Now, I can give you a case in point where the small man is not always correct and is not honest. I had a case come before me yesterday, where a merchant of a certain outport had supplied people before this thing came into effect at all. The result was, he said, he had supplied to the extent of 65 or 70 per cent, and he wanted to wish it over on us to relieve him in case they don't get sufficient fish to pay him. My answer was that we are not making any exceptions in this case – "That you, sir, if you took a risk. I hope you thought that when you had supplied you were taking a risk that was worthwhile. If you supplied, you thought you had done right in doing so when you had a man on whom you could depend." I told him we were not doing anything for him or anyone else. What we wished to do was to try to give a man a helping hand to supply a practical fisherman who had a boat, traps, or trawls or cod nets or something else, and the men who supplied the fishermen were to hold him responsible for the \$20 or \$30 that he supplied. We want to collect that amount. I have no doubt that after he has been given this \$25 or \$30, a man when he gets his fish dry is going to come back and say, "I have a certain amount of fish, but I want other supplies in order to carry on." When a schooner is supplied to go to Labrador there is a risk taken, but in a schooner there is a chance to go here and there and look for fish. Where you take a man and put him on the shore and the fish don't come there, that is the risk we have taken and we have done it with good intention, and we intend to try to collect every cod's tail that is caught. We don't want to give the impression that it is on Government, and because they get a dollar on Government account they don't have to pay it back. We are trying to put machinery in motion where we can collect. We are trying to impress upon the fishermen that they have to be honest, that we are going to give a helping hand, and the Government of this day is the only Government who ever tried to help the fishermen out. We are going to help them out, and we hope they will be conscientious enough to come forward and give us up to the amount supplied. If a man can't get fish that is not his fault, but if he makes an honest attempt and we make an honest attempt, I believe we are going to get these people to see in the right way, they are going to come across and make things better not only for themselves, but for the country in general. We are going to do everything possible in order to bring about a better condition of affairs in Newfoundland. We have not had a chance yet. The Government is now only a year old. We made an honest attempt to do something. That is more than can be said of any other Government.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I did not intend to make a political speech, but rather to advise the Minister of certain unfairnesses which were going on and which, perhaps, had not come to his notice specifically. He has launched out into the realm of politics and claimed for his Government the quality of doing something for fishermen. [omission] all the responsibility; that is a statement as absurd as it is untrue. It yet remains to be seen.

I don't say that any effort made by any government in the past has been 100 per cent successful or even 50 per cent successful. In many cases the government has suffered a serious monetary loss, and your Government in the small effort they made last year lost money. I am not criticising what the effort is going to produce. History will tell that in twelve months' time.

What I am trying to do is to draw to the attention of the Government the unfairness of allowing these men to take their orders to the St. John's grocers until they go to the fishing. The St. John's merchants have been carrying these men as long as they could. Now that there is a dollar to be made on a cash transaction, now that there is an opportunity to sell the fishermen supplies and to get cash for it, it is allowed to slip away from them and go to the city grocers who are getting it. The City grocer hasn't any connection with the fisherman. I don't say the Minister knows that it is going on. I am drawing it to his attention, and I ask him to see that these orders go to the men in the supply business, to the people who were carrying the fishermen. If you give him that opportunity, he is the man who will look after the collecting of the fish. I want to draw to the attention of the Government the injustice created where men have been already supplied to some small extent by an outport merchant, and then they come into the City and bluff the Department into giving them an additional \$25 in supplies. The position in which this puts the employer is that he dare not take any of that man's fish for his account. I am trying to point out the unfairness that exists. I am not talking party politics.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: For the information of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I might say that the instructions issued by the Department are that all orders are to be given to the supplying merchants. I will admit that in one or two cases they have not been given to the supplying merchants, but they are all under the consent of Mr. Devine. He is a very efficient man, as good as any in Newfoundland for the post. I will admit that there will be some little wrongs. Somebody will try to get ahead of us.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It is for that reason that I want to warn you, so that you will have an opportunity to check up.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Thanks very much for the information. We are trying to do everything possible in this matter. We knew at the outset that somebody would try to take advantage of us. We have asked the outport merchants to do all possible to get the man, before he has taken supplies, to sign an agreement of some sort of document whereby we can have our hands on him. I was of the opinion that somebody would come back and try to get two supplies, because a lot of people have tried to take advantage of [the] Government in the past. We will try to save as far as possible that man doing that sort of thing, and if one or two have taken advantage of us we will

bring them to account and show them where they are going to get off.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: There is one matter I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and that is that a number of the supplying merchants have refused to touch government business. Several of the outstanding merchants of Conception Bay have advised us to do it ourselves. The money put into this scheme will be risked, we know; but its effects will justify the undertaking, I feel sure. If we have to feed a certain number of men all next summer and next winter, isn't it best to risk what will feed them this summer to give them a chance to feed themselves? It is better to keep them working even if the scheme gives no return. But I want to say this, any man we will find defrauding the government, we will put him in gaol, that is sure, and teach him to be honest. If he won't be honest of his own accord, we will give him the full penalty of the law, and then perhaps he will realize that honesty is the best policy for his own sake, as well as for that of the government. It was the bounden duty of the shopkeeper who gave supplies to that man, to tell when he found that he was supplied from the government. It was his duty to come and report it to us, and then we could work together to see that neither he nor the government was defrauded. I know that this is not going to work out 100 per cent, but we are going to get as many people working as possible. We couldn't be expected to say how much we will lose by it, but it won't be lost money. We tried it through the merchants last year and it was not successful. We don't believe some of them played the game with us. I remember several incidents related in connection with the time one of the past governments granted 50 per cent of the supplies. I remember one which concerns a fisherman who went into the office of a merchant here in St. John's. His bill was \$400. He took out a roll of notes bigger than a man's wrist and said, there are \$200. The merchant asked him about the \$200 for the government. He said the government can go look for their money. Just as sure as we find a man deliberately defrauding us, he will go to gaol if we can put him there.

Hon. Secretary of State: The Leader of the Opposition spoke of some outport merchants who were not getting orders, and I must say that I have advocated that we do not give them to them. They have been taking dole orders for the last two years and have made money on them too, and now in their small settlements they won't take one 5 cents worth of risk to supply the people of their districts. I am going to advocate that these men be given no more dole orders. If he can get the dole orders he owes something to the country and to the Colony; he can take some risk. I have a half dozen of them in mind now. They will take the dole orders when the cash is coming, but they will take no risk. I have advocated that these men be overlooked, and that we rather give the supplies from the merchants of Water Street, who have done good work this year in supplying for the fishery. For dole, they have been paid their bills up to date. When they are asked by the men to supply them they say no, go to the Government.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: How many of them can supply any more? There are lots of them who have gone the limit and can't supply any more.

[Gaps in the transcript and no report in the newspapers]

Hon. Minister of Justice: For some years these reporters there have been on the same salary. They

applied for an increase and it was refused. A number of perquisites were formerly added to their salaries, among them was the case of the Justice Department. The Treasurer decided that that must be cut out, and if any department required a reporter they must work for the salary. In addition there were considerable perquisites when times were good, for instance in the case of giving copies of evidence for an appeal. The pay is considerably below the pay of any other reporter in the civil service, although they have to be more expert. They have to do more difficult work, though they do not have to work constantly. I am in a position to know that court reporting is probably the most difficult work a shorthand reporter has to do.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I should say it is pretty sharp work when you get a rapid cross-examiner on the job. Still, I think it is hardly the time for making an increase. Everybody is suffering now and you ought to make no exception. However it is the Government's policy, I suppose.

What is the increase in the chief warden's salary and the two wardens?

Hon. Minister of Justice: They are brought up to a certain standard.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: What is the standard?

Hon. the Minister of Justice: The chief warden is raised from \$810 to \$1,000. The second warden is raised from \$750 to \$900.

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 on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker announced at four forty-five of the clock in the afternoon that he would leave the Chair until eight of the clock in the evening.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at eight of the clock in the evening.

The Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 15, entitled 'Game and Inland Fisheries Act, 1924.'"

Pursuant to Order and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V., Chapter 15, entitled 'Game and Inland Fisheries Act, 1924'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I know that there at present on sale in various parts of this City, a number of these mushy, sentimental, nonsensical magazines which ought not be allowed in at all. They are worthless and ought to be taxed very heavily. The fact that more and more of these magazines are coming shows that the people are beginning to read more than they formerly did. A lot of bookstores have sprang into existence during the last three years, and where trashy stuff comes in, the Colony should get a lot of revenue, but it would be better if the tax would be prohibitive. Unfortunately, it seems that the good literature coming in is taxed just as much as the trashy kind. Take the better stuff, you have to pay 20 per cent.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: [*illegible*]. We have been talking about taxing these magazines. We have discussed that many times. But the Customs Department doesn't see how we could get that tax.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: By a stamp tax.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: The Minister of Posts has advocated very strongly for a magazine tax. How could we manage such a tax?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: So far as the regular [vendor] in the City is concerned, he could put these on when he sells them.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: We have had it up for discussion and the Customs officials tell us that it would be very difficult to work it out.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, it is now half past nine, and I don't know that I intend to delay the Committee long, but I feel that I should not allow the occasion of the Budget to pass without at least some reference from this side of the House. It would be a waste of time on my part were I to detail conditions as they exist to-day, and as they have existed practically in the same position as they are to-day for the last three years. The only difference is that, if anything, things are a little worse. Now, it will be remembered that some twelve months ago we were promised that as a result of the change in the administration of this country, or of the personality of the administration, great improvement would be effected in the condition of the people, and that improvement would, in fact, be almost immediate. No visible improvement has taken place up to to-day, and I rather hoped against hope for a Budget – that the Budget might show us some lessening of the burden which the people are carrying. But alas, I have to admit that no substantial lightening of that burden can be discovered with a high-powered microscope in any part of that Budget speech. The Prime Minister

to-day apparently realizes the situation; that must at least be said in his favour.

The Prime Minister has said that he is no pessimist. Well, if one is to believe what he says in the Budget, he certainly is no pessimist. He has told us time after time that the Bills put through this House of Assembly will be of considerable advantage to the people of the country. The Budget speech based its reasons for hoping for improvement on two things, extrinsic of Newfoundland altogether, the first of which was the World Economic Conference, which has been proceeding in London for some time past. I have had a feeling ever since that conference first began its activities that it was going to be a failure, and it has been abundantly clear that up to the present time it has been a flat failure. It has failed as all other conferences of a similar nature have failed, and in my judgement such a conference will always fail so long as the financiers of the world are in charge.

The second reason for hope for the future, as outlined in the Budget speech, is the report of the Royal Commission. It is true this commission has been laboriously collecting evidence of the various activities of the country, but any report they make must necessarily contain suggestions of a long-term character. Whatever they recommend as an attempt to take this country out of its difficulties will require a term of years, and will give no immediate relief. But the crying need is for immediate relief from the burden of taxation which is crushing the people, and I venture to make the statement deliberately, cold-bloodedly and considerately, that we of this House of Assembly and of the Upper House, have to be very careful how we handle the affairs of this country, because it must be remembered that we cannot expect the common people to stand for it always. To-day there is the problem of the decent citizen who always could support his family comfortably, and who is now forced to accept dole with bitterness in his heart, and that type of man is not likely to put up with conditions much longer.

If the Government has a policy, why not formulate it and not have people starve? Changes in the tariff are not as sweeping as I would like to have them. I give the Government credit for admitting that they did not intend to balance the budget this year, and that being so, it would be just as well to go further and lift some of the additional burdens of the shoulders of the common people of the country. If the Government cannot see the conditions under which people are living, and are not prepared to relieve them of that burden, then I say it is time for them to give up office and give place to better men. Or are we to assume that it is the intention of the Government to pay the bond holders what they can, and to let them do without the rest so far as we are concerned, and as was intimated by the Prime Minister some months ago? If that is his attitude to-day, why does he not go a little further and accord the unfortunate producer of this country some measure of relief from the tax burden?

I want to deal a moment or two with the agreement with the United Kingdom, and I am sorry that in the course of his Budget speech the Prime Minister didn't give us some little further information as to the details of this treaty. I am going to take the articles one by one if I am permitted to do so, and insofar as I can, to discuss them.¹³⁴

¹³⁴ "Referring to the Ottawa agreement he congratulated the government on what it had been able to do with regard to cod liver oil and chilled salmon but claimed that the preference should not have been granted until some arrangements had been made for the sale of iron ore, as set out in a letter from Premier Alderdice to Mr. Baldwin." *Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

Now, Article 1 reads as follows (*reads Article*). I haven't seen this Import Duties Act of 1932. It is an Act of the Imperial Parliament, of course, and I don't know what advantages it gives Newfoundland.

Hon. Minister of Justice: It is a general Act and applies to all the Dominions. It is in the Imperial statutes.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I know it is there, but I have gotten no explanation as to why it should be accepted by Newfoundland. I also notice that the section thereafter referred to, Schedule A, provides that as regards eggs, poultry, butter, cheese and other products, free entry will be allowed for three years certain, and after that the United Kingdom has the right to disallow such.

Hon. Minister of Justice: That provision is in every agreement made between the United Kingdom Government and each of the Dominions. It has chiefly to do with the Irish Free State which is a great exporter of that class of goods into the United Kingdom.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Why such fine details as to free entry for eggs, butter, poultry, cheese and other products clearly not [*illegible*] no reference whatever to what benefit we get. After all, I have yet to learn that we export any kind of those products into the United Kingdom. What is the advantage of that Article?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Has the honourable gentleman read Schedule B?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: No, I am reading Article 1.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Schedule A applies mainly to the Irish Free State. It is in every agreement made with the United Kingdom, giving free entry for all these products set out.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Article 2 (*reads Article*). Now I did refer to Schedule B and there I find [*illegible*] Newfoundland is given a preference of one shilling four pence per gallon; chilled or frozen salmon one pence half penny a pound. I congratulate the Government here upon having done something for this country, and I do so sincerely. If you can get cod liver oil in there with a preference on one shilling four pence a gallon over and above the [*illegible*] if any, which is given to Norwegian or Icelandic cod liver oil, then the Government has done something to assist the interests of the country. The same meed of praise is due in respect to the [*illegible*] chilled or frozen salmon. If it is to go in there with a preference of a penny half penny per pound, that is something for which the Government deserves credit. That is, always provided that this is sufficient to enable the Newfoundland article to compete with the foreign product. And I take it that the Government should ascertain and find out what preference is required to give Newfoundland a handicap in this respect. I credit the Government with good intentions, and I shall await the working out of the agreement itself. Article 3 (*reads Article*) ...

[*Omission*]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I take back that statement. I had forgotten some of the details for a moment. This is perhaps somewhat more serious because I have here a copy of the Imperial Conference at Ottawa, 1932, and under date of August 18, 1932, the Prime Minister receives a letter from Mr. Stanley Baldwin in which he says as follows (*reads letter*). This is from the Prime Minister dated the same day from Ottawa (*reads letter*). Clearly then, it was understood between the two high contracting powers – is that the diplomatic phrase?

Hon. Minister of Justice: One naturally dislikes to assume that name.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: It was clearly understood that between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Newfoundland, that Newfoundland did not have to include Schedule D at all unless a satisfactory scheme had been made with reference to the importation of Wabana ore into England. As far as I know nothing like such an agreement has been made. I think the Prime Minister said that he was hopeful something might be done.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I have had a telegram this afternoon from England informing us that we have sold 25,000 tons as a sample.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I wonder if it is the intention of the Government to put this Schedule D into effect to give these preferences until we get the *quid pro quo* for which we bargained. Why not withhold all preferences in this respect until an arrangement is made with the United Kingdom, whereby we can sell them our iron? And I would suggest to the Government that they proceed warily in the matter, and adopt the best tactics to insure that a reasonable quantity of Newfoundland ore be exported to Great Britain.

Now as for the next Article – by the way it must be mentioned here that there are certain injuries in the tariff sustained by this agreement, because of the fact that some of the items were formerly free. Now let me ask the Prime Minister this question re this Schedule D: I think you will find that cordage has been duty-free.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: No, there were 2 cents put on by your Government.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Yes, last year for tariff purposes in an emergency. But don't forget it took off 15 per cent which was put on by your Government.

This [*omission*] is serious if the agreement with the banks is not implemented, and as far as I am concerned this taking foreign lines off the free list is disadvantageous to Newfoundland fishermen ...

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Do you mean cordage or lines?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Isn't rope cordage?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Your Government put a two cents tax on cordage, and the United Kingdom specifies this as one of the items on which the 10 per cent preference is to be put. Ten cents and 2 cents ad valorem, this applies to lines other than from the United Kingdom.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If the lines are imported from the U.S.A. the price is higher?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Yes, the United Kingdom gets a 10 per cent preference.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You say 2 cents a pound; what would that amount to in percentages?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It depends on the article.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Is it 10 per cent?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: If it comes from the United Kingdom the 10 per cent comes off.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You say the duty is 2 per cent?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Two cents per pound.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Is the 10 per cent ad valorem?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It depends on the article.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The point I make is this. There is an additional 10 per cent goes on American lines, and if a fisherman wants to use cordage as far as American cordage is concerned he had to pay the additional duty, and the English cordage remains on the present basis. Now, that is an additional tax on one of the main utilities in the production of our staple product, and I do not think that it should be implemented until we get an advantageous proposition for our Wabana ore.

Now, I notice under Article 6 that we are invited to pass legislation to make provision for (*reads*). That can be done in two ways. If my recollection serves me the pound sterling for duty purposes was stabilized at somewhere around \$4. It [*omission*] change in value the pound sterling or foreign currency. Is it the latter that the Government intends to adopt?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: May I read the whole paragraph?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: How are you going to do that?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: We are not doing that.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Well, you ought to have told us that you know. Under Article [*omission*] we are giving certain preferences to British protectorates and Crown colonies. This includes a preference on coffee of 2 cents a pound, cocoa, tea and vegetables. Are we getting anything in return?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Yes, take the West Indies ...

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: That is only one.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Give us a little time.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Well now, you are in possession of the facts, now tell us exactly what returns we are getting for these preferences. It is information and enlightenment that I am looking for, and the country is looking for. Article (a) (*reads*) is the Newfoundland-Jamaica agreement, and it provides that shall stand. Article (b) provides (*reads*) ...

Hon. Minister of Justice: It doesn't say that.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I think that you will that is correct.

Hon. Minister of Justice: (*reads same paragraph*).

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: These letters form part of the agreement between the two countries, and Article 9 is directly referred to, and the second paragraph of Article 9 is directly referred to in these two letters.

Now, there is only one item that I propose to deal with, and I do so because of the adverse comment that has been circulated about it around the City for the past two or three days, I refer to the duties on tobacco. Frankly, I have no exact knowledge as to the working of these various poundage tariffs, percentage tariffs and excise tariffs, and if at any time I misquote anything I would be glad to be corrected ...

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: If you would permit me, I would like to take this moment to tell the House that I did not discuss with the Tobacco Factory the new duties. These new rates were prepared by the Deputy Minister of Customs and I know nothing about them. I am sorry that you did not take the opportunity yesterday in Committee, when we were going through these items, when I could have explained this matter and we could have had a full exchange of ideas. Unfortunately, I am a shareholder in this concern, and as such I feel that I should not take part in the debate on this matter. However, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Emerson, will give answer to any enquiries you may make in this respect. I would like to stay out of this debate because, as I have said, I am a shareholder in the Tobacco Factory.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I claim that it is unfair and unjust to put that excessive tariff on the

tobacco used by the poor man to-day. There is no reason and no justification for it, particularly under existing conditions. If it is found necessary to protect the revenue, why do it through the medium of soaking the poorer class of smoker?¹³⁵

It is a well-known truism that the country's public debt to-day is in the neighbourhood of \$100,000,000, and it has to be borne in mind that for the past twelve or thirteen years we have been never able to pay the charges upon it. To-day our trade is cut in half, and 50 per cent of our people are living upon government dole, and with no apparent change in the immediate future. We left you some deficit to pay and you left us some deficit to pay. There is no use now blaming anyone for the burden of the national debt. It is there now and must remain. But I will say this, that it is humanly impossible to get Newfoundland out of the straits it is in now, if the interest on the public debt has to be paid. To add to the burdens of the people and the country is the fact that a large number of our people are suffering from malnutrition, and future generations will be less virile and more degenerate unless some relief is afforded. A prominent medical man in an outport told me that in a certain district some twenty-odd children were suffering from night-blindness as a result of malnutrition. Now, it may be an ideal thing to meet our financial obligations and pay our bondholders; but when this has to be done at the expense of the destruction of humanity, I say it is time to cry a halt.

Now, it's not for me to say; it's not for me to show the way to the Government, even if I were able to do it. It's for the government of the day who have assumed the responsibilities of the control of life in Newfoundland (for that is what government means), to see that this thing is not allowed to go on any further. Whether they do it by a scaling down of duties, whether by the passing of moratorium legislation or by utter or outright repudiation, it is not for me to suggest; or by the sale of Labrador or other assets of the country. But I do say that in the interests of the people of this country, it is its duty as the controller of life in this country to preserve that life in so far as is possible, and in order to preserve that life they have got to relieve the burden under which we are now suffering and which the people cannot bear, and I fear will not bear quietly much longer. I say this in all seriousness.

I have heard the argument used whereby one member of the Government – I think it was the Hon. Secretary of State – some two months ago, when he referred to the matter as to whether we should force a conversion scheme and pay our bondholders what we could, that we had made a contract with the holders of our bonds, that we had [*illegible*] with them to pay the interest thereon at

¹³⁵ "Continuing, Mr. Bradley discussed the duties on tobacco. He did not suggest, or mean to suggest, that the Prime Minister had used his official position to assist a concern in which he was interested, but there were many things which were spoken of on the street and he desired to refer to them. He could not see why a man was compelled to buy local-made tobacco if he preferred to smoke the imported article, especially in view of the fact that in the past the Tobacco Company had paid handsome dividends and were not now even near the bankruptcy court. If the extra duty on cigarette tobacco would stop smuggling he could see some reason for it, but it would not do so, and he thought it was a crime to take away the poor man's cigarette. One of the things spoken of on the street was that the Imperial Tobacco Co. officials apparently had used conferences they had with the Customs authorities for their own benefit, and had been able to import large stocks of tobacco and sell them cheap now, whilst other importers are left with stocks on hand which they will not be able to sell. Why were not other importers also informed of what was going to happen?" *Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

a certain rate and at a stipulated time, and the principal at a certain time. And he went on to point out in a sympathetic tone that a good many of our bonds are held by widows and orphans and that we ought to keep our bargain with them. With the principle enunciated by the Hon. Secretary of State – I beg his pardon if he is not the man – I have no quarrel. But I do want to say this in reply, that while it is true we have to keep our bargain to some extent with the widows and orphans who happen to be bondholders, yet it is our duty to the orphans and widows who are not bondholders in the Newfoundland Government – and there are many more of them than there are those with bonds – to default, if that is the only way out.

Default is a subject which makes the ordinary, smug, self-complacent, conservative type of man shudder. Now, I am not an advocate of default, but I do want to point out that if it is necessary in the interests of the people, it is not such a terrible thing to shudder at. Half the countries on the face of the earth have defaulted. Half the States in the United States have defaulted at one time or another. France has defaulted and the various European countries, and it may be argued, with at least some show of reason, that the attitude of Great Britain towards the United States was virtually default. Great Britain paid a proportion only of the amount due.

My one argument is that we cannot in the interests of the people pay all our bond indebtedness and murder humanity, and according to the statement of a medical doctor I have heard in the last few weeks, that is what it amounts to. What are you going to do about it? That's my question, what is the Government going to do about it? Twelve months ago you promised that you would make improvements in conditions. You haven't done it. We don't want promises which it will take years to fructify, if ever. That's the case of live horse and you'll get hay: that horse starves while the grass is growing. The people of Newfoundland are suffering dreadfully and they will suffer more dreadfully as the days go by. What scheme have you to relieve the suffering immediately? That's what I want to know. You cannot keep the people in that condition until something unforeseen happens, until manna drops from Heaven. You are the men in power, what are you going to do about it? The country is asking for a fulfillment of your pre-election promises, but we hear nothing now but a hollow echoing of your pre-election dreams.

Our people do not want much. They are easily satisfied. I am told on good authority, very good authority, the authority of an experienced Canadian banker with wide experience in this country itself, that the Newfoundlander is a most easily satisfied individual. Very little of the goods of this world satisfies him, very little in money will give him all he needs, but they can't get that today. If a man goes to the fishery, and works all Summer, day and night, he comes back in the Fall and finds that he is behind in his accounts. That was the experience of thousands of Newfoundland fishermen last Fall. Let me tell you a story to illustrate my point. This story has its setting in a small settlement in this country. There is a small merchant or shopkeeper there, and the settlement contains anywhere from twelve to eighteen or twenty men, all fishermen. The year before last they had all been supplied. They all met with reverses. But the shopkeeper or merchant didn't supply them all last year. He only supplied about ten of them, and the other seven or eight he didn't regard as good risks. These seven men who did not get supplies sat around on the bank during the summer and smoked their pipes. They lived on dole as good as it could keep them, and the others went to the fishery. When they came back in the Fall, on an average each was \$50 in debt; and in talking to this outport skipper who, by the way, is a pretty honourable fellow, they said to him, "Look here,

skipper, we are not going fishing any more." "Why?" he said. Then they said, "We went to the fishery this summer and you supplied us. We came home and we are \$50 in debt. We owe it and can't pay it. If we stayed home this Summer we would have lived just the same and we would not owe any money. Those who stayed home and lived on dole are better off than we are. And if we go on as we are going, you will be in the same position as ourselves." The cost of producing our fish as a result of the taxation from which the people suffer is such that in view of the prices obtained in the market, the people can't make both ends meet except in a very few cases, and that has been going on now for at least two years.

The physical condition of the people is growing worse and worse, day by day. That is the evidence of a medical man from a nearby outpost. He says that the conditions under which the people are living is causing their physical condition to degenerate. Even children are affected – I suppose they would be the first to be affected. They are going night blind as a result of beri-beri, due to malnutrition. These are the very words of the [illegible] who knew the conditions, because he is treating these children, and [illegible] there is no reason to suppose that his section is any worse than any other section of the country.

How long, Mr. Prime Minister and gentlemen of the Government, are you going to tolerate that kind of thing? Should you not at any rate look to the [illegible] first and declare a moratorium and thereby give them a chance to recuperate physically and morally – an opportunity to get back to a normal layer? It is a serious question, and I am not now pleading as a politician. I am trying to face conditions as they are in this country to-day, and to visualize what will happen in the future if conditions continue as they are at present. You have given no relief to date, Sir. You have promised various Bills which will in course of time produce wonderful results; perhaps they will in the course of years. But in the [illegible] the people are starving, physically, mentally and morally. [Illegible sentence follows].

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable [illegible] in figures which I would never have seen had he not asked the question about it. There is one thing I can congratulate the honourable gentleman on, and that is in being able to keep a straight face while he was talking. To hear him talk one would never [illegible] he was in power twelve months ago as a member of the Squires government [illegible] most important member at that, and that a large share of the [illegible] attached to that administration rests upon him. Yet he [illegible] as if those things had never [illegible]. We have brought in [illegible] legislation to help the common people. We have done more to [illegible] the abnormal conditions by which we are beset and that during the last twelve months than the administration of which the honourable gentleman was a powerful member did during their whole term of office.¹³⁶

¹³⁶ "Hon. the Prime Minister did not intend to make reply to the Leader of the Opposition but merely desired to correct some of the statements he had made. To listen to him one would never think that eighteen months ago he was in power and had all the opportunities of doing what he now wants the present government to do but had done nothing. This government was in power only twelve months and at the session of the legislature now coming to a close they had brought in more legislation that is intended to benefit the common people and to antagonize the so-called capitalists, than the previous government had done in four years. He did not know of a single bill passed by the last government that had for its object the amelioration of the people." *Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

Let us go back to the loan business of 1931. [*Illegible passage*]. The United Kingdom government refused to advance the money. The government of the day then [*illegible*] to the banks. They sent two or three men – Sir Percy Thompson and Mr. Magor, and when they seemed to be failing they sent Mr. Penson.

We made an agreement with the banks which was most humiliating. They wanted someone to control the spending of the country, and to cap the climax the government of the day would not be given the money unless the Leader of the Opposition supported the agreement. Was there ever anything more humiliating? We shouldered the responsibility. We should not have done it, I was told time and time again that it meant political suicide, but I was prepared to take that chance. I felt that at a time like that, whatever else happened, the country must be saved at any cost.¹³⁷

We now come to December, 1932. It is no secret that we did not intend to ask for one dollar, we were prepared to face the music. But a week before the end of the year a cable came to us stating that the Mother Country would greatly deplore the fact of any Dominion defaulting on its payments. Between the lines we could read that they emphasized the fact that an Englishman's word was his bond. They implored us to take the money, and they said that if you will agree to us sending out a royal commission, we will be able to talk about next year. The royal commission came out, and it was felt that they would have their report before the end of the fiscal year. However, they didn't have their report ready, and still we didn't ask for more money. We were prepared to default or partially default, but they cabled us again and said, "How much do you need to pay your interest in full?" We cabled the amount and they gave us the same terms. I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that an adjustment will take place before December 30th. If we do not default we will cut down the rate of interest paid to the bondholders; if we do not get the consent of the bondholders we will do it anyway. We accepted this money for two reasons, firstly because they were sending out a royal commission, and secondly because they asked us to accept until the report of the royal commission is handed in and we have a full knowledge of your financial future. Now, is there any disgrace in that?¹³⁸

¹³⁷ "In 1931 the previous government had sent an imploring cable to England seeking help to pay the bloodthirsty bondholders, but the Prime Minister of the day was told that they would have nothing to do with him. Then three men were sent here and in December of that year an agreement was made with the syndicate banks that was one of the most humiliating that had ever to be submitted to. Not only that, but to add to the humiliation the banks had told the Prime Minister then that he could get nothing unless the agreement to be entered into was signed by the Leader of the Opposition. Then in July of last year, the same government in order to get further relief, had granted a monopoly which if it had been arranged by the present government, he could visualize the Leader of the Opposition condemning, with tears in his eyes, the injustice that was being done to the fishermen of the country." *Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

¹³⁸ "In December last year the present government was determined that there should be default and that there was to be no more borrowing to pay interest, but about a week before the end of the year a cable came through His Excellency the Governor which stated that the Imperial Government was anxious that none of the Dominions should default and offering to supply the money necessary for paying the interest, at the same time suggesting that a Royal Commission be appointed to make an investigation into the affairs of the country. He had felt sure that the report of the Commission would be presented before the end of June and he was again determined then that they should default if necessary, but again the Imperial Government came along and offered the money on the same terms. He was determined that no more loans will be raised and that the country will be relieved either by default or by the consent of the bondholders and he hoped it would be with the latter." *Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

Now, the last Government had a supposed surplus of \$29,892, they budgeted for that surplus, and in spite of the fact that we economized to the extent of \$560,000, they had a deficit of \$3,381,000. We might have had some reason to think we could do something to balance the budget, but as the year went on it got worse.

Now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been talking about [*omission*], that he saw the beginnings of this condition of affairs four years ago, and he never raised his voice to protest against expenditures which only helped to plunge our people further down in this pit of despondency. Now he says that we must save the widows and orphans. We are doing our best to save them and I think the people know that, and furthermore I believe that if we went back to the country to-day they would send us back here again.

However, I would like to get to these figures, and the only reason I have these figures at all is because the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says that the Imperial Tobacco Company, of which I am a shareholder, knew that the tariff on tobacco and cigarettes was going up, and took advantages of this knowledge to lay in large stocks ...¹³⁹

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I did not say that; I said it was rumoured that was so.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Well, you emphasized that rumour. These figures come from the Customs Department, and I want to say here and now that I don't know what the Tobacco Factory is doing to-day, or has been doing for the past few years. All I know is that they have not paid any dividends for the past eighteen months. Let us take the figures. In April 1932, they imported 1,935 lbs. of tobacco, cut and plug; against that, in June 1933, they imported 17,295 lbs. I telephoned as soon as I saw these figures, and I asked how was that, and they said that they were knocked out by the low price of plug tobacco in other countries. In May 1932, they imported 1,142 lbs., in May 1933 they imported 4,331 lbs. The month I quote now is the critical month, in June last year they imported 9,334 lbs., in June this year they imported 8,496 lbs., or in other words 900 lbs. less than last year. I am sure that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, after listening to these figures, will when he meets this rumour again, will set peoples minds at rest ...

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: They did not need any more than 8,000 lbs. in June because of their large importations in April and May.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: They had already sold that. However, I do not intend to enter into this

¹³⁹ "Referring to what had been said about the Tobacco Co. he had no desire to discuss the matter, but because he had information before him, supplied in answer to a question asked by the leader of the opposition and which was in the possession of the leader, he wanted to give the lie to what had been said in regard to the imports of the company. In April 1932 the company had imported 1,935 lbs. of tobacco and in 1933 for the same month 17,295 lbs., and in May 1932, 1,411 lbs., and in 1933, 2,331 lbs. The importations had been made because it was found that other imported tobacco was putting the company's products out of business. In June 1932 the importations were 9,334 lbs., and in 1933 for the same month 8,496 lbs. These figures should be the best answer to the rumors that had been referred to by the leader of the opposition as to the company taking advantage of the knowledge they had." *Daily News*, July 6, 1933.

discussion about the Tobacco Factory as I have already explained my position as regards it. The Hon. Minister of Justice will discuss the matter more fully. I think it is unfair to ask me to discuss a corporation in which I am interested. As the hour is getting late, I move that the Committee rise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Winter presented the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Operation and Construction of a Distillery at St. John's" as follows:

Mr. Speaker:

The Select Committee appointed to consider the merits of the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Operation and Construction of a Distillery at St. John's" beg to report that they have considered the matter and recommend that the Bill be proceeded with and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole presently thereon.

*(Sgd.) H. A. Winter
H. Mitchell
P. F. Halley
F. C. Alderdice
F. Gordon Bradley*

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole presently to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Operation and Construction of a Distillery at St. John's."

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Winter, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the said Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

On motion of Hon. Mr. Winter, the Bill entitled "An Act to Encourage the Operation and Construction of a Distillery at St. John's" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill respecting Certain Acts relating to the Municipal Council.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Attorney General stated that since the previous day the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition had been considered. In relation to the deferring of the council election it had been agreed to insert this provision in the bill instead of the one that postponed the court of revision for a year. The amendment also provided that any vacancy in the council shall be filled by co-option.

Mr. Halley pointed out that since the previous day he had received several messages from citizens protesting against the postponement of the election and he could see no justification for it. It was not being done at the request of the citizens nor at the request of the councillors and he did not think the House should take it on itself to do so.

Mr. Byrne was also against the postponement of the election. The reason given was that it would effect a saving of \$8,000 but he would point out that this would not be a saving but only a postponement of the expenditure for a year. The money will have to be spent next year and why should not the citizens have the right to elect a new council if they so desired. He strongly protested against the action.

Hon. the Prime Minister stated that he had representation of a different character. People had pointed out to him that property has depreciated and they were anxious to have the court of revision this year. These are hard times with landlords. He did not know if an election would mean that anyone better than the present councillors would be elected. [*Daily News*, July 6, 1933]

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say whether this Council should remain in power another twelve months or not, but I think in justice to the outport people that I represent in this country, and in justice to British fair play, I think it is my duty here tonight to register my protest against this Bill, especially the 13th Section. Now, Sir, I am sorry this evening that I was not in this House when the Hon. Member for the West End was making a speech, because I am prepared to take insults or to be belied when I am outside this House, but I am not prepared to take them from any individual inside this House.

I was told not long ago that I brought men out from Bonavista Bay to go to work on Signal Hill. I say that is a lie of the worst kind, and I am further prepared to say so as Member for Bonavista Bay during the past thirteen years; and I guarantee, Sir, that I wrote more letters to my constituents telling them not to come into St. John's to work than all the other Members, and I am prepared to prove it. I have the letters on file at my house at the present time, and those which I

wrote during the past twelve months are on file at the Post Office. And the only two men working in town at the present time from my District are the two men on Signal Hill, and if any merchant in town had backbone enough to supply them for the fishery they would not be here now, and those two men are as good men as ever went to the fishery. I refer to [omission] and [omission]. These two men wore off their feet in travelling the town for three weeks looking to get supplies, and they could not get a dollar's worth. One of them owns two traps and two motor boats and all the fishing gear necessary to prosecute the fishery in this country, and they can't get a dollar's worth of supplies.

The most either of them owes is \$50, and I may say that if their merchant had been satisfied to take that last Fall, they would not owe that \$50. But it happened that when two men were wanted on Signal Hill one day the when the Marconi men asked to send out for two men, those two were in my office and they went out there. That is how they came to be employed there.

What [would] the labouring men in this country do, if it were not for the outport men? I have heard the old story in this City in the prosperous times of the Monroe government in 1928. I have heard men in the City say that the fisheries were no good, and no help to the City of St. John's. Well, what has happened in the past two years? I don't blame the labouring men of the City, for maybe the half-dozen or probably twenty that are not prepared to work, because I have come in contact with as many labouring men of this town as a good many people. But I will say that for any British colony under the sun to legislate to keep any British subject out of his own country to prevent him from going to any other part of it to work is unfair, and no other country would ever pretend to do it.

When the dock was under construction here, I was told by the Monroe government, or rather by the executive of the Monroe government, that no outport man was supposed to come here to work. Consequently I wrote all my people and told them not to come in here, and then I found 200, 300 or 500 men working there from certain districts in the outports of the country, and in all five men from my District obtained work there. In the same case is the distilleries. I have written every man who wrote me to try and get him a job on the distilleries, and told them that there were more men in this town than could find work on five or ten distilleries, and Mr. Chairman, you may not think it, but it is going to cause more enmity in this country than any Act ever passed in this House. I guarantee the House now that when a City man goes to the outports in the summer, if this section is passed, he will be sent back to St. John's and I don't blame the people for sending him back. If I know the British constitution, it's equal rights and fair play to all men. You may now debar the outport men from coming in here, but I have seen the time when you were only too glad to get outport people to come in to work. And I saw men on the street this summer, when the merchants could not get men up to do work which was to be had, and schooners had to be held up for want of men to go to work, and yet we are told that there are thousands of men who need employment.

This is the second time I have been told I brought these men here from Bonavista, and I challenge any man here to prove it. But if you have all the poverty in this town that you talk about, instead of paying out for one year \$8,000 for an election, you ought to hand out that \$8,000 to the starving people of this town. Mr. Chairman, I think any man who will leave any part of this country and go to work at the present time, to try to make a dollar for himself and his family, deserves credit for doing so.

It appears to me, Sir, that there [are] a few people in this town who do nothing else but go

and try to find out some small item about me, to try to raise someone against me. I have served this country too long and too faithfully to be maligned or lied about by anybody. I have spent 40-odd years on the sea, and I brought in as much wealth as any man in this country; and I have been in government as long as any man, and I never was guilty of grafting, and I never crossed the floors of the House of Assembly, nor have I ever gone back on my leader – and I am the poorest man in the business now. You can think what you like, but it's true.

Now, Sir, I don't want to hear any more of this. You won't starve the people of Bonavista Bay by depriving them of a day or two days' labour that they might get in the City of St. John's. But if you give them supplies for the fishery, you won't see them only twice a year, when they are taking supplies and when they are shipping their fish. Why, the cry of all these people is, "Send us on the Labrador and give us a chance to earn our livelihood." And if I could do it, I would send every one of them. I will finish here, Mr. Chairman, as the night is getting late.

Mr. Moore: I want to agree with the honourable captain over this 13th clause, and I will have to register my vote against that clause.

Hon. Minister of Justice: That clause has already been passed.

Mr. Halley: Under the charge which [I] made last night I did not mention the Minister's name. I said that Mr. [omission] was responsible for putting these men on Signal Hill. And I may as well tell the Hon. Captain that so far as I am concerned, and while I represent the District, I am going to fight and fight harder to see that the men walking the streets in poverty and hunger get the first opportunity and chance to get a job in any construction work that goes on in the City, and I suggest to the Hon. Captain or any other gentleman in this House, that if in any particular district there were construction work going on which required 50 men, and if those men were sent down from St. John's, it would not be tolerated. I did not say that the Hon. Captain sent the two men on the job. I said that this man [omission] put the men on the job, and I criticized against putting outport men on jobs in this town, when there so many starving men walking the streets looking not for relief, but for work.

Mr. Moore: Did the Hon. Minister of Justice say that this clause had already been passed?

Hon. Minister of Justice: It passed yesterday in Committee.

Hon. Secretary of State: It can be referred back by a vote of the House.

Hon. Minister of Justice: If the honourable gentlemen don't sit in the House, they can't vote on its legislation.

Mr. Halley: I might say that when the Bill was being discussed I sent out to the committee rooms to call the members there, and they did not show up. The Hon. Minister was out of the House yesterday, apparently through his own fault.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: I don't have to come here to ask Mr. Halley when I may leave the House and when I may come back. But, Sir, I must say here and now that I don't intend to let the wrong horse wear the wrong saddle. Mr. Halley said he didn't say I brought these men up, but he did say so, and not only in the presence of myself but at a party meeting.

Mr. Halley: What I said was that I didn't say it in the House. I said it at a party meeting, and when I checked up I withdrew the statement.

Hon. Minister of Justice: In addition to the section I have moved, there is a serious amendment to Section 95 which will cause considerable debate, and as the hour is getting late I beg that the Committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to delay the House at such a late hour, but it is absolutely essential to have the Crown Lands Act again amended to permit exportation of timber. The Crown Lands Act of 1930 makes a penalty of \$50 for export from these lands. The Government made arrangements last year for the sale of a couple of hundred thousand cords of pitprops. It is most important to protect what is left of the Crown lands. This Act is to make a provision whereby the holders of timber licences may be in a position to make contracts to export timber. There is no necessity to make further explanation. I move the second reading of the Bill, Mr. Chairman.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act (No. 2 of 1933)" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act (No. 2 of 1933)."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act (No. 2 of 1933)" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, July 6th, at three o'clock p.m.

*The House then adjourned accordingly.*¹⁴⁰

Thursday, July 6th, 1933

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

The Hon. the Minister of Justice asked leave to introduce a Bill relating to a Shooting Range.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the said Bill was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time later in the Session.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a certain Resolution, which was read a first time as follows:

Additional Estimates\$117,214.10

The said Resolution being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolution was agreed to.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Granting to His Majesty of Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain

¹⁴⁰ The House adjourned at 12:25 a.m.

Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years Ending the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Three and the Thirtieth Day of June the Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Four, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service” was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled “An Act for the Granting to His Majesty of Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years Ending the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Three and the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Four, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service,” was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled “An Act for the Granting to His Majesty of Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years Ending the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Three and the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Four, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service.”

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the said Bill was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Hon. Prime Minister introduced the Public Service Act which was passed through all stages.
[Daily News, July 7, 1933]

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 Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Attorney General: Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises on this, the first Budget that has been introduced by the Alderdice government, I think it would be as well if a few remarks were made in a general way in relation to it. The first thing that I would like to say, Sir, is that the Session has proceeded with great good will and courtesy from both sides of the House. We have found our honourable friends opposite willing to facilitate the business of the House to the fullest extent. When satisfied that the debate upon any particular measure had exhausted the points that should be developed they were quite willing that the ordinary rules of the House should be evaded and second readings, committees and third readings were allowed to pass through without delay, and a busy Session such as this, where we have dealt with about 70 Bills, this courtesy on the part of the members opposite was, I can assure them, much appreciated by those on this side. Then again, I think it will be agreed by my friends opposite that there has never been a time when a Government with a superabundant majority such as it has in this House to-day has exercised its powers to endeavour to force through measures which had been ill considered or which they did not have ample opportunity of debating, and consequently at a time like this when conditions are so hard, when the difficulties which the Government have to face are so many, it has been a very great pleasure to have this important Session pass off with so little friction and so little a lack of the exchange of courtesy which should [be] exchanged between parties in the House, and were it not for the fact that last evening the honourable and learned Leader of the Opposition saw fit to deal with certain aspects of the Budget in the manner in which he did, I think it can be accepted that the winding up of the debate on the Budget would have taken only a few moments, and those few moments would have been engaged more or less in pleasantries. However, the honourable learned gentleman undertook last night over a considerable length of time to deal with the Budget and with matters collateral to it in a manner which makes it necessary that some short reply should be made on behalf of the Government.

I remember either on the opening day or upon the Address in Reply that Mr. Bradley dealt in general terms with the Ottawa agreement. He did the same thing a few days ago when the resolution was proposed in this House under which the Ottawa agreement was ratified, and he followed along the same lines last evening when dealing with the legislation made necessary by the Ottawa agreement in connection with the Budget. His first argument in connection with the Ottawa agreement was that it represents protection against free trade. He first of all informed the House that the erection of tariff barriers for the purpose of protection was an offence against the laws of God. On two occasions he regaled the House with a sermon on that point. I do not know, Sir, what the foundation is for such an argument, but I am sure that when his speech [is reported] in the portals of Downing Street that Mr. Baldwin [will] immediately appeal for absolution to the Almighty for having stood by protection over a period of years. As a matter of actual fact, the question of protection of free trade does not arise in connection with the Ottawa agreement at all; that is, so far as Newfoundland is concerned. The whole theory of protection and free trade arises only in connection with the protection of local industry. The whole difference that exists between the doctrinaires on both sides on this question is whether it is better for a country to protect its industries by the raising of tariffs, or whether it is better to have free trade and allow free competition. The Ottawa agreement so far as Newfoundland is concerned has nothing to do with the protection of

local industries. It has only to do with the granting of preferences, so that the exchange of trade between both countries may be fairer, better and more beneficial. Protection and free trade does not arise, and I hope that when my speech is reported at the portals of Downing Street that Mr. Baldwin will now be happy that he has got absolution on that point, and he may continue to make further agreements without finding that he is damned forever by the Leader of the Opposition.

The next criticism made by my friend was the grand speech about the Conference. He pointed out to us last evening that these conferences produced no result, that they are no good, and I have no doubt that at the time he was speaking he had in mind the cablegram or message received from England which showed that at the present time the World Economic Conference was not getting on as happily as it might be; probably he had in mind also the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, which had not been a very great success; but to suggest that because a number of conferences have failed, because a number of others have not produced results, that therefore conferences should not be held seems to my mind, and I am sure to the mind of any reasonable man, untenable, and something to which no reasonable man can for a moment subscribe. What happens when any country wishes to arrange a treaty with another country? It means a conference. If two or three countries want to make arrangements, one with the other, there is a necessity for a conference. One can come down to matters of smaller moment. Why, when my learned friend is acting for a client who has a case and the opposite side displays an inclination to compromise, what happens? A conference, and I hope, in fact I know, that when my learned friend goes into a conference he goes in the hopes and expectation that it will be a success, rather than go into court, and rather than have a trade war, it is better to have a trade agreement; exactly, and that is why the Ottawa Conference was held; and to speak of this or any conference as being futile is, I submit, appealing to the minds of people who are unable to appreciate the results achieved from time to time in this respect. I think it would have been well if my learned friend had studied the Ottawa Agreement in some detail, and he would have discovered that there was no question of tariff arising, and that no question arises but that so far as Newfoundland is concerned the Conference was a great success. And I do not say that merely because I was one of the delegates attending there. We found on all sides, the Prime Minister and myself, uniform courtesy to encourage trade in this country, and every effort was made by the British delegates to display to us their interest in our conditions and their desire to improve those poor conditions which at present exist. And as a result of the Ottawa Conference, what have we done? Have we increased the cost of living in this country 1 cent? If so I should like my friend to point out to me where we have done so. He did not do it last night. He did not do it last night when he criticised the Budget, and he did not do it when he criticised the Agreement in the Address in Reply, and I have yet to find anybody who can point to a simple item in Schedule B, where we have given a certain reference to England, which has increased the cost of living on that account 1 cent. On the other hand, we have obtained from the British Government – and it is evidence of their great interest in our welfare – we have obtained from them a preference of 1 shilling and 4 pence per gallon on our cod liver oil. That in itself is a tremendous incentive to our people to produce cod liver oil.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I give you credit for that.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I don't say that everything the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said last night was critical. I am dealing now with the terms of the Agreement as a whole. I say that although we have not increased the cost of living by 1 cent as a result of the Ottawa Agreement, we have got from the British Government a preference on cod liver oil, and that in itself is a great gain. I don't know whether my friends opposite have followed the discussion in the House of Commons on this treaty. I don't know if they have read the excerpts from the British papers published at the time the debate was on, which show that the British Government insisted on carrying out this treaty in spite of great opposition, and as a result of that I may say it has come in for a lot of unpopularity; but the British Government has stood by us; they have carried out their part of the agreement and although I don't think it's a particularly popular measure, especially among the chemists of England that we should get a preference on our cod liver oil, yet the British Government is going to see us through. Then we have also got a preference of a penny half penny a pound on our chilled or frozen salmon; that in itself is a great concession. The Russians had control of the salmon markets of England. This penny half penny per pound means the difference between calling a profit and not calling at all when selling in competition with Baltic salmon. That in itself again was not popular, any more than any preferences granted in any country which will raise prices is popular in that country. When I was in England a month ago I was discussing with various households the question of the quality of our chilled or frozen salmon in the markets, and I found that as long as the fishmonger is not overwhelmed by the Russian salmon, ours is preferred to every other kind. When the fish comes over first it sells at retail in the suburbs of London at 2 shillings and 6 pence per pound. It's true that as the season progresses our salmon is not as good as it is when first comes over and the price drops; but even during the Winter in England our chilled salmon was on sale for 1 shilling and 2 pence and 1 shilling and 6 pence per pound. Now we have a preference over all other salmon of penny half penny per pound. Now for some reason which I cannot understand the honourable and learned gentleman read the letters exchanged between the Lord President of the Council and the Prime Minister, which intimate that we might hold up the passage of the Act confirming the Agreement until the Newfoundland Government was satisfied in connection with the exportation of iron ore to England. The whole purport of these letters was this. At that time the Government was in negotiation with the ironmongers of Great Britain in the hope that upwards of from 2,000 to 3,000 tons of ore might be exported to England from Bell Island; we believed that if that could be confirmed we would be in a position to offer even better preferences to Great Britain.

But these memoranda were put in there as a protection for the Newfoundland Government, and that letter was obtained by the Prime Minister from Mr. Baldwin for that purpose; in other words if these negotiations for the export of ore did not come to a satisfactory conclusion it rested with us to say to the British Government, "We are very sorry, but the financial state of the country, owing to the fact that there is no indication in these negotiations for the export of ore does not permit of the carrying out of the Agreement, and consequently it's off." Is that a subject for criticism? Can the Newfoundland Government be criticized for keeping a way out for itself in case the treaty is not carried out? And when the letter was received from Mr. Baldwin, it was confirmed on the same evening by the Prime Minister. It is a safeguard, and if we did not have it we would find ourselves in a position to-day where we would have to carry out the Ottawa Agreement under conditions which do not exist where we could not afford to do it. However, the Government has considered the

whole matter, and has decided in spite of the letter and safeguard to accept this Ottawa Agreement in its entirety, and it is right to do so. It will probably be a matter of criticism next year for my honourable friend when he finds that the negotiations now proceeding for the export of ore have been a complete success.

The Hon. Member then gave us a dissertation upon the conditions of the country. He painted a woeful picture, a picture which in many respects, unfortunately, is not untrue, of hardship, malnutrition, [and] poverty, but surely he could not be the artist that painted the picture; he is one of the men who is responsible for its existence. The conditions which he pictured there last night was a picture resultant upon his own sins; and if there's one complaint I have to make about the debate last night, it's a complaint against the Prime Minister, who in his short reply to the Hon. Member said that we were doing the best we could do under difficult circumstances. I will go further than that and say that we are doing the only thing possible, and the best evidence of that is that under [the] conditions which he paints, of poverty, of malnutrition, of hardship, conditions which should rend his heart, he has not had one suggestion to make whereby the Government could make conditions better than they are now. He did not make a single suggestion. I have sat in Opposition and helped criticize Bills brought into this house, when it was not my business to see that the Bill was the best under the circumstances, but I never sat in Opposition when conditions were such as they were described by my honourable friend last night and criticized the Government in its conduct of affairs without at least suggesting some way in which these conditions could be ameliorated. Is my friend opposite prepared to remain there in his seat and see the Government, as he put it, blundering along not doing the proper thing and the people starving; the people in penury; the people suffering from malnutrition and not hold up a hand to say, "This is what you should do and what you are doing is wrong." There's no circumstance under which any Member of this House has any right to criticize the Government under any condition of that kind without saying, "This is what you should do," and my honourable friend made no suggestion at all; and consequently it can be said that what the Government is doing is not only its best but the only thing that can be done, and we shall continue to do it.

It would be idle for me, Sir, and I don't propose to do it – to retell the history of the country for the past four years. It has been told so often that it becomes nauseating, but I would remind my honourable and learned friend of the facts, which have been told so often that they must have sunk into his mind until his mind has been seared, and I hope I will not be called upon to tell the story each time.

Now, when it comes to the resolutions contained in the Budget I have a few remarks to make on them. They have been explained – honestly explained by the Prime Minister in his speech on that subject. During the course of the debate, several minor amendments have called for further explanation, which has been given. I don't think that a Budget ever introduced has been so frank, so honest, and has put before the country and the world the true position of affairs in Newfoundland. I remember a few years ago when the Hon. Mr. Cashin introduced the Budget here, he was supposed to have put matters frankly before the country. At the time he was seriously criticized even by his own friends. As a matter of actual fact he was seriously misled in connection with the figures which he committed. But his Budget Speech was looked upon at that time as a frank, open, really a brutal statement of the conditions of the country. The Budget submitted this year happens to be not only

frank but it is exact. As the Prime Minister himself has said we have to look forward during the coming year to a substantial deficit. He has told the world that we are striving under conditions very much the same as other countries are suffering under; but it is also pointed out that we have done what no other government has done; that is we have taken over the public services in all directions and cut them to the bone, and I can safely say and I know that I am correct, that there is not a single government in the British Empire which has taken hold of civil and public services and made such ruthless cuts as we have done by the Alderdice government. It is not a popular move, that is realised, but it is an honest one, but it is an *[illegible]* and before we default, before we can seek further assistance, we have to show to the outside world, as far as our own house is concerned, we are going to put it in order, and throughout the whole of the address of my learned friend last evening, he did not for one moment challenge the honesty of purpose of that Budget. One of the Resolutions which comes up for discussion before the House, and one which the Hon. Member for Humber dealt with at length last night is the question of tobacco. In the course of those remarks I interrupted him at one point, and he took advantage of the position that any person addressing the Chair always has; he told me to sit down; that was entirely within his rights; the only question is as to whether he should always exercise his rights. He told me to sit down in an extremely offensive manner and then as it were to seek sympathy he pointed out that he was one of only two in Opposition, that when we were in Opposition we were not interrupted when we were speaking, and that when any one was speaking on this side of the House he wouldn't interrupt him. Since he did not wish me to continue with my interruption naturally I obeyed his orders and I sat down. I even did what he told me, I kept my temper. I don't know whether there's any appeal which to my mind is more unfair and more cowardly than the one made by my friend on that particular occasion. When one is addressing this House or any organisation it does not matter whether he has one man behind him or a hundred. The person addressing this Committee has the floor and has the whole House behind him and is entitled to speak. There's no more reason why the Hon. Leader of the Opposition should interrupt me, because on this side of the House there are 24 members, than I should interrupt him when on that side of the House there only three. No interruption should take place in a debate unless it is necessary, and then it is not an interruption. I interrupted my learned friend because at the time he was making utterly unjustified incriminations against the Hon. Prime Minister, and he did not want me to prove that such was the case. It is the simplest thing in this world to make dishonest statements and say "it's rumoured," "people are saying," or "I heard it on the street," and then to qualify it by saying "Of course I don't believe it," and last night for half an hour the Leader of the Opposition was saying "It's rumoured on the street that Mr. Alderdice is dishonest," "It's said Mr. Alderdice is dishonest. I hear it but of course I don't believe it." For half an hour that was going on; and I know of no type of attack which is more insidious and likely to do damage, because you cannot put your finger on the person responsible. The speaker who repeats it is not responsible; he heard it on the street. It's rumoured. As I say it's the most insidious and most dishonest form of attack on a man the Hon. Leader of the Opposition could choose in repeating anybody else's views. He has only to listen to the gossip on the street from day to day to appreciate that fact.

Is it suggested that because Mr. Alderdice happens to be a shareholder and a director of the Imperial Tobacco Company that he should not be a Member of this House? That he should not be a member of the Executive Council? That she should not be Prime Minister? What kind of folly is it to

suggest that because a man is in public life that he should give up his business and his fortune for poverty? Is he supposed, in addition to giving up his time, to give up his living and his fortune? What nonsense. Of course he is a shareholder of the Imperial Tobacco Company and the Ropewalk. How many Members of the Canadian House of Commons are shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway? How many Members of the House of Commons in England are shareholders in large commercial and industrial enterprises? How can it be avoided? If we did not have a man who was interested in enterprises of this kind nobody could afford to be Prime Minister. We are very fortunate in having a man who will sacrifice his own interests to take over the burdens that the office of Prime Minister imposes, and because there is some question of raising the price of tobacco we are told that Mr. Alderdice told the Imperial Tobacco Company of the changes in the tariff, and the Tobacco Company imported large quantities of tobacco before the Budget was brought down. Does anyone believe it? I don't. What are the facts in connection with the variation of duties on cigarettes and tobacco? Let us take the figures. In 1933 the Imperial Tobacco manufactured and sold 19,000,000 cigarettes, they paid excise duty plus a surtax of 2 per cent of \$154,000. I am speaking now in round figures. Imported into St. John's – I take St. John's because there was very little tobacco imported anywhere else in the Island – of tobacco which could be used in the manufacture of cigarettes, 121,000 pounds. When I say that, I would like it to be understood that represents two-thirds of the imports of that class of tobacco, and I say two-thirds because it is almost certain that at least one-third was used as pipe tobacco.

They had imported into St. John's tobacco to the extent of 121,000 lbs., upon which duties had been paid to the value of \$65,000 so that in all the revenue of the country benefited to the extent of \$220,000. On the basis of last year's sales and under the new tariff, the country will get \$78,000 excise duty and \$220,000 from duties from the company. In other words, a total of \$300,000 or an increase of \$80,000 over last year. Because of the increase in output which is expected, it will mean more labour, and the revenue will also have the benefit of the extra revenue consequent of the increased wages to workers, some of whom are now on the dole, and here again a saving will be effected. In view of these figures, he asked, could it be said that a dishonest action had been taken? Times have changed now, and it would not be possible, even if it were desired, for a Prime Minister to put something dishonest over on an executive of twelve members and a party of 25. The day of dishonest prime ministers has passed away in Newfoundland.

When making cigarettes in factories, the basis of calculation is 2½ lbs. of tobacco to 1,000 cigarettes. It is difficult to say how much tobacco to the thousand is used when cigarettes are made by hand by individuals, but it would probably be less; but even if the basis was the same, under the old scale it would cost individuals \$4.10 per thousand cigarettes, and under the new basis \$6.

He had secured the figures in relations to costs in Canada and the United States, and had found that the spread between excise and duties in these countries is much greater than here, and costs of tobacco for pipe-smoking in Canada to-day are much higher than here. In Canada to-day the price of a 2 oz. tin of Prince Albert tobacco is 40 cents and in Newfoundland 22 cents. Edgeworth, for a tin of 1 3/5 ozs., the price is 30 cents in Canada, and 20 cents here. Raleigh is 30 cents in Canada and 20 cents here, and a 3 oz. tin of Three Castles is 50 cents in Canada and 40 cents here. With the new duties the costs of these tobaccos will not then be as high as they are in Canada.

It is a curious thing that even in England where some tobaccos are manufactured, the price of

tobacco manufactured in England is more than is the same tobacco here. Capstan was 30 cents a tin here, and in England it is 60 cents. Cigarettes are dearer here than they are outside. As to plug tobacco it will be found that the increased protection will mean that local-made tobacco will be supplied cheaper than heretofore, and he was assured that the tobacco made here is superior in many cases to the imported article. In view of the above figures he felt that no attention should be paid to advertisements such as he had seen in a local paper dealing with the increased cost of tobacco to the consumer.

Mr. Bradley desired to say that he had never stated that the protectionist was dishonest but he did claim that he was wrong. He had claimed that the barriers between countries were not economic, and were against the best interests of humanity. The basic principle underlying protection was that trade and commerce should be directed into new channels and that in principle was wrong. [*Daily News*, July 7, 1933]

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The time is coming, and it is not far distant, when you will have to reduce those tariff resolutions. We will leave it to time to say whether or not I am right.

Now, there is one other mental attitude of the Minister of Justice – I am sorry he is gone out – and it seems to be characteristic of a number of gentlemen on the other side. They seem to be obsessed with the idea of their own superabundant honesty to the exclusion of that virtue from anyone else's mind; in fact, they form themselves into a sort of mutual admiration society. We are told ever and often that they are absolutely honest; not the least slur can be thrown at them; the houses that they live in are not composed of glass in the least degree. All their predecessors have been men who have crawled through the tar barrel, but they have never gone into anything like that. They are pure and holy, without spot. I have no charge to make against their honesty, but beware of the man who is always professing sanctity, beware of him. He may be honest, but in 99 cases out of 100 it would pay you to watch him.

My honourable and learned friend accused me of appealing for sympathy. I don't want sympathy from anyone. I am able to take my part here in this House or outside. I am not looking for sympathy. I don't want it, but I do object to constant, insistent and persistent interruption when I am addressing the Chair in this House. I am not the eloquent speaker that the Hon. Prime Minister intimated that he thought I was in his reply to me last night. I admit quite frankly that it is quite possible to throw me off my argument by interruption, just as well as anyone else. I think it is utterly unfair to interfere with any man. I think the Prime Minister and his colleagues must admit that I have never unduly interfered with any Member on that side of the House. When I am speaking I expect the same courtesy from them. When I don't get it, I am liable to speak sharply. I did speak sharply, and will do so again in the same tone if he practices the same in future to any Member on that side of the House, or on this side.

Now, my honourable and learned friend also made the statement that I said last night that it was rumoured that Mr. Alderdice was dishonest, and that I continued making that statement for half an hour; that I had made the statement also that Mr. Alderdice was charged around town by rumour with having informed the Imperial Tobacco Company of the changes that were going to be made in [the] tariff. I did nothing of the kind. I never mentioned the fact that Mr. Alderdice was in any way

connected with the Imperial Tobacco Company. I never suggested that he was connected with the Imperial Tobacco Company until Mr. Alderdice mentioned it himself, and he did so then to assure this House, and presumably myself included, that though he was a shareholder in that tobacco factory, that he personally had nothing whatever to do with the framing of these resolutions in connection with tobacco; that it was done in the Department, that he knew nothing about it, that he kept out of it because he was a shareholder [and] he did not want anyone to have an opportunity to blame him for interference with duties on behalf of his company. Further, neither directly nor indirectly, had he anything to do with the framing of these resolutions.

What was my reply? I think I stated most distinctly – and my voice is not particularly thick, it is quite easy for anyone in this House to understand everything I articulate – I made the statement that I accepted the Prime Minister's statement in its entirety [and] that I did not accuse him in any way of being directly or indirectly connected with the framing of these resolutions, or with the giving of information to the Imperial Tobacco Company or anybody else. I say so still. But what I did say also was this: that there was severe criticism on the street, and it has got into the newspapers I notice, of these changes in tariff, and that part of that criticism was that the Imperial Tobacco Company had in some way or another been tipped off as to what was going to happen. Those of you who were here last night will remember that the Prime Minister himself told me that whatever took place between the Imperial Tobacco Company and the Department, he had nothing to do with it. I accept that statement, but if there were communications between the parties I know nothing about it. I am told by one of the biggest importers of tobacco this morning, that on the very morning that these resolutions come into effect, he had on his desk the printed circular of the Imperial Tobacco Company with their new prices. Where did they get them? Now, remember I am not accusing the Prime Minister, but there is the fact that this merchant actually had in his possession the circular of the Imperial Tobacco Company with their new rates on the morning when it came into effect. How did they get hold of that, get it to the printers and get it out that morning? I think it is something for the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Customs to investigate. Not that he is guilty of [omission], not that he is personally associated with it, not that he is the person who took that information to the Imperial Tobacco Company because he is a shareholder. I take his word for it that he had [nothing] to do with it.

In those circumstances, I have a complaint to make against him in that he ought to have something to do with the framing of these tariff resolutions. He has an obligation to this country. He is Minister of Finance and Customs. I can't understand the position of a Minister of Finance and Customs who will introduce resolutions into this House which he himself as Minister had not been pleased and satisfied with. That explains my position on that particular point.

Now, on the question of tobacco and the price, there are two outstanding points that I want to reiterate. I am not going over the whole story again. It is a fact that tobacco used for cigarettes, which formerly came in at a rate of duty of 40 cents per lb., is now put up to 90 cents per lb. It is a fact also that other tobaccos, plug tobaccos, which are not used for cigarettes have been put up from 40 to 49 cents per lb., and at the same time the excise duty on the local tobacco has, I think, been dropped.

Now, that is a clear preference in favour of the Imperial Tobacco, and it is a clear attempt to force the smoker in this country to smoke what the Imperial Tobacco wants him to smoke, rather

than what he wants to smoke himself. I claim that is unfair, unjust. Tobacco is not a luxury; we have got to get that idea out of our heads. It may be a luxury, but for the ordinary Newfoundland fisherman with the few relaxations or amusements which he has at his disposal, he has got nothing else but tobacco. Many a time I have heard of deep sea men as well as fisherfolk tell what a comfort the pipe was to them on a lonely watch at night at sea. Tobacco is a necessity. It may be no good to the human body from the standpoint of food value, just as tea, but it has become so embedded into the physical being of our people that they can neither do without the one nor the other. It has become a necessity. It is a necessity which, under existing circumstances, you ought not to make more expensive. The ordinary man who smokes Prince Albert ought to be permitted to get it as before when times were better, and not made to pay more for it now when times are worse.

I don't know whether the comparison with the prices of tobacco in Canada and Newfoundland as given by the Minister of Justice are correct or not. So far as he is concerned, I have no doubt that he has given honestly the figures that were given to him. I want to draw this to his attention. Some four years ago when I was in Canada for a month, I smoked Old Chum. I have smoked it for years. I was paying \$1.75 for Old Chum in Newfoundland. I bought the same thing in Canada for 75 cents. I could buy Players cigarettes for nearly half the price that you could get them for in the City of St. John's. What differences Canada has made in her tariff since then, I don't know. I am gravely doubtful whether she has made such tremendous changes in Customs and excise duties as would account for the apparent huge differences in prices as outlined by the Minister of Justice. I have nothing further to say, and this objection was only to correct some misapprehensions which might be in the minds of some of my hearers by reason of what the Minister of Justice has said.¹⁴¹

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Just one word. I did not interrupt the Hon. Member last night, but I felt that he was not doing either the Imperial Tobacco Company or myself justice. He was giving extra currency to something that was not true, while at the same time he had in his possession the very figures that gave the lie to that report. The statement that you made was that the Imperial Tobacco took advantage a few days before of the change of tariff to take a lot of tobacco out of bond. They took less tobacco out of bond this June than they did last June. I spoke to the manager the other day. He said he took particular care not to take advantage. He had an idea that there was going to be a change in the duties. He had been putting it up to the Deputy Minister for the last two months. He might have taken advantage of that, he might have got cigarette tobacco under the low rate. He did not do that, he immediately gave the customers the advantage of the new rate. I don't want to discuss business. I did feel hurt that the Hon. Member should give further currency to that unfair report, when he himself had those figures in his possession. I remember I did not know anything about those

¹⁴¹ "To listen to the Attorney General one would imagine that the administration of which he was a member had been responsible for the whole debt of the country and that the present administration was honest to the exclusion of all others. He had not stated that the Prime Minister was guilty of any dishonest action and he wished to repeat this, but he did state and he stated now again that it was rumored that the Imperial Tobacco Co. had been tipped off as to what was going to happen and it was significant in that respect that on the very morning the new tariff came into force dealers in the city were supplied with printed copies of the new prices from the Imperial Tobacco Co. This was, he suggested, something that called for investigation." *Daily News*, July 7, 1933.

figures until the honourable gentleman asked the question the day before. As minister of the Department I passed the two questions on to the Deputy to have them replied, and he had them replied to next day.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: It is not my desire to take up any time of the House, but as I have not spoken since I came to the House, I think that before closing possibly it would be as well to say a few words, particularly in connection with that tobacco situation which has raised recently a little furore in the House.

As a member of the executive government, naturally I was one to support it – these present duties. I did it not because I am a supporter of protective tariffs, because I am not. I am as great a free trader as possibly the Hon. Member for Humber, but on the other hand I am also a strong believer in the necessity of giving employment, and it is absolutely necessary if this country is to go ahead that we should get as much employment as it is possible to give. To put it into a few phrases, it is one of the advantages to be created by reducing the duty on tobacco. We had 40 cents per lb. on the cigarette tobacco that they use to roll themselves. On the other hand cigarettes to-day are on the market at 20 cents per package or a cent apiece – I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition has to leave because I have a few things I would like to say to him – for at least 20 cents per package, which is a considerable reduction to what it has been. It is going to give employment to the mill owner who is manufacturing boxes; it is going to give freight to the railroad; it is going to give plug tobacco to the fishermen who are the chief users at 5 cents per plug reduction, which is a considerable reduction. If they have to sacrifice their present tobacco which they are using – imported tobacco – I consider if they can get equally as good, and many people say it is better at a cheaper price, then we encourage it to keep employment as much as possible in the city or in the country – I don't care whether it is St. John's, Harbour Grace or Twillingate. We should encourage industry as much as possible. I understand that there is likely to be an increase of twenty or 30 girls who will be employed. That means considerably [*omission*], particularly at a time of this kind, with cheaper cigarettes and cheaper tobacco. With increased mill work given out and things of that kind, I feel myself that it is an encouragement, and as long as I am here I shall continue the same policy; to carry out a policy of that kind is a right policy.

I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to leave the House, because I have a few remarks to make to him, and in connection with last evening when he stood on the opposite side there and more or less accused us of neglect of those who are in dire need. I would like to tell the Leader of the Opposition through the Speaker that there is no government that has ever taken over office that has worked as hard or as industriously as the present lot. It seems a strange thing for one of the Members to get up and say that, but I think that anybody who has been watching the efforts we have made will realize that we have put in twelve months of the hardest kind of work, night and day, week in and week out, but we are satisfied, particularly those not holding office, to give our services without charge; that is practically what we have been doing. On the other hand the Leader of the Opposition, who is so very much concerned over the condition of these people – over which I may say I am very much concerned myself – these little children that he spoke of that were going blind for want of nourishment. I have never heard of its being referred to the Relieving Officer. I have never heard of its being reported to any Department. If I had, I would have seen that justice

would be done. He stated in this House that those conditions were going on.

I just want to say to the Leader of the Opposition through the Speaker that I am personally prepared, provided that he will return \$20,000 of that \$41,000 that he took when he was in office – it was ill-gotten because I considered that he never lawfully earned it - if he will return \$20,000 – I am satisfied for him to have \$21,000 for his efforts which produced nothing. If he is satisfied to return to the treasury of this country that \$20,000, then I am prepared to give my \$600 to be sent back to the treasury for the benefit of the people. That is all I have to say. I am sorry the Leader had to leave his seat. If anything got under me, it was that reference to the people suffering from malnutrition, being underfed due to men like the Leader of the Opposition and other men. I don't say entirely it was the Leader of the Opposition, but he was part and parcel of the whole that brought about these conditions throughout the country – a condition we have been working for and striving to remedy. If the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to return \$20,000 of his ill-gotten gains, I am satisfied to give \$600 for the next three years, which will be my income, back to the treasury and work for nothing.

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 amendment, and asked leave to introduce a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received.

On motion for adoption of this Report, Mr. Bradley moved and Mr. Starkes seconded the following amendment, namely:

That Item 79 be deleted, and the following substituted therefor: "Tobacco, manufactured, ad val. 10 per cent. Tobacco, manufactured, per lb. \$0.40."¹⁴²

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I want to move an amendment to Item 79: delete Item 79 and substitute therefore the following: *(reads)*.

[omission]

I have considered that point. I am subject to your ruling. I would draw your attention to the fact that we are not concerned with what happens to be the tariff now, we are concerned with the Resolution which is before the Chair, and I am moving an amendment to the resolution which is before the Chair.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The present Act says a certain figure; the Resolution now before the Chair is to amend that Act; the amendment suggested by you is that we don't amend the Act, that is

¹⁴² "On the report of the committee, Mr. Bradley and Mr. Starkes seconded that item 79 of the resolutions be amended and that 10 per cent ad valorem be substituted therefore. The effect was to bring the duties on tobacco back where they were." *Daily News*, July 7, 1933.

what it means. That is not an amendment.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am not defeating the motion. This deals with figures; it is not a mere negation of the motion. The motion is that Section 79 as set forth in the motion be passed.

Hon. Minister of Justice: If you look at the beginning of the Resolution, you will find that Section 79 [will] be amended by making the following changes:

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am entirely in the hands of the Speaker, and it is simply a matter for you to make this change.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I submit that is not to be entertained.

Hon. the Speaker: There is a Bill before the House proposing a certain amendment to the Revenue Act, that the duty on tobacco should be 49 cents; to the motion that this report be adopted, the Leader of the Opposition moves an amendment to the effect that it be 40 cents.

Hon. Minister of Justice: May I point out that the Revenue Act provides that 40 cents shall be charged; that is the present Revenue Act, and consequently the motion made by the Minister of Finance and Customs is that the Revenue Act be amended by raising the duty from 40 cents to 49 cents; the answer to that by those who vote against it is to say Nay. I respectfully submit that a motion – if my learned friend opposite made that motion – to make it 48 cents. That would be a variation on the motion made by the Minister of Finance and Customs.

Hon. Mr. Winter: I think the Leader of the Opposition is right, I think the Minister of Justice is confusing two uses [of] an amendment. The amendment is an amendment of the original motion.

Hon. Minister of Justice: At the present time under the Revenue Act, 40 cents is the rate of duty; the Government has proposed an amendment to that to make it 49 cents. We will take Mr. Bradley's amendment, and we will assume that it is carried. It simply means that the Act which is now on the Statute Book remains there so far as that particular item is concerned. If this motion is carried and this amendment is carried, where are we?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If this amendment is carried, then I presume that there goes on the statute books of this House, or rather if it is also adopted by the Upper House, a new Act containing an item with the amendment in it as I have made it. We are not concerned with what was in the Revenue Act before that.

Hon. Minister of Justice: This House is here for the purpose of passing laws, not for the purpose of passing laws twice. The law is there now.

Hon. the Speaker: I don't agree with the Hon. Minister of Justice on that point. Item 79 is to be changed to carry out the resolution. The motion is that Item 79 be changed and it is sought to delete

49 cents and substitute [40 cents].

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If His Honour the Speaker is in doubt I don't want to press the matter, but if he is satisfied to do so I would like him to rule on the point; but if the Speaker is not prepared to do so I will be satisfied. I am convinced I am right on that point.

Hon. the Speaker: I am satisfied that the amendment proposed by you is in order. Is the House ready for the question?

Hon. Mr. Winter: I would like to ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition if the amendment takes the place of the old section [*illegible*].

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Under the old 79 all manufactured tobacco was 40 cents per pound and 10 per cent ad valorem.

Hon. Mr. Winter: There is no distinction between the kinds of tobacco?

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: No, let it carry as it is.

Hon. the Speaker: The motion is that the report of the Chairman of the Select Committee be adopted, to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment that Item 79 be amended by substituting (*reads*).

I will put the amendment first. Moved and seconded that item 79 be deleted and the following substituted therefor: (*reads*).

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared in favour of the motion: Mr. Bradley, Mr. Starkes; and against it: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, The Minister of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Winter, Mr. Gear, Mr. Moore, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Shea, Mr. Halley, Mr. Gray, Mr. Earle; so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion for adoption of the report was put, when there appeared in its favour: Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Secretary of State, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, The Minister of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Winter, Mr. Gear, Mr. Moore, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Shea, Mr. Halley, Mr. Gray, Mr. Earle; and against it: Mr. Bradley, Mr. Starkes.

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further Amend the Revenue Act, 1925" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

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 Further Amend the Revenue Act, 1925."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further Amend The Revenue Act, 1925" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

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 said Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a

Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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 "Consolidation and Amendment of the Acts Relating to a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of the Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This Bill is merely a consolidatory Act.¹⁴³

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I want one assurance, Mr. Prime Minister. Am I to understand that this Bill makes no change in the existing law?

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: No. There is no change except for a few words to be added to Section 1.

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 amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that leave be given to introduce a Bill to give effect to these Resolutions.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Acts Relating to a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Acts Relating to a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

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 said Bill.

¹⁴³ "Hon. the Prime Minister introduced a bill for the consolidation and amendment of the acts relating to a tax on goods imported into Newfoundland. He explained that this meant no changes in the tariff but was simply a consolidation of those already in force. The bill passed all stages." *Daily News*, July 7, 1933.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.
Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.
Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Acts Relating to a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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 an Amendment to the Act 22, Geo. V. (Second Session), Chapter 41, entitled "An Act to Provide for the Addition of a Temporary Surtax and Excise Duties and Import Taxes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.
Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.
Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the Act 22, Geo. V. (Second Session), Chapter 41, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Addition of a Temporary Surtax to Customs and Excise Duties and Import Taxes'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

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 an Amendment to the Act 20, Geo. V., Cap. 36, entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It is proposed in the first two paragraphs to do away with the practice of a person charging capital to income. This practice was very unfair because if there was any gain in capital it was never treated as income. This is the note I received from the Assessor (*reads note*). I may say that they are very much alive to that in the United States at the present time. There was one gentleman who sold a million shares to his wife and took her note although she may never have had a cent in the world, established his losses, and then took the shares back whenever he liked.¹⁴⁴

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I think it was a high Treasury official, Mr. Andrew Mellon, who was in control of the Treasury in the last administration, was it not? However, is it correct that if a man buys a stock at 50 and it goes to 100 or 500, that he is not charged income tax on that stock?

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the Act 20, George V., Cap. 36, entitled 'An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the said Bill was read a second time, and it was ordered that it be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

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 an Amendment to the Act 20, George V., Cap. 36, entitled 'An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes.'"

¹⁴⁴ "Hon. the Prime Minister introduced a bill for the consolidation and amendment of the acts relating to a tax on goods imported into Newfoundland. He explained that this meant no changes in the tariff but was simply a consolidation of those already in force. The bill passed all stages.

Hon. the Prime Minister introduced a bill to provide for the addition of a temporary surtax to customs and excise duties and import taxes. This was a usual tax and was only an extension for another year. This bill passed all stages.

Hon. the Prime Minister introduced a bill amending the Income Tax Act. He explained that the purpose was to prevent people from computing stock losses as losses when paying income. People who had bonds which reduced in value were charging these losses to income whereas they were merely capital losses. If the stocks increased in value, income tax was not charged on the increase. This bill passed through all stages." *Daily News*, July 7, 1933.

*Mr. Speaker left the Chair.
Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.
Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.*

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

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

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the Act 20, George V., Cap. 36, entitled 'An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, it was ordered that the Bill entitled "An Act to Define the Rights of International Power and Paper Company, Limited, and Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, in Respect of Certain Timber Lands" be withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to a Shooting Range in St. John's" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill.

*Mr. Speaker left the Chair.
Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.*

Hon. Attorney General introduced a bill relating to the establishment of a shooting range at Nagle's Hill. He referred to the last range that had been there and of the value it was to naval forces, police, brigades, etc. and stated that it was now necessary to reestablish a range. For some time past a number of people had been encamped on the grounds formerly used as a range. These people had no legal right to the place and were not improving the property. On Wednesday, however fire had removed all but two of these shacks and it was now thought advisable to pass the bill and establish the rifle range.

The two people whose shacks are still intact will be provided for elsewhere. The title of the land was not clear, the only record being that it was granted to a Colonel Law in 1853. The present bill vested the property in the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The bill passed all stages. [*Daily*

News, July 7, 1933]

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act in Relation to a Shooting Range in St. John's" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921-31."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

*Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.*¹⁴⁵

Hon. Minister of Justice: Last evening, when the Bill was under discussion, the question arose whether Section 1 of the Bill should be deleted, and in its place a section be inserted providing that the Councillors should remain in office until next year. It would be a serious interference with the rights of the voters of St. John's and it is questionable if this House should interfere. If you will remember, the Leader of the Opposition suggested this amendment when the Bill came up for discussion, and that the Councillors might be permitted to remain in office next year. Last night the matter was debated further and it was deferred, and there is an opportunity to debate it now at greater length.

I ought to make it clear that this Bill, although it is in my hands, it is in my hands as Attorney General. It is not a Government measure, it is not my measure. It is a private Bill, and I am not the one responsible for the provisions therein contained or for the amendment suggested. There is no party whip. Every Member of the House is entitled to vote on each section as he likes, and I propose

¹⁴⁵ "The House went into committee on the Municipal Bill. The sections referring to the extension of the election of the court of revision was discussed at some length and eventually it was decided to alter the section of the Municipal Act which provides that both the election and the court of revision shall take place in December and to make it now necessary to hold the court of revision in October and the election in December. That will fall in line with the wishes of citizens who desired to hold the election and who wanted to assure that the court of revision will be held. On section 4 of the act there was considerable discussion too and eventually it was decided to delete this section from the act." *Daily News*, July 7, 1933.

to exercise the same right myself.

When the Bill was in Committee before, yesterday, Section 1 provided for allowing a Court of Revision next year, and an election to be held later. At the instance of the Leader of the Opposition, I approached the City Solicitor on this matter. The matter was discussed here, and there was a considerable amount of difference of opinion as to which plan was better. Frankly, I am in favour of postponement and I intend to vote for that. That is my personal opinion. I know the opinion of my colleagues and that of Mr. Halley, the Member for St. John's West. I take it my popularity in St. John's East will not be decreased by my voting in favour of the measure. I beg to move the amendment to Section 1.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Mr. Chairman, I was a little tired last night and I thought the House was about to adjourn when I went downstairs. Then I was told that they were going to go on with some other Bills, so I missed the debate upon this Bill.

I am always willing to change my opinion when I am convinced I am wrong, and I am in some doubt as to whether I was right in my good-intentioned motion some two or three days ago in connection with this municipal election. The only thing I had in mind was the saving of expenditure this year for the Municipal Council. I have no brief for the Councillors. I don't know how many of them I am going to vote for if the election is held next Fall. But I was struck by a letter written in the newspaper which I read to-day, and which referred to the statement of the Prime Minister a couple of days ago, when he said that before you extend the life of the Council these Councillors ought to be asked if they are prepared to remain or not. On the other side, the writer did not see whether the Councillors ought to be consulted at all. It was a question of whether the people wanted them there or not. And I am afraid that I cannot refute that statement. I don't know what the attitude of the citizens of St. John's is. If I could receive an assurance that the majority of the citizens want an election next fall I would vote for it, because after all the citizens are the people to be consulted. It is not right to keep the Council there any longer contrary to the will of these citizens. I don't know how I am going to vote at present. I trust the debate will develop so that I can get more light on the subject, and so that I may be able to cast a more intelligent vote than I can do at present.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, I maintain that a Court of Revision to determine the value of the property is of far more value than an election. I think the property holders at the present time are suffering a great injustice. They are taxed much higher than the value of their property. A great many of them are receiving no rents.

Hon. the Speaker: Like the Leader of the Opposition, might I ask the Hon. Attorney General in charge of the matter, does the law at present provide for a Court of Revision this year?

Hon. Minister of Justice: As I understand, yes.

Hon. the Speaker: A Court of Revision this year and also an election?

Hon. Minister of Justice: The desire of the Council is to separate them, so that an election and a

Court of Revision may not occur at the same time.

Hon. the Speaker: What is the reason?

Hon. Minister of Justice: Both take place at the same time. Both are expensive, and also disturbing to the work.

Hon. the Speaker: I was wondering whether it was not possible to advance the date of the Court of Revision. I understand it is now held in the month of December. Would it not be possible to hold the Court of Revision in the months of September and October, and have the election in the month of December? I agree with the Prime Minister it is desirable to have a Court of Revision as soon as possible. To put that off for a year I think is unfair. As he points out, the value of the property has considerably decreased, [and] people are paying taxes on fictitious values. I see no reason why that Court of Revision could not sit in September and October, and have the election in December. There is no saving putting off an election until next year. Presumably it will cost the same next year as this year. It is only deferring [it].

Hon. Minister of Justice: I must say that off hand, I agree with the Speaker that it would be possibly a solution to advance the date of the holding of the Court of Revision. I don't know whether there is anything against that. There may be something. The point had not been raised before.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Can't we get all this straightened out, so that we will know where we are, some time to-morrow? I don't think it is going to take long once we start. The City Council has been delinquent, which may be an argument for throwing them out this year, in that they have not given us any explanation. They have come in here with indefinite explanations as to the inconvenience or confusion of holding an election and appraisalment in the same year. Why do they not explain? At the moment I am very strongly in favour of the suggestion of the Speaker. It appears that the motive for the amendment is merely to avoid [the] confusion caused by the election and appraisalment occurring at the same time. Very well, we will shift the appraisalment ahead and hold the election in December.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Or put it ahead.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Either way. In view of what the Prime Minister said, I think the appraisalment ought to take place at once. I happen to represent some of the unfortunates who own property, and I am paying considerable sums of money in taxes, and I am not getting a cent for it. I have to pay taxes on the rent that I am not getting.

Hon. Mr. Winter: It is not necessary to just follow the Speaker's suggestion. Find out what the Act says about appraising. Does it fix the date of appraising? It will be only necessary to advance it as the Speaker suggests, and I very strongly support that.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There are some with more knowledge of City Council affairs than

I have. Mr. Byrne or Mr. Halley may know more about it.

Mr. Halley: I would like to see an election for reasons I stated last night.

Hon. the Speaker: Mr. Chairman, it is not quite quarter to seven. I don't know whether the Committee is prepared to vote on this matter at present. Speaking personally, I am not. Personally, I think it is a great mistake that a matter of such far-reaching importance as this should be brought in as a private measure at this term of the session. It is a very far-reaching matter, and as I say it is a matter, not a subject of a private Bill, but is a matter of public policy, and a matter that the Government really should take some definite stand upon one way or the other. I don't know what attitude the Council takes with regard to this matter. As [for] the explanation whereby the Attorney General points out and says, with regard now to the amendment suggested instead of the printed Bill which we have before us, it is submitted that the substitute section: [omission].

Now, after expressing the intention of the Legislature in 1921 in unmistakable words, speaking personally, I don't agree with that submission at all. As I tried to point out here the other day, referring to this section [of] the Act of 1921, [this] was the section dealing with leases heretofore made was retroactive, and was not clearly expressed by the Legislature when the Bill was passed in 1921. Ever since 1921 it has been a bone of contention between members of the legal profession. Some held views as to what the meaning was, others held other views. I cannot conceive that it was the intention of the Legislature in 1921 to effect what has been held, or what is held to be the effect of this section in the 1921 Act, which actually confiscates from landlords any interest, or reversionary interest, that they might have held in leasehold properties at the termination of their lease. And I think it can be done in the proper [illegible] in Committee is unfair.

Hon. Minister of Justice: The vote is put on the adoption of the Report.

Hon. Mr. Winter: This Bill was before the House two months ago, and it did not come up again for final discussion for a long time. We are never going to [illegible].

Hon. Minister of Justice: This House was not in Committee on it until the other evening.

Hon. Mr. Moore: Mr. Chairman, the Bill was not before the Committee until yesterday evening. I did not know how to vote then. I never heard the sections read.

Hon. Minister of Justice: If my memory is correct, the Hon. Member was out of the House when the section was read.

Hon. Mr. Moore: No, I was in the House.

Hon. Minister of Justice: To say that the Committee sits and can't reject a section is perfect nonsense. Why then does the Chairman say that the Members can vote it down or agree with it? This section was passed in the Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I think it is possible, with all due respect to the Hon. Minister, that he is labouring under a misconception. The Committee is different from the Members of the House. The Committee, whoever they were yesterday, decided to adopt the measure in the terms in which they brought it back to the Speaker. The Committee's work is done. They have brought in their report and recommended it to the consideration of the House. The Committee is a different body. The Bill is now in the hands of the House. The question is whether the House is satisfied to adopt the report. If so, they can adopt it; if not, they can disagree with it. The Committee does the horse work. Then the House has a right to decide whether it will accept the labour of the Committee, or take part of it and reject some or the rest of it. I think that the House has a perfect right to turn down a report of the Committee. The Committee has done its work, it is now for the House to decide whether we will adopt or reject the work of the Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: For some time this practice has been followed of amending the report of the Committee, and in my opinion it is absolutely wrong. The motion is entirely out of order. You can only amend a Bill in Committee, and if a report is to be amended it has to go back to the Committee. The practice which has grown up is entirely wrong. The motion to amend a Bill not in Committee is out of order. It can only be done in Committee.

Hon. the Speaker: Do you mean to say, Mr. Attorney General, that if a Bill passes Committee it must pass the third reading?

Hon. Minister of Justice: No, it can be rejected, but if it is to be amended it must be recommitted.

Hon. Mr. Winter: Mr. Speaker, I have a suspicion that the Attorney General is right.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: After all, when the report of the Committee is read, the motion is that it be adopted. To any motion made an amendment can be inserted, but perhaps the Bill should be send back to the Committee with instructions to insert the amendment.

Hon. the Speaker: I have to agree with the remarks of the Hon. Member that the practice that has grown up of having a division on the report stage is not altogether clear. As far as I can understand, the Bill can be amended at any stage of the Bill, even on the third reading. What the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said is quite correct. The Committee is a separate and distinct body. It brings a report to the House and asks that it be adopted. As to whether it is in order to move that a section be deleted at that stage, I am not prepared at the moment to give a decision. I am rather inclined to agree with the Attorney General that the House should go into Committee again to consider that section. It is possible to amend a Bill at the report stage or is it the third reading stage. But I don't know whether it is the wish of the House to force the amendment here as against certain Members. There is a certain amount of justification in what the Attorney General said. If it is the wish of the House to reconsider the Bill in Committee, I am prepared to order that this be done.

Hon. Minister of Justice: When the Hon. Minister of Posts was speaking last night, I pointed out to him that that section, although it was passed, could be reconsidered in Committee. I don't think it is fair that the Members of the House who have left the House should not be given a chance to vote on the question.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: Any Member who leaves the House has to put up with what happens in the House when he is not here.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: We can talk here about technical matters until it gets dark. As I understand the situation, there are Members who have a particular interest in the Bill not in the House. No Member has any desire to take advantage of their absence. There is no need to pass the matter this afternoon. Some Members now absent who have an interest in the Bill should be given an opportunity to be here. For that reason I move that it be deferred till to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

On motion this Report was received.

On motion for the adoption of this report, the Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs moved, and Hon. Mr. Winter seconded, the following amendment, namely:

"That Section 12 of the Bill as reported by the Committee be deleted and Section 11 of the said Bill be changed to read Section 12."

Mr. Bradley moved that the House adjourn before the division was put, as many Members interested in this Bill were not present, and it was agreed accordingly.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ "The House went into committee on the Municipal Bill. The section referring to the extension of the court of revision was discussed at some length, and eventually it was decided to alter the section of the Municipal Act which provides that both the election and the court of revision shall take place in December, and to make it now necessary to hold the court of revision in October and the election in December. That will fall in line with the wishes of citizens who

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Friday, the 7th day of July instant, at ten o'clock a.m.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

desired to hold the election and who wanted to assure that the court of revision will be held. On Section 4 of the Act there was considerable discussion too, and eventually it was decided to delete this section from the Act.

On the motion for the adoption of the report, Hon. Capt. Winsor moved for the deletion of Section 13 which had to do with the employment in St. John's of those who are not taxpayers. Hon. H. A. Winter seconded the proposition. Objection to the vote being taken was raised by Capt. Byrne and the Attorney General on the grounds that at that late hour several members who had voted for the section in committee were not in the House. Eventually it was decided to adjourn the House until this morning and to have the proposition put then." *Daily News*, July 7, 1933.

Friday, July 7, 1933

The House met at ten o'clock in the morning, pursuant to adjournment.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting "An Act to Provide for the Guarantee of a Loan to the United Cold Storage Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Owing to the fact that the House continued in session until a late hour without an adjournment, I did not press for the consideration of this measure at that time. It is proposed that the United Cold Storage Company, Ltd. should raise money by way of mortgage with a view to building a cold storage plant in Burin.

At the present time the Old Colony Hospital Trust is in possession of some considerable sum of money which was originally intended for the purpose of erecting a hospital in that vicinity. It represents the Hospital Trust's share of the proceeds of various sweepstakes which have been carried out in this country during the last few years. In the first place, it is doubted whether the funds in their hands would be sufficient to use for the erection, equipment, and running of a hospital at Burin, and the funds are lying fallow, not earning any interest, or interest at a very small rate, and the people of Burin are anxious that a cold storage plant should be erected there. The Hospital Trust is prepared to loan them \$30,000 at 5 per cent over a period of fifteen years, and they ask the Government, or rather the House, to consider the giving of a guarantee by the Government both as to principal and interest.

I may say that so far as I am personally concerned, even if the Hospital Trust had the required amount of money, I would be personally adverse to the erection of a hospital. I think it is unnecessary, particularly in these times. That, however, is a purely personal opinion, and does not affect the merits of the Bill. The matter has been considered by the Government and it has been decided to seek from this House power to enter into an agreement with the United Cold Storage Company to guarantee this loan of \$30,000 at 5 per cent for a period not exceeding fifteen years, and within the agreement for guarantee, the Governor in Council shall provide – this is a direction – that the company shall create a sinking fund sufficient to repay the said loan within a period of fifteen years. I move therefore that the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider these resolutions.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Unfortunately this Bill, like many others during this session, has not been in our hands for very many minutes before we are called upon to give formal consideration to it. It may be argued that the main idea behind these resolutions is to provide for the erection of a cold storage plant which will be of advantage to the fishermen at a particular section. That article I am not prepared to rebut. It is possibly correct. But on the other hand, it must be remembered that if you are dealing with this matter on the question only of the principle of government guarantees for

cold storage plants, you are opening the door to demands from other sections of the country which are probably [as] equally justified as this one.

Now, is [it] the position that the Government is prepared to guarantee the necessary capital to put up a cold storage plant from other parts of the country where such requisitions may be made? If that is so, then no exception can be taken to the resolutions upon the grounds that particular funds, at present in the hands of certain parties, are evidently to be permitted to be invested with government guarantee behind it. But if my information is correct, I fear that all this arose out of the fact that this particular Hospital Trust has moneys which were raised through sweepstakes for specific purposes which they feel now are insufficient for the requirements of that particular undertaking, and they are desirous now of securing a safe investment. If that is all that is behind it, then I suggest that it is highly improper for this House to endorse the idea of providing a secure investment for these people's moneys.

I don't know anything about the memorandum of articles of association of the Company. I don't know what particular provisions there may be there with reference to the conditions under which they were to raise this money in the way that they did, and their method of expenditure. I don't know whether it is a public trust of a specific nature that can be enforced, or whether it is a sort of general go as you please arrangement with nothing definite you can put your finger on. But I would like to ask that question, is it the policy of the Government to guarantee the necessary investment for a cold storage plant in any part of the country where such may be needed? If you are prepared to do that, why not make the Bill wide enough to cover the situation? If you are merely doing it in order to enable these people to invest their funds safely, then I think it is highly wrong in principle.

There is nothing in the Bill itself which calls for comment. The whole thing rests upon that question: is it the policy of the Government to guarantee the investment on a cold storage plant in any part of the country where such may be needed? If so, widen the Bill accordingly. If it is merely a Bill to provide an opportunity for these people who have got funds to enable them to invest their funds safely, then I say it is entirely wrong in principle and the House should not tolerate it.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It is hardly necessary to state that there is no such idea of opening a way for these people to invest \$30,000. There is nothing in our minds like that. These people approached the Government and stated, "We have this money. We have not got sufficient to provide for a hospital and operate it. We got it for a specific purpose, and that was to help suffering humanity. Now we feel we can do just as much good at Burin if we could erect a cold storage plant if we are trustees of this. We feel that it should be secured by a government guarantee. It will be the source of enabling the fishermen in that locality to fish."

You will remember that the late administration erected a bait factory at Ramea. It is no use; there is not sufficient squid. It was never operated at anything like a profit. The fishermen would rather stay ashore than use frozen bait, that is what Mr. Penney told me. The fishermen at Burin seem to be a different type, they are keenly anxious. The merchants say they will take bait from the freezer and supply the fishermen. It would justify them in giving supplies. The Bill is not general because we know of no other place where they have \$30,000 to put up a cold storage plant, and ask for a government guarantee for the proposition. We would consider any such proposal coming from

any locality, provided we see there is a chance of paying its way. The District of Burin is a great place for squid, and Gloucester vessels would be coming in there for bait, and it would be supplying local needs. As the people there were willing and enterprising, I think it would be a bad policy if we turned them down. I think it would be very discouraging. Men of all shades of political opinion came to us and were delighted that we were thinking along these lines, and trying to rehabilitate the people of that section of the coast. Some of the men on that committee are bitter political opponents of ours, but they sank their feelings to try and help the district along. I thought it was a grand opportunity when the Member for the District with some of his friends came and made that proposal.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am not dealing with this question upon political grounds at all.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I simply said that there are all shades and classes of men anxious for this in Burin.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I am sorry to learn that the cold storage plant at Ramea has not proved successful. Evidently Mr. Penney's experiences are entirely different from what was expected when the matter was before the Executive Council of which I was a member, because at that time it promised eminent success. Apparently this one promises eminent success. I trust the fishermen of Burin section will turn out to be men of a different stamp from the men of Ramea.

As I have already pointed out, I have no objection to the Bill except upon the one ground, namely, that if it is right for you to guarantee the capital of a cold storage plant in one section of the country, it is right for you to do it in other parts of the country. I do not know whether the idea is to institute cold storage plants in other parts of the country, or whether it would be any economic advantage to Newfoundland to do so, but I do think it unfair to pass legislation to help out the people of one part of the country to the entire exclusion of the rest, and I suggest that you widen the provisions of the Bill and include the whole country.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolutions and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

This Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that a Bill be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for a Guarantee of a Loan for the United Cold Storage Company, Limited" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for a Guarantee of a Loan to the United Cold Storage Company, Limited" was read a second time and it

was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for a Guarantee of a Loan to the United Cold Storage Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for a Guarantee of a Loan to the United Cold Storage Company, Limited" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill, being entitled as above, be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Temporary Control of the Trade in Coal" was withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It was my intention when we reached that stage to have that Act regarding the temporary control of trade withdrawn. We are anxious to go further. We were very successful last year in connection with the exchange of pitprops for coal, and it is working out very well and the Welsh people are pleased with our pitprops. The people were inexperienced in some sections, but as a whole they have done so well that the Company has asked for a continuance of that business. It is felt we might even go further and arrange for an exchange of iron ore and pit-props for coal on a dollar-dollar basis. It is felt that if we could arrange to have English coal it should be made to apply to English coal only. And we would arrange for orders to go through on the understanding that they must meet competitive prices. The idea was to give the Government purchasing power on English coal. It was felt we could arrange for 100 tons of ore and perhaps 100 tons of pitprops. We are not prepared to go on indefinitely cutting for export. It might impair our timber reserve. This Bill wants to control the English importation of coal, but they must meet competitive prices, that they must meet the prices of the different parties importing coal into Newfoundland. There is no intention to interfere with American coal or with Canadian coal. We feel that an important Bill of this nature might be injured by rushing it through the House in the last moments of the session. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, there might be considerable debate and we might not come to one decision when we are sent for to go to the Upper House. It was felt that it was better to withdraw it and to continue our investigations and it might be necessary to introduce it next year

earlier in the session.

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 Fishery Supplies for the Current Season"; "An Act in Relation to an Agreement with the Great Lakes Newfoundland Atlantic Company, Limited"; and "An Act Further to Amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank'" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Public Works Act 1932" 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 (No. 2, 1933) to Further Amend The Public Works Act, 1932" and "An Act to Ratify Certain Temporary Loans Raised from the British Government" 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 for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying the Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years Ending, Respectively, the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Four" without amendment.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to reconsider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Acts Relating to the Municipal Council 1921-31."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Shea took the Chair of Committee.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition:¹⁴⁷ May I suggest that as this Bill appears to be of a substantially contentious character, and since the debate may extend over some hours, that we go ahead with the more important work first. I remember that in 1930 or 1931 when there was a Bill introduced in the House in the dying hours of the session, it was hung up until three o'clock until we got a notice from the Governor that he was waiting for us. Let us get the real work done first and then fight over the municipal act.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, we were at the Report stage when the House adjourned. Since the debate of yesterday, I have been in counsel with the City Solicitor on the question of Section 1. There are two alternatives offered to the Committee: that there should be a postponement

¹⁴⁷ The placement of this statement by the Leader of the Opposition is uncertain.

of the election this year, and the other that there should be a postponement of the holding of the Court of Revision; and in Committee it was suggested that the election should not take place and that the Court of Revision be advanced from December to October.

If the Committee is prepared to accept the fact that there should be an election this Fall, then there is no amendment necessary. The City Solicitor pointed out to me that it is already the law that the Court of Revision should sit at the time suggested when we were in Committee yesterday. If the House and Committee do not feel that they can postpone either the election or the Court of Revision, then there is no need for the section.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: There is no conflict in the time at all.

Hon. Minister of Justice: I am not sure as to the procedure as to the matter whether a Bill might be recommitted. We might give the House in Committee an opportunity of dealing with it. All questions of procedure can be waived, and we can discuss it in Committee again. It will give my hon. friend the Minister of Posts an opportunity of explaining what he is going to do with all the outport men he is going to import into St. John's.

Mr. Chairman, that deals with all of the Bill as far as the Committee is concerned, and in order to facilitate debate, I move that Section 13 be now considered by the Committee.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the House in my remarks on this Bill because I have already spoken twice on this measure, and I think you all know my views on the matter, but perhaps there are some who think I am opposed to this section because it would prevent bringing in any outport men to work in the city. Now, I am prepared to bring any Member of this House to my office and show them hundreds of letters that I have on file advising outport men not to come to the City to look for work. I have done everything I possibly could to advise outport men not to come to town to look for work, especially my constituents. Apart from that however, I think it is bad practice to bring in legislation debarring British subjects from working in any part of the Island. It will be the cause of more discussion than anything else the House passed since we first had responsible government. It has caused a great deal of discussion already, and you cannot realise how far-reaching it will be. However, when the vote is taken we will see what is going to happen, and if I am defeated I am prepared to take it like a man.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the House that Section 13 is absolutely non-partisan and every Member has the right to vote as his conscience dictates. I have already expressed my opinion on this matter, and I am willing that the majority must rule. I have great sympathy for the working men of St. John's, many of whom are out of employment. I have often noticed passing through the suburbs, a man is going to build a house, and the first thing that one sees is a pile of lumber, then a couple of tents or shacks, and two or three men from the outports come in and build that house. These men contribute nothing to the upkeep of the city, their living conditions are primitive and unsanitary, and our own labouring men have to pay rent and taxes, and have to watch those outport men take their work away from them because they can live in tents or shacks much cheaper than the man in town, who has to provide food and a home for his family. I

submit that is a great hardship for the working men of the city to have to watch other outside men take their bread away from them, simply because of their cheaper living conditions. That is the only feeling I have on the matter. I can understand Capt. Winsor's viewpoint. I too would not like to see the country divided out into sections, but I think that they should contribute something, some small tax in return for their employment, that is no more than equitable. I don't think that the Council would make an excessive tax on these men, and I think that under present conditions it is a distinct hardship on the St. John's working man, and for these reasons I am going to vote for Section 13. I would like to tell Members however, that as far as party allegiance is concerned, they can vote as their conscience dictates.

Hon. Secretary of State: This section has now been narrowed down considerably; it is now narrowed down to the man who comes in with a view to doing some carpenter work. I thought first it affected the men who work on the South Side plants. They have to join the union and pay their \$5 or \$10 a year before they can go to work in St. John's at Bowring's, Job's or Monroe's. The section now has been narrowed down as follows (*reads section*). That cuts out the handyman who does small carpentering jobs. I am satisfied to make a compromise and that he should pay a small licence fee to the City, but I am afraid that if you let this Bill go to the Council, that instead of regulating men coming in here they will prohibit them altogether. If we could only bind the Council to give those men a fair show.

A matter of this kind is a very dangerous one to handle. We have already realized this in the case of Lewisporte. In Lewisporte it is always the practice for men to come from all around the bay and get work discharging the coal boats. The men of Lewisporte have petitioned the Railway Commission to the effect that no man who does not live in Lewisporte [should] get work discharging coal boats. We told the people of Lewisporte that they could form their own union and lay down their own rules and regulations with regard to work on the coal boats, and if everything was fair and above board, they could solve their problems themselves; but for the Railway Commission to make rules as to who could work in a certain town would be carrying it too far. All the settlements would be clamouring for this sort of legislation.

I am not opposed to the outport [man] paying a small licence fee, but I fear that the Council will go too far. I would like to know whether the Municipal Council could not do this without coming to the House of Assembly and embarrassing us with this sort of legislation. Some of them would be the last to let it be known that they advocated such legislation. I think that the amendment should be such that the Council cannot make it too extreme. We cannot tell what repercussions will come of this Bill if we pass it holus-bolus, the same thing will be happening in Grand Falls and Corner Brook, and such sectional legislation is not fair. I do not think that we should leave it at the discretion of the Council.

Mr. Byrne: I am glad to hear the last speaker pointing out the fact that this section is not nearly so drastic as many Members of the House understood it to be. I am sure, Sir, that it is not the intention of anyone connected with the City Council or of any representative of St. John's East or West to introduce a feeling of antagonism between the outports and the City of St. John's. But what is lamentable, Sir, is the fact that so far as I have known, for years we dared not mention St. John's as

between the outports, in the Assembly particularly, without bringing on a bitter feeling immediately. I had occasion in this House in 1929, on this very labour proposition which was then becoming very acute, but was not nearly so much as it has now become, and at that time particularly when we had bitterness arising on the floors of this House, and we were accused of wanting St. John's locked up for the citizens of St. John's. As far as that goes, I might confess that I myself, if I could do it, would have the City of St. John's and the labour that is got in the City of St. John's, solely confined to the people of the City of St. John's.

The last speaker points out that the Longshoremen's Union do not strongly object to outport men joining their union. But under this section he would not be an outport man, he is a bona fide resident of St. John's; [and] I might tell the last speaker that so much did they object to the practice of outport men in the past coming into St. John's and taking union work, that they raised the fee to \$25 - they actually raised the fee to \$25 for an outport man to work as a longshoreman. Time went on, and I may divert to say that our troubles really began during the war period, when very high prices were offered for work in St. John's, where labour was plentiful and men were scarce. That is the reason. Now we have practically a new town. When you talk about the Longshoremen's Union, you are talking about a membership of 2,200 people of the labouring class. You must remember that the Union steadily only offers work to about 350 members. They are what is known as the steam men. Apart from those 350, the other labour that the Longshoremen's Union has to offer is the salt boat, coal boat, handling fish that is going to be packed or moved around the waterfront. That is in itself not anywhere near the requirements of the big bunch of union men.

That is not what is worrying the City Council. It is not longshoremen's labour, but it is the labour apart from that, the labour that offers either on construction work or any other kind of work apart from actual waterfront work. That is what is causing the trouble. That is what we think, and what I think, at least, is most undesirable.

Now, Sir, I am speaking simply because I desire each man to look back and appreciate the difficulties that we are up against in the City of St. John's. The Minister of Labour has informed us that somewhere between 2,500 and 3,000 men are unemployed in St. John's. I am certain I am safe in saying that the number of men stands somewhere around 2,600 to 2,700. That is a problem that no body of men can sit down to-day and properly handle and solve, and I would ask for the Members to be sympathetic in their consideration of the city labourers' case, because only in justice and fairness, let us consider that we have actually passed some \$150,000 here for the benefit of the outport labourers in their labour, fishing. We have sat here and seen that vote passed, and we feel personally, and I am sure all the other city representatives will feel the same thought, that it was only right that these men should be put in the way of maintaining their independence, or if they have lost it, of getting it back in fishing. There has been no talk about it. If the outport men are satisfied and all the city representatives are satisfied, I am perfectly satisfied. But when we come to the labour of St. John's, what have we done since opening? Are we doing anything about it? Now, just at the eve of closing we are going to outfit every man for fishing. What have we done about city labour? I say we are trying to attempt now to provide for the city labour, and we want to stop the flowing in of fishermen to overcrowd an already glutted labour market in St. John's.

I might inform the last speaker that I am not quite sure about the fee; it had been raised to \$25; they now charge \$20.

Another point I would like the Members to take into consideration is the fact that there has been no per capita grant now, so far as the City of St. John's unemployed is concerned. If we were in a position to get any kind of assistance, we could ease the burden of the city unemployed considerably, and as an instance of that I might point out that last year we got a per capita grant as far as St. John's East was concerned. It came to \$18,000. That is what it is and will be for some time, on the basis of 50 cents per head, but, Sir, if [we] had even that small grant in the City of St. John's and from [the] \$19,500 which St. John's West is, we could go a long way towards relieving the bad condition of the unemployed for at least three months. And it was done simply because we had the close cooperation of the Council and in 1928, as the Prime Minister will know and well knows, with the cooperation of the Council, we were able to employ 115 family men in St. John's East apart from the large number employed in St. John's West for twelve weeks at the rate of 25 cents an hour, so that the Council spent their money practically on a 50/50 basis, although it did not come to that. The Council were willing to have water and sewerage laid all through the new annex behind the City. We put our funds with the City Council, so between the Council and the representatives we have [the] City sewered completely. There is but a small section to join up to the main, when we will have the population in the City all connected with water and sewerage. Unfortunately, in the year before last our grant stopped, and we were unable to carry on and, incidentally, we had to leave men on the dole and could not give them work.

I will say this, Sir, that I have no reason to fear the Council will take any unfair advantage, but at the same time I do not object, as the Hon. Secretary of State pointed out, that we should in some way probably put an amendment into Section 13 to see that no injustice would be done by any future municipal council.

There is no doubt about it that the Local Government Bill, when the time comes that other councils will be established throughout the country, they in turn will be able to deal with matters just as we in this city are trying to deal with matters to solve a situation. That is, the number of unemployed City residents who cannot obtain employment and whose conditions presents a problem, as I said, that no group of men at present would, in my opinion, adequately handle without a very large employment scheme. I have agreed, Sir, that I have no objection for my part, and as one who will vote on this Bill, in agreeing to any reasonable amendment as outlined by the previous speaker.

Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines: I can well sympathize with the Member for St. John's East in regard to the conditions that exist throughout the city so far as unemployment is concerned, but I am very doubtful if Section 13 of this Act is going to accomplish anything that will relieve the burden. That is my honest, candid opinion. Supplying the men is going to be the only remedy that is going to increase employment, and alleviate the troubles that we have. By the passage of Section 13 of this Act, it will not employ one individual man of St. John's East or West. The only thing that would be accomplished is that as between the men throughout the various settlements outside St. John's, would be that war is declared. I agree with the Secretary of State that no such attempt should be made by the Council to pass the buck. They have an obligation to the city and to the men who put them in office. Let them themselves discharge their obligation, and not come into this House and ask men who represent outport districts to subscribe towards this class of legislation. So far as I am

concerned I want to hold against the whole section, but as a compromise if we cut out (*reads*), by cutting out that part of the section we would not be broadcasting that no outport man, no man living outside St. John's would be looking for work. If we had an industry in Marystown or any other part of the country, would it be fair for me to come in here and ask for legislation barring the men from St. John's? Supply the men until the economic situation rights itself and when employment can be found for the people. Until that situation changes we are only wasting time. We won't increase employment by one individual hour's work for a man. I think it is a pity that the legislation is brought in at all. Up to now there has been a very fine feeling existing between the people of St. John's and the people of the outports.

Mr. Earle: I rise to say a few words in opposition to Clause 13. I did not get the Bill until this morning, and I thought at first it would confine itself to municipal work. I find now that it includes all work in the City, [and] to that I am opposed.

I take exception to the Prime Minister's statement with regard to the outport fishermen not contributing to the upkeep of the city, because indirectly this City is very largely kept up by the outport earnings. Now, take for instance, we might say, that a St. John's fish merchant derives his revenue to a great extent from the outport fishermen and the outport people's earnings. If those men, all employed equally, derive their living from the outport man's earnings, if those people wish to build a house, under this section not one of those fishermen who have contributed, and indirectly been the means of that house being able to be built, are able to drive a nail. I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that Section 13 is fair. We might argue in the outports in the same way. There is unemployment there. We might argue, why don't you pass a Bill prohibiting the fish caught in the outports being packed in St. John's? The fisheries certainly directly benefit Newfoundland, and not only the fishery, but take the factory, all the labour given here and the construction work given through the means of the factory, have been largely kept up by the spending and earning of the outport people. I don't think it fair that Section 13 as it stands now, be allowed to go through. I stand on this floor to oppose it.

Mr. Gray: I am of the same opinion as Mr. Earle. I don't believe in legislation of this kind, as had been said, because of the feeling at the present time when we desire harmony throughout the country. We want to work together to build up, we don't want to destroy and pull down. Our prosperity depends upon the goodwill and cooperation of everybody. I am in sincere sympathy with every effort being made to improve conditions in this City, but the passing of this Section 13 will not improve the situation, and I am willing to make a compromise on the Bill and I think that the suggestion of the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines solves the difficulty.

As regards taxpayers, it must be remembered that the wealth of the country is produced outside St. John's. It is a well-known truism that the consumer pays for all. Well then, the outport people, being the largest in number and who have to come to the City to buy their goods, are the largest consumers and consequently are the largest taxpayers. We are all together, so to speak. The City and outports are interdependent on each other, and one cannot exist without the other. Therefore, I do not think it is good policy to have this section in the Bill shutting out outport people from working in the city. Furthermore, it will not give one hour's extra labour to the people in the

City, but rather will create a bad and unsatisfactory feeling. I am not in favour of the Section in the Bill as it stands now, as I think there should be free competition so far as the general work of the City is concerned.

Mr. Moore: Mr. Chairman, I think both sections should be cut out. We have no right to pass such legislation at all. You might just as well contend that the people in Halifax should refuse to permit men from Ontario to go to work there. I maintain we are all as one in this country, and we should endeavor to live as one, and allow a man to go in any part of the country he likes to get a job. I am afraid this sort of thing is going to stir up a very bad and bitter feeling between the outports and St. John's people. It is improper legislation, and I am not so sure if there is not something else behind all this. The City Council should be able to do their own work and look after their own affairs. Perhaps this is the thin end of the wedge, however, so that by and by we may find a barrier across the Narrows preventing outport people from coming here.

Mr. Halley: Mr. Chairman, this House has already heard my views on this matter. I ask any Hon. Member of this House to put himself in my position as a representative of the District of St. John's West, and stand by and see 2,000 to 2,500 men idle and on relief, and see from 80 to 100 every day, and meet them personally every day; to see that number coming and asking for work, and then to see in a little section of the West End construction work going on, and to see from fifteen to twenty men brought in from the country and working there. That's a concrete case. I know of four like cases last year. I know of one particular case where there were fifteen or twenty men employed who were from the outports. I gave from 50 to 100 men letters asking that they be put on the job, and they were turned down because fifteen men from Spaniard's Bay were working at low wages on the job. They were shacking themselves there and could easily afford to undersell the labour in the market, and the employer is taking advantage of it. Just put yourselves in that position. Day by day to see men trooping into you, and then to think that when a little job is going to those who are honestly entitled to it, [they] cannot get a job because of this, what I would term scab labour.

There is no question of the outports and St. John's at all. It is not that I love the outports less, but that I love St. John's more. I can see the hardship that the men of St. John's are undergoing to-day; they are undergoing terrible hardship to-day. I am a representative of this City, and I have been for the past twelve or fourteen months, and I haven't done one thing to justify my existence, and the Government haven't done one thing to justify their existence in connection with unemployment in the City. As the Hon. Member for the East End said, we have voted \$150,000 for the fisheries. Here in the City we have thousands of men unemployed through no fault of their own, men who have to go down to get that cursed dole; and 80 or 90 per cent of them don't want dole, they want work and they can't get it. It is all very well for us to sit around the council board having had a good dinner or a good supper, and smoke a fat cigar or a pipe, and then forget about [it] and not do anything to help out our districts.

I appeal that the men of this City have the preference in any work that is started in the City, and I am not fighting about it. I don't want to create a feeling about the outports and St. John's at all, but I do think that some legislation ought to be brought in whereby we of the City should be given some protection against this scab labour which is being brought into the city. I will take up again the

matter of Signal Hill. I know the Minister of Posts is not responsible for it. But it is not right to have those men up there shacking themselves and we of the city going around idle. It is a serious problem, and I think this particular section here gives us a fair chance of doing something in connection with it.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Can't you put a limit on the power to tax? Personally, I have no interest in the Bill because it doesn't affect my District.

Mr. Halley: I am open to any suggestion, but I plead that we of the City do have some protection. The state of affairs that exists to-day is grossly unjust. I suggest that some particular section be put there to cover the exodus into the city of these people from their homes, to take jobs away from the men of the City who are only too willing to work night and day to earn enough to clothe and feed themselves, and their little children.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I suggest that you delete that portion of the section which is regarded as offensive to some of the Honourable Members, and use the phrase "any person not being a taxpayer of St. John's." That will cover anybody who may be working in the City of St. John's and not paying taxes.

Hon. Minister of Justice: If he is living in a rented house, he is not a taxpayer.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: But he is unquestionably paying taxes. Suppose an outport man comes in here and rents a house, he is a taxpayer.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Would he be a taxpayer within the definition?

Hon. the Speaker: He would not be a direct taxpayer, but he is a taxpayer just the same.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: The idea is that a non-taxpayer working on buildings within the limits of St. John's shall pay a tax to the Council. They must contribute something to the City.

Mr. Gray: This question often comes up all over the country. But when they have sufficient for the work in Corner Brook or Grand Falls, they issue orders saying that there are no more men required. Shouldn't the St. John's Council give notice when they have more men on their hands than there is work for them to do?

Hon. Minister of Justice: Are the employers in the City bringing in outport men and paying them a low wage, and they are shacking themselves all over town to the exclusion of the only people paying taxes?

Mr. Gray: I consider that the Council should have power to tax those people.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: If he is not a taxpayer already, let him pay his taxes.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Surely then my suggestion should meet the requirements (*reads*).

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: Either put through the section as it reads, or cut it out all together.

Hon. Mr. Winter: I don't think the section is capable of amendment. I am entirely in sympathy with Mr. Halley's views, but I don't think that this is the remedy. I can't see that a particular locality has anything to do with it. I think this section, even if it is amended, will still have the same principle in it. Then other places are going to do exactly the same thing. It is not going to start any employment and as the Hon. Secretary of State says, the repercussions are going to hit St. John's more than anywhere else.

The same thing is going to happen at Corner Brook, and I don't say but that the people should not retaliate. The thing that has been lost sight of is that we are applying the criterion of [the] desperate times that prevail in our country to-day. If a man pays rent he has a thousand advantages that an outport man has not, and the logic of it is, that is why he does the work cheaper. I don't think it is possible in any way to amend this Act without keeping that principle in it. I think such a section is vicious, and I think that it is better for the Council to carry on as they have been doing, and let them try and regulate their affairs without asking us to endorse a policy which is contrary to the feelings of a great many people throughout the country.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: I agree with the previous speaker. I cannot see how Section 13 can be amended without a great deal of further discussion. The only way to get rid of the section is to put it to a vote, and then let us see what we are going to do.¹⁴⁸

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the said Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Acts Relating to the Municipal Council 1921-31" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a Message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries it was ordered that the Bill entitled

¹⁴⁸ Section 13 was defeated.

"An Act to Amend 15, George V., Chapter 15, entitled 'Game and Inland Fisheries Act, 1924'" be withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: Mr. Speaker, as the time is very short and we should not have sufficient time to discuss this Bill, I move that it be stricken from the Order Paper.

Pursuant to Order, and on motion for the Second Reading of the Bill "An Act Relating to Insolvency," Hon. the Minister of Justice moved that a Select Committee be appointed from the House of Assembly to confer with a similar Committee from the Legislative Council to sit out of Session to consider the said Bill and report at the next Session of the Legislature, and that a Message to this effect be sent to the Legislative Council requesting their concurrence.

This motion being passed, the Speaker appointed the following Select Committee: Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Mitchell, Hon. Mr. H. A. Winter, Mr. Bradley and Mr. Earle to consider the said Bill, and to confer with a similar Committee from the Legislative Council to sit out of Session and report back at the next Session of the Legislature, and it was ordered that a Message to this effect be sent to the Legislative Council requesting their concurrence.

Hon. Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been under consideration for several months. Mr. Gushue was instructed by his Council to prepare a Bill, and the Bill which has been prepared makes several changes in the present law relating to insolvency, and the Government was of the opinion that this Bill was of such a character that with the time at our disposal it should not go through this session.

This Bill occupied several months in preparation. Copies were sent to the Judges and Registrar of the Supreme Court, and I asked several senior members of the profession to give it serious consideration. These men had considerable doubts as to whether it should pass, but I think that if the Bill had been printed earlier it would have passed. However, I find myself in [a] minority, and people who have had a great deal more experience in this matter, held views [that] insolvency should be in a large measure amended along the lines outlined in this Bill. There are two angles to be considered, first the creditor and second the debtor, and the subsidiary point, the question of procedure and consequently one of law. It seems to me that if a committee of this House were to sit on a Joint Committee with Members of the Upper House, then we might be in a position to deal with this matter next year. I hope Mr. Bradley will sit on that Committee if it is appointed. I therefore move that the motion for [a] second reading be amended and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting them that we have appointed members of this House to sit on a Joint Committee on this Bill out of session to report next year.

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 entitled 'An Act to Further Amend the Crown Lands Act 1930 (No.2 of 1933)'" with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The amendment is as follows:

Section 1, Line 2

After the word "from" insert the following words: "the date of the passing of this Act."

Strike out the words "time to time" in this line.

Line 4

After the word "timber" insert the words "for a period not exceeding four years."

Line 5

Strike out the words "and for such periods."

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: It is unfortunate that the Hon. Members of another Chamber are not able to see as we do in this matter. Four years is not sufficient to induce any group of men to undertake a worthwhile capital expenditure. They can't expect in four years to get 25 per cent capital expenditure each year. In Quebec there are hundreds of thousands of cords of raw wood exported every year, and the forests are not becoming depleted. Just as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines stated, the increment is 2 per cent per annum. The effect also remains that almost 2 per cent per year of any timber area dies of old age. It is standing, it falls down and there we are letting it die. It rots, deteriorates, and we are getting no return. We can't expect any company to make any worthwhile plans entailing any great expenditure – when I say great expenditure, I mean \$30,000 or \$40,000 to be particular – only for four years. As the Minister states, half a loaf is better than no bread. Perhaps next year we may induce the Upper House to take a more reasonable view, and they may permit the Bill to go through as we had intended, that is to say (*reads*).

So far as the Gander area is concerned, I understand the owners of the freehold and leasehold property are anxious to make a beginning as soon as a Gander proposition looms in sight. As I have already told the Leader of the Opposition – he rather scoffed at it – there is still a chance of the Gander proposition, and as soon as that looms we will stop the export of raw material.

It is criminal the way we are allowing people to cut on Crown lands. That has got to be stopped. It would be an eye-opener for our people if they could only see how they conduct lumbering and the cutting of timber in Denmark. They are not allowed to cut a tree even if they own it. Every tree is marked before cutting. In spite of the fact that they have been cutting in some of those forests for 500 or 600 years, they have more timber now than when they started. It is unfortunate that the Upper House can't see as we do. I think it would be as well to accept the small mercies that they extend to us, and perhaps next year we will get them in a better frame of mind.

The said amendments having been read a first and second time and concurred in, it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been concurred in without amendment.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: Before you go, there will be probably no opportunity of my drawing [this] to the attention of the House at 2:30. There is one matter I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Some time in the early stages of the Session there was a petition presented to this House by an organization interested in merchant shipping, and I understand that a number of conferences were held with the Minister, and I am informed that these

people were led to believe that there would be legislation introduced bringing into operation at least some of the suggestions which they made. I am informed, and the Prime Minister can correct me if the information is wrong, that at a conference with him he disagreed with the idea of giving free entry, I think it was of giving goods out of bond, that was it, to our local shipping, but suggested that he would be glad to give a bonus of 10 cents per quintal on all fish exported in local bottoms.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: I figured it out at ten.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I realize the introduction of that measure is impossible. What the reasons were behind the failure I don't know, but we have passed through this Legislature an Act called an "Amendment to the Audit Act," under which the Government, I think, will have powers to give [the] encouragement which he suggested to our merchant marine.

In the Oporto market they don't want steamer shipments at all, they don't want any shipment over 6,000 [quintals]. I do know of one instance in the city now, where a certain vessel can secure a cargo of 5,000 or 6,000. It is a notorious fact that the West Coast is shipping practically all its fish in local bottoms, and I suggest particularly to the Prime Minister and his Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as well as to the others of the executive government, the advisability of considering the matter at an early date, and at least using their powers under the Audit Act to give that necessary encouragement to our local bottoms, in order that we may get more men to work instead of having foreign shipping doing it.

There is one other matter to which I would like to refer, which occurred in my absence. The Member for Trinity South took occasion to rise to his feet to make a personal attack upon me. Just what actuated him, I don't know. So far as I am aware, I have said nothing to him to give him any cause to attack me. I certainly gave him no cause to lie about me as he did. He accused me of having got out of the government, during the past four years, \$40,000. This is utterly untrue. He is either ignorant, in which case he should not have made the statement, or he has deliberately misrepresented. I have not made any attack upon any Member of the House. I have avoided it. I have directed my attention wholly to assisting the House in passing legislation. It is no part of my programme to attack any Member, and certainly not to lie about him. I have earned my sessional pay in this House this Session, and if the amount of value given by the Member for Trinity South is represented by his contribution to debates in this House during the Session, I suggest that he has a lot of it yet to earn. The only two occasions on which he previously opened his lips during the Session was sitting in his seat to interject, to throw something in my teeth, but he has never contributed anything to the debates. He has never offered any suggestion good or bad, and yet he must take occasion in the dying hours of the Session, when apparently all was amity so far as the other Members were concerned, to make a personal attack upon me. If that is the specimen of [the] contribution to the public life of this country that he has to make, the sooner he gets out of public life, the better.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, it is hardly worth while wasting further time on this matter. What brought up the subject yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition knows very well. It was his personal and nasty attack of the evening before in a general way on the Government and on the Leader ...

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: I rise to a point of order. The Hon. Member is misrepresenting me. I made no attack on anyone in this House.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: Possibly I took it wrong. I was here listening to the debates, and when we are accused of more or less being responsible for the starvation of the hungry cases that you say, then I take exception to it. I spoke the truth so far as I am concerned. The records that I gave here yesterday are the truth and nothing but the truth, and if they are incorrect I shall apologize to the Leader of the Opposition. The figures that I have are those given me, and if you want them I can give them to you.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition: You got figures over six years, a good proportion of which are out of pocket expenses.

Hon. Mr. Mitchell: I was given these figures as correct. If they are not correct I shall apologize. There is the position so far as I am personally concerned. I have no desire to make a personal attack. I will say that if I have to sit here and listen and be talked to as a schoolboy, I am not satisfied to sit down and take what was given to us the night before. The rest of the party can do it, but I won't.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries: In reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I may say that the matter has been taken up with those interested in local shipping, and I know of two conferences myself that have been held. I took this matter up myself with Mr. Dunfield, the Deputy Minister of Justice, and he could not see eye to eye with the drafters of the resolutions, and so therefore nothing could be done. I took the matter up with the Minister of Justice, and he thought that such an important Bill was being brought in too late in the session, and he thought it better to draft some regulations in the near future, or take the matter up at the next session of the Legislature. It may be possible to do something this Summer. I would like to see our sailors employed. Merchants on the southwest coast who ship fish are clamouring for smaller shipments, they do not want shipments any larger than 5,000 quintals. We circularized every firm on the west coast for their views on shipping fish, and every one of them were in favour of the smaller shipments. I hope sincerely that it will not be long before our local shipping will begin to show a very substantial increase.

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: This is one matter in which I am very interested, as I would like very much to see our sailors back to work again. I have been discussing this matter for the past five years with Capt. Kean and he is of the opinion that free duty is all that they require. I explained that the Government is willing to grant a bonus on every quintal of fish exported in a local bottom, and we would base this bonus in such a way that we would lose nothing by granting it. We would be giving our men an earning power, and this would naturally increase their spending power, and it would mean more money for the Exchequer. I asked several merchants what they thought were the chances for getting our schooners back again sailing, of course under efficient masters so that we could get low insurance, and they thought that the biggest hindrance to-day is the want of money.

There has been a proposal to prohibit the shipping of fish to Oporto in steel bottoms, but I

don't know how this would fit in with the Merchant Shipping Act. If a British steamer came in here to take a load of fish, I do not see how we could refuse them. However, I put it up to the Justice [omission] about this matter before anything definite could be done, that there would not be time to do anything this year, but we have not forgotten it, we are working on it actively and we are hoping that next year will see a revival of our old merchant shipping. The west coast is waking up to the fact that although it costs more to ship their fish in sail, they get a better price for it. When you get a steamer to take 15,000 quintals, it takes her some ten weeks to load, and very often the sailing vessel with a smaller cargo is across before the steamer is cleared. However, we are working on this matter and if a bonus of 10 cents per quintal were acceptable, I don't see why we cannot do something right away.

Mr. Speaker announced at 1:30 of the clock that he would leave the Chair until 2:30 of the clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at three of the clock in the afternoon.

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 Acquisition by the Government of Certain Lands"; "An Act to Provide for the Guaranteeing of a Loan to the United Cold Storage Company, Limited"; "An Act for the Further Amendment of the Revenue Act, 1925"; "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances"; "An Act for the Consolidation and Amendment of the Acts Relating to a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland"; "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the Act 22, Geo. V. (Second Session), Chapter 41, entitled 'An Act to Provide for the Addition of a Temporary Surtax to Customs and Excise Duties and Import Taxes'"; "An Act Respecting an Amendment to the Act 20, Geo. V. Cap. 36, entitled 'An Act Respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes'"; and "An Act in Relation to a Shooting Range at St. John's" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act to Encourage and Assist the Construction and Operation of a Distillery at St. John's" with some amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly. The amendments are as follows:

Section 7, line 3:

After the word "Customs" insert the following words: "On or before the expiration of 90 days from the date of the passing of this Act."

Section 9, Line 4:

After the word "year" insert the following words: "or fail to deposit the said sum of \$25,000.00 as provided in Section 7 of the Bill"

Schedule, Part 2:

Strike out the word "bottle."

The said amendments having been read a first and second time and concurred in, it was ordered that a Message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been concurred in without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a Message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Act, 1921-31" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair until ten minutes to four of the clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

At four p.m. of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a Message from His Excellency the Governor commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:

May It Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly have voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

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

An Act respecting a Tax on Certain Incomes.

An Act Relating to Salt Codfish.

An Act Further to Amend the Crown Lands Act, 1930 (No. 2, 1933).

An Act to Grant Certain Advantage to North West Products Company, Limited.

An Act in Relation to a Shooting Range in St. John's.

An Act to Further Amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank."

An Act to Grant Certain Franchises and Privileges to the Clarenville Light and Power Company.

An Act to Amend the Act 20, George V., Chapter 9, entitled "An Act to Provide for the Creation of a Public Utilities Commission and for the Investigation of Prices and Rates Charged to the Public."

An Act Respecting Local Government.

An Act Further to Amend Chapter 105 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Lotteries."

An Act Respecting a Bonus Addition to Pensions under the War Pensions Act, 1922.

An Act to Amend the St. John's Municipal Acts 1921-31.

- An Act to Amend the Department of Public Works Act, 1932.*
- An Act to Consolidate and Amend the Acts Relating to Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland.*
- An Act to Amend the Act 15 George V., Chapter 29 (The Livestock Pedigree Act).*
- An Act to Amend the Act 59 Victoria, Chapter 39, entitled "An Act to Incorporate a Company under the Style and Title of the St. John's Gas Light Company."*
- An Act Relating to Alcoholic Liquors.*
- An Act Respecting Fishery Supplies for the Current Season.*
- An Act Relating to the Sale of Artificial Fertilizers.*
- An Act to Amend the Act 21 George V., Chapter 6, entitled "An Act in Relation to an Agreement with Great Lakes Newfoundland Atlantic Company, Limited."*
- An Act to Amend the Act 22, George V., Chapter 12 (The Health and Public Welfare Act 1931).*
- An Act to Modify the Conditions of the Holding of Certain Licences to Cut Timber by Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.*
- An Act for the Ratification of a Temporary Loan from the Royal Bank of Canada.*
- An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925.*
- An Act Further to Amend Chapter 125 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Trustees."*
- An Act to Provide for the Guaranteeing of a Loan to the United Cold Storage Company, Limited.*
- An Act Relating to the Culling of Codfish.*
- An Act to Render Certain Abandoned Lands Available for Agriculture.*
- An Act to Authorize the Issue to the Executors of William Ashbourne, Deceased, of a Licence to Cut Timber.*
- An Act to Assist and Encourage the Construction and Operation of a Distillery at St. John's.*
- An Act Respecting an Amendment to the Act 22, George V. (Second Session) Chapter 41, entitled "An Act to Provide for the Addition of a Temporary Surtax to Customs and Excise Duties and Import Taxes."*
- An Act Relating to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.*
- An Act Respecting an Amendment to "The War Pensions Act 1922."*
- An Act to Authorize the Issue to Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited of a License to Cut Timber.*
- An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances.*
- An Act Respecting the Acquisition by the Government of Certain Lands.*
- An Act (No. 2, 1933) to Further Amend "The Public Works Act, 1932."*
- An Act to Ratify Certain Temporary Loans Raised from the British Government.*
- An Act to Authorize the Issue of a Licence to Cut Timber to Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited.*
- An Act to Amend the Summary Jurisdiction Act 1930.*
- An Act to Amend and Consolidate the Law Respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.*
- An Act to Amend Chapter 23 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the*

Auditing of Public Accounts.”

An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years Ending, Respectively, the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Three and the Thirtieth Day of June One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty-Four, and for Other Purposes Relating to the Public Service.

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following Speech to both Branches of the Legislature:

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

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

I am glad to be able to relieve you of your duties after an extended Session. The time has now come when the general business of the Country claims your attention.

In this Session you have given consideration to a large number of Bills and your work has been marked by diligence, thoroughness and despatch. The measures which you have passed are important in their bearing upon the industries of the country, and I trust will prove to be of advantage.

The Bill relating to Salt Codfish creates a Board which the Government trusts will so organise this industry, particularly in relation to the export of Salt Codfish, that the results will be of benefit to the country and the trade. By the Act relating to the Culling of Codfish it is hoped to standardize the production of Salt Codfish, and we look to the cooperation of both fishermen and suppliers in the carrying out of its provisions. My Ministers realize that at the present time the fishing industry, which is the mainstay of the country, needs particular attention, and it is hoped that the operation of both Acts will help greatly in the re-establishment of this industry upon a sure and remunerative basis.

The legislation for the carrying out of the agreement made at Ottawa between Newfoundland and the Mother Country will make possible that cooperation with the Government of the United Kingdom that will tend to increase business in iron ore, cod liver oil, and other products of this country.

Because of economic conditions, my Ministers found it necessary to provide means whereby fishermen without supplies might be able to prosecute the Cod Fishery. The Act regarding fishery supplies seeks to establish machinery whereby the interest of the Government in connection with such industry shall be protected. It is hoped that the result of this outfitting will prove beneficial to all concerned.

The Local Government Act is an endeavour to create a community spirit in towns and settlements of this country. While you have safeguarded the position by the provisions of the Act, it is hoped that, in a few years, with the experience gained, the supervision of the Government can be safely withdrawn, and our people, with a sense of responsibility, take the conduct of their local affairs into their own keeping.

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

I thank you for the provision which you have made for the carrying on of the Public Services

of the Country and for the wisdom which you have shown in bringing into effect the retrenchment measures necessary because of economic conditions. In the absence of a report from the Royal Commission, my Ministers have adopted the Estimates as they stood after the various retrenchment measures had been put into operation. The Budget has been estimated upon the results of the past years of depression, and it is considered that the revenue, as set down, will be realized. It was thought wise to allow these Statements of Expenditure and Revenue to appear in this way, making no provision for estimated deficit pending the receipt of the report of the Royal Commission, which will set forth a constructive basis for the fiscal policy of the Dominion for the future. My Ministers will exercise the strictest control of expenditure of the moneys voted.

Mr. President and Honourable Members of the Legislative Council:

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

The Members of the Royal Commission have during the past three months been making research into the economic life of the country in all its aspects. Their investigations have included the taking of a mass of evidence from all classes in Newfoundland, which will require to be carefully examined. The members of the Commission have now adjourned for consideration of their report, and will reassemble in September next.

It gives me pleasure to record that the Government of the United Kingdom have made provision of an amount which will enable the Government of this Dominion to make payment in full of the interest on the Public Debt due at 30th June last. While making every endeavour under existing conditions to meet the obligations which fall upon us, it is with gratitude we acknowledge the solicitude and the financial assistance of the Mother Country.

The exchange for coal under the provisions of the Act passed last year has been proceeding with satisfactory results to both parties to the Agreement.

It is hoped that the prospecting which is now being carried on in Labrador may result in the finding of valuable minerals in paying quantities, so that the development of that territory may proceed with benefit to this Dominion.

I trust that in the coming months of this year we may find abundant success in all the avenues of industry in this land, and that Divine Providence may guide and prosper our people.

After which the Honourable President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency, said:

Gentlemen: It is His Excellency's Will and Pleasure that this General Assembly be prorogued until Saturday, the thirtieth day of August, ensuing, then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

H. Y. Mott,

Clerk of the House of Assembly.