PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE *of* ASSEMBLY

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

1927

ST. JOHN'S, N.F.
The Evening Telegram, Ltd.
1928

Proceedings of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION 1927

Begun and holden at St. John's in the said Island this eleventh day of May, Anno Domini, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Twenty-Seven, being in the Seventeenth year of the Reign of His Majesty, Our Sovereign Lord, George, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India.

WEDNESDAY, May 11th, 1927.

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

Messrs. W. McKay Chambers, Harris M. Mosdell, and William E. Brophy, Members newly elected and returned for the Districts of Burgeo & La Poile, Fortune Bay and Saint John's East, respectively, were introduced to Mr. Speaker, having first been duly sworn in in the Legislative Council Chamber by the Honourables Sir Patrick T. McGrath, Robert K. Bishop and J. Alexander Robinson, His Excellency's Commissioners duly appointed for that purpose, and having signed the Roll of this House.

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

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber; and, being returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that when in attendance upon His Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency had been pleased to make a gracious Speech to both Branches of the Legislature, a copy of which for greater accuracy he had obtained and then read to the House as follows:—

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of The Honourable House of Asesmbly:

Since you were last in Session the long existing dispute between the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland as to the boundary between respective territories of the two countries on the Labrador has been brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for adjudication, and has resulted in a judgment for this Colony. Newfoundland now has her right authoritatively recognized to the disputed territory of 110,000 square miles, rich in timber resources and

water powers with unexplored possibilities of mineral wealth. The country can now enter upon the unrestricted development of these assets and the confirmation of our title to this vast area cannot fail to materially improve the financial standing of the Colony and enhance our prestige at home and abroad.

The codfishing industry in 1926 suffered considerably through decreased prices prevailing in foreign markets. While the shore fishery was, in point of catch, well up to the average, the Labrador catch was unusually small.

The seal fishery, just concluded, has been above the average of recent years, but the lower values for oil have resulted in poor returns to those who undergo the hardships of this precarious work.

The development of the paper making industry shows a marked progress, and the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company has reached the large output capacity of four hundred and ten tons per day. The Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company has added another paper machine to its plant, reaching the satisfactory capacity of three hundred tons per day.

In the months of October and November the Prime Minister and his asosciates attended the Imperial Conference held in London, at which the status of component parts of the Empire was determined and other important matters of Imperial interest were discussed.

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

There will be a deficit on current account for the financial year 1926-27, owing, largely, to decreased importations and the reduced value of those imports of which cotton is a large constituent. While consumers, therefore, have been getting cheaper goods and paying small duties, the Consolidated Revenue Fund has suffered. The conditions referred to are largely transitory, and do not seem to call for immediate action. The Government considers it would be wiser to await the movements of trade in this Colony before suggesting any drastic remedial measure. Part of the deficit is attributable to the increased sum required to meet interest on the public debt, and another part to the loss incurred in operating the railway system. The latter deficit will be considerably less than in 1925-26.

With a view to avoiding a possible future deficit you will be asked to re-enact, in amended form, the Income Tax Act repealed in 1924.

Estimates for 1927-28 will be submitted to you in due course.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

In view of the difficulties that have since occurred in connection with the affairs of the British Empire Steel Corporation, it seems fortunate that the Government concluded an Agreement in January for the continuation of work at Bell Island during the current year, and providing for the employment of at least twelve hundred men per day to the end of November.

Several Bills for the promotion of important industrial developments will be placed before you. The first of these seeks the ratification of an agreement made between the Government and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, with respect to prospecting and mining operations and a proposed mining and ore treating industry in the Red Indian Lake district and for the admission free of duty into the Colony for the period of twenty years provided by the said contract of certain goods and articles therein specified for use in connection with the proposed industry.

A Bill will also have to be introduced in connection with the development of the Gander timber lands it

appears that the owners have recently entered into an agreement with a corporation in the United States of America, which contemplates the acquisition of the property by this corporation. The parties will need special legislation during the Session to implement this agreement.

My Ministers propose to submit for your consideration, a Bill providing that applicants for timber or water rights in Labrador should be required in every instance to present their application to the Legislature and that grants should not issue without the approval of the Legislature.

In leaving you to the discharge of your duties, I pray that your deliberations may be blessed by Divine guidance.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY

THE HONORABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—Since this House was last in session two gentlemen who were very closely identified with the Legislature for many years — two gentlemen who occupied the position of Prime Minister of this Colony—have passed to the Great Beyond.

Sir Michael Cashin died at his residence in St. John's just shortly after the session closed last year, and a couple of months ago the Right. Honorable Sir Robert Bond was also called to another world. Sir Michael was a man of big heart and generous spirit and one who always took a very deep and active interest in the welfare of this country. He was a man of ripe experience. For thirty years consecutively he represented the very important district of Ferryland and I think he almost holds a record in that respect; and I think that had Sir Michael Cashin lived for another twenty years he would have been elected for that district continuously by merely putting himself in nomination.

Sir Robert Bond was an outstanding statesman, who, we all know, will never be forgotten in this country. He was Prime Minister for nine years and was a man of rare gifts. His engaging personality, his gift of oratory and his very pleasing manner would have done grace to any Parliament in the world. I remember when Mr. Warren failed to form a Government some time ago that I was among those who very urgently sought Sir Robert Bond to come back into public life and take charge of a Party, but he was in failing health and found he could not undertake the important duties of public life again and so had to refuse. He showed his great public mind and great public spirit by the Will he left, in which he bequeathed to this country a Model Farm in the shape of his residence at Whitbourne where he had spent the declining years of his life and where he had devoted his entire life to the creation and improvement of that particular property. Correspondence which has passed between His Excellency the Governor and the Executor of Sir Robert Bond's Estate I propose to table in this House, and I propose to move the House into Committee of the Whole to discuss as to whether this bequest can be accepted or not by the country. We do not understand the value of this gift but it is left to the counttry in perpetuity, and before we can accept the gift an endowment fund is necessary in order to ensure perpetuity.

I just merely in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, move the following Resolutions:

WHEREAS since the last session of this House there have passed away the Right Honorable Sir Robert Bond, P.C., K.C.M.G., Ll.D., for many years a Member of this House and for nearly nine years Prime Minister; and Sir Michael Cashin, K.B.E., Ll.D., also a Member of this House for many years, and for a period Prime Minister.

BE IT RESOLVED, that this House places on record its sense of regret at the demise of these gentlemen,

and that a copy of this Resolution be sent to their families.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty this afternoon to second these Resolutions of regret in the passing of two great public men of this country in the persons of Sir Robert Bond and Sir Michael Cashin. They both filled the chair now occupied by the Prime Minister and they both occupied the chair now filled by myself. Sir Robert Bond was looked upon throughout the whole country as a great statesman. Sir Michael Cashin was also a great statesman and a good citizen. Scarcely a session of this House passes without the Prime Minister is called upon to move Resolutions of this nature, and in the present instance we all very much regret the passing of two great men. Sir Robert Bond lived a very quiet and retired life during his later years but he was respected by all who had known him. He did great work for the Colony in many conferences and he had the distinct honour of being appointed by Her Majesty's Government as a delegate in connection with a fishery conference in the United States many years ago. Sir Michael Cashin was a mercantile man and one who had made a success of his business. He also made a success in political life. He occupied the position of Minister of Finance and Customs for about ten years and during that period he had no deficits and when he vacated the department of Finance and Customs he left a surplus of four million dollars in the Bank of Montreal, which he had saved, and which was put by to offset any contingencies that might arise in connection with the future administration of the affairs of the Colony. Both Sir Robert Bond and Sir Michael Cashin will be sorely missed. I join with the Prime Minister in his expressions of sympathy and second the Resolution which has been moved by him.

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister, seconded by Mr. Hickman, the following Resolution was passed unanimously:

RESOLVED, whereas since the last session of this House there have passed away the Right Honourable Sir Robert Bond, P.C., K.C.M.G., Ll.D., for many years a Member of this House and for nearly nine years Prime Minister; and the Honourable Sir Michael Cashin, K.B.E., Ll.D., also a Member of this House for many years, and for a period Prime Minister.

BE IT RESOLVED, that this House places on record its sense of regret at the demise of these gentlemen, and that a copy of this Resolution be sent to their families.

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of proposing that a committee of this House be nominated to draft an address in reply to the gracious speech from the Throne which has just been read, but before offering a formal motion I should like to make some brief comments on the various items referred to in this speech. A few months ago the country hailed with universal delight our magnificent victory in the Labrador boundary dispute whereby as a result of the decision of the Privy Council the colony was confirmed in absolute possession of an immense territory comprising over 110,000 square miles. From all information to hand this great territory is rich in timber resources and water powers, with every hope also that proper survey, investigation and development will disclose great mineral wealth. In fact it was not until the Labrador boundary case had actually come to trial that most people in this country at least began to have an approximate idea of its immense potential value, this possibility being brought home to those directly interested in the case through being made

aware of the immense amount of money which had been expended by the Canadian government in exploring and surveying the Labrador territory. It would have been very easy you will agree with me, I am sure, for the Government to have made a false step in this matter and even, perhaps, to have concluded some bargain or arrangement with Canada which, having in mind the final result of the case, would have been a betrayal of the rights of Newfoundland and the selling of our birthright for a mess of pottage. It was indeed fortunate then to have in power men with full confidence in the justice of our cause and the validity of our claim backed by a firm determination to fight to the end for our full and complete rights. Great credit is undoubtedly due the government and in particular the Department of Justice for the prompt and businesslike manner in which this great and important case was handled and brought to a final conclusion, with a special meed of praise to the Minister of Justice, Hon. W. J. Higgins, K.C., who was in charge of the Colony's case whilst it was actually before the Privy Council. The Minister's reputation as an unusually powerful and successful advocate in the courts of Newfoundland has now been extended to higher plains and wider fields, and all patriotic Newfoundlanders may well tender to him their sincere congratulations. In connection with our success in this case also it would be unfair not to mention the great work of Sir Patrick T. McGrath, whose industry and expert information and advice were invaluable in the preparation of Newfoundland's case. That the acquisition of this immense and valuable territory has enhanced the credit of the colony and greatly improved conditions financially and otherwise is admitted by all, and by reason of our success the general outlook which might otherwise have seemed somewhat gloomy has been turned into one of great hope and promise.

The announcement in the Speech from the Throne that applicants for timber or water rights in Labrador shall obtain such grants only through the Legislature will, I am sure, be hailed with relief and satisfaction by all, and is one more piece of evidence that the Government is most vigilant in its guardianship of the rights of the people and is determined that during its regime there will in no case be permitted the shameless dissipation of public assets which formerly prevailed. Whatever benefits, financial and otherwise, result from the Labrador shall be for the people of Newfoundland and their descendants, the rightful owners, and not for individual speculators.

The poor returns from the codfishery last year was a cause of concern to all interested in the welfare of the colony. Whilst calling for the best thought and consideration of those directly interested in this industry and of the Government itself with a view of exploring all possible methods of improvement, the present state of affairs in the codfishery again emphasizes the necessity for and development of and encouragement of other wage-earning industries in Newfoundland. That both these phases of the question are engaging the active and earnest attention of the Government is a matter of record in the Speech from the Throne. According to the old saying troubles never come singly and it is particularly unfortunate that following the poor returns from the codfishery, the sealfishery also, though above the average of late years in numbers, should, owing to the low price of oil, have yielded poor returns to those engaged.

The Speech from the Throne refers to the great developments in recent years of the paper making industry, and naturally Newfoundland with her large untouched forests of timber has

benefited greatly by this development. On the West coast we now have, where was formerly the untrodden and virgin forests, the immense plant of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company and the thriving town of Corner Brook. Here thousands of Newfoundlanders have found remunerative work in the land of their birth, a great proportion of whom would otherwise in all probability have migrated to the United States.

Again it is worthy of note that the Anglo Newfoundland Development Co. after years of successful operation at Grand Falls has only lately increased its plant by the addition of another paper machine, thus showing that this Company has absolute confidence in the future of the paper making industry in Newfoundland. A further important development of this Company's business is also referred to in the Speech from the Throne when it is announced that this House will be asked to ratify an agreement between the Government and the company with respect to prospecting and mining operations and a proposed mining and ore treating industry in the Red Indian Lake District. This refers to what is popularly known as Buchan's Mine, at which several hundred men are already employed, and from all accounts this industry bids fair to be of great value and lasting benefit to the country. Aside from the number of our workmen which it will employ it is interesting and extremely gratifying to learn that under the original grant to the Company of the mineral rights of their properties a royalty of five per cent. on the nett profits of any such operation has to be paid directly to the Government. Developments such as this would seem to show the great benefit likely to result to Newfoundland from the introduction of foreign capital, more especially when such capital is in the hands of large and wealthy corporations of unimpeachable character and standing. It also must bring still more sharply to our attention the wonderful potential value of our great dependency of Labrador and the immense possibilities which the future may hold for us in connection therewith.

Still another important industrial development which the Government has pleasure in announcing, and in connection with which a bill will be brought before this House, is that of the Gander Timber Lands, which it is understood has been acquired by the International Paper Co. Ltd. of the United States. Here again there are wonderful possibilities of the development of an immense industry, larger in volume probably than that of Corner Brook, and providing that much to be desired employment for thousands of our people.

The proceedings of the Imperial Conference held in London during the months of October and November last were followed with great interest all over the British Empire, and perhaps nowhere with more attention than by the citizens of Britain's oldest colony. It was indeed a pleasure to note the able manner in which the reputation of Newfoundland was upheld by the Prime Minister and his Colleagues and how as a result particularly of the Premier's interviews and speeches the loyalty and devotion of this colony to the empire was fully brought home to the people of Great Britain and Ireland, as well as the visitors from overseas. At the same time every opportunity was taken advantage of by the Prime Minister and his associate delegates to place before the British public the advantages and attractions of Newfoundland, as a tourist and sporting resort, and also as a most promising field for the investment of British capital.

A not altogether pleasant announcement in the speech is that there will be a deficit on current account for the financial year 1926-1927. Under all the circumstances this is not alto-

gether unexpected to most people, and in view of the wild rumors that have been spread abroad from time to time, more especially during the recent political contest, when the moderate size of that deficit is announced most sensible people will be more relieved than otherwise. It is pointed out in the speech that it is not considered necessary to adopt any drastic remedial measures, showing, happily, that the Government believe that the unfortunate conditions which have brought about this result are only transitory and are bound to improve. It is further noted that this deficit is caused in part by the increased sum required to meet interest on the public debt and in part by the loss incurred in operating the railway system. Having at the end of its first year turned a deficit of about a million and a half dollars into surplus of several hundred thousand, and having had also a surplus to show at the end of its second year, the Government, to my mind, has now no need to be too apologetic for showing a deficit for its third year especially in view of all the surrounding circumstances. Compared with the record of its predecessors, who showed a deficit each year for four years, totalling in all nearly six million dollars, the record of the present Government seems very bright indeed. Taking prompt steps to avoid a possible future deficit the Government announces the reimposition, in amended form, of the Income Tax Act. Remembering the vociferous opposition to the repeal of this tax by some members on the opposite side of the House, and their references to it on political platforms, I presume I am entitled to assume that here at least we have one piece of Government legislation which will have the enthusiastic support of the opposition, whether of the first, second, or third section. Here at least they will have common ground for uniting together.

In the daily and financial papers of recent months you no doubt have read of the upsets and difficulties in the affairs of the British Empire Steel Corporation, and reading these accounts perhaps wondered what would be the result as far as our mining industry on Bell Island is concerned. It is most pleasing therefore to learn that under an agreement concluded by the Government with the Company in January last at least twelve hundred men per day will be employed on Bell Island till the end of November. Had the Government been less prompt and attentive to the interests of the miners on Bell Island it might well have meant a serious blow, if not absolute disaster, to the people of that settlement.

It was at the second session of this House, I remember, following the return of the Monroe Government to power, that I had the honour and privilege of proposing the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. On that occasion I also remember that at the conclusion of my remarks I voiced an appeal to all members in the House to forget party politics and personal grievances and to unite together in earnest and sincere endeavour to promote the general welfare and prosperity of the country. And it is with all sincerity and earnestness that I repeat the invitation today, but I must candidly admit, as a result of my past three years' experience, not with quite the same confidence as on the last occasion. It is an absolute fact that since its return to power the Monroe Government has made an earnest and determined effort to live up to its promises, to bring order out of chaos in the public departments, to prevent waste and scandal, to effect retrenchments wherever possible, and generally to conduct the affairs of Government in an honest, efficient, and economical manner. All its energies had at first to be directed towards a general

clean up of the terrible mess in which most of the public departments and the affairs of the country generally had been allowed to lapse, and following this it was able to devote its attention to considerable legislation of a remedial and beneficial nature. Contending against innumerable obstacles, including, I must point out, the indifference of the public and even the hostility of some sections thereof who were directly affected, it has steadfastly continued in the path of duty, sacrificing possibly its own political future and that of its individual members in the cause of good government. As a result of its efforts no longer is heard in the land, except from the lips of the most untrustworthy and irresponsible, the whispers of Government scandals which were altogether too frequent a few short years ago, for these are now things of the past. Though handicapped by the defection of five of its own members under circumstances which would seem to admit of no justification and which cannot be said to have brought any credit to the malcontents, it has refused to compromise with partisan and Tammany Hall political methods and has determined to stand or fall by the standard of open, honest and clean government.

And with that spirit the Government faces the coming session undauntedly, determined to carry out its programme to the very end, and with full confidence in what the final unprejudiced judgment of the great majority of the people will be. The people may be mislead temporarily—they may appear to be the natural victims and simple tools of the blatant demagogue, of the selfish agitator, of the purveyor of half truths and inuendoes, of the dishonest maker of ridiculous and extravagant promises impossible of fulfilment, of the smooth retailer of unfounded accusations and even deliberate mis-statement against political opponents, of the busy and unscrupulous spreader of unfounded rumours, of the practical exponents of the theory that every man has his price ranging from a dollar or a bottle of rum upwards. But this is only for a time and does not last. Their victory if it comes at all is a false one and only temporary, and like the melodrama on the stage, everything comes right in the end. True friends are once again recognized and appreciated, and those by whom the people have ben deluded and deceived are rejected with scorn and contempt. That honesty is the best policy must be as true in political as it is in private and business life. Newfoundland has many serious problems to face, demanding the very best care and attention of those in charge of Government, who need above all things to be statesmen of broad vision and incorruptible honesty. Heaven defend us, I say, from the man who is prepared to sacrifice his country to see her progress and the prosperity and happiness of her people retarded for years, perhaps for ever, in order to purchase his own political advancement or gratify his personal hatred and spleen. The public, of course, has its own responsibility to the fullest extent. The people must see and realize that such men are false prophets and not their true leaders, that they will lead them not into the land of promise, but rather into the land of disappointment, and disillusion and despair. The people must see to it that such men are relegated to political obscurity and that only those are retained in power who have demonstrated in a practical manner their absolute sincerity of purpose, honesty of conduct, and unselfish devotion to the true interests of the country that gave them birth. That such may be the happy state of affairs which the future holds for Newfoundland must be the ardent wish and prayer of every true patriot and lover of his country.

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker in rising

to second the motion before the House I do so reluctantly, because I feel that there are other members who would better grace the occasion than my humble self, being, as I am, one of the silent knights of the House, or one who has only been conspicuous in the Assembly because of my silence.

However, though being silent I offer no apology, because while not being heard I have been working quietly and constantly for the District which I have the honour to represent, and whatever the District may think of me or the Government or its policy, I can go back to them with assurance that I have done all that was honorable to do.

It affords me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to offer my sincerest congratulations to the Hon. Proposer of the Motion for the able and extensive manner in which he has dealt with various matters which the Speech contains; not alone do I congratulate him but I offer him my sincere thanks because he has so intelligently covered the whole programme that it has lifted a weight from my shoulders in not expecting much from me. In a word, the learned and Hon. gentleman has in his address not alone covered what was expected of him but has done it in such a manner that there is but little left for me to say.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are a few points that, with your kind indulgence, I would wish to briefly refer to and in so doing I must humbly pray for your kind consideration because of the fact, that I have had but a few short hours' notice to prepare for this occasion; therefore, I feel that you will not expect of me as much as might be expected had I had more time at my disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my learned friend, the Proposer, in offering to those who are responsible for the decision which has come to us by the award and the settling of the long and historical dispute of the "Labrador Boundary." I fully concur with the Hon. member in all that he has said regarding it. I know personally that when this Government came into being, that one of its first decisions was to tackle the Labrador Boundary dispute. It was definitely decided to settle it for once and all, regardless of what the outcome would be. We were guaranteed by the Minister of Justice that during his term of office this question would be finally disposed of whether for good or ill. This question has been one of many years standing. It has been one that has had the attention of the most noted "legal lights," not alone of this country but also Canada and England. Each and every gentleman who assisted in bringing this problem to such a successful issue might well feel proud of themselves and the country generally should well feel proud of them, and those who are not conversant with this historic legal battle need not go further than read the Canadian papers and reports of the Quebec Assembly to realize what a grave loss the Labrador territory has been to Canada, and being of grave importance to Canada it must naturally be of greater importance to us.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the public fully realize what has been done by this Government, for if they did I am sure that they would be louder in their rejoicing. I feel that the Minister of Justice, Hon. W. J. Higgins, who steered the case through its last lap should feel justly proud of his accomplishment, and, even if the public do seem ungrateful, he has in himself justified the trust that has been placed in him.

It's regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that the reference made in the Speech from the Throne with regard to fisheries is not of a more encouraging and cheerful nature. Poor fisheries and poor prices have been our fate periodically in years gone by and will happen

again in years to come. Most every citizen is to-day looking with asking eyes as to what is going to happen our staple product, namely our cod-fish. I do not propose to dwell on the subject because I feel that I am not an authority on it, but it is quite plain to all of us that we can no longer depend on our fisheries for a livelihood for all our people, whilst I feel that conditions as they happened in recent years have had a tendncy to discourage our people in pursuing the fishery; yet, I contend that the fact of our fishery being discarded does not altogether lie with poor prices or bad fisheries. Practically speaking, I might say that even a major portion of our successful fishermen who have reared families, or are rearing them, do not encourage them to take up and follow along the lines that they pursued. They prefer to see them enter into channels less arduous. One branch of the fishery that I am directly interested in, and one in which I have had quite a deal of experience, is the Herring fishery. To the Marine & Fisheries Department, because of bringing the herring pack to such an excellent standard as we find it to-day, much credit is due. We are putting on the market a herring packed by the Scotch style that is second to none in the world. It has gained a foremost place on the American and Canadian markets, that we may well feel proud of. In connection with this particular style of cure, there is one very severe drawback and that is, the duty we are forced to pay on every pound of herring entering the States. This duty was put on our fish by the introduction of the Fordney Tariff Bill. It is not my intention to enter into any long discussion of this Bill, but I would take this opportunity of asking the House to give this matter its most serious consideration. I merely mention it with the hope that this matter may again be taken up and some means devised whereby arrangements might be made with the American Government for the reconsideration of this barrier to our fisheries. To-day, Mr. Speaker, for every barrel of herring that enters the States we are forced to pay one cent per pound on the gross weight. It is needless for me to remind you of what it means to the shippers of herring.

Since it is quite clear, as I have already stated that some other means must be opened up in order to give employment it is most gratifying to note the reference that has been made to new industries which are being brought into the country. The Buchans Mine is one that is looked upon as one of the most hopeful and most encouraging ventures of its kind in the history of the country. Much greater is the assurance that it is going to be successful is because of the people who are identified in its working as it is generally known that the A. N. D. Co. and the American Smelters are associated in the working of this mine, and as we know well and have absolute faith in the A. N. D. Co. we also know that though the American Smelters are here for the first time, yet their reputation is world-wide and being, as it is, the largest concern of its kind, we surely bid the corporation a hearty welcome to our shores and wish that all the undertakings may be crowned with success. Their success is success for us. The initial work of making a beginning for the opening of this great development has already begun on the first steps that are being taken in the building of a railroad some twenty-two miles long. Already work has begun at the new townsite and permanent houses of modern type, and other necessary structures, are about to be erected. Serious consideration is being given to the erection of a large smelting plant which means if it comes that every possible bit of work connected with it, from the

mining to the finished product, is to be done in this country. Newfoundlanders get the benefit of it all. I do not speak authoritatively, but I have the information from reliable sources, that before any actual returns can be had by the development of Buchans Mine an outlay of some millions of dollars will have taken place.

It is not very pleasant for the government or any other government to come into this House and announce to the country that it is to be faced with a deficit. My Honorable friend the mover of the motion has dealt fully with this, but from the present outlook for our railway which has shown such an enormous deficit this year and years passed it looks as if it will during the coming year have a decidedly different and decidedly brighter story to tell, that the whole machinery of the railway will be working to its fullest capacity during the next five or six months is a certainty. The A. N. D. Co. alone not counting on or taking into consideration its regular work have engaged three thousand cars.

By special efforts of the travelling agent of the railway (Mr. Mosdell) who has personally canvassed all the leading importers and by re-arrangement of freight rates induced them to patronize our own means of transport, as a result to-day a fairly large quantity of freight is being daily carried by the Caribou which has been plying back and forth the Gulf the past year practically empty.

The Gander proposition tends to be of great assistance in the future development of the country in the manner of giving employment to many men and of helping to bring prosperity. The outlook for the West Coast is much brighter because of the activity in connection with the St. George's Coal Fields. Mr. Freeman who has been in charge of the work on behalf of the company in conjunction with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines have been instrumental in having boring operations started and the results are of such a nature that they are most gratifying not alone to the Minister and Mr. Freeman and those asociated with him but also to the whole country. Mr. Freeman by the assistance given him by this Government after many years of hard and constant work has proven to the country and the world at large that large deposits of coal are laying awaiting development on the West Coast. It is proof positive we have coal of great commercial value. It is now a question as to what we are to do with it.

Owing to the heavy rains and the absence of frost during the month of January, which made it difficult to move heavy machinery across swollen rivers and very rough ground, drilling operations on the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., were not started until late in February. However, we are in a position to announce that, in addition to the estimate made by the late James P. Howley, Esq., F.G.S., two new seams of coal have been located; one at a depth of 244 feet, containing about 5 feet of coal, and another at a depth of 660 feet, containing 3 feet of coal. These new finds, when calculated on the basis of 1,500 tons to the acre-foot, will add 7,680,000 tons per mile to the property, that is, for every mile that may be found to underlie.

The late James P. Howley's estimate which was made from surface measurements of the seams of coal in sight on this property, were about 25,000,000 to 26,000,000 tons of coal to the square mile. Judging from the exploration work carried out by the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., and taking into consideration the new discoveries, it is evident, the area contains about 30,000,000 to 35,000,000 tons of coal to the square mile.

The first hole put down was on a site prospected some years ago by the

late James P. Howley, and at a depth of 244 feet a seam of coal about 5 feet in width was located. In the second hole, which is now at a depth of 850 feet, a 3 foot seam at a depth of 660 feet was located. Meantime, the drill passed through several other seams at various depths, one seam, evidently the Jukes being cut at a depth of 141 feet, containing 9 feet, 2 inches of coal, thus assuring, at the angle at which it was cut, 6 feet to 7 feet seam of coal.

We are also in a position to state that engineers from Mining Companies of international repute will investigate, with a view to working the property on an extensive scale, as soon as the drilling operations are completed.

During last week I had the pleasure of visiting the Codroy Valley. There I found most active preparations being made by the farmers for the coming season. One of the best signs of the times in that locality was to see the numberless different farming implements that were daily been put off at the stations along the farming sections. Through the efforts of the agricultural department connections have been established all over the island and particularly so on the S. W. Coast, where formerly practically every pound of produce was imported from P. E. I. or some part of Nova Scotia. The farmers have had one of the greatest aids handed them when this government gave them a flat rate along the railway and its coastal service which has made it possible to compete with the imported article and to reach every householder's door with a local article at a reasonable price. The farmers of the West coast ask from this Government just one more request: they have the land, they are farmers, they are prepared to work, they do not ask for one dollar for their own personal benefit. They ask but one thing, that is that immediate attention be paid to their road and at least made passable whereby they market their produce and haul their fertilizer to their lands. On the whole though things may not look too bright, yet I feel that with all the new developments that are within our reach a new era for the country can be confidently loked for, an era which I most humbly pray and trust will soon be with us.

I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion before the House.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I shall make a few remarks regarding the Speech from the Throne, but I shall be brief. This is not the usual Speech from the Throne that the Monroe administration has presented to us since they came into power; it is usually more elaborate and longer—in fact I remember once making the remark that the Speech from the Throne contained nearly everything. If this document had a black border I would say it was the Government's obituary notice.

I must congratulate the mover of the Address in Reply, the junior member for Harbor Main, and I must congratulate him for his openness and frankness. He told us that the Government had "cleaned up," and also that there will be a "modest deficit," which is proof of what he has said. I also congratulate the seconder of the Address, who has indeed made a noble effort—they are both young men, and no doubt have a political future before them. I wish also to congratulate the members who have been elected into this Chamber since we last met—Mr. Chambers, who has been re-elected for Burgeo and La Poile; Dr. Mosdell, who carried Fortune Bay against great odds. The district of Fortune was previously represented by an Independent Member who was returned by a large majority, and who by accepting a position on the Bench

was practically purchased by the Government.

MR. SPEAKER—I cannot permit the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition to make a statement of that character, nor can I allow it to pass unchallenged or unreproved. Such a comment is manifestly incorrect, and is entirely out of order, patricularly in view of the fact that it is a most derogatory and unwarranted reference to one who occupies the eminent position of a Judge of the Supreme Court of this Colony.

MR. HICKMAN—I must accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I must say that the member accepted a position from the Government.

MR. SPEAKER—I must ask the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition to refrain from pursuing that subject further.

MR. HICKMAN—I must accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. However the seat was contested and Dr. Mosdell was successful. I congratulate Mr. Brophy on the wonderful election he had in St. John's East. St. John's East is a district which under constitutional rights should have been opened long ago. It should have been opened when Mr. Vinicombe resigned to go into the Liquor Control Board. The district, which was won in 1924 by the Government by a large majority, has now given a seat to the Liberal Candidate, which shows the feeling of the people towards the Government.

Now Mr. Speaker, this Session is opening on May 11th, and it should have been opened and closed long ago. One of the promises made by the Prime Minister was that he would have early sessions, and I suppose this is the latest session under similar circumstances ever. Now we are here, and we are told by the Speech from the Throne that the country faces a deficit, and we are also told that this administration is about to inaugurate measures for development of the country's resources. I am here to support, and I think I can safely say that the members on this side are of the same mind, any measures for the country's good, and they will have the support of this side if they are such. I do not pledge my support to anything that is not in the interests of the people of this country, or anything that enables speculators to make money out of our people—any good legislation we welcome. It seems strange, Mr. Speaker, that a Tory Government should introduce developments, because I think if we look at past Legislatures we will find that no such legislation has been introduced by Tory Governments. The Anglo Nfld. Development Co. came in under Sir Robert Bond, and the Humber was effected by a Liberal administration; in 1923 legislation for the establishment of the enterprise at the Gander was introduced—and so I forecast that when it is put through it will be by a Liberal administration. We are told in the Speech from the Throne that we have a deficit—the member for Harbor Main calls it a "modest" deficit. I haven't any idea what he means by "modest," but we shall see later on. My opinion is that this is not the only year in which there has been a deficit, and that there was one in 1924-25 as well as 26-27. The Minister of Finance and Customs in his Budget Speech of last session told us the following. This is what is contained in his speech. He also stated:

(Reads)

And now we find in the Speech from the Throne there is not a surplus, but what the member for Hr. Main calls a "modest" deficit. Now I don't know whether the Minister of Finance was in earnest last session, and believed what he told us, or whether he was deceiving the House. There was no surplus last year as stated—in fact there was a deficit, which we shall soon discover. Now

this "modest deficit" will, I understand, prove to be a substantial sum, probably going into millions of dollars—if that is so the present Minister of Finance will have the honour of bringing down the largest deficit since the days of Responsible Government.

I think it is time now for the Prime Minister to give us plain speech, and to tell us exactly where we stand, and to put his cards on the table.

The Prime Minister will no doubt follow me when I have finished and we will appreciate very much a frank and open statement as to what are the financial conditions of the country at the present time, and how he purposes getting over the Governmental difficulties. I notice from the Speech from the Throne that he purposes putting on the income tax again, and reference has been made by the Member for Harbor Main that it is likely to have the full support of the Opposition. As far as I know it will have the full support of the Opposition if the Income tax bill is properly worded, whereby it will cover all those who are well able to pay income tax. We are prepared if the Government need our help to go into it with the Prime Minister and see that a bill will be brought in that will be in the best interests of all concerned.

I trust that the Government will carry out everything that they have forecasted in the Speech from the Throne. The Mover of the Address in Reply elaborates on the fact that the Government has saved the situation in Belle Isle by making an agreement with the Dominion Iron and Steel Company to carry on the work. The fact of the matter is that this agreement expires in December and must be renewed again in January, and so this Government has only done what every Government has done in the past. I cannot see where the credit comes to the Government for that. There was nothing for the Government to do if they wanted to keep the people working on Belle Isle.

I find in the beginning of this Speech from the Throne that reference was made to the dispute between the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland on the Boundary question. We now know that the decision has been given in favour of this country. I may say however that this savours of credit to the Government, but there is not much credit due to the present Government for the settling of this question, that has been so long in dispute. An agreement was made in 1920, and signed by the Attorney General of Canada, and of Newfoundland, to have this matter placed before the Privy Council, long before this Government came into power.

(Reads)

The question of status has always been the same. We have only put into writing the practice and principle that has been in force in Newfoundland for years. Newfoundland with its 250,000 people is not supposed to have as much influence as Canada for instance with its nine millions. I notice in the Speech from the Throne that a bill is to be brought in in connection with the Water Rights on Labrador.

I agree with that part of the Speech. I think that what we have gained on Labrador we should hold in the interests of the country, and not allow it to be made the territory for speculators that might come in here and take what we have without giving us adequate returns.

We will have an opportunity later in the discussion of the Speech from the Throne, to make any remarks that we think fit, but we would like now to have a frank expression of opinion from the Prime Minister, as to whether in view of the result of the Bye-Election in St. John's East, it is his intention to carry on the Government or to have an election in the Fall, so that the people may have

an opportunity of electing proper representatives to this House of Assembly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is never expected to throw out bouquets to the compiler of the Speech from the Throne. I remember on one occasion, he said the speech was celebrated for what it did not contain, the second season that I had occasion to sit in this House, the Leader of the Opposition told us that it contained everything except a reference to the eclipse of the sun. To-day he tells us that it is not elaborate enough. I am not surprised to find that the Leader of the Opposition is not particularly pleased with the Speech from the Throne. I don't suppose there ever was a Leader of the Opposition in this country or anywhere else who rose to congratulate the Government on the Speech from the Throne. He has to do his part in that connection.

I want to join with the Leader of the Opposition in congratulating the new members of the House of Assembly. I want to congraulate Mr. Chambers on his victory by a large majority, in the bye-election in his district. I want to congratulate Dr. Mosdell on his victory in Fortune, and Mr. Brophy on his return in St. John's East. I hope that everyone of them will make good use of his seat in this House of Assembly, and that they will devote their entire energy to the interests of the country, and if they do that they will be doing a great deal of good for the Colony.

Mr. Hickman has said that the Opposition is prepared to support wise legislation. We don't propose to bring in or have we ever brought in, in my experience, anything but what we believed to be wise legislation, and we don't propose to bring it in in the future. But the legislation that we are bringing in in connection with these industries, is we think quite worthy of the consideration of the House.

The income Tax has been referred to this afternoon. It is not, as I said when I made the motion in this House to abolish it, a fair tax in this country. And so I still believe. There are numbers of people in this country who have not paid their taxes, and it is a very difficult thing indeed to collect taxes in this country with the same thoroughness, as they are collected in countries where there are a greater number of people and consequently better organisation for the collection of taxes. The tax is also an unjust one as the trade of the country is very hazardous, and sometimes a man who is in the way of doing a large business, makes big profits one year, and the next year perhaps he loses as much again. We have been giving consideration, in putting that Bill back on the Statute Book, as to whether we could make it effective over an average period of three years. But it will be difficult to arrive at any plan in that respect, that could be work satisfactorily.

The Leader of the Opposition has said that we have made no change in our Status, owing to the Imperial Conference ruling. That is not correct, for we are now an autonomous community equal in Status with any other Dominion of the British Empire. We did not ask for it, nor did we want it, and we did not throw our hats in the air when we got it. It is of no value to us. But the important point is this, that should we at any time find that we are incapable of governing ourselves, and should wish to appeal to the King or his Representative, to send out a Royal Commission, we might very well be told "Physician, heal thyself." That is the difference in the Status of the Colony to-day.

The Leader of the Opposition has asked me to give a statement of the financial conditions of the colony. I

do not intend to enter into any particulars this afternoon, but in the regular debate, we will leave that matter to be dealt with by the Finance Minister in his budget. There will be a deficit of somewhere about 1½ million dollars. People have been talking about three millions, but a million and a half is what the deficit will be outside of the railway, which will lose about $750,000, the same as last year. It has been a natural losing hazard. Nobody can prevent it. But it has as good a chance of coming back as any other Department. It would only take one or two good industrial propositions along the railway line, to turn the railway from a losing venture into a winning one. In the month of December, for example, which is a bad business month for the railway, we actually made $500 profit. That only goes to show that the railway, put in proper condition, is not going to be a very big and continuous liability to this country. When we got the railway, we got a lot of junk. It was not properly ballasted, and a large amount of the cost incurred in connection with the railway has been caused by the necessity of re-ballasting. When it is fully put in condition, and with Buchan's mine, and other industries in full swing along that railway, I predict that the railway will be a paying proposition.

I may say that I am not at all happy over finding the country with a deficit. I am not at all satisfied that something might not have been done in the way of further retrenchment, by the party in power. But I would like any man listening to me this afternoon to be in my position for twelve months, and find the clamour that is made to the Government for further expenditure of money, and let us see what he would do about it. It is one thing to criticise, but another thing to construct and clean up.

I myself talked about "cleaning up" when I came in to power. But I have not found it quite as easy to clean up as I thought, and that is a great deal the fault of the people of this country. We have spent, we have been obliged to spend in this town during the past two months between $80,000 and $90,000 for poor relief. A large number of people are still in need. What is to be done about it, money does not grow on gooseberry bushes. There are a large number of people of this country who think that the Government chest is a bottomless pit, into which you can dig all day long. Unless people understand that unless we cease to spend in excess of what is coming in, we are going to be in trouble.

Now don't imagine that our position to-day is due to anything that the present Government has done, or, to anything that the past Government has done. The War cost this colony $30,000,000. We insisted on having our own regiment a very fine and patriotic thing to do, but $30,000,000 is what the war cost this colony, and we have got to pay pensions accordingly. That is what really brought the condition of affairs that exist to-day, and it would have been the same no matter what Government had been in power. We were gradually going that way and we had to have a deficit. Unless some big industry is developed, or we sell the Labrador, it seems that we will be constantly faced with a deficit.

The gentlemen on the other side may say "Put us in and we will fix things up." I would be perfectly satisfied to hand over the Government to Mr. Hickman to-morrow if I thought that he could do better than we have done. But I am satisfied that he could not do a bit better. That is the reason why I say when the Leader of the Opposition asks me if there is going to be an election in the coming fall, I cannot tell him that. If we are the Government in power in the fall, why we will decide what is

time we will try to carry on and do the best that we can. But we acknowledge that we are not as powerful to do things that we think ought to be done, as we were before we lost six members to the other side. If we had those members we would be able to introduce drastic measures that we don't feel powerful enough to do at the present time. I want to make that point very clear. You can't run a Government as a private business. To do so, you would require somebody to take charge of this country, in the shape of a Mussolini, with an army at his back, to dictate . what had to be done in drastic measures. I don't care what Government you may have, I don't believe that those necessary but drastic measures will ever be carried out by Responsible Government in this country. That is what I feel. There are minor reforms that can be effected, and these we are trying to effect, and we have a great possibility of industrial development in this country at the present moment. That is our great hope.

We have Labrador just given to us. An immense tract of land. But can this country afford to borrow money to investigate it? It sems to me that there are only two alternatives open to us, either to sell it as a "pig in a poke," or else to exploit it. Now the first thing required in respect to Labrador is a legal survey. I was very hopeful that when we got Labrador, we would be finished with lawyers in connection with it, but I am afraid that is not so. We don't know yet whether all the water power rights in Labrador have not been given away. There are hundreds of people who have been promised various concessions when once the Boundary question was settled, by the Government. There are water power rights on the Muskrat Falls given away to a man named Dickey for thirty dollars per year for 99 years, by the Bond Administration. In these days these things were considered of no value. Then the first thing is to make a survey of what is on the Labrador, and when we find what we own there, then to try and turn it into money. But I don't believe that this country will ever be able to develop it.

In the second place we have very great hopes of mineral development in Newfoundland. I consider that the discovery of Buchan's mine is of more importance than what we have gained by the Labrador Boundary award. The Company that has been established at Grand Falls has proved that we are able to turn out the concentrated product in this country out of the already proved enormous quantities of zinc and lead in that mine.

I cannot say as much for the Gander. There are certain proposals coming before us ,in fact, we delayed the opening of this House in order to get those proposals, and we will have them in a few days. It is very possible that we will be asked to build a certain number of miles of railway to the Gander, to connect up with the various industries. If these proposals are worthy of the consideration of this House they will be placed before you to judge as to whether or not it would be a paying proposition to join up these industries with the main line. They may also be asking for concessions in connection with the export of wood in the raw condition, something that I am very much opposed to. Careful consideration will have to be given to any proposal along those lines. But I do not want to enter into any particulars at this time.

We are about to enter on this session of the Legislature. We have a majority in the House. As long as it is so I take it that the Opposition will consider that we are the Government. We want to put through our legislation as soon as possible and get back to business again. If the Opposition have decided on a policy of

obstruction of any legislation that we may introduce, then I say that we are able to stay here as long as they are. I suggest to you gentlemen that the Government is still in power and proposes to remain in power unless it is beaten on the floors of this House, and then we will hand over the reins to somebody else. In the meantime we propose to carry on to the best of our ability. We hope that the Members of this Legislature will not find it necessary to discuss every section of the Speech from the Throne. When the various Bills are brought up later on in the session, then it will be time enough to discuss them. Why must every member of the Opposition take part in a long discussion on a bill that has not even been brought before the Legislature. Last year we listened for hours to opinions expressed by members of the Opposition concerning an agreement with Besco. And it never came before the House. I only suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that he organize his forces. If there are two or three parties in the opposition, then have the leader to speak for each particular section. That would save a lot of time in this House. I hope that we have before us a very pleasant and very amiable session of this Legislature.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I would not have risen this afternoon or made any remarks with regard to the speech from the throne were it not the fact that the Prime Minister who has just sat down has intimated to this House that it is the intention of the present administration to continue in office and to attempt to carry out their term of office until 1928. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of this country and the members of both sides of this House will agree with me that the majority of the people rule. I contend to-day, sir, that the majority of the people of this country are represented by the members on the Opposition side of this House. The majority of the people of St. John's East in the recent bye-election held there, told the present administration in so many words that it had fallen down on its job and was not wanted any more. That district three years ago gave the Government a majority of from 4,000 to 5,000 votes. To-day that majority has been destroyed, and the Opposition candidate has been returned with a majority of 552. In view of this fact, which expresses in an unmistakable way the attitude of the people of this country towards the present Government, I think that the only course left open to the Prime Minister is to resign. The Prime Minister has suggested that the various leaders on the Opposition side of the House should rise and on behalf of their various parties tell the House what they intend doing with regard to the various measures that are to come before the House. Now I think it would be wise for the various sections on the Government side who have their own leaders to also rise and tell the Opposition what they intend to do during the present session. The Prime Minister stated also that the deficit for 1926-27 will be around 1½ million dollars; but he did not tell that the deficit for 1925-26 is one million dollars, nor is any reference made to that deficit in the Speech from the Throne, and I defy any member of the House to get up and say if what I have stated is not correct. Hints have been thrown out by the proposer of the Motion for an Address in Reply that unfair tactics were employed and wild rumours broadcasted in the bye-election recently regarding the deficit on current account. I tell the House now as I told it last year that the Budget last year was "cooked." A letter appeared in the Government press recently stating that the deficit on current account for 1925-26 was $80,-000.00 I say that the deficit was one

million dollars approximately. The Government evidently forgot that the people own the railway that is operated by the Government. Now the loss on the operation of the railway for 1925-26 was over $900,000.00. This added to the $80,000.00 plus the five per cent. interest on the one million dollars borrowed on railway account brings the total deficit for that year up to a million dollars. Whilst we do not intend to obstruct any legislation of a constructive nature, I feel it my duty and it is the duty of every member of the Opposition side to-day to tell the present Government that they are unable to carry on and that we should not allow them to carry on. If they were decent, they would resign because a vote of want of confidence was passed on them by the electors of St. John's East and Fortune Bay. Still they have the gall to attempt to carry on the administration of the affairs of this country. The Prime Minister has claimed that, owing to a depletion in his ranks, no other Government could do any better than the present one. Now what has caused that depletion? It has been stated in the Government press that members who left the Government should have gone back to their districts for approval or disapproval of their actions; but it did not state that the man who left the Opposition side and joined the Government ranks should go back, certainly not, that would be too consistent. I say, Mr. Speaker, we should all go back to our districts next Fall, and if I can do it the Government will be forced to have a general election next Fall because they do not enjoy the confidence of the people. We are told in the Speech from the Throne that the Government proposes to put on the Income Tax again and the Prime Minister stated that he is trying to make a law to put the Act back for three years. If the Government had not repealed the Act in 1924, or had put it on in 1925, as they were advised to do, they would not be up against it financially as they are to-day, and I defy any financial wizard that the Prime Minister may have in his Party to-day to deny that statement. The reason is, of course, that people can only purchase according to their means and they can buy more when goods are low than when they are high. Accordingly, the 15 per cent. extra taxation that the Government put on reduced the purchasing power of the people with the result that there was a falling off in the revenue at the Custom House. The Speech from the Throne states that the deficit was created on account of decreased importations of cotton goods. This is a most ridiculous statement to try and get any people to swallow. I did not intend to get up and speak this afternoon, but the remarks of the Prime Minister made me do so. I intend to make a more lengthy criticism of the Speech from the Throne later.

With regard to this contract with Besco, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that before this session of the House closes I hope to have the privilege of referring to the Prime Minister's speech in connection with that contract and I intend to occupy as much time as the Prime Minister did when he introduced the Resolutions last year. These Resolutions were brought in here and driven out again. They went to a Party meeting of the Government and never came back since. The Prime Minister said at the time that this contract was one out of ten or twelve that the Government had from Besco and that this one was the best one. This contract was signed, sealed and delivered. It was signed on behalf of the Government by the Colonial Secretary and the Minister of Justice. The Executive had entered into an agreement with Besco and were thrown down because the whole Government Party passed a vote of want of con-

fidence in the Executive. Now what about the contract with Besco for this year? The present Government had nothing whatever to do with the operations of Besco at Bell Island this year. Besco would operate no matter what Government was in power because they had orders in for one million tons of ore. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the Speech from the Throne should have a black border around it, denoting the Government's obituary notice. The obituary notice of the present administration has been written by the voters of St. John's East and Fortune Bay. Because they have one or two members in majority in the House—men who are getting concessions and jobs out of the Government—the present administration is holding on to the reins of power. Mr. Speaker, I serve notice now, Sir, that so far as I am able this Government will not put through any legislation this session of the House. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for delaying the time of the House this evening, but as this is the opening day, as the curtain is raised on the annual drama and as certain people who only come here once a year and who are unaware of the doings of the present Government, I hope and trust when they come here again that they will see a different aggregation of politicians guiding the destinies of this our Island home.

It was moved by Mr. Cahill, and seconded by Mr. Power, that an Address of Thanks be presented to His Excellency the Administrator in Reply to the [illegible]ious Speech with which he had been pleased to open the present Session of the Legislature, and that a Select Committee be appointed to draft such Address in Reply.

The Committee to consist of Mr. Cahill, Mr. Power, Mr. Puddister, Dr. Mosdell, Mr. Brophy.

The Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill dealing with the disposition of land, timber and water powers in Labrador.

Tht Hon. the Colonial Secretary laid on the Table of the House Statement of Expenditure and Revenue of the St. John's Municipal Council for the year 1926.

The Hon. the Prime Minister laid on the Table of the House a copy of the Will of the late Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond (bequeathing certain lands to the Colony to be used as a Model Farm), together with certain correspondence relating thereto.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

Mr. Lake gave notice of question.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Brophy gave notice of question.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister moves adjournment of House.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, rising to support the motion to adjourn, I would like to bring to the notice of the Internal Economy Commission, through you, the state of the rooms occupied by the seventeen members on this side of the House. There is no space there, and there are only eight chairs for seventeen men. Might I suggest that there is a room upstairs occupied by the Clerk of the House which we could have, and let him move downstairs. At the present time there is no way to get fresh air —if you open the windows the people in the park can look in. We could also do much better in a room 16 x 16 than in one ten by ten, and it must be remembered that the room never held seventeen members before. We will take good care of it and return it when the session is over.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, the sixteenth instant, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 16th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Halfyard, from Ireland's Eye, re Roads.

Mr. Halfyard, from Caplin Cove, Trinity Bay, re Roads.

Mr. Halfyard, from Winterton, re Roads.

Mr. Halfyard, from Little Heart's Ease, re dismissal of a ferryman.

Mr. Hibbs, from Barred Islands, re setting of cod traps.

Mr. Hibbs, from Fogo, re Roads.

A delegation of unemployed persons appeared at the Bar of the House praying leave to present a petition.

On motion leave was granted.

The petition was then read, asking that employment be provided.

On motion the petition was received. The delegation then retired.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to report that the Select Committee formed to draft a reply to the gracious speech with which His Excellency the Administrator was pleased to open this session has drafted the following reply:

To His Excellency, Sir William Henry Horwood, Kt., Administrator of the Government of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

May It Please Your Excellency:

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

Signed: CYRIL J. CAHILL,
THOS. J. POWER,
J. C. PUDDESTER.

Assembly Room, May 16th, 1927.

On motion this report was received.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject matter now before the House. Before considering the speech of His Excellency, I would make a few references to the personnel of the House since last we met here. We all regret that Mr. Mott, the Clerk of the Assembly, is now undergoing treatment at the General Hospital. He is a highly esteemed official and we trust that his treatment will be successful, and that, in a little while he will be able to take his place again and that he will be blessed with complete recovery of his usual health and strength. I notice also that Mr. Duff, the Honourable Member for Carbonear, who possibly considered some of us so good-looking that he would get from the back benches here to the other side so that he would have a good view of the good-looking chaps on this side of the House. Now, I trust he is feeling quite comfortable, basking in the sun of the Government ranks, having moved his seat from the cold shades of Opposition. Mr. Duff is now enjoying the questionable privilege of being a member of His Majesty's Executive Government, but, after all, he must realize that all is not gold that glitters. I trust the zeal the honourable member manifested, when he was a member on this side of the House, will continue, and that the adding of his strength to the Government ranks and his presence there will be a "leaven that will leaven the whole lump." But I fear he has assumed an impossible task. He himself is looking in the pink of condition physically, and we can only say, to use a homely phrase, that he will

have to put up with all the discomforts in reclining on the bed that he has made for himself.

Then, in Fortune District, there has been a bye-election rendered necessary by the resignation of Mr. Warren, who took a seat on the Bench, made vacant by the retirement of Mr. Justice Johnson. By the way, I may say that vacancy came as somewhat of a surprise to some of us; for, in answer to a question asked the Prime Minister last session by reference to Hansard the Prime Minister said, "that Mr. Justice Johnson had no intention of retiring to the knowledge of the Government, and that the Government had given no consideration to the appointment of his successor." I regret the absence of Mr. Warren from this House. He was one of the oldest members of the House, in point of the number of years he was a member. He was an experienced parliamentarian, an expert in constitution practice. If any of us had any occasion to ask any questions of Mr. Warren on constitutional usage or the practice of the House, he was always only too glad to give the information. We regret his absence on that account, and it is to be regretted, as the years pass, men of experience are no longer in this House to legislate or advise the younger members.

I congratulate Dr. Mosdell on his victory in Fortune District. Considering that it was a bye-election and that he had to fight one of the strongest opponents that the Government could send to that District at the time, no doubt the victory is due, to a great extent, to the personal popularity of Dr. Mosdell and the strenuous campaign he fought. But it was no doubt principally due to the unpopularity of the present Government. It was impossible for their man to win. Our heartiest congratulations are extended to Mr. Brophy, whose victory in St. John's East, was unique in the political history of Newfoundland. He and his associates put up a whirlwind campaign, a most strenuous and manly fight against the most influential and powerful odds. That is generally recognized by all in this House and those who happened to reside in St. John's at the time of the bye-election. All the Government forces were routed, horse, foot and dragoon. All the artillery at the disposal of the Government during the last lay of the fight was brought into requisition. They even brought the "Big Berthas" into requisition, and there was a regular bombardment in every section and corner of the District. I do not know whether they received an S.O.S. call or not. Anyway, some of us were sent to trail after the Government speakers in the different outlying sections. As we were in the game we had to follow suit, so that the constituents of St. John's East would not consider themselves neglected by us. So we put in an appearance; I put in an appearance at Pouch Cove. The Government were counting on a certain kind of ammunition. Some people said it was the silent ammunition—the silent vote, but that silent vote was very weak when we consider the results. Anyway, our young hero came through unscathed with victory perched on his banner. We welcome Dr. Mosdell and Mr. Brophy to this Assembly. They have a future before them that depends on their own action to a great extent as to what success they will meet, but I trust, like their predecessors in St. John's East, and those who went before them in the District of Fortune, they will tread the straight and narrow road so far as the political road can be travelled. We cannot expect impossibilities, and no doubt they will then get success and the confidence of the people in those districts. I trust that when they put on the armour again, to fight another election, that they will have similar success. While the bye-

election in the District of Burgeo and Le Poile did not make any change in the membership of this House, I heartily congratulate Mr. Chambers on his return and the increased vote he received in his district. Mr. Chambers won his seat in spite of the unpopularity of the Government. I had the pleasure of shaking hands with Mr. Chambers on his return from the District, and I gave him my personal congratulations. It showed his strength in that District. No doubt, if there were a General Election, Mr. Chambers would have considered "discretion the better part of valor," unless he had gone to the District under a different party. Then he would have had a chance of being elected because his personal popularity in that District cannot be denied.

According to statements made in the press by some members of the Government during the bye-election in St. John's East, Major Cashin, Mr. Moore, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Little, Mr. Lake, Mr. Russell and Mr. Duff should resign their seats and appeal to their constituents. I suppose it is too late in the season to do that now. I draw the attention of the House to these statements. I do not know why they were made. I suppose it was thought they would have some political effect. But, can you imagine a more deceptive and hypocritical statement from a Government or the supporters of a Government that ignored one of the fundamental principles of constitutional government for over two years in connection with the vacancy for St. John's East and when a writ to fill this vacancy was then only issued to save your Government from further disintegration and ignominous destruction. The writ for an election was then brought about figuratively speaking at the point of the political bayonet of a member of your Government. I just mention this to show that these statements are not sincere. If all those members who have changed their seats from the Government to the Opposition side of the House did resign their seats, what guarantee would they have that the Districts would be opened that they might appeal to their constituencies for a confirmation or otherwise of their actions, and that they would not have been out in the wilderness with the Government carrying on and laughing at those who had resigned their seats? That is patent to everybody. Two years ago numbers of petitions and demands were made that even brought into the matter the representative of the King himself, to have the District of St. John's East opened, all with no avail. And then they say that those members should have resigned their seats and gone to their constituencies. I am inclined to think that St. John's East was opened because the Government could not meet this House otherwise and that is not news to anybody. The Government did not intimate by word or gesture that the seats would be opened if these honourable members had resigned. Now, if there is any honesty or sincerity in such statements, how can they contend that the action of Mr. Duff was perfectly alright. Mr. Duff has become a mem- of the party whose policy he denounced in 1924, in 1925 and right up to the closing hours of the session of 1926. They have now taken him to their bosom though he denounced them in the strongest language at his command. If there is any honesty in those statements, the Prime Minister should have said to Mr. Duff, "Upon principle we cannot take you into our party or into our Council. We should be very glad to have you, but you must resign your seat. We will open the District of Carbonear and you can go back to that district and get the approval or otherwise of your constituents as to whether you shall leave the party with which you

were elected and join our ranks." That was not done.

These purely political hypocritical statements cannot go unchallenged by me. Members of the Monroe Government were reported as saying on a public platform: "that if a member is elected on a certain policy and he decides to leave the party in which he has been elected, that he should go back to his constituency to seek re-election." A Daniel came to judgment. Imagine a member of the Government ranks proclaiming that to his hearers at a public meeting in St. John's East. He was condemning the action of the Party with which he was connected. Can you wonder that there is disintegration and dissatisfaction amongst the ranks of the present Government. You could go from Alpha to Omega in their political record and not find anything but inconsistency there. So much for the political inconsistency of the present Government. It is the rule on an occasion like this when we are speaking to the motion for a committee to be appointed to draft a reply to the Speech from the Throne, to refer to the remarks made by the proposer and seconder of that motion. Mr. Cahill, the Honourable Member for Harbor Main did very well in his presentation. We have heard Mr. Cahill on a former occasion with great interest and sometimes with a little irritation, and more often with edification. The Government, no doubt, selected him for the part he had to play because he is a lawyer, and in the course of his practice he sometimes has to defend criminals, and I sympathize with him when he had to plead the case of the Government. He did it well. It is not an enviable position for anyone to occupy when his clients are of such a character that he knows they deserve the penalties of the law. Still he has to put up a case for them. He is paid for doing it. Whether they are honest or dishonest he tries to make out as good a case as he can, and he has made out a good case for the Government, who are political criminals. But I think his speech after all is an echo of a speech made in the recent bye-election. It seems to be back-wash of the speech made in the recent bye-election in St. John's East. It will be alright for the honourable member when he is contesting the District of Harbor Main or for any district that he may be contesting in the near future, but the arguments that Mr. Cahill has used to defend the policy of the present Government, and that jury which is the electorate when it gets an opportunity, that is at the General Election, will record their ballots against the present Government. Their verdict will be political oblivion. I must also congratulate Mr. Power on his effort and now that he has broken the ice as a speech-maker, I trust that we shall hear from him often during the session.

We have been hearing quite a lot for a number of years about coal seams and their probable value to the country. I hope the prospecting that is now going on will be successful, and that coal mines will be starting in Newfoundland, which will be of great commercial value to us. I trust that coal will be found in commercial quantities, which will bring to Newfoundland, no doubt, a great blessing, —if we get that industry started in Newfoundland after all the disappointments in connection with coal mining in this country. Some people are inclined to be a bit pessimistic. Nevertheless, whether it is successful or not, I agree that the Government should spend money on prospecting for coal and put up with the results. It is better to gamble in that respect than to throw away two million dollars on a mad, crazy tourist policy. Mr. Cahill reminded us in the course of his remarks that the honor of proposing that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the

Speech from the Throne fell to his lot also in 1925. I looked up the Hansard and I find that Mr. Cahill said: "that it might be a matter of interest "to Newfoundlanders to know that in "having a Winter session the Govern-"ment is following the precedent and "reviving the practice of earlier "years, when the House of Assembly "was always convened in February "month. Of late years expediency and "opportunism have often dictated "otherwise and the present Govern-"ment realizing that a session of the "House in the months of February is "in the best interests of the fisheries "and trade of the country generally, "have reverted to the old and proper custom." Of course, he has made no reference this year to the time the House has been opened, but I feel sure that if he was honest in his observations then, as I believe he was, he will admit that expediency and opportunism is dictating the policy of the Government. The opening of the House at this late date is inconvenient and interferes with the avocations of the Members, especially the members in the Outports who have to come in here at this season when they should be attending to their regular business.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is condemned by the words of its own advocates and supporters. I can't see for the life of me why we are opening the House at this time of the year. In 1917, Sir Edward Morris attended the Imperial Conference. He did not get back to Newfoundland until late in the season and even then it was said that the House should have been opened while he was away. It is against the best interests of this country for the opening of the House to be delayed to this time of the year. There is no excuse for it. The Government know how this House is constituted. They know that the best interests of this country cannot be served as this House is constituted at the present time. There is not sufficient strength of numbers on the Government side, and there is no spirit of determination to put through legislation that this country needs, and is languishing for. This Speech from the Throne ,the only thing tangible about it is the paper on which it is written. I have often heard the expression that the speech is remarkable for what it does not contain. Could anything be more applicable to this Speech. The Leader of the Opposition has said that if it had a black border around it, it would be regarded as an obituary notice of the Government. Mr. Speaker, it is ghostly in its nakedness. There is nothing material about it. It is not even padded. It is a most gloomy document. Those who read this speech and especially the part referring to the industries of this country will abandon all hope. The people residing on the coast will take to the woods. And then they can't stay there, because there are too many there already, seeking employment and finding none. Of course there are many things in connection with the policy of the Government that this Speech from the Throne do not contain and it shall be our privilege to refer to some of these things later on in the session. There are many things that justify criticism and time has told that many of the criticisms of the Opposition side of the House during the last few sessions were amply justified. Last year the Finance Minister gave Mr. Puddester a financial statement which set forth the financial condition of the country. This year nothing like that has been done. Mr. Puddester at that time gave a comparative statement of expenditure for the years 1923-24 and 1924-25. It will be remembered that this Government came into power in 1924 and the House met on July 10th, 1924. In presenting his Budget the Finance Minister stated that he did not have time to make a new Budget

but that he had accepted the figures left at his office by Mr. Cave, his predecessor. The expenditure statement for 1924-25 was six hundred thousand dollars less than what it was for 1923-24. But the present Government cannot take any credit for decreasing that expenditure. It was there in black and white for them. On the contrary, every year since this Government came into power expenditure has increased. The Finance Minister's intentions might have been good but he did not have the courage to put them into practice We have been going ahead increasing our expenditure at such a rate that for 1926-27 we actually voted over a million dollars more than what was voted for 1924-25

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE

	1924-25	1926-27	Increase	Decrease
Finance Dept.	$3,438,776.45	$3,801,489.38	$332,712.93	
Colonial Secy.	67,179.00	61,757.00		$5,422.00
Justice Dept.	341.479.16	372,017.92	30,538.76	
Education Dept.	836.351.03	892,977.53	56,625.50	
Public Charities	376,861.71	463,761.11	86,899.40	
Marine & Fisheries	335,589.39	430,992.29	97,402.90	
Agric. & Mines	78,190.00	109,160.66	30,970.66	
Public Works	938,098.57	1,095,039.95	56,491.38	
Posts & Telegraphs	1,146,397.83	1,213,571.35	66,173.52	
Customs Dept.	439,552.25	452,788.00	13,235.75	
Assessors Dept.	14,840.00	15,120.00	280.00	
Acct. Conting.	184,617.00	216,992.00	32,375.00	
Pension Bd. Comm.	651,766.00	618,550.00		33,216.00
			$834,156.80	$38,638.00
		Decrease	38,638.00	
			$795,518.80	
Interest on New Loan at 5 per cent			$250,000.00	
Decrease				$1,045,518.80

Increase in Expenditure in two years.

Mr. Puddester can put this comparative statement of expenditure in the Daily News to-morrow for the information of its readers. These are the cold, unvarnished facts. This is the Government, we were told, that was going to reduce expenditure and reduce taxation, and this country was going to be a fishermen's Paradise and fishermen and their families were going to live in peace and contentment. This is what Mr. Monroe circulated throughout the length and breadth of this country in 1924 when he signed a document said to be his Manifesto. Instead of a fishermen's Paradise, the Monroe Government has made this country a fishermen's Purgatory and every bit of manhood and determination men had for the prosecution of the fisheries have been purged out of them. Now if the Daily News wants this comparative statement I have on my desk regarding increased expenditure to print tomorrow they can have it. Having in mind the conditions of this country, I fail to see that any justification can be given for that expenditure. But the people of this country do not want any newspaper to tell them about the burdens they have to bear,

in the way of increased cost of living, largely due to increased taxation, and increased public expenditure as a result of the iniquitous policy of the present Government. What is the good for a person who is physically ill, to be told that his condition is serious, unless a medicine is prescribed, or a surgical operation is performed, that will eradicate the roots or cause of the disease? Figuratively speaking, this country requires a surgical operation by the application of the pruning knife to cut out the cancerous growth of waste and extravagance.

The Prime Minister says: "We need drastic legislation," but his Government is too weak and cowardly to introduce that legislation. For newspapers to cajole and apologise for the actions of the Government is absolutely worthless, for the people know by sad experience what the conditions are under which they live. And what are we doing about it? What are we doing about it? And then we wonder—the Honourable Leader of the Government wonders why the people are dissatisfied—the electors are dissatisfied, and the members of his own party are dissatisfied. Is it any wonder? It is said that the men who left the ranks of the Government are held up to ridicule. Called traitors! These men were elected to this House to support a policy. The members of the Monroe administration were elected to support a policy; that was alright, but did the Government try to put that policy in effect? There is a difference in being elected to support a party and being elected to support a policy. They have been elected to support a policy, and that policy has been thrown to the four winds of Heaven, and no attempt made to put it into effect. That brings me to the point as to the policy under which the Monroe Party was elected. I was in an election campaign in St. John's East also and I have an echo of something used there.

Here are extracts from your Manifesto:—

"The cost of the public service must be reduced and efficiency increased."

"I promise that, if given power I shall cause a careful investigation to be made in the financial methods of the country, and I shall enforce a policy of wise economy and retrenchment."

"Public expenditure must be drastically reduced."

Can you wonder at men leaving you, Mr. Leader of the Government, when you promised that, and when instead of reducing you have increased expenditure by one and a quarter millions in three short years? And we don't know where the end is yet. "Expenditure must be drastically reduced,"—and you wonder why you are unpopular and why your men are leaving you! "The House of Assembly should meet in January or February." This is the wrong time to have the House open, and we are not told why the opening is delayed. Some people are unkind enough to say it was because Captain Winsor went to the Ice, and that he said he didn't care whether they opened the House or not, he was going to the Ice.

CAPT. WINSOR—It would be better if some members of the Opposition would go to the Ice and bring some revenue into the country.

MR. HALFYARD—I am tired hearing you get off that trash, as if nobody but a Winsor could successfully command a sealing steamer. Now, if all the Winsors and all the Keans and Barbours, and Halfyards, too, were dropped out, somebody would be found to take their places and go on. Why prolong the agony? It is patent to everyone—the blunders and inconsistencies of the Government. I wouldn't mind a man making a blunder sometimes, but the whole lot of

us are suffering for it. We speak of the "Country"—"Save the Country." What do we mean—the hills, trees and rivers? It is nice to live in a country where there is lovely scenery to inspire—the plains are monotonous. But the man who goes out through the Narrows in his boat to drag the wealth from the ocean, it is no inspiration to view the Southside Hills and see its catharacts and streams, if he can't market his fish. And what are we doing about it? We are doing nothing; it is hopeless—but still we are here. Not one of us should be here! We should be out of it and giving our places to better men. We are simply hanging on to get our sessional pay, others to get positions of emolument. The Country is going to the dogs! No beneficial legislation can be brought in, owing to the constitution of the House at the present time, and still we stick to our jobs. But enough of that!

Now let us get down to this document, which is very disappointing, having in mind that which affects the welfare of every man, woman and child in the country, that is ,its staple industry. From that point of view I criticize the Speech, and say that nothing material or promising is in it. Reference is made in the first paragraph to the settlement of the Labrador Boundary question. We are all delighted that the case before the Privy Council was decided in our favor. The potential value of the Labrador may be great; it may run into hundreds of millions, but that is problematic. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I recall that in 1925, when we were considering the Re-Distribution Bill, I took occasion to refer to the Labrador Boundary question, and by reference to Hansard I find that the statements I made then were practically correct, if not critically so. I then took the trouble to look up all the data on the question from the historic point of view, of the commercial value of the Labrador, and the opinions of learned men as to our claims to that piece of territory. I said then the areas involved were about 120 thousand square miles, which was pretty nearly correct, for it turned out to be 110,000, which allowed for a point of territory given to the Canadians at Blanc Sablon. It was said then that one third of the area was timber land; well, one-third of say 120,000 square miles is 40,000 square miles of timber limits—allowing six cords to the acre, and there are 640 acres in a square miles, at $1.00 a cord that would be $153,600,000.00. Then as regards water power, I said that the water power was worth $200,000,000, that is compared with the value given for water power in Ireland and other places, where the data is given. Take electric farming. In some cases power has been transmitted 800 miles, to places where the climate and soil would yield nothing, have been heated by electric power.

(Reads)

Sometimes, you know, in the course of my remarks I take the trouble to repeat something that other people have said that may be of value. Now in 1925, I made some remarks in connection with representation for Labrador. Now we own Labrador and we have no provision for representation in this Assembly. Therefore you will have to amend the Election Act this session, and give Labrador representation. Now you have all this trouble because you did not take my advice. And although I say it myself, if you had taken my advice in other matters also, you would be better off than you are to-day.

I trust that Labrador will be of great value to us. Whether in the years to come conditions will improve ,and we will be able to develop it ourselves, or whether we will turn it into cash, it is a matter of opinion. I am not here to express an opinion

on it. But if we can get a $100,000,-000 for it I think that we should get clear of it as quickly as possible.

(Reads)

It is said in the Speech that the Income Tax Act will again be enacted. Now I know the Leader of the Government and more particularly the Minister of Finance, will give me credit if nobody else does for advocating the continuation of that tax. I think we on this side of the House gave our reasons why it should be continued. Then we were increasing our general tariff, which was inconsistent on the part of the Government. Conditions in this country are such that this tax may be an objectionable one. But all taxes are. But when you are leaving the wealthy free from any extra taxation and putting it on those who can least afford to bear it, then I say that that is a very bad and unwise policy. I am sorry to see that conditions in this country are causing you to intimate in the Speech from the Throne, that the Income Tax will again be put on the Statute Book. Last year, and this is worth repeating, I asked a question of the Assessor as to who paid their income tax. In reply to that question I was told who did, not individuals but those who paid according to their income.

I was curious to know whether the tax was paid by men with incomes of one thousand or two thousand dollars or by people or corporations with incomes ranging from six thousand to one hundred thousand dollars. We find that 45 corporations and 1042 individuals paid forty-five thousand dollars on incomes from $1000 to $6000. The total collected for the year, according to the statement given me, was $338,000.00, $45,000 paid by 45 corporations and 1042 individuals. The balance of $292,330.97 was paid by corporations, not many of them, and individuals with incomes ranging from $6.000 to $100,000. I advocated then to the Minister of Finance and Customs to take the schedule of taxes paid in Canada, and increase the exemptions up to $2,000 for a young man and $3,000 or $4,000 for a married man. I hope that is what he is going to do when he brings in the Act. And the sad part of it is that we have lost about one million dollars during the last three years. And it is reported by the Prime Minister that we have a deficit of two and a half million dollars, including the railway. Now I ask you is it right for any individual living in this country under the present conditions to be relieved of a legitimate tax, a just tax. It is just as well to put the money in the Treasury as to have it left as bequests in wills, while the laborer and the fishermen, the sick and the disabled are taxed and taxed out of existence.

There is a reference here in the Speech from the Throne to the codfishery.

(Reads)

Here the fisheries of Newfoundland are dismissed with two short paragraphs. There is nothing said as to what is going to be done to try to remedy this condition of things. Towards the end of the Speech there is reference to the Gander. I trust that when the Bill is presented that it will be of such a nature that it will receive the approval of this House. But we must be very careful. We must not allow slipshod legislation to pass through this House, as it has happened in the last two or three sessions. This has been a great mistake. We must not take anything for granted. I trust that the Minister of Justice will be a little more careful this year, concerning anything coming under his Department. It is ridiculous that Bills are brought into this House and then have to be thrown out again.

We come now to the crux of this Speech from the Throne. That is that there will be a deficit on current

account for the year 1926-1927. The Prime Minister said the deficit on the railway was three-quarters of a million, which makes the total deficit two and a quarter million dollars.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this Speech as to how we are going to meet this deficit.

Major Cashin's statements of some time ago it appears are not far out we will find when accounts are tabled and we get a true statement of receipts and expenditures. No suggestion is made in the Speech as to how we are going to meet this deficit. The country was never in such a hopeless mess; financially and industrially; when we think of our staple industries, the cod and herring fisheries. There is not a word in the Speech as to how we are going to meet this deficit; not a word about reducing expenditure. We can only come to the conclusion that the Government intends if they stay here long enough, to introduce another loan bill of three or four millions and when they get it to pay off the deficit. How long is this condition of things to last. If you pursue your present policy of expenditure you will certainly have to meet another deficit next year. We cannot go on borrowing indefinitely. Eleven and a half million dollars in three short years. Now, a prospect of four or five millions. Fifteen millions in three years, with interest of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. That is what this poor, down-trodden country that we are all bleeding for will have to pay. Unfortunately the producer is being bled, and you are helping to bleed him as a result of paying an extra seven-hundred and fifty thousand dollars interest on public debt in three short years, what have you to show? You have rerailed the railway, given us a dock ,and a highroads tourist policy. We are not one cent's worth better off than before you spent that money, when we consider the increase in the earning power of the people, not one cent greater income. The dock is operated the same as before. The railway is safer, but has it increased transportation or freight? I am only pointing out conditions in the country as compared to conditions in the country when you took charge. Your highroads policy of spending two million dollars is creating a liability unless you wish the roads to be torn up and the money be gone for nothing. You have spent $2,212,000.00 on roads and now have the liability of spending another half million to keep them in repair and still nothing can be done for the staple industries of this country either by word, act, or gesture, either by the State or the Exporters. The Government and 90 per cent. of the exporters should be marooned on some desert island and made to exist on mussels and seaweed. The men of the country are leaving its shores. Unfortunately not only are the men leaving but they are taking their families with them and leaving their homes. The Prime Minister, no doubt, as a result of his three years' experience is a sadder and a wiser man than when he assumed office and took control of the Government, and if we could read his thoughts and know his feelings, we would see, I do not doubt, that he would wish that he had never attempted to try and lead a party and lead a government. But he assumed the responsibility and now he has come to the conclusion that he can't do anything for the best interests of the country, and he can't get any legislation passed that he knows should be passed, he should resign and let somebody else take charge. Let the country decide. Get a mandate from the country; then I trust that whatever Government comes back shall be sufficiently strong in numbers and determined in spirit to do something for the country by way of legislation. We have been living

largely on loans for the last three years, for a number of years, and now we anticipate another one. Is it not time to cry halt? Was it not a miscalculation of the Finance Minister last year? He anticipated a surplus, I understand, and now he has to come in and tell us that there is a deficit of one and a half millions. Of course, it is said that only a member of the Opposition is talking and all he says is only for political purposes. No doubt the Prime Minister was told, "Don't listen to a word that crowd over there say. We are tired listening to them. They don't mean a word they say." You don't want to be a philosopher or prophet, you only want ordinary common-sense and some consideration of the conditions and commercial history of the country, to know that you are going to have some lean years, and what may be regarded as fat years. In 1924, when you assumed office everything seemed rosy and bright. In those days the proposer and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne said that there was going to be no more unemployment, and generally, spoke of bright prospects. Those things happened when everything looked promising, and it went on so for about twelve months. As a result we got big revenue for 1924-1925, but what caused that revenue was the good price for fish and construction work at the Humber. There you had a big revenue, but it is only the act of irresponsibles that when you have a good year, you spend every cent of your revenue, and increase your liabilities. That is what you did by a policy of spending over two millions on highroads with no idea of getting returns. Money was wasted in every department of the Government. A boat was sent down to Lower Labrador that was not necessary. The Earl of Devon cost about $16,-000.00, in 1925. The Watchful last year cost about $45,000.00. How grave the situation now is we do not know, and will not untli we get a financial statement from the Minister of Finance or a report from the Auditor-General. On Wednesday last the Leader of the Government waxed virtually eloquent in an appeal to the members of this side of the House not to talk too long, and suggested that some two or three members be deputed to present the case for the Opposition. Was there ever heard such a suggestion made by a Prime Minister before? My good friend, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, knows that I am not going to let anybody talk for me any more than he would. I am here to do my duty and to talk for my constituents, and for the country, and I shall do so whether it is July, August or September, or whether it is daylight or dark. If the Opposition are not going to criticize the Government, who is going to do it? It is our privilege to represent our grievances, and we are going to do it whether you like it or not. It is not always very pleasant for us to do so. It is said you cannot have good Government without strong Opposition.

Under our party system of Government you must have an Opposition, and members on this side are expected to criticise because members of the other side will not.

The only criticism that will be made by members on the other side is in the secrecy of the party caucus. I have some little experience and I know what I am talking about. The Hon. the Prime Minister has a misconception of the duties of the members of the Opposition. It is our bounden duty to criticize and one of the most ancient privileges of Parliament even before party Government was introduced into the House of Commons in England, was to make criticisms, present grievances, and ask for redress. The other side of the House abandoned that and this most ancient function of Parliament

was left to this side of the House, and it is the bounden duty and privilege of every honourable member on this side of the House to express his opinion on any matter which affects the welfare of the community. Is it because the Government for political expediency has postponed the opening of the Legislature to this season of the year which is most inconvenient to the members and to the country that the rights and privileges of the members of the Opposition are to be curtailed. We know that the Government under the Monroe regime is farcical and is becoming a byword and a reproach, and as time advances the damaging effects of its policy is becoming daily more apparent, which are causing people to say, "We are not fit to govern ourselves," and are talking of Royal Commissions.

What a terrible and appalling position we are in; under a three-year administration of a Monroe Government. A country that was described by the Honourable Leader of the Government in a Manifesto signed by him in May, 1924, as a fisherman's Paradise. Thousands of fishermen are saying if it was a fishermen's Paradise three years ago, it is now a fishermen's Purgatory, and are not only leaving the country themselves but are taking their families with them, and then we are not to make lengthy remarks, and two or three men on this side of the House should be selected to speak on the "Address in Reply" for the whole of the Opposition. I don't want any man to speak for me either on this side of the House or the other side of the House. My constituents expect me to speak my opinion of the Government, and the country demands me to speak, and that applies to every member of the Oppostiion, and I would not insult a member of the Opposition by suggesting that someone else speak for him.

Further, why if any Administration that ever existed in the history of this country deserved criticism surely it is the Administration on the other side of the House, and the trouble is that in the past it has paid no heed to advice or criticism. If they had listened to criticism from this side of the House they would not be in the hole they are to-day. Did not this side of the House tell the Prime Minister in the session of 1925 that the policy of expenditure outlined by him, which means the spending of millions of dollars on visionary projects and public works, would lead you to financial ruin and chaos. What you were told from this side of the House you know, by sad experitnce, was only too true. You were told less than twelve months after you took charge that your policy was a made one; some of us knew what we were talking about, that your policy would bring disaster, debt and difficulty to the country. You did not heed the warning which was given, as far as I was concerned, with sincerity; you were told that the country was disappointed and alarmed. They expected that you would make an attempt to put into effect some of your election promises, and reduce taxation and expenditure; you were elected for this purpose and you fell down on your job; you were told that you were condemned by the country, and you, Mr. Prime Minister, said at the time, "The country would not judge you by nine short months of power." You were told that if you were to bring about the necessary reforms for which you were elected that you should begin at the very beginning of your Administration, and you would have four years to live down the unpopularity that possibly may arise. But for lack of experience you listened to some of your partners in the Executive Government who told you that was part of the game of the Opposition to oppose any policy of the Government. You thought you were

sincere yourself, but you gave the Opposition no credit for sincerity and their experience, and scornfully ignored their warnings. What is the result, as I have already said we are now faced with debt, difficulty and disaster. You are a discredited Government, and if the result of the bye-election in St. John's East is **any** criterion of the feeling of the people of this country, and it is, it is questionable if you were to appeal to the country at the present time whether your candidates would gain a seat in the whole country. The Government must certainly realize this. But you are there and you must carry on or drag along for a few months longer. I presume you intend to vote Supply although you have not told us how you propose to get ways and means to pay your bills after making your commitments, I suppose you intend to ask the House to give you authority to borrow a few million more to pay our account. A private business concern in a similar deplorable financial condition would be put in liquidation overnight. Scores of fishermen planters with 50 per cent. better collateral security than the Government cannot borrow a hundred dollars or get credit to prosecute the fisheries and have to leave the country.

I would like to refer now to a question asked the Leader of the Government by the Leader of the Opposition on opening day, namely, as to what the intention of the Government was with regard to the holding of a General Election next Autumn. I would like to point out to the House that, according to constitutional law, respecting the length of life of a House of Assembly, "The House of Assembly shall continue, notwithstanding the demise of His Majesty, for four years from the day on which it shall by Proclamation be appointed to meet, unless sooner dissolved, and no longer."

The House of Assembly shall continue, notwithstanding the demise of His Majesty for four years, from the day on which it shall by Proclamation be appointed to meet, unless sooner dissolved and no longer. (1) The first session of the 26th General Assembly met on July 10th, 1924. Therefore on July 10th, 1928, there will be no House of Assembly if the present Government intends to hold to office and should continue as a Government until the Autumn of 1928. There will be no House of Assembly until a new House is formed as a result of an appeal in a General Election to the electorate of the country. Should the Government continue in office until the expiration of their four years and no longer, which will terminate July 10th, 1928, the constitution of a new House can only be brought about by a General Election in the Spring of 1928. Is this a desirable condition to anticipate? We have been told by the advocates of the present Government that a Spring election would be a calamity, that it interferes with the general trade and business of the country. At the time when employers and employees, merchants and fishermen should be giving their time and attention in preparation for the prosecution of the fisheries, business is upset by a political turmoil which is detrimental to the best interests of the country. Certainly, after the vociferous protestations against a Spring election by members of the Monroe Government, their supporters and thousands of electors who are opposed to the policy of the present Government, it is inconceivable that the Honorable the Prime Minister and His Executive entertain the idea or propisition of trying to hold on to office until the Spring of 1928, and then issue a proclamation for a Spring election. It would be most glaring inconsistency, and brand the Government as the greatest crowd of political poltroons that ever occupied seats in this Legislature or any other

Legislature in a civilized community; not having in mind what is expected from men working under British constitutional Government. Therefore we can reasonably conclude that the present Government has no intention of bringing about by word or act a condition of things in this country for political expediency, which has been proclaimed by them deplorable, causing chaos and instability.

(3) Mr. Monroe, the Hon. the Prime Minister, stated in his speech last Wednesday. "We acknowledge that we are not as powerful to do things that we think ought to be done; we were before we lost some members to the other side. If we had those embers we would be able to introduce drastic measures that we don't feel powerful enough to do at the present time."

We therefrom infer from the remarks of the Prime Minister that the present Government can no longer tion in the best interests of the ntry. The Prime Minister in his lear, emphatic manner states that he annot introduce necessary legislation owing to the depletion of his ranks. agree with the Prime Minister. If e are to retain our independence and h status of a Dominion in the British Empire, that such legislation should not be delayed one hour longer than is absolutely necessary. If he Prime Minister is sincere, and I have no reason to believe he is not, how does he hope to get a Government strong enough in members and determined in spirit to enact legislation which is of vital importance to the country at the present time. Does he expect his ranks to be increased from the members of the Opposition of this House? Would the Prime Minister welcome to his ranks the men he asked to leave his party and others who left his Government? Is the Prime Minister now hoping to strengthen his Government by getting men from the Opposition? If so, I think the Prime Minister is leading a forlorn hope. We canont afford to sit down and be content to collect the revenue and pay the salaries of the officials in the civil service. If we are to continue to be a Dominion that men will continue to make a home in, and not to leave, we must be prepared to deal with matters of pressing importance.

For the reasons I have enumerated I think there is a good and sufficient cause for the holding of a General Election the coming Fall. I agree with the Prime Minister that, if we are to retain our independence as a Dominion of the British Empire, drastic legislation will have to be enacted. At the present time we are unable to meet our financial obligations without going to the money markets and borrowing. I will leave these few remarks for the consideration of the Government and I trust that the Government and Opposition will come to a decision that will bring credit to themselves and bring about some condition that will be better than what obtains at the present time.

It now being 6.30 of the clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate, as I propose to continue for a few minutes at the next session.

On motion the debate was adjourned to to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the bill entitled "An Act to govern the granting of lands and rights in Labrador" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Russell gave notice of question.

Mr. Brophy gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Lake gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that this

House at its rising do adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 17th, 1927.

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

Mr. Speaker read a communication from the Rev. Geo. J. Bond, LL.D., thanking the House on behalf of the relatives of the late Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond for the House's Resolution of Sympathy on his death.

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs laid on the Table the Public Accounts for 1925-26.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Scammell, from Fleur de Lys, re Coastal Service.

Mr. Moore gave notice of Question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of Question.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of Question.

Mr. Mosdell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of Question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow move the House in Committee of the Whole to consider the bequest to the Colony of the property of the late Sir Robert Bond, P.C., K.C. M.G., and the correspondence in connection therewith. I would call attention to the fact that the Executor is particularly anxious to get an answer regarding this bequest, and I have promised to bright the matter before the House at the first possible opportunity. We may be quite a time discussing the Address in Reply and I shall therefore ask the indulgence of the House to take up this matter to-morrow. The Government has no desire to shirk responsibility, but we felt that we ought to give representatives of all districts an opportunity to express an opinion on this matter, before the Government sends in a reply.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Answers to the following questions were tabled, Numbers 44, 48, 49, 50, 55, 61, 71.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that any member of the House guilty of making any lengthy remarks should be deprived of the privilege of having a clock to look at, as I notice that the ornament that we have for a clock is not only stopped, but it has lost its hands since yesterday. I trust this is not an indication that the Government is run down and out of commission. I presume there is someone preparing a synopsis of debates for publication in the outport press this year, as the general practice seems to be to take what is published in the daily press and send it along to the outport newspapers. I have no fault to find with the report of the Daily News this morning of my remarks of yesterday. It was better than I expected. I would like to refer to a part of the report, however, in which I think I was misrepresented. I am reported to have said "Mr. Hickman could not be expected to assume all the responsibility of leadership." What I did say was that, in dealing with some remarks made by the leader of the Government, it could not be expected that Mr. Hickman should speak for all the members on the Opposition side of the House. I trust that the reporter who supplied that report to the Daily News will be more careful in future. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Government should remain in power as long as they can function in the best interests of the country and no longer. Whether they have one or two in majority, if in the opinion of the Government they cannot introduce legislation which is in the best interests of the people of the country, the proper

course for them to take is to relinquish their power and appeal to the country for a mandate to strengthen their position or for another party to take their places. The House of Assembly according to the Statutes is a House for four years and no longer and according to that the present House of Assembly will cease to function as a House on July 9th, 1928. Secondly, a Spring election is generally regarded as a wrong time in this country because it interferes with trade, as I pointed out yesterday, and I think we can avoid a Spring election under present conditions by having an election next Fall. The Prime Minister told us that he could not introduce drastic legislation, owing to the way the House is constituted, even though the country is in need of such legislation. Therefore, for the three reasons I have mentioned we should have a general election next Fall. When we realise that we cannot function as a House of Assembly there should be a dissolution and an appeal made to the country and I trust that the Government will consider that. The Prime Minister in the course of his speech referred to a deficit on the railway and said that when his Government took over the railway it was a lot of junk. That might have been said with a greater degree of truth in 1920 when the Government at that time had to appoint a Commission to try and carry on the railway in connection with the Reid Newfoundland Company. I happened to be Colonial Secretary in 1918 when the railway was in a frightful state of disrepair. There were run-offs and derailments every other day and there was cause for the travelling public to lose confidence in it. The matter was referred to me in this House and I gave warning as to the unsafe condition of the road. Our Government were very much worried over the condition of the railway at that time because it was only an act of providence that there was no serious loss of life. The condition of the railway in 1920 was in a deplorable condition, as very little money was spent for its maintenance for many years previous to that.

In Mr. Hall's report on the Railway Commission in 1920, he describes the conditions of the railway at that time, and states the amount of money that had been spent to try and put the railway in safe condition for transportation—for life and also for property. We are very unfair in our criticisms of Governments and reference has been made, no doubt, for political reasons to the vast amount of money that was spent by the Railway Commission of 1920 and succeeding commissions. We have been told about the large amount of money the Government had to find to meet the deficit on the railway at that time. We generally compare our doings with the doings of similar businesses and public transactions in Canada. During the year 1919 there was a deficit of $100,000,000 on Railway Account in Canada. At that time the rates charged on our railway were only 52% of Canadian rates. This report goes on to show (Reads): "Great Britain and the United States took over, etc."

I just mention this to give a comparison of what Newfoundland had to put up with in connection with the operation of its railway and also the conditions of trade with regard to railway transportation in Canada, the United States and Great Britain. Unfortunately while these countries are now operating their railways without any loss, in some cases with a surplus, Newfoundland is still operating its railway at a great loss, as referred to in the Speech from the Throne. I understand that the Canadian Railway this year made a surplus of about $35,000,000. They are progressing in trade and it seems that we are going backward, or at a standstill. It is most unfortunate.

The Railway Commission at that time bought six new locomotives.

(Reads.)

That was the condition of the railway when the Commission resigned. For the money that was spent by the Government of 1919-1920, 1921 up to 1923, the railway was in fairly good condition. It was not a lot of junk. It was in very good condition. Further, I may say, the General Manager of the Railway told me that if the money had not been spent on the railway to the extent it was, if improvements had not been made, if ballasting had not gone on to the same etxent, when we entered into a contract with the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company for the construction of the Mills at Corner Brook, he said it would have been just as possible to cross the Atlantic Ocean in a dory as it would be to move the machinery which was required for the construction of the mill at Corner Brook over our railway. Every satisfaction was given by the railway during that construction period, and although money was spent, the result showed that it was a very wise policy. I just mention this because we are liable to make off-hand statements without knowing the difference or without consideration. In the Speech from the Throne, referring to that part which deals with the deficit, there is a reason given for the deficit:

(Reads.)

I do not know what the Government means by referring to conditions being largely transitory. It says that the price of cotton goods is decreased. I do not know whether they are hoping that the price of cotton goods will increase so that we will get a better revenue. That is one meaning we can read from this. It is ambiguous anyhow. It hopes that something turns up and deplores the fact that cotton goods are low. I think we should all rejoice that the price of cotton goods is low. Anyhow, the only hope for increased revenue is if the price of cotton goods goes up in the foreign markets, then our revenue will go up, and we will be happy because we have to pay more for the clothes we wear. Well, we are going to await the movements of trade before taking any drastic remedial measures. The Government shows its weakness in that paragraph. We know we should have drastic legislation, and still our only hope to meet our deficit is to borrow more money. Well, a crowd of school children would do just as well. Anybody at all can sit down in the Custom House of the country and collect the revenue according to schedule. Anybody could come in here and pass supplies for the next fiscal year, not knowing where the money was going to come from to pay for those supplies and merely trust that they would be able to go to the money markets and borrow money and pay off a debt. Still, we are responsible people, supposed to be working under a responsible Government. Responsible for what? Certainly that is a travesty on British Constitutional Government that we cannot find legitimate ways and means to meet our expenditure for public services for carrying on the business of the country. If it was a private individual he would be declared insolvent over night. Our only collateral security we now have, they tell us, is whatever may be derived from Labrador. At present that is only a liability. It will cost thousands of dollars to find out what we own down there. Lawyers' fees in galore will have to be paid for the next three or four years to find out what we own and the boundary line, and we will have to have surveying parties sent down. We have been depending on Canada before to get what bit of information we had. We learned from their surveying parties about timber

and water powers and other things. Now we are a responsible people. As the Prime Minister said the other day, if we were to appeal to the British Government at the present time to come to our rescue they could say "Physician, heal thyself." We should cut our garment according to our cloth, and if we cannot afford luxuries, let us cut out the luxuries and try to get along as the people got along years ago. I realize that would be difficult.

(Reads: "Part of the deficit is attributable," etc.)

That is plain unvarnished truth, we have to admit. But we have done nothing as a Government since 1924 to reduce interest on public debt. We have been "going to it" as hard and as strong as we can to increase the interest on $11,500,000 which was borrowed by this Government; over $575,000 (nearly $600,000) in interest. Next year the amount may be $750,000; that is what we have to look for now. The public debt has increased so much that we will have to find $750,000 extra as interest on public debt. It is said the deficit on the railway will be considerably less than in 1925-26. We all hope it will. The deficit on the railway for 1923-24 was

(Reads.)

If all the money spent on the railway had been charged to current account it would be nearer a million dollars. A lot of money spent on the railway has been charged to Capital Account.

That is the condition we are in and still we are helpless and hopeless and do nothing but sit down and hope, according to this Speech, that the price of cotton will go up and by that we will be able to meet our expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue all this afternoon and then continue, but I cannot see what is the good. Every business house, and I suppose every private individual, has to do a little stock taking, and this is one place, in connection with the business affairs of the country, that we should have a heart to heart talk on conditions that we have to face. We are responsible for the dealing of the country as members of the Legislature. That is one reason why I would speak of conditions that obtain. If legislation could help, let us do something. I know that there is some legislation that would not help matters, but we can do a little to help. I have here some notes on the Budget of 1924 which I found amongst my papers. I notice from them that the Finance Minister in that Budget Speech denounces vigorously the squandermania of the preceding Government and their miscalculations in their budgets. He says there will be much saving in the cost of transportation. I would like to have a comparison, taking into account the cost of coal at the present time and the cost at that time, and then see how great a saving has been made. "If there is a shortage it will be met by enforced economy in some of the public services," he then said. He said this, and now unfortunately he comes in with a deficit. He hoped to cut expendture down to an irreducible minimum. He uses the biggest adjective and the strongest terms in the English language that he has at his command to define exactly what sort of "a minimum."

(Reads.)

One of our most respected statesmen is credited with saying, "By their deeds we shall know them." The Finance Minister now admits his absolute failure to reduce expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, I will now give place to better and more acceptable speakers because the hours unknowingly are quickly passing by. I thank the House for its kind and attentive hearing.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, on

Wednesday last I listened with close attention, some interest, but no hope to the Speech with which His Excellency the Administrator was pleased to open this session of the Legislature. Close attention, in order that I might ascertain just what that speech contained, just what forecast it might give us of the nature, character and extent of the legislation which the Government proposed to submit to us; some interest, in that, as each paragraph began, there was the anticipation of the succeeding words containing something which might be of service to our Colony; but no hope, when I realised at the end of the paragraph that there was nothing in what preceded that end which could in any way improve conditions in this country. It was a colorless document, as colorless as the water in a glass, as the air that surrounds this House; and it consisted merely in repetitions of facts already known, well known, for they have been dinned into our ears by the present administration on the platform, through the press and elsewhere.

Before proceeding to further discuss this matter I would like to extend to the several members of the House the usual congratulations. In particular I congratulate Mr. Chambers, who, by accepting the office of Minister of Public Works, had necessarily to return to his district for its endorsation of his action. Mr. Chambers was returned by a large majority. I congratulate him on that majority, and I do so all the more heartily because I feel that it was due solely to the popularity of my good friend Mr. Chambers himself and not to the popularity of the administration with which he is associated, though one of the items upon which certain money of the loan of 1926 was expended may possibly be referred to as an indication that there were other causes for the majority which our good friend obtained. I would like to congratulate also my good friend Dr. Mosdell, who defeated the Government candidate in a district in which it at least conceived itself to be firmly entrenched. He took his political life in his hands, resigned his seat in the Upper House and went down into the political whirlpool to fight this strongly entrenched Government in the District of Fortune. It struck me as rather strange to see how quickly the Government opened that district after it had removed its representative, a member sitting on this side of the House in opposition. I don't know the reason why one seat remained closed two years and why the other seat was opened within two months after the vacancy occurred. One might perhaps be forgiven if suspicions as the motives of the Government, not particularly complimentary to them, cross one's mind from time to time in this connection. The facts were that at that time the Government and Opposition were practically even on the floors of the House; that shortly before one member who sat in opposition to the Government had been induced by what means I know not to cross the floors and support that Government. I have heard that gentleman time after time and session after session stand here on this side of the House and condemn the policy and actions of the Monroe administration in the strongest possible terms. He was a member of the Liberal Party, elected, I believe, under the Liberal Party to support the policy of the Liberal Party, and he did carry out his pledges no doubt for three sessions of the Legislature. It may be due to party spirit this afternoon that I regret his presence on the other side of the House. In due course I suppose he will go back to his constituents and answer to them as I will to mine. His conscience is his own and I trust that within himself he is perfectly satisfied with his action. I do congratulate

Dr. Mosdell on his victory. I repeat he took his political life in his hands. He went to a district entirely new to him, a district opened by the Government silently and without other than the usual legal notice. It was, I have no doubt, a great surprise to the present administration that a district upon which I believe they counted confidently had gone against them. It was a blow, a serious blow to the administration. It was a plain statement from the people of Fortune Bay that "we electors of this district have no confidence in the present administration." To Dr. Mosdell a large measure of credit is due for having presented the facts and issues so clearly before the electors of Fortune Bay that the powerful agencies on behalf of the Government against him were of no avail. I repeat my congratulations to him.

I would like also to congratulate the honourable member of St. John's East, Mr. Brophy, upon his recent election to a seat in this House. Mr. Brophy is a young man, younger politically than I am myself. He went down into the whirlpool of politics to fight what appeared to be a forlorn hope in the stronghold of the Government, in a district, sir, where the third candidate who fought that district for the Monroe party in the election of 1924 polled over three times the vote of the highest Liberal candidate of that time; where the lowest candidate of the Monroe party polled more votes than the combined vote of the three Liberal candidates of 1924. And Mr. Brophy emerged from that contest victorious in spite of that tremendous majority, in spite of the heavy artillery which the Government used against him. It was a wonderful fight. I had the honor, the privilege and the pleasure of taking some part in it myself, so I speak from personal knowledge, and I do most heartily congratulate Mr. Brophy who so successfully came out of a fight which, on the face of it, to the ordinary man, would seem to be a hopeless one.

I remember seeing in the Government Press during that campaign a statement to the effect that a defeat of the Government candidate in St. John's East would be tantamount to a vote of want of confidence in the Government. You have got it, sir. The District of St. John's East has given the Government its answer. The answer is "we have no confidence in this Government." I trust that the Government itself will take the verdict of St. John's East as being what its own official organ says it is. I don't know whether it was the intion at the time to stampede the electorate into voting for the Government candidate; but if so that attempt signally failed. If not, then it must have been a truthful statement of what the Government organ believed, and the Government itself believed, and I trust that they will now take that decision in the spirit in which it was given and govern their actions accordingly.

I would like also to congratulate the junior member for Harbor Main and the honourable member for St. George's upon the speeches which they made in moving that an address be sent to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The latter I would congratulate generally, the former merely upon the early part of his speech. It would hardly be expected of me to congratulate Mr. Cahill upon that portion of his speech which had particular reference to those members who sat on the Government side and now find themselves on this side. I did notice this, that while there was apparent sincerity in the early portions of the honourable member's speech, the latter portion did lack that sincerity; so insincere were they that the honourable member felt that it was more than he could do to speak extemporarily, and he was guilty of a venial breach of the

rules of debate in that he read the latter portion of his speech. It was high sounding and must have taken some time to compose. I like the rythm of it myself, although it did attempt to cast some reflections on me; but its apparent artificiality convinced me that it was insincere, and therefore in its nature complimentary. Now, sir, this speech, so-called, as every honourable member of this House knows, and indeed as most citizens know, is the emanation of the Government rather than of anybody else. I presume it is our duty to pass such remarks as we may deem proper upon its contents. In order that one may judge with any degree of correctness or with any degree of intelligence of the pronouncements of any particular party or body it is essential that we should have some conceptions of the chracteristics of the party or the body making those particular pronouncements. It would seem, therefore, rather necessary if we are to arrive at a reasonably correct conclusion as to what may be foreshadowed for the Colony in this Speech from the Throne that we should analyze the characteristics of the Monroe party from the day the party was first conceived, and bring our research down to the present moment. If we can with the materials at our disposal arrive at a reasonably correct estimate of its salient features, then perhaps we will be in a position to judge what may be expected from the contents of the speech for the weal or woe of this unfortunate Colony.

I remember in 1924 when I was a member of that party, Mr. Speaker, one of the salient characteristics of the policy which that party undertook to put into effect was retrenchment, the reduction of public expenditure, the stoppage of unnecessary waste of public moneys, the cutting of our coats according to the quantity of cloth which we hapepned to possess, the abolition of the payment of unnecessary salaries. The whole of the public services was to be cleaned up. Having succeeded in doing this, it was to be kept clean. A wise and unquestionably wise policy, one at which no reasonably minded, honest citizen could possibly cavil, one which if it was beleived in must necessarily be voted for by every honest citizen who happened to posses the franchise. There were quite a number of people who did believe in the honest intentions of this party as it was then. In consequence the Monroe party was elected to power. Never before in the history of Newfoundland was an administration in such an advantageous position to bring about the retrenchment and reduction of expenditure which was promised by the Monroe party in 1924. Never in the history of this Colony was public opinion so prepared for the pruning knife and the axe, and never since we received Responsible Government in this country have we seen less of it. Some of us waited in the hope that when things settled down this policy would develop. Naturally a new Government just taking office, even though many of them are experienced politicians, is not in a position to begin with the pruning knife at once. It must find its feet, get what, in the venacular would be called, the hang of things. It was reasonable the Government should be given the opportunity to get this "hang" before expecting anything in the nature of a drastic reform. The Colony looked on and waited for what had been promised, and, sir, I stand here this afternoon quite prepared to receive contradictions, if such can be given, and I am quite prepared to admit that I am wrong if anybody can successfully dispute what I say. I make this statement that since the advent to office of the Monroe administration there has not been a single substantial attempt to reduce any of the expenditure of this Colony.

On the contrary, sir, year after year since this administration came into office we have come down here and witnessed the spectacle of increased votes in practically every department. And I hear, sir, that during last September, down in Bonavista Bay, a constable was going around the settlement enquiring as what old women were receiving the widow's mite, presumably for the purpose of weeding them out. Beyond that I have no knowledge of any retrenchment that this Government has undertaken. That is one fact, sir, from which we judge of the character of the administration which now unfortunately controls the destinies of this Colony. It was fairly crammed down the throats of the electorate that they would, if returned to power, reduce public expenditure, which they claimed to be scandalous, and would wisely expend public moneys which they claimed had been uselessly squandered previously. And yet after a record of three years in office these promises have been so contemptuously flung aside, and expenditure instead of being reduced has been so substantially and disastrously increased, that one might be forgiven perhaps if, with a record of that kind before one, the suggestion comes to one's mind that even at the moment when these promises were given prior to the election in 1924, they were not given honestly. We were promised a "wise" expenditure of public moneys. I suppose that wisdom is a comparative term. Nobody is all-wise, at least on this earth, though some may be wiser than others. If we were to say that that phrase meant a comparatively wise expenditure of public moneys, we would be at least charitable towards the present Government. Iam prepared to ent Government. I am prepared to admit that if the present Government had been comparatively wise in expenditure, they would have gone a little way towards the carrying out of their pre-election promises. But has their expenditure been even comparatively wise I understand that there has been something like $2,212,000 spent on high roads in the past two years. That I believe is the answer to a question that was asked a couple of days ago.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, another answer that was given this afternoon, showing that an amount of $250,000, allocated from a loan in 1926, was appropriated to the Highroads Commission. That I presume was done under the Executive authority which was so described by the present administration before they obtained office. Such is the consistency of the party which was incensed against the methods of the previous Liberal administration because of their alleged government by Minute of Council. And, sir, in spite of its serious objection to that type of government, I have here before me this afternoon an admission by that very Government which so decried Minute of Council Government wherein they admit having appropriated a quarter of a million dollars to a purpose for which this Legislature never intended it. That is a type of Government to which we Newfoundlanders in the peculiar conditions in which the Colony finds itself to-day should no longer entrust our destinies if it at all can be prevented. I believe that some miles of high roads have been built, just how many I don't know. But I do know that last year we got 146 miles of road built and repaired for over one million dollars. I presume that if I were to say 300 miles of road for $2,000,000 I would be fairly correct. Now the question is, was this expenditure a wise one? I should be pleased, sir, to learn just exactly how these roads will benefit the fishermen of this Colony. I do remember a statement as contained in the Manifesto of the Monroe party, wherein it said that the fisheries woud ever be the mainstay

and the great support of the people of this Colony. Now one would naturally expect that the expenditure of $2,212,000 would in some way concern this great mainstay of the Colony. One would imagine that these high roads would be of some benefit for instance to the fishermen in the lower end of the district of Port de Grave, who fish from the time that the ice goes off the coast until it comes back again. And yet these roads are not within six miles of these fishermen. The road over which they have to travel to get to the railway is in such a condition that if you took a barrel of flour on a long cart a distance of six miles from Clarke's Beach to Hibbs' Cove you would get there with half the barrel of flour strewn on the road. One would have imagined an expenditure upon such a road to be a reasonable expenditure; that six miles of road is of benefit to this Colony in so far as it concerns the fishermen of that particular district. But one fails to see just how a high road from here to Salmonier can be of any benefit to the fishermen of Harbour Grace, Conception Bay, Labrador, or any part of this Colony, except in so far as it may be of advantage to gentlemen who on a whole or half holiday take their fishing roads and go up their favourite stream to catch the fresh water fish with which our streams abound. But so far from being of advantage to the staple industry of this country, that high roads policy is entirely useless. And it is the fishermen of this Colony that have to pay the piper. They have to pay the interest on the $2,00,000 which has been expended. They have to pay $200,000 or $300,000 for the upkeep of these high roads and they do not derive any benefit whatever from them. High roads are good. I would be delighted to see them running from one end of the island to the other, and touching every village and hamlet on the coast. That would be an excellent thing. But how a number of high roads in the Peninsula of Avalon are going to benefit the fishermen in another part of the Colony is entirely beyond me to conceive. Possibly my intelligence may be limited, but if so my mental condition is similar to that of a large number of people in Newfoundland today, for most of the electors of this Colony agree with my opinion on that point.

Money has been spent, and by Minute of Council, by a Government which formerly condemned such a procedure. It has spent $2,212,000 upon high roads which will be useful only to those seeking pleasure, and who are in a position to possess those vehicles which the ordinary working man of this country cannot possibly hope to have—high roads which will never be of service to the fishermen of this country, a constant expense to them instead. In place of a reduction in favour of the producing interests of this Colony we have increased the expenditure at the cost of those interests.

We were also promised a reduction in taxation. The words sounded very sweet to the average taxpayer of this country, so sweet, indeed, that they dissolved in the mouth before the flavour became palpable; and in fact it is very seldom, so far as I am aware, in the history of this Colony that the public has ever succeeded in enjoying this flavour. I believe that the Liberal administration under Sir Robert Bond was responsible for a reduction in taxation, but just to what extent I do not know, because I am not old enough to remember things of 25 years ago. Reduction is looked upon by the ordinary taxpayer with favor, and any party which comes into power is graciously received by the average elector of this Colony, of any colony or any country, upon a promise to reduce taxation. As I have already remarked in another connection, the majority believed that pro-

mise; they felt that they had gotten together an aggregation of gentlemen of character likely to interest themselves in the country, and prepared to see the needs of the fishermen and the other working classes; that they recognized that the conditions under which the fishermen and the other working classes existed were almost impossible ones—men who were in fact satisfied that in order for the fishermen and other working men to gain a decent livelihood it was essential to reduce taxation. No one anticipated that in the session of 1924 the Government would bring into effect any serious reduction of taxation. It was the wrong time of the year to undertake any legislation of a drastic character; it was the wrong time of the year to make any difference in the tariff, and the public was quite satisfied when the Government simply adopted the Estimates which were prepared by the previous Government, and put them through in August of 1924. But it was confidently anticipated that during the session of 1925 a real attempt would be made to remedy the condition of the workingman of this country. It was an accepted fact that the fisheries were not remunerative; it was an accepted fact that fishermen were dissatisfied with conditions under which they prosecuted that industry, and that many young men who under ordinary circumstances would be the fish producers of the future were getting out of the country to seek their fortunes in more favourable climes. I know this, for I have been talking with them. I know the conditions in which they found themselves. I know that it was with regret in many instances that they found they had to leave their country. But the first necessity of man is to live, and to live one must eat, and these young men found themselves in a position where the avocation which their forefathers had pursued for centuries was no longer capable of yielding sufficient remuneration to keep them alive, and wherever possible they got out, and wherever possible they are still getting out. One of the hardest things I have had to do in my short history as a member of this House was to advise a couple of young men, constituents of mine, who placed their situation before me, that there was nothing for them to do but to leave the country. They were prepared to go in the fishing boats to earn their living if it was possible, but they were not prepared to work on the high roads. The people, as I have said, confidently ever since, until the Tory administration in 1925 would introduce legislation which would have the effect of lightening the already too heavy burdens which lay on their shoulders —and they waited to see the tariff that would be brought down. Consternation ran like wildfire throughout this Colony the moment the tariff became known. Instead of the reduction which they had promised, various articles which are essential to the people were taxed more heavily still. The butterine which every fisherman uses—when he can get it—was taxed a further two cents per pound; the cost of his tobacco was increased also; a duty was placed on lines and twines, which were twenty-seven years ago placed on the free list by Sir Robert Bond, and have been free ever since, until the Tory administration taxed them. Not only was there no attempt to lessen the burdens of the people, to lessen the burdens of the fishermen, but that burden was piled more and more heavily still on their shoulders by the very people who had promised to reduce it. It may be that the present Government has some abstruse economic reason which may be explained hereafter, but to ordinary man it would seem to be a first principle of political ecenomy that taxation which affects industry is disastrous. In the words of this

administration, the fisheries are the mainstay of this Colony, and if that is so, how can it be contended that taxing them is encouragement. On the other hand it is clear to the merest tyro that every cent of taxation hampers that industry, and that means hampering what the Government itself characterized as the mainstay of the Colony. Can one conceive of anything more contradictory than hampering an industry which the hamperers say is the mainstay of the Colony? It reminds one of the Corn Laws of a century ago. It took fifty years to drill in the minds of English statesmen the fact that protective laws result in a loss of trade. But in this Colony we don't seem to realize that to tax industry is to hamper the fishermen and to hamper the great public of the country. This does not seem to have occurred to us. If it has it is the more culpable, because these actions are not from accident, but design.

(Reads.)

I have yet to learn that these further burdens were placed on the people to meet extraordinary conditions, because in the same breath the Government introduces reduction in taxation in other directions—in fact they effected a reduction in certain taxation, but not of the kind this country was looking for.

Amongst other things there was a reduction of the Bank Tax. I do not pretend to know much about banks; but I do know that they in common with other people in this world dislike taxation, and I have no doubt that they were delighted when the present administration decided to reduce the tax. One of the reasons offered by the Government to justify this reduction was that it would materially benefit the trade of the Colony and that the seven per cent. interest charged by the banks would be reduced to six per cent. Possibly the rate of interest was reduced in some instances, but I know of instances in which it was not. I am not simple enough, sir, to believe for a moment that the banks are prepared to hand over to the business men of this Colony any advantage they may get through the Government. Just what amount the banks profited by this reduction I can not definitely say, but my information is that they benefit in the neighbourhood of $75,000 annually. I speak, of courst, subject to correction. So that we may say, and not illogically, that this additional tax of fifteen per cent. placed upon our tariff and which has to be borne by the ordinary working classes provides the $75,000.00 which has been handed over to the banks by the present administration; and that is the sort of reduction in taxation that the people of this country have been getting during the past three years. I do not know what explanation the Government has to give for their attitude in this connection. I have heard various excuses offered for it. I do not propose to further delay the House in dealing in detail with the Banks because they are not worth wasting time over. I do know that these Canadian banks are here for the purpose of making money. They are not philanthropists in the interests of the people of Newfoundland, and when they get an advantage from the present administration to the extent of $75,000.00 a year, they are not going to hand it back to the people of this Colony. Our Government gave this money to them and taxed the fishermen of this country to get it to give to them. Then, Sir, we had another reduction in taxation. We did have in this country an Act known as the Business Profits Tax Act. I think it was imposed by the Squires administration or the one preceding it during the war years. I am told that that was an unfair tax, although just how that contention can be sustained I do not know. I have not a copy of the Act before me, but I take it

as a general principle that if any business or corporation made profits that it should be paid a certain proportion of those profits to the people from whom they obtain them, and that the greater the amount of profits made the greater the amount of taxes which should be paid. Sir, that seems not unreasonable to me. The tax was in effect for several years. It did cause a certain amount of dissatisfaction, as necessarily it would amongst those taxed and it was offered as an excuse for abolishing the tax that it operated unfairly. We were told that in connection with certain fishing concerns of this Colony—those firms who bought and sold fish—the tax operated very unfairly indeed, and the reason given was a plausible one. In fact I will go further and say that it was a reasonable one in some instances, notwithstanding that there were years when those fish buyers made huge profits and upon which they paid considerable taxes, because there were others years when they met with large losses and could not get back any of the profits that they had paid to the Government in the fat years in order to recoup losses in the lean ones. I say the reason is plausible, and perhaps to some extent reasonable, but I do say that on the whole these gentlemen make profits. These concerns and corporations must make profits else why are they in business—for the good of their healths? No firm on Water Street to-day is going to remain in business unless it is making profits on the whole, and, if it is unfair to tax any business concern upon huge profits that it makes this year because of losses next year, then it suggests itself to me that a scheme should be devised so that profits and losses could be added together and proper safeguards instituted whereby a tax should be paid upon the average net profits for every two, three, four or five years. But no attempt whatever was made to do this. No attempt was made to work out any such scheme. The merchant classes were freed from the Business Profits Tax and the fishermen of this Colony paid their fifteen per cent additional to offset the loss of the tax of which these firms and corporations were relieved. Nor does the argument end there. All the corporations doing business in this country are not engaged in the fishing business nor are all the profit making concerns engaged in the fishing business. There are many of them whose profits are as regular as the rise and decline of the Sun. There are some of them whose profits are so large that they have adopted the expedient of watering their stock four or five times in order to conceal huge dividends. There are others whose profits are so large that they adopt even easier methods of concealing the facts from time to time. Yet these people are allowed to go on and make their huge profits and pay no tax on those profits, and in order that they may do this the working classes of this country are called upon to pay an extra fifteen per cent. This is the sort of reduction in the high cost of living the common people have been getting from the Monroe administration during the past three years.

Next we come to the Income Tax, a tax which, perhaps, contained provisions which bore somewhat harshly upon certain sections of the community and which I believe should have been amended in some respects. But the principle of an Income Tax, generally speaking, is right, and the difficulty of its application is no excuse for destroying it, particularly when the country has lost three or four hundred thousand dollars through its abolition, which amount now has to be squeezed out of the fishermen who have been as the lemon for the past three years. I realise that the Government had to increase the tar-

iff by reason of the fact that they removed the taxes from wealthy individuals and corporations. The money had to be made up somewhere unless we got reduction in the public expenditure which the Prime Minister promised to the country in his Manifesto and which is not forthcoming yet. I wonder where does the present Government expect the Colony to land, if we are to go on as we have been during the past three years, borrowing year after year to pay deficits on current account and which deficits are continually increasing. The Prime Minister the other day informed us that the deficit on current revenue was one and a half million dollars. I wonder how much more than that it will be. He told us that the deficit on railway account was $750,000.00. That gives us a deficit of $2,225,000.00. Twelve months ago I made what might be regarded as a guess that the total deficit for 1926-27 would be two and a half million dollars. Already the Government admits $2,225,000.00 of it, according to the Prime Minister's own statement, and I venture the opinion that when all the facts are known that I underestimated rather than overestimated the facts. We were told by the Prime Minister in his Manifesto in 1924 that Newfoundland was going to be made a fisherman's Paradise and that everything that could possibly be done would be undertaken for the prosperity of the fishermen. I do not know whether Newfoundland was actually a fisherman's Paradise at that time, but I know at the present time it is next door to a fisherman's hell. Sir, there is not a fisherman in this Colony to-day who can make two ends meet and give his family a half decent living. I say also that I know from personal knowledge and from information furnished me by my constituents that the great majority of the fishermen in my district last Fall did not have fifty dollars with which to feed themselves and their families throughout last Winter. Is that what some people call a fisherman's Paradise? What has been done, I ask, to encourage in any way the fishermen or the fisheries by the present Government since they assumed office? I have some recollection that a bonus on fish was promised by the Prime Minister in his Manifesto, and I am honest enough to admit the difficulty of applying this bonus on fish.

I am honest enough to admit the difficulty of the application of the idea of giving a bonus on fish. I see that it is likely if applied by giving so much per quintal to work out like some other legislation of the present administration namely to the advantage of those already fairly well situated at the expense of the less fortunate. The man getting most fish would get the biggest bonus and the man getting least would get the smallest. In other words the man needing most gets least and the man needing least gets the most. A bonus on fish would need to be worked out very carefully. Whether it could be worked out at all or not I am not prepared to say at the present moment and after giving the matter some thought I do not think the Monroe administration would be able to work out such a scheme as would be useful to the people of this country. But the promise was there and if something could not be done in the way of giving a direct bonus surely some encouragement of some kind should be given to the fishermen. Some sort of a scheme should have been worked out if it were not practicable to give a direct bonus. If they could not give fifty cents a quintal as a bonus to the fishermen they could take it off the cost of his outfit. Surely some effort could be made whereby this trade might be made more remunerative. The cost of his lines and twines might have been decreased instead of increased. The cost of his clothing might have been decreased

instead of increased. The cost of some of his articles of food might have been rendered less. And these are not the only means by which it was possible at least to consider some betterment of conditions for the fishermen of this colony.

We have our problems in connection with the marketing and curing of our fish. Was it not possible for the present administration containing as it does several men who are at least somewhat familiar with the export of codfish to take up the matter and make some effort to market our fish more profitably than has been done heretofore. There was, I know, an act in force some six or seven years ago known as "The Codfish Exportation Act," whereby an effort was made to regulate the shipping of fish. To a large extent it failed. For what reason I do not know, except that probably it contained some conditions that while well intentioned were not suited to the particular conditions that obtained at that time. While I remember it I do desire to draw to the attention of the House the matter of a petition I presented last year, in connection with the export of codfish from the Labrador. I represent a district which comprises at least half the stationers on the Labrador and I have talked with various ones of my constituents dozens of times about conditions which exist in connection with the export of codfish from that coast and they have explained to me just what are these conditions under which that exportation takes place, and the disastrous results which follow. The great bulk of the fish today is taken from Labrador to market by steamers which come there in early September and as many as 100 to 150 boats may be around one steamer in an afternoon all rushing their fish aboard the ship. One doesn't need a very fertile imagination to get some idea of how that fish goes down into the hold of that steamer. In the first place the coal has to be passed out in order to make room for it and then the fishermen, all anxious to get his fish aboard, walk over the coal and cinders and grind it into the fish as it goes down into the hold of the vessel. Not only is that the case but the fish itself is often, very often improperly and insufficiently cured. Now I want you to imagine for a moment what condition that fish can possibly be in when it gets over to the market, having been improperly cured and trodden upon because of the rushed nature of the job, remembering always that the markets are warm countries. The conditions under which fish is taken from the Labrador to-day warrant its being said that it is not treated as an article of food at all. I brought into this Assembly last year a petition signed by every Labrador fishermen in my district, and signed by a number of fishermen in the district of Carbonear and also in Harbor Grace, praying that these conditions be remedied, and absolutely no attention whatever was paid to it after I had read it in the House and it had been referred to the Department to which it relates. When I realized what was going to happen to that petition with the unanimous support of every fisherman in my district I almost took an oath that I would never bring another petition into this Assembly again. The wishes and desires of all the fishermen of Port de Grave district were treated simply as a scrap of paper and went in the waste paper basket at the hands of a body of men who had promised to do everything in their power to minister to the prosperity of those fishermen. The export of codfish from Newfoundland présents a problem which had been engaging the attention of our legislators previous to the advent to office of the Monroe administration. Whether or not that legislation was wise I don't propose to discuss now, but this much can be said at any rate, namely, that

it was at least some attempt to do something. Even if it was a blunder it was at least an attempt and for that at least these previous legislators must be given credit. At any rate they have shown us pitfalls into which we need not fall to-day. I am told that one of the great difficulties in connection with the export and marketing of our codfish is that there is no order in the sending out of shipments; that the various firms on Water Street and in some outports in the colony have agents on the other side and down in South America and the other ports and places in which our fish is sold and that from time to time as an opportunity is seen to sell fish in some particular market the agent of every firm in Newfoundland which has an agent is that locality advises the firm he acts for that there is an opening for a sale. (I must say that my information on these matter is merely hearsay and if I say anything improper I am quite ready and willing to take it back if some one who knows better can correct me). As a result of the information sent cargoes are shipped accordingly and go off into these markets for sale, at the same time and because of the fact that several of them start off for the same port at about the same time and then in the ordinary course of events they arrive just about the same time, the result is inevitable. Picture then a large quantity of Newfoundland codfish dumped down in Oporto on the 17th of May, 1927. What is going to happen to the price? I don't suppose there is a child of the age of fourteen who is not able to answer that question, it must fall. First because the market is oversupplied and secondly because the article itself is a perishable one. The conditions which obtain in that foreign port are exactly the same as those that would obtain in St. John's if on the 2nd of July, 1928, some one dumped one hundred thousand cases of oranges in the city. Why, anyone could go down with a wheelbarrow and would be given all he wanted to take out of the storekeeper's way. The result of this manner of shipping fish and consequent overcrowding of the market is that the price falls and the moment the price falls in the foreign market it immediately reflects back on the fishermen of this colony. I don't know the reason why the exporters of this country can't get together and arrange the matter so that the merkets will not be flooded in this way. I have heard from the Government side of the House severe castigation of that body which is called the Board of Trade and the Exporters' Association. If as is suggested each man looks to his own benefit and there is no co-operation amongst them, and if these gentlemen are so blind to their ultimate interest that they will not co-operate, then they should not be allowed to hamper the interest of the fishermen of this colony longer. If they will not cooperate then it is time that the Goverment of this country took them by the throat and made them do it, in the interests of the whole community instead of subjecting the industry to the whims of those men whom we are told are incapable of and antagonistic to co-operation. One does not perhaps need a very deep knowledge of human nature to realize why this is the case. Every man I suppose wants to make money and he wants to make it as quickly as possible. The immediate dollar appeals strongly whereas ultimate good is to the ordinary business man merely a look into the apparently distant future. It is quite natural that Mr. Jones who has a cargo of fish will want to get into the market early, and get a good price for it. Therefore he will attempt to reach it before anybody else can get there. Therefore it becomes a race for profits rather than an organized business campaign. There has been no effort to control the export of fish, or to force

those who will not wait for the proper time to send the fish into the market to act sanely. If the gentlemen of Water Street and Bonavista and Trinity Bays, and the other people who are exporting fish from this country are not prepared to voluntarily co-operate, then I say that this legislature should take the matter in hand and see that they do so involuntarly. The idea of co-operative marketing may be somewhat new to these people. It may be contrary to our conservative English ideas, but it is one result of the advance of civilisation that has come to stay. Practically all the potatoes that come from Prince Edward Island comes under some form of co-operative marketing, and the same applies to every egg that comes from Nova Scotia. Every orange that comes from California comes in the same way. In Australia to-day, one of the most progressive of British Commonwealths,—I think it is in the Province of Queensland—the Government took hold of the growers and the exporters, and forced them into cooperation by legislation. They had to do this to save the industry which would otherwise have been irretrievably injured. The same type of legislation has got to be undertaken in this country if we are to save the fisheries. If those who are in charge of the fishing enterprise in this country, the exporters and supplying merchants, are not prepared to adopt those measures which in the long run mean the saving of the industry then they must be forced to do it. If they are not willing to protect themselves, then because of the fact that the people must protect themselves, they must also compel the capitalists to co-operate whether they like it or not.

Lat year I heard various reports from the fishermen in various parts of this country, complaining of the manner in which the fish is being culled. They did complain that the culling was entirely different from what it had been the previous year, and that they did not know how to make fish to suit the merchants of the country to-day. I had a report from one man that I know very well. He belongs to Trinity Bay. He told me that during the Spring of 1926, he was here to get supplies—and by the way he wants no merchant to give him credit. He is able to pay for what he wants—He had a conversation with his merchant in connection with the cure of fish—A big supplying merchant I may say—He was given specific instructions as to the type of fish that would be required that year, and how it should be cured. He cured it accordingly. And he told me—and I believe him, that the fish that he brought into St. John's to sell last October was as good as he had ever brought to any merchant in his life, and as well cured, and he received for it the price of $3.50 a quintal. That was fish sir, which had been cured according to instructions. And it was supposed to be exported some for No. 2, some Maderia, some West Indies, but very little of it was No. 1. And a poorer grade of fish at the hands of another merchant received a different price altogether—a bigger price. The truth was that no fisherman in this country last year knew how to make fish because he did not know what quality was required. Are we so lacking in intelligence in this country that no means can be found whereby fish can be graded. Oranges, apples, potatoes, beef are graded in other countries, but we in this country are not capable of grading our own principle product. No attempt has been made by the Government to remedy this evil. They might at least have made the attempt. I do not say that it would have been successful. Possibly it would not have been. Some would go so far as to say that it probably would not. But sir, that does not excuse them from having failed to make the attempt, par-

ticularly in view of the fact that they proposed to do everything which would minister to the prosperity of the fishery. Now sir, I am open to correction, and I would be pleased if any honourable member of this House can give me any information as to what would better minister to the prosperity of the fishery of this country than a scheme whereby the fishermen would obtain a better price for their fish and market it to better advantage. Nothing along this line has been done. Their burdens have been increased from time to time, and not the slightest effort has been made to enable them to bear those additional burdens which the Government has been pleased to put upon their backs. Their taxes have been increased in order to take the place of the taxes which were removed from the backs of those better able to bear them. And now in the last days of a dying Government we find in the Speech from the Throne that they intend to reimpose the income tax. I presume that the people must regard this as in the nature of an admission that their previous action was a mistake, and that now upon their death beds they have come to repentance. I notice further sir, that the measure which should go with that income tax, is absent. I refer to the business Profits Tax. Concerning that I will have more to say when that measure comes down before this House.

So much sir, for the type of legislation that has been proposed by the Monroe Government in the interests of the people, during the past three years. That record coupled with the undertaking which were given to the people afford an approximation of the true value of the Speech from the Throne which was read to this House by you sir on Wednesday afternoon. But after all these are not the only facts upon which we can base an opinion. As to the true meaning of that Speech, the political machinations of the present administrations present facts which will throw considerable light upon what we may expect from them in the future.

Last year this time the situation in this House was that the Government had 17 supporters and there were 17 men in opposition. That is how the House stood when it was prorogued in June. Subsequently one man then sitting in opposition was induced to join forces with the Government and we now see him in the camp of his former enemies. I trust that he is well satisfied with his action in this regard. and that his conscience does not afflict him for his conduct in that respect. Just what love the present administration had for that gentleman I do not know. Shortly after that another member who was sitting in opposition was removed from the floors of this House. He was given by this administration a very prominent and a very honourable position in this Colony, and I trust that he will grace that position. As to the particular motive which actuated the Government in removing a member from this side of the House, that is an entirely different matter—I have yet to learn that it is a common attribute of human nature to hand out plums of that kind to one's enemies, and one might be pardoned in suggesting that members of the Government were not altogether altruistic and unselfish, in this particular case.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It was done in the case of Judge Kent.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I am not going to allow references to that gentleman, so the hon. member will kindly discontinue. I am not going to have it from either side of the House.

MR. BRADLEY—I quite agree with you, Mr. Speaker. I have already drawn to the attention of this House the contrast between the Government's action in connection with that district and St. John's East—in the for-

mer they, with undue, almost indecent haste, opened the district vacated by that gentleman. Can it be that they anticipated defeat there? That they were delighted to give the people the opportunity to turn their candidate down? Is that what we could expect from ordniary mortals, or may we be forgiven in believing that the Government was quite confident it would win? But they reckoned without their hosts, namely the people of Fortune District. And then, feeling the effects of the sledge-hammer blow thus dealt them by the electors of Fortune Bay, and in view of the fact that during the winter disruption occurred within their own ranks, they were compelled to open St. John's East, which for two years they refused to open. I am glad to be able to stand on the floors of this House and say without fear of contradiction that I advocated the opening of the District of St. John's East from the start; that I considered it the constitutional right of the District to have its quota of three members and not two merely. And the reason for keeping that district closed was that the Government feared to open it, just as their reason for opening it was that they were compelled to do so, and felt that they couldn't lose under the altered circumstances. Again they reckoned without their hosts, and the people of St. John's East have also given the Government their answer, and that answer was the one given last Fall by the people of Fortune Bay! Sir, in common, brutal English, that answer was "Get out"! The people of no district in the Colony have any confidence in this Government—the people of the whole Colony are in exactly the same frame of mind as those of St. John's East. And the question arises—"What are we going to do about it?" What is the Government going to do? The people have unanimously given their ultimatum—in two districts they have told you clearly that they have no desire for you to remain longer in control of the affairs of this country, that they have no longer any confidence in you; that they want a change—whether for better or worse—they want a change in the conduct of public affairs. They are not satisfied with the way the present administration has dealt with these affairs durnig the past three years! And on the admission of your own official organs we are told that the decision in St. John's East was tantamount to a vote of want of confidence. I wonder if the Government intends to take it as such, or does it intend to hold on like Grim Death, by tooth and by nail, until the last moment? And if the latter is the course they adopt, is it one we can conceive to be honest, to be in accordance with those high and pure motives which the Government apes. Is there any motive other than to hold on to place and pay as long as possible. The Government to-day finds itself in the position of having a majority of one on the floors of the House, a position which is clearly an untenable one. Ever since I have been old enough to understand politics I have heard it said that a Government needs a working majority of four or five members, and if the majority is reduced to less than that the position is such that there is only one thing to do, and that is to go back and see if the electors are prepared to give them a mandate to go on, and make them strong enough to undertake such legislation as is in the interests of the country at large. I repeat that the majority of the Government is one member, clearly far below the standard of a working majority. The Prime Minister himself on Wednesday last admitted that conditions required drastic legislation, that we were faced with a huge deficit and a failing fishery. I would say that fishery and labor conditions are such that we need drastic, if not revolutionary legislation—a situation that needs handling as speedily as

possible. The Prime Minister admitted that his forces were not sufficiently strong to do that—these are his own admissions. And we on this side of the House are not simply desirous of casting the Government into outer darkness as far as place or pay is concerned; we have no desire merely to go to the other side of the House. We are prepared to abide by the decision of the electors of this Country, and we want the Prime Minister to take his own remarks to heart and act on the opinion he has formed, namely, that the Government is not sufficiently strong to effect the legislation which the needs of the times require. Let him go back to the polls and see if the people are prepared to put him back in office. If the electors are satisfied to do that we are content.

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

On motion the second reading of the bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador" was deferred until to-morrow.

Mr. Russell gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Brophy gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that this House at its rising do adjourn until to-morrow at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 18th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Brown from Little Bay Islands and other places, re Roads.

Mr. Ashbourne from Friday's Bay, re Roads.

The Hon. the Prime Minister laid on the Table of the House a Summary of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1926.

Mr. Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Mr. Mosdell gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines laid on the Table of the House the following documents:

Report of Department of Agriculture and Mines, 1925-26.

Return of Crown Land Grants issued, 1925-26.

Return of Licenses to Cut Timber issued 1925-26.

Return of Mining Licenses issued 1925-26.

Return of Ninety-Nine Year Mining Leases issued 1925-26.

Return of Water Power Leases 1925-26.

Return of Saw Mills, 1926.

Report of Chief Woods Ranger, 1926.

Report of Fire Patrol of Newfoundland, 1926.

Report of Government Analyst, 1926.

Report of H. J. Duder, Surveyor, 1926.

Report of M. J. James, Surveyor, 1926.

Report of J. H. Burridge, Surveyor, 1926.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Speaker, with your permission and with the indulgence of the House I would like at this juncture to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if he is in a position to tell me when the steamer Sagona will be ready for service in the Straits of Belle Isle? The people there are in a bad way and only last evening I received a telegram from Port Saunders to the effect that the people there and at Flowers Cove particularly were in a starving condition,

(Reads telegram)

There is no reason why the people in this section should not get steamboat communication and as good a treatment meted out to them as well

as the people in any other section of the Island; but the point I want to make is this: ever since some time in April last I have been asking the management of the railway to get a steamer to go to the Straits of Belle Isle so that the people could get their supplies of provisions and food-stuffs. Only a couple of days ago I discovered that there was something wrong with the Sagona and that she had to go on dock. I consider this is not good enough treatment for people who happen to live in extern portions of this Colony. It seems that it is alright for people who can come here in person and express their claims, but for people who live in extern portions there is nothing thought about and it was just as well they were living at the North Pole. Now I would like to here from the Prime Minister when the Sagona is likely to sail? The Prospero was prevented from visiting the East Coast on the pretext of ice conditions, whereas if the Government had been alive to their responsibilities they would have sent the Kyle there and even if ice conditions were bad there the difficulty could have been gotten over. Now, Sir, I think this is outrageous treatment for the people in my district to get and it is absolute neglect on somebody's part.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I wish to take exception to the remarks of the honourable member for St. Barbe that the Government have been trying to starve the people. The Government have been just as much concerned about the people of Flowers Cove and vicinity as he has been. We have been doing our best to get a steamer to go to the Straits of Belle Isle and the S. S. Sagona sailed for there this morning.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS gave notice that he will on to-morrow move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole upon certain correspondence in relation to the bequest to the Colony of the property at Whitbourne of the laet Rt. Hon. Sir R. Bond.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

THE HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I mentioned yesterday that by the Will of the Right Honourable Sir Robert Bond valuable property had been left to the people of this country. I then said that the Government did not want to shirk the responsibility of making a reply for the acceptance or otherwise of that bequest because it was felt that as the gift was one to the people of the Colony that the representatives of the people should be consulted before an answer was sent in. I hope, if on no other occasion in this House, that members will try on this particular occasion to forget which side they are sitting on and that we may all be able to treat this particular proposition solely in the interests of the country generally. I have before me, a copy of which I tabled in this House on the opening day, a copy of the last Will and Testament of Sir Robert Bond. I will not weary the House by reading it in full because it does not necessarily concern us. The first part of the Will provides that if several of his relatives, nieces and nephew, die without issue that a large proportion of his estate shall become the property of His Excellency the Governor and Executive Council in Newfoundland in trust for the establishment in Whitbourne aforesaid of an Industrial School in which shall be taught a practical course in different trades. Later on the Will goes on to say: "It is my Will that my Whitbourne Estate consisting of "The Grange" and nearly eight

square miles of fee simple land, upon which I have expended large sums of money and years of personal effort to render it an ideal property, shall be immediately transferred to His Excellency the Governor and Executive Council of this Colony to be held in trust by them for the people of Newfoundland as a Model Farm for ever. If deemed advisable the land lying to the railway line may be sold by them, but the lakes and land to the south of the railway line which passes through my property I desire shall be retained as part and parcel of the Model Farm. Unless the Government aforesaid shall be prepared to take over the cattle, horses and farm stock, and the household furniture in "The Grange" paying to my Executor therefor the sum of ten thousand dollars it is my will that the same be removed to St. John's and sold at public auction." When I read this Will I asked the Executor, Reverend Doctor Bond, brother of the Testator, to call and see me and I told him that, having given the matter a great deal of consideration, I wanted to get his views as to whether it would be an infringement in his opinion of the desires of the Testator were the Government to take over that farm and use the very large residence, which is not necessary for a Model Farm and which is on the property, as a Tourist Hotel, and to use the lakes, which are not necessary for a Model Farm, for the purpose of attracting tourists. It occurred to me that if that house was made into a summer hotel and if the people stopping there had the privilege of using the lakes for fishing and boating that enough revenue might possibly be derived to endow the Model Farm or to support it. Rev. Dr. Bond said that he would take the matter into his serious consideration. I asked him for an expression of his opinion as to whether there should be a farmer outside this country take charge of the Farm and I asked him if he would be good enough to express his views in that respect in a letter to His Excellency the Governor. I did not want to make the suggestion that we should have an imported farmer because I felt sure we would be told that we have good enough farmers in this country to take charge of it. The result was that Dr. Bond wrote a letter to His Excellency the Governor. I think that, as there may be a great many members of this House who have not read the correspondence that was tabled, it will not take me very long to give you just what Dr. Bond said in his letter.

St. John's,
April 11th, 1927.

Your Excellency:—

When conversing some days ago with the Hon. the Prime Minister with reference to the Whitbourne Estate, consisting of The Grange and nearly eight square miles of fee-simple land, which my brother, the late Sir Robert Bond, has by his Will bequeathed to the people of Newfoundland for a Model Farm forever, under the Trusteeship of the Governor and Executive Council, the Prime Minister suggested that I should write a letter to Your Excellency stating my own convictions as to the intention of my brother in making the bequest and my own judgment as to the way in which that intention should be secured and carried out by the Trustees under the Will. That, with Your Excellency's permission, I propose now to do so clearly and succinctly as I can.

I wish I could convey to Your Excellency's mind anything like an adequate picture of the extent and beauty of the Estate, its slopes of splendid woodland rising from the shores of a chain of large and romantic lakes mile after mile, where forest growth has been carefully preserved, where fire has not occurred, and where cutting of either large or small timber

has not been allowed. Its cultivated portion, close to the Village of Whitbourne, which indeed has been built on land originally part of the Estate and was, I believe, named by its proprietor, forms but a comparatively small part of the whole acreage, which stretches about equally north and south of the railway line about four miles in each direction. Crowning a hill on the west side of Junction Lake and half a mile from the centre of the Village is the residence of the owner "The Grange" embowered in trees and with lawns sloping down to the lakeside, laid out in landscape gardenings interspersed with groups or groves of ornamental trees, upon which park-like space the taste, skill and constant personal labour of Sir Robert Bond have been for all the years of his ownership, till laid aside by the illness which resulted in his death, lavished without stint. To make these lawns as he expressed it, "like a bit of England," to add to their beauty year by year, was an aim in which he spared himself neither toil nor expense. Hundreds of trees, some eight hundred in all, he planted with his own hand or under his personal supervision, and there in the days of spring, summer and autumn you would find him at work, literally manicuring the place he loved so well into a perfection of most careful aboriculture and horticulture which only such personal attention and labour could bring about. Now it is this estate that Sir Robert Bond has given by his Will to the people of Newfoundland as a Model Farm to be held and worked by the Trustees, for that purpose and no other and that in perpetuity. As a matter of fact he has maintained the place as a sort of Model Farm for between thirty and forty years. He broke it out of the original forest; cultivated it and cropped it; erected a commodious residence for his own occupancy and a comfortable lodge for the occupancy of his foreman farmer; constructed suitable barns; purchased in Canada from time to time numbers of registered and high grade cattle; gave away his thoroughbred calves year after year for many years to people in different parts of the Island in order to improve the general stock of the country; sold his milk regularly to a butterine factory in St. John's despite innumerable hindrances and anonyances due to irregularities of transportation; left it as it is to-day a going concern in good working order not merely paying its expenses but yielding a profit. That Estate and that Farm he has left by Will to the people of Newfoundland that it may be taken hold of immediately by the Trustees as a going concern and without any disturbance or dislocation whatever continue to be a Model Farm no longer the property of an individual but the property of the people to be held for them and worked for them by the Trustees never to be alienated to other ownership or diverted in whole or in part to any other purpose whatsoever, but with increased resources and enhanced developments to be maintained and worked in perpetuity for the information of every farmer large or small in the country and for the practical training of young men in agriculture, cattle raising and forestry, that they may be qualified to make farming their vocation and win a living from their country's soil.

To secure this purpose two things are absolutely necessary. First the Estate must be managed by an expert farmer obtained from outside the Colony, a man thoroughly trained, experienced, competent, and conversant with the most modern and most approved and scientific methods, preferably a Canadian expert because conditions in Canada are most similar to our own. Canada has several Agricultural Colleges and Farms in successful operation and in these are to be found men eminently suitable for this

proposition which demands a skilled, educated, practical farmer able to work and to train young men to work, and to bring this Estate both farm and forest up the best that it can be.

The second thing that is absolutely essential and imperative is that the general management of the Model Farm be kept from the very beginning entirely outside the control of politics and be placed at once in the hands of a non-political commission, composed of gentlemen chosen for integrity of personal character and for their practical interest in Agriculture. The Commission which need not be large enough to be unwieldy should be at once authorized to secure an expert from Canada or failing that from Scotland, to set him over the property, to visit him from time to time for purposes of direction and encouragement, to receive from him monthly reports as to the progress of his work, and to make an annual report themselves to the Governor and Executive Council.

The points which I have emphasixed having been secured, namely direct management of the Model Farm by a practical expert chosen from outside the Colony, and general management by a completely non-political commission left unhampered and independent to exercise their best judgment in all matters pertaining to it for the sole benefit of the people of Newfoundland, I see prospect of my brother's desires and purposes being brought to fruition.

"The Grange" is a larger residence than would be required for the use of the Manager of the Model Farm alone, but it is admirably suited for the accommodation of farm students residing with him and working the farm under his instruction and superintendence, receiving their board free or at small cost and giving their services in return for their practical training and their certification after two or three years of such training as to competency in modern farming. Openings for the employment of such men, apart from those who would take up land of their own, would not be difficult to find in this country. All who have had anything to do with farming here know the difficulties, annoyances and losses caused by farm owners having been compelled to employ men lacking all real knowledge of their duties. These men after two or three years training would supply a need impossible to supply under present conditions.

Besides the practical training on the farm could be made increasingly efficient by forming a link between it and the technical classes of farm-chemistry and soil-study available at the Memorial University College; every student in turn as he became fitted for it could thus receive the scientific side of instruction in Agriculture, cattle raising and forestry, and haphazard and rule-of-thumb methods give place to reasoned and perfected carrying out of well-based plans. A system of student passes over the Government Railway tenable and usable only for periods of study would make College and Farm practically one.

Further than this it will be recalled that under the contingency that there were no heirs to his property otherwise devised, it was Sir Robert Bond's Will that it should go to support an Industrial School at Whitbourne. Whether it will ever be usable for this purpose no one can predict, of course. One thing is certain and that is that should the Trustees so determine, The Grange would supply the accommodation and the Farm the training ground for a sufficient number of Industrial School pupils to keep its rooms always full and its fields always tilled, while a band of happy, healthy young men are learning by doing—the only way in which real learning can be obtained.

This then is Sir Robert Bond's bequest to the people of Newfoundland. It is for the Trustees under the Will to say whether they will accept the Trust with all that it implies, or whether its acceptance would involve obligation they are unable to meet and they are compelled to return it into the hands of the Executor of the Will.

It must be guaranteed by the Trustees: 1. That the Estate shall be used as the Testator has bequeathed it, as a Model Farm for the people of Newfoundland. 2. That it will never be alienated from that purpose. 3. That it will never for any reason or any pretense come into the hands of a private owner or in any degree under private management or be used for any private emoluments, and that it will be used simply and solely for a Model Farm and not for a Tourist resort or for a Road House for the convenience of motorist week-enders or others or for any other additional subsidiary or supplementary purpose whatever, whether to increase its revenue or make it a convenience for ends not contemplated by the Testator.

I am quite aware of the fact that Model Farms in this country have been made a hissing and a bye-word. They have been made a sink for the wasting of the people's money. To safeguard this bequest to the people of Newfoundland from being or becoming any such scandalous drain upon that people's own resources is above all things in harmony with Sir Robert Bond's desires and intentions and would be, I conceive, the great responsibility of the Trustees under this Will. I believe, and not without advisement, that an annual expenditure with a minimum of about five thousand dollars and a maximum of ten thousand dollars would run this Farm and make a very valuable and increasingly valuable asset to this country, paying its salaries and providing for some development year by year. I think that a non-political and unhampered and practical commission would not spend any more than ten thousand dollars, and could work the Model Farm at least in its beginnings for about Five Thousand Dollars a year. It is of course for the Trustees to say whether they can afford this expenditure or must return the property into the hands of the Executor, as involving obligations beyond their means.

I have the honour to be,
Your Excellency's humble servant,
ESTATE ROBERT BOND,
Per (Sgd.) GEO. J. BOND,
Executor.

This letter came into the hands of His Excellency the Governor, and His Excellency first had to decide whether or not he would accept the position of Trustee, and he came to the conclusion, after being legally advised by members of the Government, that he could not accept the position as Trustee with the Executive Government because it will be seen that the Will says that the property is to be held in trust by His Excellency the Governor and the Executive Government for ever. Now Dr. Bond is inclined to interpret this particular wording as used, to keep the management outside political influence, and Sir Robert Bond did not mean it would be the Governor-In-Council; but it was pointed out to Dr. Bond that further on in the Will Sir Robert referred to the "said Government" which goes to show definitely that it cannot be recognized as anything else than that the Governor-In-Council has to take charge of this particular bequest. I have come to the conclusion as well as many of my colleagues that we have no legal authority to accept a trust for the people of Newfoundland which might entail an annual expenditure of public moneys for ever. Such authority can only be given by the Legislature.

Naturally, we as a Government, or any Government, cannot commit their successors to such a proposition, because their successors may not want to operate a Model Farm. If we were anxious to have a Model Farm now, somebody else later on might be anxious to do away with it, and certainly we could not undertake the upkeep of a Model Farm from Sir Robert Bond for ever, unless this Legislature provided this endowment fund and the interest on which could take care of the running of the Model Farm for ever. It would require an endowment fund of two hundred thousand dollars at five per cent. interest to provide ten thousand dollars a year for the upkeep of the Farm, and, it is quite possible and even probable that the expense of running it would be very much more than ten thousand dollars a year. There is also a great difference between running a farm of any kind as a public institution and running it under the management of such a man as the late Sir Robert Bond. Sir Robert Bond with his skill, his keen interest in values, his authority over labour—and he gave his entire time without any charge against the farm—was able to make a small profit out of that farm. He was selling his milk from that farm to butterine factories in St. John's; and I claim that if this farm was run as a public institution now, subsidized by the Government, that we would not have any right to sell milk from that farm in competition with other farmers. And so the position in respect to the Model Farm run by a private individual and run by a Government is entirely different. There are three kinds of farms as I look upon the situation here. One is the ordinary dairy and market farm around St. John's. Then there is the farms in small outports where they grow vegetables for their own use and sell their surplus stocks. Then there is such farms as are in the Codroy Valley. Personally I do not feel that Whitbourne is a very suitable place for a Model Farm. It is out in a wilderness practically and the soil there is nothing extra. It is not a place where people would visit to see a Model Farm, and altogether it does not appear to me to be of the value to the Colony that some people might at first be inclined to think. Then again it must be remembered that Sir Robert Bond's will was made thirteen years ago. He tells us in the Will that we would have to pay a certain sum of ten thousand dollars for the live stock and implements on the farm and for the furniture in the house. These things have been valued by an auctioneer in St. John's who finds that they would not realise more than five thousand dollars, if sold at the present time. We are not called upon to accept that offer because it is expressly stated in the Will that if ten thousand dollars was not considered fair value for the live stock, farming implements and furniture of the house they were to be brought to St. John's and sold by auction. These, Mr. Chairman, are the principal points that appear to me in connection with this bequest and they would certainly make me hesitate before I would accept the gift. We have had a considerable experience in Model Farms in this country. The farm now occupied by Mr. Macpherson was bought by the Government of Sir Robert Bond and the Government of Sir Robert started it.

I don't think it was long in existence when another government came in and they did away with the Model Farm. In that respect it might be interesting to read an extract from a letter from Professor J. B. Reynolds, head of the Guelph Agricultural College. He is a great friend of Mr. Paton, who wrote him asking his opinion as to whether such a thing might be taken up. His letter is an interesting one and in some respects

runs parallel to my own opinion expressed prior.

(Reads)

I just mention this in connection with our experience in Model Farming. The first farm I understand dropped something like four thousand dollars a year before the Morris administration decided to close it up. Then under a later administration a Model Farm was started in the West End of St. John's, and some of you gentlemen on the other side of the House know how much it cost the country and whether it was to our advantage or not. I don't want to dwell upon this, or to create a political controversy; I merely want to place before you as clearly as I can the facts regarding the Model Farm as proposed. I have tried to give you the views of several people in connection therewith, and I want to get your opinion as to whether we should accept this offer, take over the farm and make an attempt to run it, or whether we should tell the Executor that we feel it would be a liability rather than an asset, thank him very much for the bequest of Sir Robert, contained in the kindly and gracious terms of his will—a will that was written long before he had any knowledge of what a Model Farm would cost the country and tender a courteous refusal. It is for the House to give its opinion as to what kind of a reply will be sent to Dr. Bond's letter.

CAPT. RANDELL—I should like to ask the Prime Minister one question. Mention has been made of the land of the Estate north of the Railway. I should like to know if there are any people living on that and if they are paying rental?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am not quite clear as to that. I rather think that there are some people living on part of the estate. I could find out in a short while if it has any bearing on the matter.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I am not going to offer any opinion as to what the Government should do in this matter; I presume it is the business of the Government to decide that. The Prime Minister has told us that this is non-party and non-political, and that it is open for discussion by both sides of the House—it is non-party as far as we are concerned. The point over which the Prime Minister is exercised is that we have to maintain this bequest, and he is looking for ways and means whereby that can be done if it is taken over. He has very frankly placed the matter before the Assembly. It is a pity that he doesn't place other matters of expenditure before the Assembly, and that he isn't as open about them as he is in this case, instead of minute of Council expenditure: I think this thing has to be thought out before there is some obligation on the Government of the Country with reference to such a gift and foresight of the donor. A man like Sir Robert Bond, who has been held up as a model statesman, should have something to his memory, and I think the Government should consider well before deciding. It is a gift that is to be under the control of the Government. I am rather surprised at the suggestion that it be used as a Tourist Hotel or Road House, because these things would not be patronized without a license, and in view of the attitude of Sir Robert Bond and his brother regarding temperance I think they should have been considered before this proposition was made. If it were possible for the dead to see what is going on in the world, I think that it wouldn't give Sir Robert Bond much pleasure to see tourists fishing the lakes around the "Grange" and have them when catching a trout seeing two or three. My opinion, without deep study, is that this place might be used as a sort of training school for young men who wish to follow the agricultural life. You find in

other places schools of agriculture, and in Norway, Holland and adjoining countries we even find schools of fishery and seamanship. If therefore this place at Whitbourne could be properly used as a school for the teaching of agriculture for young men who wish to learn Agriculture it might be of some benefit to the country. There is a reference in Rev. Dr. Bond's letter to making it a link with the Memorial University—the Prime Minister is also Minister of Education, and is the best one to tell the House what he thinks about that. Perhaps it is possible to link the place at Whitbourne with the Memorial University in St. John's, and have it controlled more or less by them. It might be very difficult unless something like that were done to keep it out of politics—no matter who manages it or how non political a commission is appointed you will find that operating anything in connection with the Government is very difficult.

Then there is the question as to what it would cost to run, Dr. Bond suggests from five to ten thousand dollars. If that farm could be run at that expense and no more, and be used as a training school for young men for agriculture I think it would be money well invested. He stated that the residence could be used as a boarding school, and I suppose the furniture now there could be retained by the Government. No doubt there would be a lot of produce raised on the farm .and if it would be unfair to sell the milk to a butterine factory, it could be used for making into butter and the residue fed to pigs. There is really no agricultural policy in this country although many administrations have claimed one. I have no doubt that Newfoundland can produce all the vegetables it needs if they were properly looked after. I have stated in this House before now that if encouragement were given the farmers, the farmers of Trinity Bay, Bonavista Bay and the rest of the Island, particularly in raising potatoes and turnips ,it would be a great asset. At the present time what a man cannot sell in the Fall he has to store away in his cellar and cannot open it again till the Spring, and then he is likely to find the contents half decayed. There is no doubt that the farmers something like that is needed in New-Brunswick there is a Provincial Warehouse, built by the Government, in which farm produce can be stored, and which has cold Storage, and heating facilities sufficient to keep produce during the winter months—something like that is needed in Newfoundland. The large quantities of potatoes, cabbage and turnips imported could be raised in this country, and turned into money—the farm is as productive as the fishery or the produce of the mines of the forest. I do not wish to offer an opinion, but would like to have the opinion of the House—perhaps the Prime Minister would afterwards decide that a large select Committee might be appointed to go into the matter.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I regard this as a subject which requires careful consideration; we should give it the very closest attention, before we decide to turn down this very generous bequest of the late Sir Robert Bond. One thing that struck me when the Prime Minister was speaking was that he spoke merely of the cost, and I fully appreciate his desire to reduce the burdens of the Colony. But the Prime Minister left out of his consideration the fact that we cannot look upon this merely from the standpoint of dollars and cents. When we speak of an Experimental Farm, and I prefer that term, and would ask the Prime Minister if there is any difference in a model farm and an experimental farm, as we know it? I notice the term "Model Farm" is used, but don't suppose there is anything in the bequest to interfere with an Experi-

mental Farm or Training School.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— The Will says it is to be a model farm forever. It would require a legal mind to distinguish.

MR. HIBBS—I think the purpose was to secure for young men an elementary education in farming, and if the property were taken for an Experimental Farm I think it would meet the wishes of the testator.

First of all, I am unable to go into this very deeply, because I feel we should have more opportunity to consider and discuss it more fully. But I am going to say that if there is one thing we need it is something to teach farmers, and I am confident that we would augment our output 50% if our farmers had the opportunity to learn the science of agriculture. If we go back we find that the question of agriculture has occupied the attention of the country at times, almost in spasms as far back as 1822, and that the Governor of that day urged the necessity of farming and that an effort was made at the time to inaugurate it. Then in 1842 we find that the first agricultural society was formed and an attempt made to do some practical farming in Newfoundland. Very little was done, and we come down through the years and find the fishermen farmers going along in a slip-shod fashion, until the year 1908, when the matter referred to in the letter to the Principal of the Memorial University was taken up, and the government of Sir Robert Bond inaugurated the policy of the model farm. The idea was to have an experimental farm, that some more practical knowledge might be obtained, where young men might spend one or two years or a shorter time, where practical demonstrations could be given, and men go in and learn the value of the science of farming. As the professor said, that was in 1908; the Bond administration went out in 1909, and the Government of Sir Edward Morris did as so many Governments do to the work of their predecessors, destroyed it. I understand that Professor Murray, who was here then, was a brilliant type of man and not overpaid, but the question was made a political football, and he was roundly abused and driven out. I am afraid that the Professor who wrote that letter to Principal Paton was a little pessimistic and prejudiced by the fact that they made a political football of the former effort, but let us hope that we have gained wisdom through the years, and consider the fact that this is a gift of a man who believed that there was considerable prospects in agriculture in this country, and who made an attempt while in office to inaugurate that policy. We all remember that in 1909 the politicians would go everywhere shouting about the "Model Farm," and the cry took like all political catch-cries, and deceived many. Then in 1910 Sir Edward Morris brought in the Agricultural Societies, constituted of people who had seats in the House of Assembly; at the time legislation had to be brought in to enable them to hold their seats. That policy died a natural death; it wasn't founded on fundamental principles — the people who handled the agricultural policy had no scientific knowledge of their subject, and the result was that considerable money was expended but little progress made. This was the state of affairs in 1919 when the Liberal Government of Sir Richard Squires went into office, with a policy very much akin to that of Sir Robert Bond, but a stock farm instead was established. But that also was made a political football of, and the people who did the most talking were those who had no knowledge of the subject. They did not know what they were talking about. Mr. Chairman, if we are to continue to tear down everything our predecessors have built in the agricultural line or any other policy, it is

time to quit the House of Assembly because we are not fit to be in it. I believe the motives that prompted the Head of the Ontario Agricultural College were that he believed this would be made a laughing stock.

I know that stock farm here in St. John's did not accomplish all that was hoped for it, but at the same time, even to-day, there are great results manifested in the large number of farmers who thought that that stock farm was a good thing. A better breed of cattle was imported. There was, to my knowledge ,in the neighbourhood of two hundred young bulls of the finest breed distributed among the farmers. The result was very beneficial. It put new blood into their stock, and now we find a much improved stock of cattle, particularly in the vicinity of St. John's East and West and Harbour Main. I also know that there were about 115 foals of the progeny of one of the finest horses ever imported into this country. Wherever we find foals from that horse they are splendid animals and a credit to the stock farm. The same thing applies to pigs and other animals. So, after all, some good accrued from that stock farm.

But there came a change of Government, or, at least, a change of leadership, and because there was so much criticism, the Government was stampeded into the destroying of that farm. At that time I made this statement, openly and publicly, namely, that some of the people responsible for that deserved to be publicly horse whipped. There was a sale of animals, some of which not worth less than $1,000, going for a paltry sum of $100. The splendid young stock was sent to the block. That has been going on all the time. Now, to come down to the time when this bequest was made. Frankly, I will admit that, as a stock farm, I do not think that it is favourably located. There is not a very great deal of cattle around that vicinity, and certainly not at Whitbourne, and it would be a difficult matter to bring cattle there for breeding purposes, and to keep sires at the farm or horses or bulls, etc. That is a very important part of a stock farm, particularly if you want to combine it with an Experimental Farm. So that would be one of the arguments against making it a stock farm in conjunction with an experimental station, but I see no reason why the Government could not seriously consider the matter of an experimental station, a model farm, .f you will.

When we speak of the expenditure of $10,000, I would like to direct the attention of the Prime Minister to this fact. The Prime Minister is of the opinion that it might cost more than $10,000, but when you come to consider that the Government to-day is engaged in a Tourist Policy of building roads. Now, I don't want to be misunderstood. Whenever I speak of road building, I seem to give the impression that I am opposed to road building, but I am not. But when you come to consider that every mile of road that has been built has cost not less than $10,000, and I am prepared to prove that, then surely you could manage to do without the building of one mile of road per year and instead have a model farm at Whitbourne.

HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—We have got to do it forever.

MR. HIBBS—I know that. You must carry on. You are not supposed to drop it. I don't think we will have to do that. I think in every other respectable city, except our own, if it is centrally situated, there is a stock farm. There is one thing that I cannot understand and that is the provision that is made there that the man who superintends this undertaking is to be a man from the outside. I take it for granted that the objection is that the Newfoundlander

is not as well qualified, because he has not the same training, since there is no special training in this country. There again we are reminded of the fact that this bequest was made some thirteen or fourteen years ago, and, since that time, several Newfoundlanders, one gentleman by the name of Mr. LeDrew has already been mentioned, a graduate I think of MacDonald College, another gentleman of whom I spoke last year, and there are several more besides. Referring to this particular gentleman of whom I spoke last year, I endeavoured to impress upon the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the wisdom of having that young man brought down here and given charge of the agricultural policy of the Government. I dont think the Govt. has done much as far as agriculture is concerned. Instead of that, it is a matter of history that a man by the name of Mr. Steer was appointed and later on in the season his services were dispensed with, because, I suppose, the Department did not feel that he was capable. Then another man was sent out of the country.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—We sent a man from St. George's and paid about $100 towards his education. He qualified for what he went for.

MR. HIBBS—I merely refer to that because those conditions laid down there stipulate that the man in charge of that farm must be from outside. I cannot see why a Newfoundlander, if he is sufficiently qualified, should not take charge of that farm, in preference to a man from the outside.

I don't intend to refer to this matter at any length, because I presume that acting on the advise of the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister will very likely have a committee appointed to look into it. I think that he should make haste slowly, and not immediately turn it down, because, as Mr. Hickman pointed out, it is almost a sacred bequest. Men who have done less for their country than Sir Robert Bond have had memorials erected to their memories by the state. I feel that if we made a general appeal throughout Newfoundland that the people of this country would contribute largely, and that you would find that the memory of the late Sir Robert Bond is held in such reverence that a memorial would soon be erected. I think also that we could not have any more fitting memorial to his memory than the acceptance of this model farm. So that is one of the reasons why there should be more consideration given to this matter.

Dont let us forget the beneficial side of this thing. A very great number of the farmers residing in this country are not educated; they are very ignorant as far as farming is concerned. People are doing a lot of useless labour, and they are not getting anything like the returns that they should get for the labour that they are performing, because they don't know how to go to work. Agriculture is one of the greatest things in the world. Lord Beaconsfield said that agriculture was the invention of giants and the employment of heroes. So we should make up our minds that we are not going to oppose this because somebody else got a model farm and it was not successful. You must investigate the causes. I think then that you will be satisfied that political prejudice more than anything else caused the destruction of the model farm.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, after the gloomy speech of the Hon. Prime Minister one must have courage to be outspoken in regard to the adoption of a Model Farm in this country.

First of all I should like to venture a few remarks on the legal aspect, with all due defence to the legal gentlemen who have advised the Government on the construction of the

Will of the late Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond.

Like other hon. gentlemen who have preceded me I own to a great admiration for the late Rt. Hon. gentleman. I have read his speeches and followed up his Parliamentary career as far as it could be followed up by reference to the official records of this House. If we consider the course of that career we may see that from the outset he was a most remarkable man in many ways. He gave up all thought of a profession and devoted himself exclusively to politics, and the one motive of his life was the welfare of this country. When we look back now and see him sitting in his study at Whitbourne quietly penning his Will almost on the last day of 1914, and remembering the people in his Will, I am sure that we cannot fail to appreciate the very generous offer which he has placed before the people he loved.

Not only did he make that Will and give to the Government which had done a great deal to drive him out of office and out of public life; but, when he considered his bequest after the lapse of eleven years on writing the codicil dated 1925, he still saw no reason to alter it.

Now the Prime Minister has read to the House the particular words in the Will referring to the matter before the Chair, whereby the testator left his "estate and the eight square miles of land that it contained to His Excellency the Governor, and the Executive Council in trust for the people of this country to use it as a model farm for ever." The legal advisers to the Government have construed that phrase to mean that His Excellency the Governor has been mentioned in this will in his personal capacity. Now I say that that will must be construed and interpreted according to the contents of the will itself. There is not a doubt from the terms of that will that it was given to the Government of this country as such, and the Government are the trustees of the people of this country to-day. And it was given to the Government forever. It was given the same as any other conveyance would be made to trustees forever. Now I dont mean to make any reflection on the executor when I say this. And if a gift is given to anybody forever, it is his to dispose of as he sees fit, when he gets it. Therefore I would like to point out that we must now consider what was the intention of the testator. What was the farm to be used for? After we have considered the fact that it is a valid and legal gift, and after we have considered the fact that the Government were entitled to accept it, we shall have to consider what the Testator intended it to be used for. Before going on to that I would like to make one point clear and that is in reference to the fact that the Governor has seen fit to refuse to act as trustee. This gift is a trust, a charitable trust. The practice that prevails in English law and which we have adopted in our law here, is that if the trustee fails to act, or for some reason or other does not wish to act, then the King will step in as the father of his people, to see that the purpose of the testator is not defeated, and he will then as the constitutional trustee appoint someone to manage the trust. As His Excellency the Governor occupies the same position in this colony as His Majesty the King does in Great Britain, I feel that it would be wrong advice if it were represented to His Excellency that this trust should be allowed to fail, merely because he thought that he should not like to accept it. It was not given to His Excellency or the present Government. The Will was made in 1914. We have had several Governments since then. The gentleman administering the affairs of the colony to-day was not the one who answered that letter. His

Excellency will not be here forever, and we will have successive Governments. So no particular Governor or Government was intended to be trustee for the operation of this farm.

Now what are we given? We are given a "model" farm. The first point in this connection that we have to consider is the need for a model farm. Has agriculture been developed in this connection that we have to consider is the need for a model farm. Has agriculture been developed in this country to such an extent that there is no more need for encouragement Can we look back, and look back with complacency upon a successful agricultural industry in this country? To say that this country has developed agriculture to the fullest extent is not the opinion of several distinguished men, and I propose to refer to them now, individually. In the first place I would like to quote the distinguished gentleman who presides over the Memorial College, Mr. Paton, who in an article in the Newfoundland Teachers' Journal, which was quoted in the Daily News of May 13th, said that we should like to see Newfoundland developing the wealth of its own soil, growing its own potatoes, wheat, vegetables, and part, at any rate, of its fruit. What an enormous increase, he remarks, that would be to our national income. Our young men should study nature and apply it to our needs. That is the opinion of Mr. Paton. Mr. Blackall in his report 1924-1925 says the same thing. There is no need for me to quote it. Mr. English, the representative of the Roman Catholic Board of Education, also speaks to the same effect. Doctor Curtis spoke particularly strong upon the subject, and said that we were forgetting to apply science to ordinary life with particular reference to agriculture and fishing, and we were importing thousands of dollars worth of agricultural products because Newfoundland had not been able to adopt and maintain a policy of land development.

I took the trouble, Mr. Chairman, yesterday to look up data connected with the imports and exports of this country and I totted up the total value of the agricultural products imported into this country. I found that exclusive of flour and woollen manufactures, the value of the imported products was $5,000,000. Is there no need for farming in this country with such a state of affairs? I submit that there is, and a great deal.

People have said that this country is not a farming country. Now for the year 1924-25 the total value of the fishing products was estimated at $11,000,000. The total farm products for the year 1921, according to the Financial Post Survey, was $17,844,000. Of course, that calculation is very much in error. The number of sheep produced in 1921, according to the same authority, was 86,732, having a value of $300,000; the number of goats in 1921 was 86,732 with a value of $1,300,000. I think, sir, that when these statistics go abroad some people may have an erroneous idea of the great value of agriculture in Newfoundland, and particularly of goat breeding.

Coming to the question of what the model farm should be, I think we could do no better than to refer back to the Act which Sir Robert Bond introduced himself, in 1908, as the culmination of all the years of thought and effort he had devoted to devising a sound agricultural policy. That Act which became a dead letter by the bitterness and the interference of his political opponents was not repealed until 1924. The objects he set out to attain were contained in the 2nd section of that Act, and the farm was called an experimental as well as a model farm. They include the testing of evils, manures and different methods of planting and rotation; the breeding of live stock and conduct of

experiments on plants and animals; recording diseases to which our crops are subject, and investigating causes and remedies. These are some of the objects outlined in the Act which he introduced. The Act was only in force one year when the Government appointed an agricultural commission whose first recommendation, (and this recommendation was the basis for the dropping of the model farm), was that this country could not afford to pay $2,400, the annual upkeep of that model farm, whilst at the same time each member of the commission was receiving a salary of $1,800.00 or $5,400 for the three. Now sir, if we look back upon the history that the idea of a model farm has had I don't think that it can be said to have failed. I contend that it has never had a fair show, and even in the administration of Sir Richard Squires, when the Minister of Agriculture and Mines didn't hold a seat in this House, the Department of Agriculture and Mines was not carried on in any worse manner than any other of the Departments, and money spent on agriculture gave back as good returns as money spent on poor relief. I consider that five or ten thousand dollars spent on the Model Farm will give far better returns than the eighty or ninety thousand dollars that are being annually spent on poor relief in St. John's, and it will be doing more than that, it will be following along the lines of every country. In England they are saying "Back to the land." Mr. Hibbs quoted from Sir Robert Bond's address in this House in 1911 a statement of Lord Beaconsfield that "Agriculture was the invention of the gods and the employment of heroes." That means that a man has to be a hero to be a farmer, that he has to go to work with a will and say, "Well, it is going to be hard work, but I will succeed." The work will be hard but it will be satisfying. It will make a man self sufficient, and we ought to be more self-sufficient in this country. We ought to be able to supply all these agricultural products that I mentioned are now being imported.

Having considered whether there is need for a model farm or not, and when we remember that we voted here last year $20,000.00 for encouragement of agriculture and spent $26,000.00 and did it without any policy in view, leaving it entirely to the discretion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, placing the responsibility with him, and giving him no advice, for what assistance he got I suppose he got from Mr. Bayly—the only official in the Department of Agriculture and Mines who knows much about agriculture,—do we not come to the conclusion that there is need for an agricultural policy, and need to spend money on such a worthy object. Let us say that the Government will decide to accept this model farm, what then can be done with it? what will be done? I agree with the outline stated for its operation; not to begin in a large way. I think that the suggestion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition a worthy one, that it might be affiliated in some way with the Memorial College. A man to manage the farm may be brought from Canada; whether he be a Newfoundlander or not will make no difference. If we can get a Newfoundlander, so much the better. The suggestion that a man from Scotland or Canada to be manager is only the opinion of the executor. Let us have the instructor as suggested under the direction of Professor Paton, in the same way as the other professors up at the Memorial College. We have men up there, distinguished graduates of Oxford, Cambridge and London Universities lecturing on the history of civilisation, on engineering, on biology, on the foreign languages, on Greek and Latin and numerous other subjects. Is it not possible that we could have

a man lecturing on agriculture and instead of having him here in St. John's, could we not have him out at Whitbourne to study under his charge as students now come to St. John's to study the classics or engineering? Begin in a small way. Keep it outside of political influence. I think that then in time, I don't expect it next year, we will have graduate farmers. The country has enough lawyers. It has enough doctors; and has enough men of other professions; and I hope that the Government will accept this gift so that in a short time we will have some graduates in agriculture. Reference was made in a letter to Professor Paton which the Hon. Prime Minister has read to Professor Lavitz. He was a gentleman brought down here by the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond to advise the Government of the day upon the idea of model farming in this country. That gentleman retired from active life and his professorship only the other day, and I have brought along with me a clipping which I found in the "Family Herald and Weekly Star" in reference to his retirement, so that in my conclusion I might give you some idea of the expert opinion which Sir Robert Bond had consulted before he started his Model Farm. Professor Zavitz had been experimenting for twenty years before he came here. In Canada he was an inspiration to thousands of students who later helped to make Canada's agriculture so great and he was one of the very few agriculturists to be honoured with a degree for agriculture when he received from the University of Toronto the degree of Doctor of Science for his work

What has this country lost by not carrying out the policy of Sir Robert Bond? We must go back to 1908 and begin all over again. In conclusion, I hope that the Government will see their way clear to accept this gift. No more worthy memorial could be erected to the memory, to the glorious memory, of Sir Robert Bond than the establishment of a model farm within a short distance of that romantic spot where his bones lie buried.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to what the speakers before me have said in reference to the model farm and the matters before the chair, and I heartily concur with them in what they have to say in reference to the very generous gift of Sir Robert Bond. This gift was the outcome of the spirit of a great patriot who was always, as has been stated, considerate of his country's welfare before his personal interests. The wording of the Will shows that he still had within him that high regard for having things conducted in such a way as to appear in the eyes of the people as workable and as worthy of consideration and as worthy of any effort that might be put forward.

The first thing that came to my mind when this matter was introduced was what was the value to Newfoundland to-day of its agricultural trade, and what encouragement has it received.

(Reads)

That shows no advance from thirty or forty years ago. I have looked over the reports of the Department of Agriculture and Mines to see the growth of the agricultural industry. During that period although our population has increased from 160,000 in '89 to 260,000 in 1927 the quantity is not so much as it was way back at that time showing that so far as assistance given by the Government is concerned it has not increased the quantity of agricultural produce in this country. It may perhaps have prevented a further decline, and that is already shown, but it has not increased the quantity. Are we going to leave our agricultural industry in the position it is in to-day Twenty five thousand dollars a year is spent

with so little returns. It seems to me that a portion of that money could be utilized to carry out what is expressly stated in the will of Sir Robert Bond. A question that I have asked myself is what are we going to consider a liability and what an asset. We spent $30,000 or $40,000 in connection with the encouragement of shipbuilding and that is a liability to the Govt. They will get nothing in direct returns from the expenditure of the shipbuilding vote ,but the country has benefited considerably and will benefit by the quantity of fish that is caught by the vessels that have been built because of the encouragement of the bounty. We are paying out to different industrial concerns in this country four, five and six thousand dollars a year for interest guaranteed on money for paid up capital, and some of these industries are not working to-day. We have a place called the Newfoundland Knitting Mills in the west end of the city and we are paying the investors in that the sum of $5,000 on paid up capital, and it is not working and employs no one, yet that money must come out of the pockets of the taxpayer. We are quite satisfied to pay four or five thousand on that knitting mill, but if asked to consider paying four or five thousand to establish a model farm, we say, "Well it is a liability that we can't very well place upon the country." I say that is a penny wise and pound foolish policy. If we can find money to pay out to the people who invested money in an industry and see that industry to-day not employing anybody then turn down a proposition of this kind, I say that we have not given the thing the careful consideration that we should. I like very much one thing about the proposition that it is to be free of political influence. That will guarantee that it will be carried on successfully. Another thing I like about the proposition is that it is to be free from political control, and that is a pretty good guarantee that whoever goes in charge of that Model Farm that it is going to be carried through successfully. And why cannot a Model Farm be run successfully in this country as well as Model Farms are run successfully in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and other countries? Have we not got faith in our own people to see that this farm can be properly managed? Truly "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country"; but I think the time has come when we ought to have a little more faith and confidence in ourselves. I spent a few years when a boy on a farm in Brigus. I knew the hard work in connection with a farm and knew a number of young men around Brigus who were engaged in a small way in farming and then it got to where they came in and around St. John's where men come in contact with knowledge of soils that gave considerable growth. And this affords an opportunity to give men in the outports who are interested in farming a chance to acquire knowledge about soils. To-day there are scores of young men in this country who are most anxious to go in for farming, if given an opportunity. I have met people in the districts of Port de Grave and Twillingate who have asked the question as to whether they could get some encouragement from the Government of Newfoundland the same as the Canadians do in Canada in connection with acquiring knowledge for running a farm. It seems that the only answer that could be given these people of ours is that the money could not be found for the establishment of an Agricultural College or Model Farm; but, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, hundreds of thousands of dollars could be found to throw away on projects less worthy than that respecting the development. of agriculture in Newfoundland. The Prime

Minister stated that in the running of the Model Farm it may happen that what may be produced there may come in competition with our local farmers. I do not see why a local farmer should be afraid of competition in the matter of selling milk for instance. It has been the custom for several years past amongst the farmers to agree on what price should be charged for milk, and I think it would be an easy matter for the management of a Model Farm to make a similar arrangement. In any case whether the Model Farm is established or not there are more men today going to farming than formerly and competition is becoming greater. We have the Newfoundland Butter Company who are, some people say, in competition with local farmers today, so why should the line be drawn in connection with the Model Farm from a competitive viewpoint. It has also been stated by the Prime Minister that Whitbourne would be a very poor place to have the farm established. I do not profess to know a great deal about Model Farms and Industrial Colleges, but I do know that they have one in the town of Truro, Nova Scotia. There are also a large number of people engaged in farming long distances from the town of Truro, yet they find the time valuable to them to consult with the Professor of the College about soils and to know what is required in order to make soils valuable. Well then if Truro is a suitable town in the Province of Nova Scotia and situated long distances from many farms I cannot see why Whitbourne would be unsuitable and disadvantageous to farmers here, because, after all, Whitbourne is only a few hours run from St. John's, so that as far as distance is concerned Whitbourne is just as suitable as any other place that can be found. Besides we are importing into this country large quantities of foodstuffs which could be raised in this country if proper encouragement was given. We imported last year fresh meats, poultry, oats, turnips, carrots, parsnips, onions, potatoes, hams, eggs and bacon valued at one and a half million dollars and all of these foodstuffs could be raised in this country. I merely point this out to show what little interest is being taken in the matter by the Government and in order to try and get the people of this country to produce for themselves and feed themselves with foodstuffs that they can raise instead of having them imported. The other point that suggests itself to me is that we have before us a splendid opportunity to get that place at Whitbourne for ten thousand dollars and why turn down such a reasonable offer, and when we see all other countries in the world increasing their interest in and encouragement for agriculture why should we be behind the times? Mr. Chairman, I heartily support the proposition before the Committee and I trust that the Government and the entire House will be heartily in favor of the project also.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, as the District which I represent is to be a considerable extent engaged in agriculture, I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing my views on the question of a Model Farm. I admit that at the moment I am not prepared to express a positive opinion as to whether we should accept the offer from the Estate of Sir Robert Bond; I have not had the opportunity to go into the matter as fully as the Government has, neither am I in possession of the facts regarding agriculture, such as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is; but at the same time it seems apparent from the history of most countries which have agricultural possibilities that the idea of the Model Farm is a sound one—whether we have or have not an agricultural future to warrant the expenditure of such a sum, I don't

know. I am not an agriculturist—I can distinguish a potato from a turnip, but I can't tell potato land from turnip land. I am glad the Prime Minister saw fit to bring this matter before the House, not so much for our decision, because it is the duty of the Government to make the decision, but that the facts might be put before us so that we could know what they might be.

I am sorry the Prime Minister seems to suggest that the members on this side of the House might view the proposal from a party standpoint. In connection with such a proposal, in particular when it emanates from such a great statesman, I do not think the Prime Minister appreciates the respect in which we hold the late Honourable gentleman who is regarded as one of the incorruptible Commoners of our history. Whatever may be said of those who have sat in this House, or who now sit or stand here, there is one thing certain —that Sir Robert Bond placed country before himself, he devoted his life to his country, and whatever remuneration he received, I am satisfied he returned to the people, for whatever he got he distributed among the people again, and he never received the advantage of a single cent. And I believe that when he bequeathed this property to the country he did so sincerely believing the gift would be one of great advantage to the people of this country. For that reason I would hesitate long in turning down this gift from a man so interested in country first. He had nothing to gain when he made the bequest, and he shows that interest to the last when drafting his will. He had been associated with the agricultural policy of 20 or 25 years ago—I am not of such an age that I can recollect that, but I do know that a Model Farm was started, and that it was started with honest intentions Before it had time to work out another Government came in, and whose views were, rightly or wrongly, not in line with those of its predecessor, so they destroyed it It cannot be said that the Model Farm was a failure, for it never had a fair chance, and I think that if anyone in Newfoundland believes there is an agricultural future for the Colony, and I do not know, that something ought to be done other than the course that has been taken for the last fifteen or twenty years I suppose during that time we have spent half a million dollars, and I wonder if anyone here can assert that we have benefited to that extent I understand that annually we spend twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars, much of it in seed potatoes that in many instances last long enough to get in the pot for dinner I don't blame the Governments—possibly they were well-intentioned, but their efforts were misdirected, and conditions have improved little since the days of the last Model Farm Now Sir, we spend, I understand, about $25,000.00 in a desultory sort of fashion without any sort of policy, in what we are pleased to call the agricultural policy of Newfoundland, which has produced no results. It is a fact, as has been said by Messrs. Browne and Grimes that huge quantities of agricultural produce are imported into this country—I don't know how much, but think that a value of half a million dollars would not be too great. Now, Sir, if that half a million could be kept in the Colony, many people at present out of employment would find it—and from any indications we have that will continue to go out—and we could produce those things presently imported. The scheme is both excellent and wise. Our money at the present time is going to provide labor for those we import from in the United States and Canada. If we are capable of such production, and the Model Farm would assist in that end, it seems to me that it would be sinful dereliction of duty

on the part of the Government to turn down the Farm Measure and let things go on as they have since Newfoundland was Newfoundland.

I repeat that I am particularly interested because Port de Grave district is largely engaged in the growing of the common artciles of the farm, such as potatoes, turnips, cabbage and such like, and I should like to see something done that would enable them to produce to better advantage. We hear suggestions at various times that such things as selling methods and standardization, so frequently heard as applied to the fisheries, but applicable to other industries, must be remedied. But standardization can't make an article better or worse, but a policy of encouragement will possibly, nay probably enable the people who farm to produce more and increase the land capacity. I don't suggest that Newfoundland will ever rival Prince Edward Island in producing potatoes—possibly we have not got the soil, but I do say that, given the opportunities, with proper soil and education, as good a potato can be produced as ever came out of Prince Edward Island. And if that can be done, and we can produce sufficient to avoid importation, won't it be worth while Won't it be of advantage to the people of the Colony generally?

The Prime Minister suggested that the Government had no right to take this gift, entailing expenditure, without legislation. I do not propose to enter into a legal discussion as to that, for I have not considered the point, but I am inclined to agree, because I believe that to be the opinion of the Attorney-General, and I have the greatest respect for his opinion in matters of that kind. One thing is clear, and that is that we can have the property if we are inclined to take it, and I do say that such a gift, coming from a man actuated by such motives should be carefully considered indeed before turning it down. Scientific instruction of the farming classes is one of the greatest needs of this Colony, and farming is one of the greatest, possibly the greatest branch of modern science. I would like to see the scheme tried if it can be done with a reasonable probability of success. I don't know if the Government has asked any farmers for an opinion, but I suggest that there are men engaged in farming around St. John's who are able to give valuable advice and that the Government ought to consult them. I don't propose to delay the House further in connection with this matter, but I presume that it will come up again under the form of a report of committee. But I should like to impress the belief that it would be unwise to reject this without the most careful consideration.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this bequest of the late Sir Robert Bond I should like to say that I agree with the Hon. Members from St. John's West, and from Fogo and Port de Grave, and I might say that in my opinion the Government ought to take over the Model Farm and see what can be done with it. It is no more to spend the money on a farm than anything else, and money has been wasted and squandered by governments—the present government as well as all other governments. I see no reason why this farm should not be taken over and run in the interests of this country. But when it is taken over what will be done with the products. To-day there is no market for produce in Newfoundland. What we need here is a central market in St. John's where the outport farmer can sell his produce. This has not been discussed to my knowledge and has never been tried out. The farmers around St. John's and in the outports cannot find a market for most of their produce. They charge more as a rule than you have to pay for the import-

ed article. That is due to a want of organization. If the farmers would only organize and come down they would see that if they were to sell their products a little below the imported atricle there would not be any trouble about markets in this country. The member for Port de Grave stated that you can grow potatoes in this country equally as good as any country in the world. I firmly believe it. But we have no market for our produce. And unless there is it will be just as well for the farmers to give up growing these things.

There has been a lot said with regard to this model farm. I do not purpose to go on speaking at any length on this matter. Everybody in this country no doubt is glad to learn that Sir Robert Bond has left a large part of his estate at Whitbourne, especially the farm and the residence thereon to the Government. Something should be done with it. And having regard for Sir Robert Bond and realising the good that he has done for the country, I think that something should be done to perpetuate his memory. For years he represented the very important district of Twillingate, that district which today I have the honour to represent. That was the Premier's district for years. Several people in that district, a matter of 20 or 30 people, wrote to me and my colleagues to ask us to see what could be done for the memory of Sir Robert Bond. Though I may be a little bit off the track, I think that now is the important time to speak of it. I think that the Government of Newfoundland should erect a monument to the memory of the late Sir Robert Bond, and I have much pleasure, sir, in asking the Government to give consideration to the erection of that monument.

MR. POWER—Mr. Chairman, before going any further it strikes me that we have very little knowledge of the farm itself. I wonder if the Prime Minister could give us any information as to the amount of land under cultivation?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think that there are about thirty eight acres.

MR. POWER—I think that we should also have some knowledge of what the farm would be worth regarding its production. We have down in the Department of Agriculture and Mines to-day Mr. Bayly, a man who has given the best years of his life to the study of agriculture, as it may be locally applied. He has had practical experience in such matters and I would suggest that he be sent to Whitbourne and with him several of the most practical farmers around the city, and who would bring back to this House a report of the farm's possibilities generally, and have it read to the House the next time that this subject of debate is on. I also think that this debate should be postponed for a few days so that we could give more consideration to it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, in reference to this matter under discussion I take it that this model farm was left to the people of Newfoundland as a means of educating the youth with regard to farming and agriculture. Now, Sir, when it comes to the matter of education a few dollars is neither here or there, in my opinion. Thousands and millions hvae been spent on fanciful schemes which perhaps do not afford very great possibilities, and not at all equal to the matter under discussion at the present time. I think that if we believe or if we can see or hope to see that Newfoundland can have an agricultural future, then, now is the opportunity to begin and institute an agricultural policy for Newfoundland which we shall develop and hand down to other generations. Let us see what are the possibilities. We are told that the fishing industry is over-crowded. We are being told

that the future of Newfoundland lies in the development of our minerals or in some other direction. Well, if the fisheries are overcrowded and as men are leaving the country, certainly a policy of agriculture, if it were scientifically adopted having regard to the possibilities of Newfoundland as an agricultural country, would be of the utmost importance, and now is the opportunity to begin and experiment with it. Mention has been made of the question of marketing and as to what we are to do with the milk supply. If it could not be sold locally I would suggest that it could be evaporated or condensed, and I feel sure that we would find a ready sale for it here in Newfoundland. I think myself that any difficulties which would arise, would be overcome, if we were given an opportunity to do so. Other countries have difficulties as well as Newfoundland and we too must expect them. I think that we have here in Newfoundland men with foresight and vision and ability who would be able to meet the contingencies when they might arise. I say that that model farm should be received as a lasting memorial to the memory of the late Sir Robert Bond. He was a statesman of remarkably great judgment. Even though his will was made as far back as 1914, he saw no reason up to the time of his death to change that will, and I take it that he had faith in the people of Newfoundland. I think that the model farm, if put under right management, and probably the right way to do that would be to take it clear of party politics would be a success. Get a competent man who has a knowledge of our soil and conditions here, because there is no doubt about it that we have not here the same summer weather as they have in Western Canada. Yet nevertheless I take it that Newfoundland has some agricultural future.

I was reading a few days ago a report that was tabled by the Government geologist. At the end of the report, it was mentioned that as a result of borings in Whitbourne, there was the possibility of finding minerals there. I think that it is ideally situated as regards a place for opening a college for students who might want to take an agricultural course. Men born in Newfoundland as a rule don't want to leave their country unless they are forced out of it. There is no place like home. But there are many men to-day who if they saw a chance of of getting an earning power in Newfoundland on the land would only be too glad to embrace the opportunity.

Now in my opinion a great deal will depend upon the man who will be in charge of that model farm. We find to-day that we are spending $800,000 or more on education here in Newfoundland.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Nearly one million.

MR. ASHBOURNE—We spend nearly a million. Compared to that what is ten thousand dollars. And the question of agriculture is a practical question. I know men who have been farming in Canada and have come back and started in Newfoundland, and they contend that they can make a living out of it. Our population is not large but we have an area of country larger than Ireland. I do not think that we can get an influx of people into this country to go fishing, but if we have an agricultural policy and can show that a living can be made at agriculture in this country I don't think that it will be very long before we shall be exporting produce the same as Prince Edward Island does now We can get the markets. All we have to do is to get men started at farming. The fisherman is not a farmer. To some extent the non-success of fishermen to-day is due to their attempting to devote time to working on the land as well as to

their fishing. I maintain that the successful fisherman is a fisherman only: that he requires to fish and fish only and can't afford to spend much time on the land. I think that if we produced a standardised article, as regards the quality of the produce in general and as regards the size of potatoes in particular, which should be properly graded, we could sell a large quantity here in Newfoundland in place of the tens and hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of potatoes and other produce that are imported here annually.

Reference to re-afforestation in Newfoundland has been made by me several times in this House. We have pulp and paper mills at Corner Brook and Grand Falls using up timber and which must be supplied with timber. Perhaps with the Labrador recently confirmed to us with its supply of timber land we feel we now have an unlimited supply, but the question of re-afforestation is one that might be taken up by such a college as has ben suggested would perhaps be in conjunction with the model farm. I think that the suggestion of the Honorable Leader of the Opposition that the model farm be worked in conjunction with the Memorial College is a very sound idea, and whatever educated man under whose direction students will want to take courses at the model farm, might, as I have suggested, give lectures on the subject of re-afforestation.

I know that those people with whom I chatted before coming on to St. John's, when they heard that Sir Robert Bond had left the land at Whitbourne to the people of Newfoundland, hailed it with universal delight and thanks. I myself feel that this is our opportunity; that we should accept it and keep it and see to it that it is kept as a memorial to the memory of the late Sir Robert Bond who did noble service for Newfoundland.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I don't quite see where the House can get with a discussion conducted under present conditions. I would like to ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture and Mines whether we might not get some information as to the possible cost of some of the various suggestions in connection with the working of the Model Farm, or the conduct of a school of agriculture. I think that, before coming to a decision, we should see exactly what we are going to do, and where the accepting of this gift is going to land us.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Following on the remarks of the Honorable Member for Fortune, Dr. Mosdell, I must say that I was just about to rise to suggest that this committee should rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. It is obviously a mistake to refer the matter at this stage to a select committee. As members will appreciate in a discussion as at present, in open House, sentiment is mixed with the business side of the matter in our speeches, and I think members on both sides of the House will appreciate that in a matter of this kind there are many practical difficulties, and while giving all respect to the memory of the man who has left this gift, at the same time this is one of the things that can't be decided upon by the Government by making up their minds over night. The executor is anxious to have a decision in order to get an early reply, probably amongst other reasons because he wants to make up his mind as to whether he will work the farm this year or not. The Government wants to thoroughly consider the decision, however, and with that idea in view the opportunity might be taken of utilising the time between now and the next sitting of the committee to obtain further and official information on the points raised so that we may

consider them with better hope of a good decision in the light of that information. I would suggest to the Prime Minister who made the motion, that he propose the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SCAMMELL—I concur with the view expressed by the Attorney-General, Mr. Chairman, that this matter should not at the present juncture go to a select committee. We have heard opinions from several members of the House on the matter, but the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has not yet given us his views. He has probably been holding back with a view to obtaining at first the various ideas and opinions of the other members that he may answer them and discuss their suggestions. We would like to hear what he will have to say and we would also like to get further information as referred to by the Attorney General just now. I agree with his motion that the Committee ris and ask leave to sit again.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I also agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, but I want to remark now that I would like to be distinctly understood that this committee should not put too much importance on the speech that the Minister of Agriculture may make. I have no experience myself in model farming, nor have any of my associates in my office any practical experience in this regard. Apart from the statistics at my disposal I do not know that any remarks I may make in connection with this matter may be of any more benefit than those of any other member. I refrained from entering into the discussion in order to obtain the various opinions of the members, and I must say candidly that I have learned a great deal. I subscribe to the suggestion that the committee rise and I want to add that I think that this matter should be considered from every possible angle. The executor is naturally anxious to know whether he ought set his crops, but I do not think that this should rush this House into a decision. To accept the gift and terms binds the colony for ever, and on the other hand if we should decide to turn it down we might be striking a very serious blow at agriculture in this country. I suggest the committee rise and ask leave to sit again to consider the matters before the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the motion of the Minister of Justice, but before proposing that the committee rise I would like to quote one item from the letter of Mr. Reynolds, the head of an agricultural college of Guelph, because what he has to say applies to some of the remarks made on the other side of the House.

(Reads)

That is the opinion of a man who is head of an agricultural college. I want members on both sides of the House who talk about instituting a college out there at Whitbourne to bear in mind the opinion of this expert. He says that the proper place for a boy to learn farming is on a farm carried on privately for profit. It would seem natural that if a man wanted to learn farming he would go on a farm being so operated, and I think that a boy going out to a good farm will learn more about farming than at a technical college that might cost this country $25,000 a year at Whitbourne. I have listened with great interest to the various suggestions and opinions on the subject before the chair. I was rather surprised to hear the opposition say that as we had spent so much for the last two or three years, why not spend some more on this. When the money would be spent they would be asking us why it was not spent on the fisheries or something else. One member of the Opposition said this Govern-

ment and other Governments have wasted money therefore let us keep on wasting money. I think that we should have all the information in connection with this matter obtainable. I think we might get information from the farmers. I want to say that while I appreciate just as much as any member in the House, the gift to this country by Sir Robert Bond, that I am very anxious not to see any more money wasted on model farms, and I am very much afraid I don't care what Government comes in that, if accepted, this thing won't be handled as it ought to be handled. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman for the Committee reported that the Committee had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE SPEAKER — I should like to refer to the notice of motion given by the Honourable Member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, this afternoon, which I do not think is acceptable. The notice is that he will on to-morrow move the House into Committee on a question of privilege, arising out of what he terms the refusal of the Prime Minister to answer the Honourable Member's question No. 71, regarding certain correspondence relative to the recent by-election held in St. John's East. I understand from the remarks of the Honourable Mem- that his real object in making the proposed motion is not so much to deal with the specific question raised therein as to discuss, as a matter of privilege, certain statements published in the press during the bye-election in question, and before the House met, which he states imputed to the Opposition Party responsibility for the holding of the election. Is that right?

MR. CASHIN—Yes, Mr. Speaker.

HON. THE SPEAKER—I fear the motion cannot be entertained for several reasons. I need not stress its want of correct form as that is quite apparent; but I should like to point out that it is not accurate to state that the Hon. the Prime Minister refused to answer that question. In fact he replied to the question in the negative, that there was no correspondence as between the parties mentioned by the Honorable Member. Apart from the question itself the Hon. the Prime Minister went on to say that he had received a communication on the subject, but as it was between him and a private member of his party he would not feel required to disclose it even if the question had been properly framed. I would think that such a question as that should not be put on the Order Paper. There is authority for the correctness of this opinion (May P.P. 224). In the next place in my opinion it would not be competent for me to allow the Honourable Member under cover of such a motion to discuss the extraneous matters with which he states it is his real intention to deal nor would it be permissible for him to introduce as he proposes topics irrelevant to the specific subject matter of his motion. I am further of the opinion that the newspaper comments to which he takes exception cannot be discussed as matters of privilege at all, and this is clearly so under the procedure which the Honourable Member has adopted. The general principle is that in order to justify a motion complaining of newspaper references on the ground of privilege, the article complained of must concern the character or conduct of a member in immediate relationship with the House, and must be based on matters arising, (i.e. actions performed or words ut-

tered) in the actual transaction of the business of the House. The correct procedure to follow then would be to have the newspaper produced, and read by the Clerk, when upon motion of the aggrieved member it would be dealt with as a matter of privilege. I must therefore rule the motion out of order.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to make a remark. I regret that my question is evidently out of order, and that the Prime Minister took it in a different manner than I expected. I asked in all sincerity, and without making a reflection on any gentlemen or newspaper, but in view of the attitude which you have taken there is nothing left for me to do but to bow to your superior decision. But I shall take the first opportunity in public or private to prove that members of the Opposition had nothing to do with the state of things to which my motion referred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, May 19th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 19th, 1927.

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

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the Newfoundland Customs Returns for 1925-26.

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Cashin, from Bay Bulls, re public wharf.

Dr. Mosdell, from Garnish, re transfer of Garnish from Burin West District to Fortune Bay District.

The Hon. Colonial Secertary tabled the Report of the Registrar General of Births, Marriages and Deaths for 1925-26.

The Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General for 1925-26.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Superintendent of the Poor Asylum.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs Supply was granted to His Majesty.

Answers to the following questions were tabled, numbers: 108, 109, 114, 116, 117, 119 and 131.

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

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, when we were last discussing the motion now before the Chair, I was dealing with my views of the record of the present administration with a view to applying that record to the interpretation of the Speech from the Throne with which His Excellency the Administrator opened this session of the Legislature. First of all, while we are discussing speeches, I desire to draw the attention of the House and make some reference to what is presented to the public by certain parties whose business it is, or whose business they themselves conceive it to be, to report the proceedings of this House. I am not looking for any cheap notoriety from any newspaper or other publication. I am not anxious that the remarks I make in this House should be reported by them at all, but if I am to be reported I expect the report to be correct, and I am not satisfied for any aggregation of white livered Pharisees to misrepresent statements that I make here, and to report for me statements that I do not make, particularly when those statements emanate from sources which are supporters of the Government and whose impure, improper and dishonourable motives in doing that kind of thing are apparent on

their faces. I say I have not any desire to be reported by these people at all. To have one's words reported through channels of such a type is to besmirch one, and far from being complimentary, is purely a gratuitous insult. My honourable friend, Mr. Halfyard, has had occasion to complain of this already. I have to complain of it to-day. I happen to belong to the profession of the law, and there is in law a principle which we hold in connection with dogs that "every dog is entitled to one bite." I do not suggest that the same principle applies in law to human dogs, but I am prepared to allow the journalistic type to have one bite, and one only, and I want to be clearly understood that henceforth any person who improperly reports any statement that I make in this House or reports me as making any statement that I have not made or so grossly misrepresents any statement as to deprive it of all semblance of its original character and of its original import, I propose then to bring the matter before this House in privilege and have those persons brought before the bar of the House for condemnation and punishment. I trust that those persons to whom I refer will take due notice and govern themselves accordingly. I am not making statements of this kind this afternoon without warrant. I have a copy of the Daily News here on my desk which I am prepared to produce and have read by the Clerk of the House if necessary, and I am prepared to make the motion at the proper time. Now, Sir, having served these parties and any others who may be of evilly disposed mind, with due notice that I intend to ask this House to protect its privileges, I will proceed with the matter before the Chair. I have dealt, I say, with the record of the present administration with a view of ascertaining so far as possible their principal characteristics in order that we may, by the application of the knowledge thus acquired, interpret with some degree of intelligence the various phrases and contents of the document presented here as the Speech from the Throne which presumably foreshadows the legislation which the Government intends to bring down this session, but before I proced to the consideration of the Speech from the Throne in the light of that record, there is one other incident of it to which I desire to make brief reference. I refer to the delay in the opening of this session of the Legislature. From the time when I first had sufficient intelligence to have even the simplest conception of what the House of Assembly and the Legislature meant, I have always heard that the best time to hold the session was in the early months of the year. Some assert that it should be opened as soon after New Year's Day as possible; others that since the month of January is given up to the making up of accounts and the finishing off of the previous year's business that month should be excluded. I think the concensus of opinion, ever since I have been able to discuss the matter, has always been that the Legislature should open some time in the month of February, as early as possible in fact, in the month of February. This was one of the promises that was given to the electorate of this Colony by the Monroe Administration in 1924. Late sessions of this Legislature were condemned in no uncertain terms. It was pointed out that these late sessions interfered with the business of the year at its commencement, and that the proper time was the season which goes between the winding up of one year's business and the commencement of the next year's. In other words betwen the month of January and the month of May. I was very pleased to see in 1925 that this House was opened by the Monroe Administration on the 18th day of February. I was not

so pleased when I found that in 1926 it did not open until the 3rd day of March, but the difference was only a matter of a couple of weeks, and, after all, one cannot cavil at small things of that kind; but, Sir, the present session of this Legislature had its opening on the 11th day of May, after the country's business for the year 1927 had begun. It is surely reasonable that we should look for some justification for the action of the Government in going back upon a principle which it had announced before its election and which, for two years, it had carried out, or nearly so. There must be some suspicious causes which actuated them in changing their policy from early sessions of the Legislature to late ones. I have heard it suggested that possibly it was due partly to the absence of my honourable friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He has not chosen to deny this; I am not in a position to affirm it. But I, in common with every other citizen of the Colony I can judge for myself as to whether or not this fact had any effect upon the minds of the Government in postponing this session to so late a day. I do recollect that when the Hon. Joseph Long was in England in 1926, the Legislature was opened on the 3rd day of March. At that time the Monroe Administration had 24 seats in this House. I do see before me, at the present moment, 18 men sitting on the Government benches and 17 on the Opposition side, and the absence of the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries would possibly make the situation a little awkward for the Government, and I think that we Newfoundlanders may, perhaps, be pardoned if we have some suspicions about the matter. There is another aspect of this matter more serious than the point to which I have just referred, and that is the fact that many of the men who sit on this side of the House are engaged in some way or another in the prosecution of the staple industry of this Colony, and to bring them here at this late season of the year when they should be attending to those duties, the performance of which is essential in order that the business and industries with which they are connected, some of which are staple industries of the Colony, should not suffer, is not such an action as an administration having the interests of the country and the welfare of its industries at heart should be guilty of. One would think that if the present administration had the interests of this colony at heart that it would give those members an opportunity to perform their duties here in the House of Assembly early in the year and so enable them to get back to their avocations and to forward the country's staple industries. Instead, however, of holding the session at such a time as would not interfere with the prosecution of one of the Colony's staple industries those members are brought here at a time when it is almost imperative that they should be at home. What motive can be behind this action on the part of the Government? Was it in order that they might obtain the decision of the electors in St. John's East? I claim that they waited two years too long before they asked for that decision. I might also be suggested that that object was one not wholly without ulterior motives, in that possibly the Government counted upon the fact that some of these members might not be able to remain in this House during a session of the legislature at this time of the year. As I say though I am not in a position to make any positive statement as to what particular motive or motives actuated the government under all these circumstances, I have my own opinions and so have the people of the Colony, and I will go so far as to

say this, that their opinion and mine square exactly.

We have now a brief and possibly a comprehensive view of the record of the Monroe administration from the day when that party was conceived down to the present time, and from it we can judge of two things; firstly its sincerity and secondly its capacity. When one recalls all the emanations of this administration in its promises in 1924; when one recalls all the burdens that were promised to be removed from the backs of those who could ill afford to bear those burdens; when we recall all those promises that were given us of improvement in the management of public affairs of this colony; when we recall all the condemnation of graft and squandermania that emanated from the supporters of this party during the election of 1924; and place on the other side of that particular page the record of the administration itself in that respect; it does not seem to me that it requires a "Daniel come to judgment" in order that we may be enabled to know whether such sincerity existed or did not. If one may have regard only to bald facts of their political history and judge these people by their deeds then by the unanimous voice of any impartial jury they must be condemned utterly and absolutely. No sincerity whatever can be discerned in a record such as I have detailed to you during the past afternon or two. We then are justified, I submit, in approaching the consideration of this Speech from the Throne with a preconceived idea that we must beware at least of possible insincerity as to its contents. And now sir, I propose to deal for a moment with this Government's capacity in view of this record. Let us first look to the expenditure on the dry dock in 1925. We were informed that the dry dock was in extremely dangerous condition; that repairs were absolutely essential and immediately essential as otherwise a catastrophe might occur. I took it for granted that these facts were correct and I assumed that in the main they were. The Government immediately undertok to remedy this condition. It was suggested from this side of the House that substantial repairs might be executed for a comparatively small sum of money, but the Government on the other hand felt that partial repairs to a dry dock of a type already obsolete would be mistaken economy and they undertook therefore to build a modern dock to accommodate large steamers, large tramps or lame ducks as we call them, which come in here sometimes for the reason that they have had a sudden introduction to one of the icebergs that are sometimes to be found off our coasts. Various estimates were obtained by the Government as to the probable cost of building a new dock which would be of increased breadth and depth and of concrete instead of wood; and a decision upon this question was finally made—after having numerous foreign engineers here to consider the matter as well as our own engineers and others expert in that kind of work. The estimated cost was $1,085,000. I do not know exactly what the cost of that dock was, but I think I would not be exaggerating to a very great extent if I said it cost double that amount. That, sir, to me, does not argue any particular business capacity. That does not argue that nobody else could have done any better than the present administration; if there is nobody in Newfoundland who can go nearer the cost of a Government work that to underestimate it by one hundred per cent. then God help this Colony. That is one instance from which we may draw a conclusion as to the capacity of this administration to handle public affairs. Let us look back for a moment and note all the salient features of the policy of the present Government as

accomplished since their election took place. I referred yesterday to highroads; during the year 1925 140 odd miles of road were dealt with. A certain number of these miles were of wholly new construction, but a number of them were simply repairs to old and existing roads, and those 146 miles of new and repaired roads cost this colony over a million dollars; a million dollars for 146 miles of new and repaired roads. Mr. Speaker, I am not very good at mental arithmetic but I suggest that that cost is somewhere in the neighbourhood of seven thousand dollars a mile. $7,000 a mile expended to create highroads which are useful for tourists who have money enough to hire a motor car when they come here,—which a great many have not, as I have been told that some come with their tickets and enough to buy a packet of picture post-cards,—useful also to those of our citizens sufficiently fortunate to possess a motor car, but wholly useless to the great bulk of the people of this Colony who will never see them if they live to be a thousand. There are a few miles of road in the lower end of the district of Port de Grave upon which I would be delighted to spend $5,000.00 and give the fishermen of that particular section a road such as they want, but I could not get that small sum. The Government was too busy building seven thousand a mile roads for tourists. $2,212,000 has been expended upon these highroads during the past two years and interest on this will have to be found by the people; from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent. of that cost will have to be found annually in order to keep up these highroads, and we are told that this tourist policy is going to pay the piper. I say that any man who believes that the tourist policy for the next fifty years in this country is going to pay the cost of these highroads speaks very hopefully. It is the staple industries that will have to make it up and these staple industries will never receive any advantage from it. Is that evidence from which we can conclude that the present administration is capable of administering the affairs of the country? Another point in connection with this highroads policy to which I wish to draw attention is that these roads were all built at a time of the year when ordinarily our people would be at the fishery. Who is going to the fishery when there is an opportunity of earning $2.00 or $2.50 at work on highroads? Who is going to the fishery if he sees a reasonable opportunity of getting $2.00 or $2.50 a day working in his own home. I know supplying merchants on the Peninsula of Avalon who told me that men who had been with them in previous years laughed when they were asked if they would ship with them in 1925 and 1926. Of course not! Would any man who can earn more at home, and at the same time do a little in the agricultural line bother with the fisheries? The result was that these men who would otherwise have been producers stayed home, and we can't blame them for that—I would do the same myself. By the act of the Government they were placed in the position of being parasites on the people of this Colony instead of producers. We are living on our vitals to-day and if that is going on it is only a question of time when Newfoundland as an independent entity will cease to exist. Does that demonstrate a capacity on the part of the present administration to conduct the affairs of the Colony It is an admitted fact, for the Government itself says so, that the fishery is the mainstay of Newfoundland, and despite that admission not a single effort has been made in the past three years to help it—I repeat that there has been not a single effort in the past three years to encourage the fishery or to save that declining

and dying industry. And unless some effort is made shortly to alter conditions which at present exist in connection with the codfishery, it will cease to exist. I don't know what my Hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries can tell us, but I am informed that out of scores of schooners which last year prosecuted the fishery from the district which he has the honour to represent, not half the number is likely to go this year. That is the information which I have, and I have it from men of Bonavista Bay. I shall be pleased and delighted to hear that the Hon. Member can deny that report. I do know that in my own district if fishermen have anything at all whereby they can earn a dollar or two they will have nothing more to do with the fishery. That I know to be a fact, and I know it from their own lips. As I told the House a few days ago, scores of my constituents who prosecuted the fishery last year, when the season ended didn't have $30.00 per man to support their families during the winter, and many were hopelessly in debt. And in spite of the fact that things grow hourly worse no effort whatever has been made to better conditions. There has been no attempt to improve marketing, no attempt at standardization. At various times efforts have been made to remove evils in connection with exporting, some of which I dealt with in connection with the Labrador, but nothing has been done by this administration. Nothing! No hope held out; nothing offered the fishermen—the whole industry may sink and still the Government worries not. I don't think anyone can even by the utmost stretch of the imagination argue that this shows a capacity on the part of this administration to deal with the affairs of the Colony at the present time.

One might further deal with the question of relief. In the early days of the present Government relief was given by way of the dole. I don't know whether they found that shovelling snow was cheaper, but I do know that when a man is employed he expects to have to give reasonable returns, and I would like somebody to point out what returns the Government have received from the money spent in snow shovelling. I did hear of one case where snow was shovelled off the road, and had to be shovelled back again! I did see snow being shovelled when the sunlight furnished by the Almighty was doing the work faster—not but that the men were doing what they could—but climatic conditions made the work ridiculous. Didn't it suggest itself to the Government that these men might have been more profitably employed. We heard a lot of criticism of the rock sheds during the Squires regime and during the election of 1924, but at least we had the rocks, and to-day we haven't even got the snow. Couldn't something have been done? The Battery, in St. John's East, is sadly in need of aid; I understand that the Municipal Council are unable to do anything because of lack of funds to cope with this situation or give adequate sanitary conditions. It must be admitted by anyone who has ever visited the Battery that improvement is essential and if the Government found that it had to spend ninety or a hundred thousand dollars why couldn't they have spent it there?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—The Municipal Council had the spending of it.

MR. BRADLEY—That is no excuse. You can't get clear of responsibility by attempting to shoulder it on someone else. The Minister of Justice may laugh, but I shall be glad to see him laugh when he goes back to his district in 1928. I did not condemn the expenditure—certainly not. The people had to be looked after, but they were ready to give a reasonable return, and for the money spent in

snow shovelling we have no returns at all.

Now, Sir, to deal for a moment with the financial situation. I take it that it is a principle of political economy with which most men will agree that to place an impediment in the way of the progress of an industry is likely to be disastrous. You simply take a step towards killing the goose which lays the golden egg, which in Newfoundland happens to be the fishery. If you tax the fishery so that it becomes unremunerative, it will soon cease to exist; if the cost of producing fish becomes so great that there is no profit in it for the fishermen, they will not fish, and that is exactly the state of things which exists to-day. I do not say the price of fish is wholly due to the action of the Government, (and I don't want that statement misinterpreted in the Press either,) but I do say that the course which the Government has taken, in taxing the things essential to the fishermen, has hampered the fishery—one of the acts of the Government was to increase these taxes. I for one am not prepared to admit the principle that a Government which forces the fishery to the wall is a capable one.

And then, Sir, we have to consider the deficit. We were told last year that there would be a surplus in the neighbourhood of $300,000.00, and in the Government organs during the bye-elections it was admitted, for the purpose of bolstering up their case, that there was a deficit of $80,000.00. Now I wonder how much it really is? We are somewhere near four or five hundred thousands behind the last Estimates, and to-day, although the Government predicted in 1926 that things would be alright, the Prime Minister has admitted that for the fiscal year 1926-27 up to the present time he anticipates a deficit of one and a half millions on general revenue and seven hundred and fifty thousand on the Railway. And how can a Government whose predictions are so far away from actual facts be considered as capable? Sir, I think it is fairly evident from the facts before us that this Administration cannot be considered as wholly sincere or wholly capable. On the other hand I think we are justified in assuming that when we approach any promises which they make for the future, or any indication of what they intend to do in the future, that these promises and these supposed intentions should be approached with grave suspicion as to their sincerity and considerable doubt as to their capability of carrying them out in the interests of the Colony.

Let us consider the Speech as read by His Honour the Speaker on Wednesday last. It is a weak document —what might be termed a "milk and water" document, one which shows no courage, no confidence in its writers that they can do anything under the circumstances to deal with the future. It begins by telling us the story that we have so frequently heard in the Press and on the platform during the past few months, that the dispute between Canada and Newfoundland as to the Labrador has been settled. We are grateful for the reminder, but it offers little information, and no hope for the future. While I am aware that Newfoundland has won the dispute, and I am quite willing to give credit where it is due to those associated in its settlement, I would be the last in the world to deprive any gentleman associated with the present administration of the smallest amount of credit due him for the part which he took with the settlement of the dispute. But it must be remembered that there are some other gentlemen who have been associatd therewith, some of whom are in their graves, and some not in this country at all, and I would like to pay tribute to them, as well as to those closely associated with the dis-

pute at the time of settlement, because their labours were given at a time when things didn't look bright for Newfoundland. I refer to the late Martin W. Furlong, who was associated with the dispute many years ago, and did a tremendous amount of work in connection with the case, which I understand was practically completed in 1924. I think the late Sir James Winter also was associated therewith, and I believe the present Mr. Justice Kent—to them also our thanks are due. And then we have to go outside—and should be grateful to the Government's solicitor's and to that famous counsel, Sir John Simon who pleaded the case before the Privy Council. I am grateful to all these, from the earliest down to the present, including the Minister of Justice. But we must remember that while we are now in legal possession—whether in actual possession or not I don't know—that it will be some time before we can hope for any tangible benefits to accrue to us, though it may have the effect of improving our credit and enable the Government to raise another loan if they want to. It is not an asset that can be immediately developed, because the Prime Minister has already informed us that these gentlemen whom the Prime Minister regards as necessary evils, belonging to the profession of which I have the honour to be a member have yet to get another little slice out of the Labrador, and those lawyers associated with or friendly to the administration can hope for some few plums yet. So much for the value of the announcement in the Speech from the Throne that we have won the Labrador for the people of the Colony.

Now, Sir, we are told that the cod fishing industry in 1926 suffered considerably from prices prevailing in foreign markets.

(Reads)

I suppose these are truisms which we can't dispute. But there doesn't seem to be any attempt whatever by the Government or any suggestion offered to relieve those conditions. A statement of fact is no good to the Colony at the present time; what we want is a constructive policy whereby these unfortunate conditions can be relieved. It is not much use to tell a hungry man that there is no bread—what he wants to know is where it can be obtained. And after three years—after they have had plenty of time to find their feet, the Government comes in here and tells us that the codfishery has suffered. That is all; they might just as well have left it unsaid—we knew it before they told us.

(Reads)

We are told here also,—and here is a distant beam of light,—regarding the development of the paper-making industry.

(Reads)

I am glad to learn it, Sir, very glad indeed, but I have yet to learn that the fact that the output of these factories is slightly increased is going to cure the evils from which this Colony unfortunately suffers at this moment. And the Colonial Conference is referred to by the Prime Minister, who tells us that we are now in a position different from that which we formerly occupied, that we are now an independent unit of the British Empire. It may be that that is correct—I am not prepared to accept it, as my opinion is that no change in status had been made, but that the position of the Colonies was more clearly defined. It was with regret that I heard the Prime Minister state that our status had in fact been changed, because if that is so, and we have to admit a change in status, it is due to the efforts of parts of the Empire which contain elements which are disloyal to the Crown—I refer to Canada and South Africa, where the French and Dutch races are known to be hostile to British influence. If

our status has changed, I regret it exceedingly because it is one step, however large or small, which these particular parties or influences have gained towards their desired goal, the disruption of the Empire. That surely is not a matter for congratulation, not that it directly affects this Colony, for I agree with the Prime Minister that it doesn't matter much whether we are regarded as independent or as an ancient and loyal Colony. We know that Great Britain will allow us to hoe our own row, and we don't require that we should be regarded as independent. It is a high sounding phrase and may tickle the vanities of some, but it is of no value to this Colony or any Dependency which is truly loyal to the Crown.

The announcement of the deficit is contained in this Speech from the Throne, and the Prime Minister has given us further figures as to the amount. An effort is then made to explain how this comes about, and we are told that the deficit of 1926-27 is owing largely to the decreased importation and reduced value of imports.

Of course it is due largely to decreased importation. If the importations were as large as ever they were, and the duties are greater than ever they were, then there ought to be more revenue; but in spite of the incrased tariff our people are in such a position financially that they are not able to buy, therefore, the importers have refused to import. The impoverished condition of the people, Sir, is the cause of the decrease in the revenue, and you will never increase that revenue until you increase the people's earning capacity. That will not be done until we take matters in hand and apply a constructive policy to our staple industry.

Then we are told that the reduction in the value of articles in the manufacture of which cotton is a component part is also responsible for the decrease in the revenue. In other words the fact that Newfoundland can buy cotton cheaper in the foreign markets to-day is partly responsible to the deficit in the revenue, or to put it another way, the Government hopes that when the people have to pay more for cotton in the foreign markets they will get the revenue back again. Stuff and nonsense of the worst possible type to lay before the intelligent citizens of this country. It is surely against the best interests of the people of this country to practically announce in the Speech from the Throne that one of the regrettable features in the year's operations is the fact that the people were able to obtain cheaper cotton, and because of that the Government did not obtain as much duty on cotton articles as they did before. If we are to judge from that the nature of the capacity of the present administration to bring Newfoundland out of the slough of despond into which we are now drifting, then, sir, I am afraid that unless a change of administration takes place very soon Newfoundland will have to call her creditors together.

Furthermore it says here that the deficit is caused by the increase in the amount required to meet the interest on the public debt. I quite agree with that. But who is responsible for the increase of the amount required to meet the interest on the public debt. Is it not the Administration itself which borrowed two million dollars to expend on roads and bridges whilst the fisheries and other staple industries in this country languished in poverty. Every difficulty that the Government has to face to-day is caused by its own action, or lack of action. They are caused by its action in undertaking those useless public works, and they are caused by its failure to undertake some remedial legislation for the encour-

agement of the staple industries of the country. Truly, Sir, they have done those things which they ought not to have done, and have left undone those things which they ought to have done, and in those two statements you can sum up the whole career of the Monroe Administration from June, 1924, to May, 1927.

Down at the bottom of the first page in the Speech from the Throne we first reach something that is tangible. "With a view to a reduction of possible future deficits, etc."

(Reads)

If the Government hopes that it will avoid a future deficit by the re-enactment of the Income Tax, it is greatly mistaken. I suppose that tax annually would not amount to more than half a million dollars. Yet we are faced here to-day with a deficit of two and a half millions, two and a quarter at any rate. We are told that the income tax is to be introduced with a view to avoiding a possible future deficit, but we have not been told here that there is anything which would warrant us in believing that there was even a possibility under the existing conditions, of the deficit being less next year than it is to-day. With the introduction of the income tax, I agree. I am glad to see that the Government has to some extent at last seen the error of its ways; that at last they have realized that the income tax which was repealed in 1925 ought never to have been repealed. I suppose we may regard it in the nature of a death-bed repentance, or possibly some people might be so uncharitable as to suggest that it was the repentance of the thief upon the cross. I agree, sir, with the principle of the income tax, and I trust that the Government will bring down here such a tax, and I assure them if it is properly adjusted so that the burden bears on those well able to support it, that it will have my heartiest support; but I noticed that a tax which is the twin brother of the income tax and which should go with it is not here, namely, the business profits tax. It will be interesting to see how far the incomes of corporations will be covered by this income tax, which the Government proposes to bring in, because, sir, it is a simple matter for me or any other man with a large profitable business to draw therefrom a nominal salary upon which to pay the income tax, and leave the bulk of the profits of the business in that business and pay nothing upon it, unless there is a proper safeguard in the income tax itself, unless it is drafted in such a way that the tax will cover that situation. Unless the one is done the other is useless, because a man who can pay will naturally beat you every time.

And then, Sir, we are informed that the Government were fortunate enough to make an agreement in January with the Bell Island people. Perhaps there was a certain phase of that situation at the time which rendered it almost hopeless for the Government to expect that such an agreement could be made. I take it for granted that this is the annual agreement that has been made every year for the past six or seven years which is referred to here. The Company were forced to consider the employment of a certain number of men and keep them employed during the year in return for a remission of the export tax. No particular credit is due for that contract unless there was extraordinary difficulty due to the peculiar conditions of the time that made it almost hopeless that an agreement could be reached this year with Besco, and by some particularly skilful manipulation the Government managed to trap Besco into this agreement once more.

(Reads)

I do want to make this statement at the outset, when considering this

particular part of the program outlined in the Speech from the Throne, that the legislature in past years has been too prone to grant concessions to capitalists. They are too prone, sir, to adopt the attitude that these people have put a gun to our heads and that we have to grant them these concessions or they will run away from us. I have heard that cry of wolf so often that I am very sceptical about it now.

The A N. D. Co. I understand own these areas down there in the neighbourhood of Red Indian Lake. I also understand that they have entered into some sort of an agreement, of the details of which I have no knowledge, with some other corporation in connection with the working of these areas. They have already expended certain sums of money in development, and now they come to this Legislature and ask us to admit duty free, certain articles which they require. Now so far as it concerns articles in the nature of construction materials, it perhaps might be regarded as reasonable, but that they be freed from all tax for a period of twenty years, on certain articles is unfair. What do we get in return for it. That is what we would like to know. If Newfoundland deprives itself of certain customs duties by giving free entry to certain articles, what do we get to pay for that. I suppose that we will be told that we get the labour, and that if we don't give them these concessions, that they will run away and leave the mine alone. Sir, if that mine is any good, if it is capable of being worked at a profit I am of the opinion that the owners will work it anyway, whether they get concessions or not. I would be glad, sir, to learn that any other country on the face of the earth—the United States for instance—is prepared to give concessions to any man that happens to start a mine in any part of that great country, and to give him free entry on any article for a period of twenty years. As I have already said, sir, if they ask for free entry for the materials essential to the construction itself it might be regarded as reasonable, but to continue in the future, as we have in the past, exempting these corporations from the ordinary tax which the ordinary business man in Newfoundland has to pay is not fair, and in particular is it unfair, unless it can be clearly shown that the Colony gets an adequate return.

(Reads)

What advantage is it to the people of this Colony if we permit capitalists to come down here and cut down our raw material and then take it in its raw state to some foreign country to be manufactured. We are simply providing the raw material wherewith these people can find the labour for foreigners in foreign countries, when we need that labour so badly in this country ourselves. We strip our country of its raw material in order that foreign countries may work it up into a marketable commodity, and take the advantage and the profit therefrom. If we have timber in this country that is capable of being manufactured, then I say let that corporation come down and make pulp and paper out of it right here in Newfoundland. It has been done here and it can still be done here. I strongly condemn the idea of allowing the raw material to go out of this country, to the United States to enrich Yankees when we are so badly in need of the labour here ourselves. I propose sir, to oppose that agreement unless it is quite different from what I understand it to be; unless this agreement has some saving clause in it to protect our own labour I propose to fight it tooth and nail.

I do, Sir, in this speech from the Throne, see one piece of legislation with which I am in entire accord, and that is the reserving of our timber

areas on Labrador from all foreign speculators. I quite agree with the Government that no grant of any timber in the future should be made out of this territory except by this legislature. In the past people have obtained Crown land for little or nothing, and after taking our valuable property for practically nothing they have grown wealthy upon it. These lands belong to the people of this country and should not be given away for a song to speculators. They are for the people's use and the people should have the benefit of them. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to support that bill.

Now, Sir, there is one more matter to which I wish to draw the attention of this House. I refer to the position existing here to-day. I want to refer to the remarks of the Prime Minister when speaking to the motion for the appointment of the Committee on Wednesday last. He told us that the situation of the country was serious or words to that effect. He told us further that drastic legislation was necessary to meet the exigencies of the times. He admits further that his Government at the present time is not sufficiently strong to introduce that legislation which conditions demand. This matter was referred to by Mr Hickman and I intend to pursue it, because I think that it is of extreme importance. The Government was elected with 25 men in 1924. Rightly or wrongly it has lost the confidence of six of these, in other words twenty-five per cent. of its supporters. Then a shuffle took place and we find ourselves in this House with 18 men on the Government side and 17 in Opposition. The Government has been defeated at the bye-election in Fortune Bay, and it suffered an ignominious and discreditable defeat in the bye-election in St. John's East a month ago. There is not the slightest shadow of doubt about it that the majority of the people of this country to-day have no confidence in the capacity of the Monroe administration to meet the situation. It is also a fact that the people of this conutry to-day expect and want an election this fall, and when I say that, I want also to say that I know what I am talking about. Now I ask you in all sincerity is it consistent with the alleged honest motives of the present administration, that they should continue to hang on to office—for what reason I know not, after the fall of this year, when they know and admit that they have not the strength to bring in that legislation which the condition of the times require. We know that the people of this country have lost their confidence in them as a Government. Is it then consistent with their professions of honesty and integrity that they should still continue in office. Is it not their plain duty as citizens of this country to forget politics at least for the present, and to give some heed to the existing conditions. Is it not their plain duty with the knowledge that they have lost the confidence of the people, with the knowledge that they are too weak to introduce the legislation that the times require, and with the knowledge that the people of this country want and need an opportunity to place in office an administration sufficiently strong to do what is required of them. If they desire to live up to that reputation for honesty which they claim, then there is only one course left open to them and that is to dissolve this House, go back to the people, and answer to them for their deeds during the past three years. If then the people are satisfied with the conditions, if the people are content that they have done their best under the circumstances, if they are quite satisfied with all this, and put the Monroe Government back in office, I am quite satisfied.

The Prime Minister has stated in

his Manifesto that there are too many unearned salaries being paid in this country, but what has he done about reducing these unearned salaries? I venture to say that in every part of the Colony to-day, and in the city of St. John's itself there are more employed nominally, than there were when the Monroe administration came into power, and still the Monroe administration comes in and tells us that there are too many unearned salaries being paid in this country and that they were going to reduce them. "Rigid retrenchment and the utmost economy." I have yet to see one iota of retrenchment that was carried out in this Colony by the Monroe administration. There has been no economy whatever. I don't care whether I am elected at the next General Election or not. But what I want to see in this country is what the Monroe administration used to call a "square deal." Now there is another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the Government, and it is this. That this House of Assembly dies in July, 1928. It dies by Act of Parliament, and nothing can save it but another Act of Parliament. That being the case from early July, 1928, until sometime in November, should this present Government decide to hold office, if they can do so, this Colony will be at least three months without a House of Assembly at all. The gentlemen who sit in the Executive Council and occupy departmental office during that period will represent no one. They will not even be trustees of the Colony, but merely private citizens, occupying offices of trust by reason of a constitutional accident. Is it consistent, Sir, with the principles of political good faith, that any administration should remain in office for a period of some months after it has ceased to represent anybody? The other alternative is an election in the spring. I think that upon this point I can speak for 95 per cent. of the people of this country: I think that I can speak for 100 per cent. of the gentlemen on the Government side of this House when I say that a spring election is not in the best interests of the country.

The alternatives then that face the Prime Minister to-day are the dissolving of this House and granting a General Election in the fall of 1927 which the great bulk of the people of the Colony expect him to do, the granting of an election in the spring of 1928 which would be detrimental to the best interests of the Colony, or carrying on by virtue of a constitutional accident until the fall of 1928. In the latter case he and his associates will be usurping by that constitutional accident the positions which they at present occupy, and will represent nobody in the House of Assembly because there will be no House in existence then. It is also very probable that within the next twelve months an occasion may arise making it absolutely necessary to call the House together immediately, and if such an occasion does arise between June and November 1928 we would have a Government in power representing nobody, and no House of Assembly to call together. All consideration of patriotism, all consideration of justice and all consideration of decency demand that there shall be an election during the fall of 1927. I believe and I can speak for members on this side of the House jump into office, we have no desire when I say that it is not our desire to at all at the present moment to root the Government out and occupy their positions. Personally I have no such desire. What I do want is that the Government shall treat the people of the country fairly. I sincerely believe, and I am quite satisfied that the present administration cannot undertake to pass that legislation which is now so essential for Newfoundland. That being the case, their continuance

in office is a stumbling block in the path of the people of the Colony who are endeavouring to get out of the mess they are in to-day. Does the present Government desire to go down in history as that stumbling block; and if it is its intention to hold on to office, for what reason does it ask to so continue. As I have already said, every consideration of the constitutional rights of the people demand that there shall be an election the coming fall, and if the Government fails to give the people their just rights then we can only attribute their attitude to such motives that are not particularly complimentary. I am quite satisfied, Sir, that, if any attempt is made by the present administration to continue in office after November next, the common people will put a construction on their conduct which will condemn them to perpetual infamy. I cannot believe that the Prime Minister is prepared to adopt any such course; I cannot believe for a moment that he will go so far as to deprive the people of the country a chance, which they desire, of saying what party of men they require to grapple with the serious condition of affairs that confront this Colony at the present time. I think it is about time to forget party politics. I do not stand here to-day merely as an advocate of the Opposition. I stand here free and untrammelled, and, no matter what motives may be attributed to me, I speak wholeheartedly for the best interests of this Colony, and I sincerely believe that the way the Prime Minister and his associates can best serve the interests of the people of Newfoundland is by granting a dissolution and a General Election in the fall of 1927. I trust, Sir, that the Prime Minister will take this matter into his serious consideration. Possibly he does not see things as I see them, but while I am not always so confident advancing my opinion I feel that what I say now is absolutely correct, and I feel that the Prime Minister believes the same thing. I trust that the conditions under which the people are living to-day will cease and that the Prime Minister of Newfoundland will take the proper, honest and honorable course, grant an election the coming fall and give the people of the Colony a chance to have a strong, stable and capable Government, a Government that will be able to handle our desperate conditions and which is so absolutely essential in the interests of Newfoundland—Newfoundland not merely as an independent unit within the Empire, but Newfoundland as an ancient and loyal Colony of the Empire.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Address in Reply I wish to first express my regret over the passing of Sir Michael Cashin and Sir Robert Bond; both sad events occurred within the past year and both gentlemen were closely identified with this House for a quarter of a century. These great statesmen were very much admired by the people and we all deeply regret their passing because while they were alive they inspired the younger generation and helped in no small measure to keep the lamp burning in this country. I also regret the absence of Mr. Mott, the Clerk, from this House through illness and I hope to see him back in his old seat before this House closes because he was a very genial and courteous official.

I have to congratulate my friend Mr. Chambers and the district of Burgeo and LaPoile upon his victory. Mr. Chambers was successful after a hard fight and I feel sure that he feels elated upon coming back to this House as Minister of Public Works. I must also congratulate Dr. Mosdell upon winning the election of Fortune Bay against overwhelming odds. In the last general election in Fortune Bay Mr. Warren (now Judge) won a mar-

vellous victory there. Therefore, Dr. Mosdell must feel proud over the wonderful turnover that he made as an Opposition candidate. Last but by no means not the very least I must heartily congratulate Mr. Brophy who won the district of St. John's East in the recent Bye-Election against heavy odds. I understand the Government candidate in 1924 had a majority of 2500 votes and Mr. Brophy, the Liberal candidate won by 500 votes. In other words Mr. Brophy's actual majority over the Government candidate in the Bye-Election was 3000 votes. Therefore, the Government has lost the confidence of the people of St. John's East and Fortune Bay and I think that these districts speak for the whole of this country at the present time. As I know it that is the way the people in the outports are viewing matters just now. I regret Mr. Warren's retirement from public life. He represented the district next to my own and he was a great friend of mine. There was no political enmity between us and were he here this afternoon I suppose he would be termed by the Government members as another faction in the Opposition. I see in the ranks of the Government this afternoon Hon. Mr. Duff, who left the ranks of the Opposition within the past year and joined the Government forces. I think, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Duff's action is unprecedented in the history of this country, in that he left the ranks of the Opposition and went with the ranks of the Government in power and the country wonders why. Was it for an executive seat and the pay he is receiving on the pension board? Mr. Duff did not leave while the House was in session but waited until the House closed. (Enough said).

Mr. Speaker, before I drew your attention to the fact that there was no quorum in the House I was remarking that I thought the action of My friend Mr. Duff for Carbonear was unprecedented in the history of the colony. I have only been a member for the past three years and I cannot of course make this as a definite statement Mr. Duff did not have the courage of his convictions to leave his party while the House was in session and took the opportunity to go over to the Government ranks when it was on the rocks. That as I said I think is unprecedented and I am afraid will look to the people of this country as rather a cowardly action. The members have just had to be called in to make up a quorum and it appears that they are getting tired of sitting here. Well we don't blame them. I myself would rather be at home attending to my business than down here at a session in the month of May. I think that unfair and that we are not being given the square deal that we were promised in 1924 and that we should not be here but back attending to the fisheries and trying to do something for the good of the country. That was one of the promises you made the country Mr. Prime Minister that you would have early sessions and it has not been carried out. You, sir, have offered various reasons for not doing this, one I understand is that the Gander proposition is not ready. If that be so it may be a very good reason but in my humble opinion I do not think that a sufficient reason for the delay in opening this House until the 11th of May in any year. Another reason I understand why this House was not open was that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries decided to go to the seal fishery, and when he decided to go the Government said that they couldn't open the House. That I understand is past history and considering the depletion in your ranks they decided to postpone the Legislature until the Minister should arrive. Another reason I understand is that the question of St. John's East District had not been attended to and the Bye-Election had to be held. For what reason I know not except the opinion

of the public, but that went against you and now you stand with nineteen, eighteen on the floors of the House, When you came back to office in 1924 you had twenty-five. You said that in your present position you could not give us any drastic legislation as you thought was required. I think we should have had drastic legislation. I think we should have had it in 1924. I think if you had drastic legislation then you would be in the House with as large a majority as you were at that time, but you decided against drastic legislation, and now you come before us and say that you are unable to pass legislation because of the depletion in your ranks.

I was also going to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Justice, Mr. Higgins, on the victory of Newfoundland on the Labrador Boundary Question. I want to congratulate him in his absence and also any other person who took part in the settlement of that great question. I think that we have won a very valuable asset, and the question arises in my mind, what shall or can we do with that asset. We are a small country, some forty-two thousand square miles, and have now tacked on to us some one hundred and ten thousand more, an area of about two and a half times as large as our island. The question arises what are we going to do with this property? Are we going to give this hard won property away to speculators, or are we going to develop it? The question is, can we develop it? Have we financial status to start it wherely we can develop this undefined, unknown and undeveloped property, or are we going to sell it? I am perhaps not very visionary or far-seeing, like many others, but it seems to me that if we sold the Labrador and tried to reduce our national debt we should have less interest to pay, taxation could be reduced, and our people could be allowed to live. At the present time the fishermen of our country cannot live. It is absolutely imposisble for the fishermen to get the necessities of life with the taxation with which they are burdened. The Labrador should be saved from grafters and politicians. I don't say that as a reflection on the present Government. We have such grafters and speculators who are not in the ranks of the Government or in those of the Opposition, who are outside of the House altogether. I say, what is to be done with this property which has come to us? I notice from the Speech from the Throne that a Bill is to be brought in whereby land will not be given away to speculators and politicians, but at the same time I understand from persons acquainted with the machinery from the Department of Agriculture and Mines that considerable of this land is now alreeady given away. I think this requires the most careful consideration in order that it may be seen whether this property which now belongs to Newfoundland is in reality given away, and if it is given away, is it then rightfully theirs, or in dispute. I think this Colony should go into that matter very carefully, and not give away something which would be of great benefit to us and to future generations. We have the future to consider. We have to consider and we should be very careful that we have Labrador for Newfoundland and that all of us have the benefit. We have the future of Newfoundland and incidentally that of Labrador placed in our hands, and as I said before, we should be very careful and not give away this land to hungry speculators and politicians. We have already given away too much of our little Colony of Newfoundland. I understand to-day that there is scarcely a stick of wood inside the three mile limit that doesn't belong to some one. Unfortunately some of us are not lucky enough to be in a position to grab some of that property. Our in-

terests are taken up with the fisheries of the country. With a debt facing us of seventy millions and a deficit of a million and a half dollars, as stated by the Prime Minister on opening day, and a deficit on the railway of seven hundred and fifty thousand, to make a grand total of two and a quarter millions, I state that we must be very careful with the Labrador. That is a bad financial state in this country, I say. The Prime Minister told us he was going to clean up, but I am afraid instead of cleaning up he has cleaned out, and now in order to pay the current expenses of this Colony we have to borrow. That, I say, is a sad state of affairs, and what the end will be I am not going to forecast. I leave that to greater financial minds than mine; but I am afraid that it is a sorry state of affairs when we can't make two ends meet. Passing on in the Speech from the Throne I see that the codfish industry suffered considerably. That is not any news. The codfishery as always said by all politicians to the people of this country has been the main industry of this Colony, and it is given in this Speech from the Throne but four small paragraphs. I wonder what we have done for the codfishery of this country. I wonder what the present administration has done. Mr. Monroe told us in his Manifesto of 1924 that it would ever be the mainstay of the Colony. With that we agree. Every one agrees that the fishery of the country will ever be its mainstay. He goes on to say that everything that can minister to the prosperity of the fishermen will be undertaken.

(Reads from Manifesto.)

Now I would like to know what the Prime Minister has done for the fisheries of this Colony. One thing I know he did was that a duty was placed on lines and twines after being, I understand, 27 years on the free list. If that is working for the encouragement and in the interests of the fisheries then I would like to know what encouragement of the fisheries means. One thing I do know, Mr. Speaker, is that we spent two millions in a highroads policy, and that it took nearly every man in Conception Bay away from the fisheries. I take that from men who have lived in Conception Bay, and men who are still living there, and they can't get the gear now to start fishing. The Government may say that we have fish enough, but these men fished for years and always got enough to support their families for the winter. In my opinion the people who worked on the highroads spent as they earned, week by week, and when the highroads were closed in the fall of the year there was nothing for them to do but get the dole, for they had nothing left. This is a very sad state of affairs, and what the Government is going to do about it is difficult for me to say. Are you going to continue the highroads policy or not? I see from information tabled that $2,213,000 has been spent on highroads, and I should like to know where we are going to get the revenue to pay it. I may say that I do know—you are gonig to get it from the hands of the fishermen, and no other source, for I can't see where the tourist policy is going to pay for an expenditure of over two million dollars. Another thing is that the fishermen in Conception Bay, before the highroads policy started, had lines and twines and were able to carry on from year to year. They spent two years on the highroads and have nothing to show but a pick and shovel, and nothing to pay for their supplies with. I understand they are leaving the country by the hundreds, particularly young men, to seek a livelihood in foreign countries. It is indeed a sad state of affairs when the young blood has to leave in that way, for when the young blood goes, a large

majority stay away and don't come lack. Where are we and whither tending? Are we going to depend on the old men and women for our fisheries? No, we have reached the cross roads and unless something is done whereby the fisheries are assisted in some material way I think we are doomed. During the past winter on the West Coast, Mr. Speaker—and I speak with some authority, coming from there — there was something like $100,000.00 worth of halibut caught at Port aux Basques and Rose Blanche, to say nothing of codfish, which no doubt is at least equal numercially. Now I would like to know some small thing the Government has done to assist these men whereby their profits or the lives of these men have been safeguarded. We say we don't want more codfish, but here is a market whereby the fishermen of Rose Blanche and Port aux Basques could fish for halibut and get as high as 14 cents per pound brought in. I think that is a great fishery and one that ought to be encouraged, and I understand that an American came down here and showed us where we could make a profit on it. A hundred thousand dollars is not to be sneered at by the fishermen of Port aux Basques and Rose Blanche.

MR. CHAMBERS—It was more like $150,000.00.

MR. LAKE—I am glad to hear it. I speak from figures rece.ved from the Bank Manager at Channel, and I am modest with my figures. But what I was going to remark for the benefit of Mr. Chambers, and in his hearing, since he was out of the House when I spoke of it before, I congratulate him on his great election in Burgeo and LaPoile. It to my mind was not altogether due to the Government but to his own efforts and his personality and the satisfaction which he has given his district. I give the Government no credit, and I don't think they are entitled to any—another man would have gone down to ignominous defeat as did the Government candidates in Fortune and St. John's East. I say that with all respect, and congratulate him.

One thing I want to bring to the attention of the Government and this House is this—I would like to know what the Government has done to try to encourage the fishery on the South West Coast. During the winter of 1924-25 some sixteen lievs were lost there, and during 1926-27 another five, and almost twenty-five more. I ask what has this Government done to try to save the lives of these men? You have in St. John's all the winter a steamer called the "Daisy," which is lying up, and I understand with a paid captain, and I suppose an engineer and partial staff. Why could she not be sent to the South West Coast during the winter months, so that men can carry on their work more safely and profitably. Any one who knows anything about that fishery knows that the fisherman gets up in the morning and looks at the sky, which is all he needs to tell the sort of day it is likely to be. But weather is very treacherous, and these men leave without hope of getting back in case of a storm. How much anxiety of wives and families could be relieved if the "Daisy" were placed in Port aux Basques, and it wouldn't cost a copepr more than it does now—there are always plenty of volunteers to go if required. No, sir, nothing is done for the fishermen, not even to save the lives of the men who go down to the sea in ships. These are the men who are the life blood of the country, the men to whom you will look for the wherewithal to pay for the highroads and dock.

You have nothing else with which to pay it. And what do they get out of it? I will ask the hon. member for Burgeo & LaPoile how many miles of highroads he has in his dis-

trict. I will venture to say there is not one all over Fortune District—there was a short piece of road made in Burin last fall These are the people who produce the wealth of this Colony. I take from statistics furnished the following figures: 70,000 quintals of fish last year in Burgeo; Burin, 182,000; Placentia and St. Mary's, 145,000; Fortune Bay, 91,000, and Ferryland, 74,000—562,000 quintals from St. John's to Port aux Basques; over half of the total ctach. These figures have been provided by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries last year. We haven't got a mile of road, with the exception of three or four built by Hon. Mr. Long around Burin, fit to drive a motor car on. It is true that this administration has built several bridges, and I take the credit of that to myself, for making certain statements about these last year, with which everyone who saw them will agree, including the Colonial Secretary who saw them. And one fell down last week, so that the people refuse to bring the doctor and minister back and forth over it. I made the statement that I would hold the Government responsible for any calamity taking place in Grand Bank should the bridge not be built, and I think the Colonial Secretary will agree with me that I wasn't very far out when I made that statement.

That is one case that Hon. Mr. Bennett saw. He also saw what they had to put up with there in the way of getting their vessels in from sea and out to sea. I have made an appeal to the Government about a pier in Fortune which is gone, washed away by a storm over a year ago. I understand that a member of the Government told a gentleman from the town of Fortune a little while ago that if Lake had not left the Government he would have had his pier. All I can say is that I must have been of some value to the Government, and I think also that I have been of some value to the town of Fortune.

Now, sir, we shall have soon to give up fishing from the town of Fortune. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of the day, or whatever Government happens to be in power during the fall of this year, will see to it that some steamer such as the "Daisy" plies between there and Rose Blanche during the winter months. I would ask the Government to see that the fishermen up there have their lives protected in some small way. As you know, when these men know that they have a steamer watching over them they will be able to prosecute the fishery more efficiently. Most people have no idea of the hardsh ps that these men have to undergo who prosecute the fishery up there in the winter time. I am speaking from personal knowledge, as I have had some experience up there myself. I think that Mr. Chambers told me that during the month of April 20,000 quintals were caught there this year.

MR. CHAMBERS—16,000.

MR. LAKE—That would be worth $100,000.00, to say nothing about the halibut which is taken away for export elsewhere. One of our vessels caught 700 quintals, which is not included in Mr. Chambers' estimate. That same vessel caught $400.00 worth of halibut in one week. I think that this country has a gold mine on the West Coast in the shape of the fishery. We have Buchan's Mine, it is true, and no doubt before very long we will have a Bill brought before us from those interested in that mine, asking us to grant them free entry for many things in connection with that mine. But I know that there are not many free entries for the people of this country. The only free entry that we did have was lines and twines and you put duty on them and make it harder for the people to live.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — You know that lines and twines are cheaper this year.

MR. LAKE—That is due to the fact which has been stated in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the low price of cotton. I may not be as learned as the hon. gentleman who has spoken, but I do know what I am talking about when it comes to catching codfish. I do not profess to know about everything in this country, but I do know that you have lost the confidence of the electorate of St. John's East and Fortune Bay, and you have also lost the confidence of the country in general, as you will find out when you go to the country in the next General Election.

What have you as a Government done for the fisheries of this country? It is very hard to see anything that you have done for the fisheries. When I state here that a vessel which fish could not pay its bills, I know what I am talking about. I believe that the Prime Minister knows that also, though I don't think that he has any connection with it this year, not directly at any rate. He did not prosecute it as an industry because he could not make it pay. Neither can we, except by hard work day in and day out.

In a few days a Bill will be brought in this House in connection with the Humber and Buchan's Mine. But what are you doing for the fisheries of this country? I don't think, sir, that it is fair to come in here and put the duty on lines and twines and remove the income and other taxes from the rich, who should be paying their share. I don't think that it is a square deal. I think that it is anything but a square deal.

It would be well for the Prime Minister and his associates to go and visit some of the outlying districts of this country. Go to Burin. Go back to Fortune Bay and to Burgeo. I won't say anything about the other districts, because I don't know anything about them. But in those districts you will see poorly clad children, almost naked, trying to get to school in the winter time. I wonder would his heart be untouched and whether he would continue to put duties on the necessities of life in order to pay the interest on monies borrowed for highroads on which these people never expect to ride. These are the underdogs who have to pay the upkeep of this country. Only a few minutes ago there were some figures passed down to me here from the Minister of Justice's Department, wherein party lawyers have received $44,613. Who pays the party lawyers, I wonder? The poor as well as the rich. They have to go barefooted, almost naked, with but a scanty education. I have nothing to say against the educational system. No doubt the people in charge of education are trying to do their best. But the people that live in the bays and cannot get an education, these people are the underdogs of the country—slaves you may call them.

The Prime Minister and his associates did not forget to take off the Income Tax. There is no income tax taken off the poor fisherman of this country, who have to haul cod from the water in order that we may get the revenue to pay the interest on the money borrowed for the building of the highroads and the dock. I was going to say something about the hotel, only the Prime Minister has said that we have not had to pay anything on that yet, with the emphasis on the yet, because the day will come when we will have to pay it.

It is not the fishermen but the fishermen's wives that you have to do with now. It wasn't the men of Fortune Bay and the men of St. John's East who licked the Government representatives. It was what they didn't count on. It was the women's silent vote. They are the ones who are going to

decide who the future legislators will be, the persons to whom you gave the bottle a day. Perhaps I don't know what I am talking about, but I know what I am talking about now, as you will find out at the next General Election, whenever that may be.

I trust that whatever I may have done by my speech this afternoon, I trust that if nothing else I have done some good if in any measure I induce you to send a steamer to the West Coast of Newfoundland to protect fishermen at sea. Compare protection given our fishermen and the protection Nova Scotia gives to its fishermen, and the Frenchmen. The Nova Scotians have a steamer on the Banks all the year round. The French have a hospital ship, and if one of our men gets sick they are only too glad to minister to them also. But what have you? You have absolutely nothing. And if someone wants to send a man to the hospital, "there isn't room, the hospital is full". That is the answer I have received since I was a member of the Monroe administration. I have told some to send their men along, anyway, and I'd try to get them in if I had to carry them on my back; and I almost had to do that. It is the fishermen who suffer. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to put a ship, whether small or large, in the vicinity of the fishing grounds on the South West Coast during the winter and spring months. Do something to assist the fishermen and help them bring in more revenue, because if we don't get it from our fisheries I don't know where we are going to get it.

(Reads: "low price of fish")

What have you done to enhance the value of fish? You were going to do everything to help the fishermen. I would like to see what you are going to do.

(Reads from Manifesto of Mr. Monroe)

I would like to know what the Prime Minister thinks of that deep down in his heart. If he would state it to me I would believe his statement, but I am afraid his conscience troubles him too much with regard to that statement. The fisheries of this country are, as he said, its main industry, and what are we doing about them? I claim that we are doing absolutely nothing. The fisheries have been neglected and we are devoting time to highroads, docks, and hotels, and what are the fisheries of the country going to benefit by these. I say that they will benefit nothing. The fishermen will have to produce whereby we will procure revenue to pay interest on that debt of highroads, and now we are faced with two and a quarter million dollars of a deficit. That is a bad state of affairs, a very bad state, and now the Prime Minister says in the Speech from the Throne that with a view to avoiding a possible future deficit we will be asked to re-enact the Income Tax Act, repealed in 1924. It never should have been taken off ,and I was very much opposed to it and I am still opposed to its being taken off. I think any man with an income over three thousand dollars should pay. I would be very pleased if I had to pay. I was so fortunate as to have an income that brought me under the Income tax once and I was very pleased to pay.

(Reads from Report of Assessor's Dept.)

Why shouldn't a man pay income tax who is getting six to eight thousand a year? If a fisherman had made six to eight hundred he would be tickled to pay out of it, but the average earning power of the fishermen last year was less than three hundred, and I say that without fear of contradiction. Some of the best fishermen of the country made about six hundred. I would like to know how these men are going to live and pay taxes as well. Why shouldn't a man pay income tax? I am sure that

he should but the Government decided that it was not going to tax the rich but the poor. It put a duty on lines and twines and the poor man has to pay it. Is that consistent with the Manifesto of Prime Minister Monroe? It is not. I may not know what I am talking about, but I know that.

(Reads statement receipts Assessor's Dept.)

Just imagine, that amount, on incomes running from six thousand to one hundred thousand. That was removed; they didn't want to pay taxes, they wanted to buy Rolls-Royces and things of that kind; but the poor fisherman with a wife and family, who can't get bread and butter, who are glad to have bread without butter, these are the poor people, the poor underdogs that are to be put down and taxed while taxes are taken off the rich. If I told this House what the people of Burin told me about taxes it would be astounded, and I am talking of the educated people and not the uneducated classes, and I know what I am talking about, although the Prime Minister had the audacity to tell me I didn't know what I was talking about. I have made no statements here, excepting possibly what I offered subject to correction, that was not true. The Prime Minister went back on every promise made in his Manifesto and expects us to come in here and swallow it. I swallowed it for two years until I got out. I did get out and I have no regrets. I say this country is in a bad state when the Government will stand for taxes being taken off the rich and placed on the backs of the poor. That is a very bad state of affairs. You not only took off the income tax but a portion of the bank tax. Bank stocks cost 300 per cent. but the tax must be taken off them, and poor women and children without clothes to wear, it is those who must be taxed.

On motion the debate was adjourned until to-mororw.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that this House at its rising do adjourn until to-morow, Friday, May 20th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 20th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Dr. Mosdell, from Belleoram, redredging.

Dr. Mosdell, from Hermitage, redredging.

The Hon. Minister of Finance tabled the Report of the Board of Liquor Control for the year ended January 31st, 1927.

The Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the Report of Operations of the Newfoundland Railway for the year ending June 30th, 1926.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of Question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of Question.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of Question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. LAKE—At the last sitting of this House I was trying to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to this House and I failed to do so. I am pleased to see him now in his seat, as I don't want to say anything behind his back that I would not say to his face. I remarked in the course of debate that the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries possibly had something to do with the delay in the opening of this House. Be that as it may I do not know, but I want to state what I said in his hearing. I also stated that the Government

should see its way clear to put a boat such as the "Daisy" on the West Coast to protect the lives of the fishermen over there at sea and relieve the anxiety of those on shore. I feel sure that Capt. Winsor will agree with me as to the soundness and necessity of this suggestion and I trust he will impress upon the Government the need of it and that they will see their way clear to putting the "Daisy" or some other ship over there. If it is done it will be money well spent.

I think, sir, that this would be money well spent. Frequently in the Fall of the year in stormy weather vessels are driven off and very often lives are lost, whereas if we had a ship like the "Daisy" it would help to save lives. A captain, engineer and fireman could be on board the ship the whole year round and it would be an easy matter to pick up a scrap crew in case of an emergency. I hope and trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his wisdom will ask the Government for this concession on behalf of the fishermen of the South West Coast. This is a matter that is really worth while, particularly when we take into consideration that last year one hundred and eighty thousand quintals of fish were produced by the people of Burin. Not being a member of the Executive Government, I do not know just what influence Captain Winsor will have along these lines that I have suggested, but I trust that the Executive will not give a deaf ear to his request. Last year the "Daisy" was engaged on the S. W. Coast, but I do not think that she did anything of a tangible nature, and all last winter she has been laying up doing nothing. Captain Winsor made a trip to the South West Coast in the "Daisy" last summer for the purpose of locating a suitable site for a bait depot. I understand that last session of the House a bait depot was to be erected in Burin. So far the matter has dropped because I have not heard of Captain Winsor's report or what the Government is doing in the matter. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what he has done with Dodding Light at Burin. The lighthouse there was burnt down last year and the light was replaced by a light which is no better than an ordinary lantern with which the people are absolutely disgusted.

Now I would like to ask also of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what correspondence was received from the people of the town of Burin in that connection? This is a matter of great importance and a great many mariners are greatly interested in it. Another matter that Captain Winsor visited the South West Coast last year was to inspect Fortune pier and Fortune breakwater, which was washed away two winters ago. Nothing has been done with this breakwater except a little bulwark has been placed in front to keep the sea from washing it down. Now, Fortune breakwater is the protection for the town of Burin and at present it is in a dilapidated condition. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries inspected that breakwater and I understood was to give me a copy of a report of his finding, but so far I have not seen it. The Colonial Secretary on the visit to the S. W. Coast last year also had occasion to see the wretched condition of this breakwater, and I trust that he and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that something is done this year in the way of repairs to provide the people of Fortune with protection for their fishing and coasting veseels. It has been said by a certain gentleman of the Executive Council that if Lake had not left the Government that Fortune pier would have been attended to. I do not think in all sincerity that the Monroe Executive would be small enough to penalize the people of Fortune and

hamper them in prosecuting their avocations because I happened to leave the Monroe administration.

Getting back to the matter of bait depots, I understood at last session of the House that Ferryland and the town of Bay Bulls were each to have a bait depot, but for some reason or other they have not been erected. At the same time we fought for a loan here last year. Out of that loan three hundred thousand dollars were spent but not one cent was spent on bait depots or not one cent was spent in any way to promote or encourage the fisheries. We also voted last year one million dollars for special public works and improvements around the Island. Of that amount, I notice by the public accounts, $775,910.14 has been spent. Out of the balance I trust that the Government will see its way clear to repair the breakwater at Fortune and also erect two bridges, one at Lamaline and another at Loires, as both bridges there now are falling down and in an impassable condition for pedestrian traffic. I am very pleased to see that seven thousand dollars were given for the construction of a concrete bridge at Grand Bank, and I must congratulate the Highroads Commission for the excellent work they have done there. The gentleman who went there in charge gave the people of Grand Bank every satisfaction. Regarding bait depots I trust the Government will have a couple of them erected along the South West Coast. Now, some time ago the people of the town of Grand Bank requested the Railway Commission to try and divert the route of the S.S. Portia to North Sydney in order that business people could have their freight brought along by the Government Railway boat. The Portia is supposed to be the S. W. Coast boat, but when some other part of the Island wants her she is taken off the route. I made a trip in the Sebastopol last December from St. John's enroute to Fortune, and I must say that the accommodation on that boat was a disgrace to the Railway Commission and the Railway Management. In the first place the captain was an old wornout man, a Customs official, who was forced aboard that boat. The ship was not as good as a cattle boat. Six people who had come out of hospital in St. John's were travelling second class. Two of them were in a dying condition during the passage, and one of them died on the lounge on which he slept on the ship ,and the other passed away when he reached Lamaline his destination. Whoever is responsible for this neglect ought to be ashamed of themselves. The people who travelled on that boat could not live properly on her and it certainly is a crying shame to have a ship of that sort loaded with passengers during the month of December. I was taken sick on her for absolute want of ventilation and I had to leave her at St. Lawrence and travel over fifty miles to reach my home.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fish business is fast declining in this country and it is no wonder. I should like the Government to take into their consideration what other countries are doing in the marketing of their products. For instance, look at the way Canada looks after the marketing of their wheat. If we could get the fishermen, merchants and Government to co-operate in the handling of our fish I believe that the fishermen and the country would prosper; but the trouble is that the Government do not give any encouragement to the fisheries in any way, shape or form. I was told here last evening by the Prime Minister that I did not know what I was talking about; but there is one thing I do know that the duty was put on lines and twines to protect an industry already protected and an industry that the Prime Minister is closely identified with. The Bank fishery, Mr. Speaker, cannot survive owing

to the low price of fish together with the high prices of articles such as lines and twines that are used in the outfitting of vessels. Owing to increased taxation and the high cost of living generally, fishermen and their families cannot live in this country. It is true that the Government took the duty off flour, pork, beef, kerosene, and gasoline but against that they took off the Income Tax and reduced the Bank Tax in order that large corporations and rich men can make big dividends. This is the kind of class legislation that is going on in the present administration, with the result that the working class of people and their dependents are half starved and half naked. Still we hear a lot of talk about honest Government. I fail to see Mr. Speaker, wherein the honesty lies. I admit that I was a member of the Monroe party who voted for the increased tariff. But why did I vote for it? Because I had to or get out. Eventually I saw my way clear to get out. I am not so blind as not to see that the Government to-day stands condemned in the eyes of the whole country and the only thing that is holding them together is that there are a number of parasites reaping the benefits financially or plucking the cherries off the tree which others are trying to grow. I think I have said almost enough about the codfishery and I trust that the Government will assit the fishermen on the South West coast by giving them a properly equipped steamboat. With regard to the sealfishery I do not propose to say much because I was never at that business. I leave that question to other gentlemen who are better acquainted with it than I am. The speech from the Throne also deals with the paper making industry and says that the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company has reached the large output capacity of four hundred and ten tons per day and that the Anglo-Nfld. Development Company has reached an output of three hundred tons per day. That is very encouraging and it sounds very nice and I trust that these companies will continue to manufacture seven hundred tons per day between them; but I understand that some of the machines at Corner Brook were laid up the past winter and I should like to ask the member for St. George's, who represents the N. P. & P. Company what was the cause. The Speech from the Throne also tells us about the visit of the Prime Minister and his associates to the Imperial Conference in London last October and November. We are hearing almost daily about a Crown Colony and getting three or four men from England to run us. Perhaps it may be a move in the right drection if we had a Crown Colony, although maybe if we asked for it the Home Government would tell us to mind our own business. I was very sorry to hear the Prime Minister state here the other day that we would have a deficit on current account for last year to the extent of $2,225,000.00 while the Speech from the Throne says that that deficit was largely due to the decreased price of cotton.

That is a very lame excuse for a Government and it looks as if the Government did not know what to put down to account for this large deficit. Now I do not think that the decrease in the price of cotton played such a part as the Government would have us believe in the big reduction in the revenue. As a business man, I do not think that the price of a shirt or any other cotton article is any different this year than it was last year. The Speech from the Throne also says, "The Government considers it would be wiser to await the movements of trade in this Colony before suggesting any drastic remedial measure." On the opening of this session the Prime Minister stated he was not in a position owing to the depletion in his ranks to bring in any drastic legisla-

tion this year. I trust he will see the wisdom of his remarks and that he will see that we shall all go back to our districts in a General Election the coming Fall.

(Reads)

People who know anything about the Railway are convinced that in 1926-27 it ought to have been operated for less than in 1925-26—there was very little snow shovelling the past winter. I know personally in 1925-26 that I spent about seven days on the Topsais—they must have had to spend thousands of dollars to clear that storm, and I say that during the past winter the railway should have been operated more cheaply. I do not propose to deal at length with the financial conditions of the country—there are people here who know more about that than I, and I shall leave it to them to thrash it out.

The next on the programme, and I suppose I can call the Speech from the Throne a programme, says

(Reads)

That is a pleasant thing to know. This Act is on a line with the Bank Tax—I suppose they don't intend to increase that, as the stock is only about 300 per cent. above par, and they are quite satisfied with their dividends. But the income tax will be put on again, because the burden of that falls upon the laboring man and the fisherman. The Income Tax should have never been repealed but it should have been left on the books, and it should have been properly enforced by the Assessor's Department, and I trust that in the future they will see that it is carried out to its fullest extent, and no one whether he be a farmer or a fisherman be able to get clear, and that politics will not be allowed to play a part as it did in the past.

I see there is nothing in the Speech as regards the Highroads. I suppose the Government of the day thinks it has spent enough on that. Some $2,213,000.00 has been spent on highroads around Conception Bay and I suppose the intention was that the tourists should pay, but the ones who will use them most are the sports and the high mucky-mucks of St. John's. I suppose I shouldn't be quite so hard on the people of St. John's because I come from the outports. I suppose it isn't quite safe with so many car owners around me. But the people have to pay that interest. A few days ago a question was asked here as to what was paid certain men for their work on the highroads. Now I understood when the Bill was being drafted that the Commission was working for nothing, and now in answer to a question of May 16th I see that Mr. Hall got $1400.00; Mr. Milley $1000.00; Mr. Baird $1000.00 and Mr. Bradshaw $1000.00—and I thought they were doing the work free. I guess that few people do work free here for the Government or anyone else. I understood quite clearly at the time how the money was to be spent, and I remember the Prime Minister at the opening of the mills at Corner Brook making the remark as to how patriotic these people were to be giving their work free. Now we see them taking this money. It is a crying shame and the quicker they are dumped the better. I don't know who had authority to give them the money but these people ought to be curbed. I don't see what Hall wants to get $1400.00 for the highroads for, when he gets about $5000.00 as Government Engineer. Isn't that enough for any man to live on?

The other three are merchants who I understood were giving their work for nothing and now they demand a thousand dollars each. No wonder the country is in such a state. No wonder there are so many children who can't get clothing or nourishment. I think that our affairs are rotten to the core. We come here and pass Estimates year after year. It would be interest-

ing to the people to see the Public Accounts and to see the list of parasites sucking the country's blood—I am sorry I am not in a position to give any names. I have had the opportunity during the last few days to examine the Public Accounts and I would like for the people to see them. Talk about packing their bags and getting out. Everyone of them would do it and I must say now that I feel like doing it. The country is rotten to the core and nobody is doing anything for it. The quicker they leave the better it is for them—I say that in all sincerity and that a good deal of the rottenness is due to the Monroe Administration. And they expected a man to come into this House and vote as they told him. Last year we voted a loan of five million dollars, and I would like to know how it was spent. I only read a portion of the public accounts but the part I read was enough to sicken any honest man and fisherman—but not these parasites; I say that in all sincerity—they are living off the life blood of this country. The people have to provide the revenue and have to fill the Government chests for such as these. And the people are forced to the dole—I know that some getting it didn't deserve it but many of our people who couldn't earn enough at the fisheries had to take it, and the men working on the highroads spent all their money and there was nothing left for them. A great many of them have now left the country.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it pleases the Prime Minister to leave the House while I am speaking. I don't care if he leaves or if he ever comes back but I know he won't come back after the next General Eelction.

The country can't stand present conditions. By figures I have they have paid lawyers $46,000.00 since January 1926. I suppose some of them do the work, but I notice that they are all on the Government side or friendly with it. With all due respect to my friend Mr. Bradley, and to the profession, I am glad I am not a lawyer. And these men on the Highroads Commission getting $1000.00 each and Mr. Hall $100.00 more. No wonder the country is starving—we can't help it. If the outports don't rise up sometime it will be a surprise to me—they will have to do it sometime. Another matter of great interest is the Dock. Now, Mr. Speaker, a Canadian expert was brought in and estimated the Dock would cost $1,086,000.00. It would be very interesting to know what it did cost—I understand Major Cashin has the figures, and they come something over two millions. It would also be interesting to know how much graft was given out on the Dock—I wouldn't be afraid to say it amounted to hundreds of thousands—the figures will never come out. What did the laborers of this country get? I suppose they got a few days work but there was not one man from Burin or Fortune working there, and I am glad to say only one from Burgeo and LaPoile either on the Dock or Highroads or Hotel. What did we get out of the Hotel? I know the gentlemen on the other side will say that we have not paid anything to it but that is only because the time is not ripe for the promoters to put the stock on the market—then we will pay and pay well. It is indeed a sad state of affairs. The fishermen and the laborers are the people who have to pay for the high mucky-mucks with their watered stock, who pay nothing but reap everything. Take the Imperial Tobacco Co., the Ropewalk and the Standard Manufacturing Co.—it is interesting to know how much they have watered their stock in the past few years. I know and I am almost ashamed to tell the people of my district what the Government has done for them. And tell them I will. I am glad I left the Monroe party. I have no regrets. I never have had any and I never will have any—and I know some gentlemen now on the other

side who would be glad to find an excuse to come over, because they know they are not playing the game. They are a disgrace to the Colony and to the people who sent them there. Two millions of this country's money spent on highroads. It looks as if our only salvation is the Labrador, and I don't know whether the Hon. Minister of Justice was here last evening when I congratulated him on the result, because the Government members evidently didn't like what I was saying, and left one by one. With all due respect to my friends on the other side, I hope I have created no enemies since I left it, but I am afraid I shall before I am through. I congratulate my hon friend Mr. Higgins—I know he has worked hard. He is one of what he terms "necessary evils"—the lawyers like the undertakers. I suppose we have to get down to the humorous side of things sometimes.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I don't want to interrupt the hon. member but I just want to say that I had a message from Fortune that an aeroplane passed there at 3.30 p.m. flying fairly high.

MR. LAKE—May she come and clean up this House and take us to a fairer clime; it would be the best thing that has happened the country, without exception. Some of the people asked me some questions as to how public money was spent, and asked how it was that the Public Debt has always managed to rise. I have a statement showing the rise since 1901 (Reads). And now, Mr. Speaker, it was increased last year by five million and stands at nearly seventy-three millions, the interest amounting to nearly four millions—I ask how are we going to exist? Do the gentlemen who passed the highroads policy think we are going to pay our debt by that, or that the beautiful Hotel is going to pay the interest on the two millions? Do they think that the lame ducks from the Atlantic are going to pay the interest on a Dock which cost over two millions? I don't think that for one moment we can ever expect it to pay for itself. We must pay our interest out of capital account, and that is a very sad state of affairs. Borrowing money year after year to pay our debts. And we are $2,250,000.-000 short this year, and the price of fish $5.00 a quintal and that of fat less than last year. We can't expect to improve until we are prepared to take drastic steps, until we are prepared to take up the question of reduced expenditure and taxation. I saw somewhere in the Speech from the Throne, or I think it was the Monroe Manifesto this (Reads) We all know of the re-arrangement when he taxed everything possible, even lines and twines, so that the Ropewalk could pay big dividends. I don't want to say much about the Ropewalk, but I am sorry the Prime Minister answered me in such a fashion yesterday, when he said I didn't know what I was talking about. I will bow to the authority of the Speaker, but I don't want anyone else to challenge my statements on the floors of this House, except in a jovial way, and I am not going to stand for it. I can be humorous and I can be bad and I feel badly about the remarks of the Prime Minister yesterday. I say that for one who is supposed to be the most honest kind of a politician, that to put a tax on lines and twines, and put the stock dividends of the Ropewalk up to 100 per cent. and make the stock worth almost three times its former value, does not look honest in his convictions. He is nothing but honest and comes here and tells us that conditions are bad and that the Customs require re-arrangement. We know the kind of re-arrangement it needs, and it is not the kind the Prime Minister used. And that is his idea of re-arranging the tariff, to put a duty on lines, twines and tobacco. We know that the Prime Minister is one of the largest

shareholders in both industries—in both the Imperial Tobacco Co. and the Colonial Cordage Co. I would like to know Mr. Speaker, and it would be very interesting for this Colony to-day and the producers in this Colony to-day to know how many unearned salaries are being paid in this country. In this morning's public news I read a statement here which must be very interesting to the taxpayers of this country. There are a number of outports which collect no revenue whatever and still they have officials there drawing salaries. I certainly don't think that the Prime Minister has not got courage enough to advise his Government as to the uselessness of having those offices kept open. What are they there for? It would be better to pension them or to remove them off the map entirely. They have to burn hard coal and soft coal, and they have nice easy chairs to sit down in, in order to go on duty from nine to five. For what? To draw down nothing. Here is the list of what appeared in this morning's paper: St. Anthony $297; collected in 1925-26; Renews $295; St. Mary's $263; Holyrood $233; Conception Hr. $231; Cape Broyle $29; in 1924-25; and $73 in 1925-26, and two customs officials in Cape Broyle are paid the total sum of $2000 a year, and Flat Islands, Glenwood, Isle au Mort, Kelligrews, LaScie, Lord's Cove and Lories, and these offices collected nothing at all. Yet each of these officials was paid salaries ranging from $665 to $146. For what? I suppose (as Mr. Woodford said, "for protection and detective work.')' I have remommended to the Government Mr. Speaker, to remove one and all of those officials whether they may be in my district or not.

The Prime Minister has stated in his Manifesto that there are too many unearned salaries being paid in this country, what has he done about reducing these unearned salaries? I venture to say that in every part of the Colony to-day, and in the city of St. John's itself there are more employed, nominally, then there were when the Monroe administration came into power, and still the Monroe administration comes in and tells us that there are too many unearned salaries being paid in this country and that they were going to reduce them. "Rigid retrenchment and the utmost economy" I have yet to see one iota of retrenchment that was carried out in this Colony by the Monroe administration. There has been no economy whatever.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that there is a Norwegian whaling ship now on its way from Norway bound for the Labrador with a full equipment to carry on whaling. I wonder will that ship make any customs report. I don't suppose Mr. Minister that this is very much news to you. I know that the hon. gentlemen is not in the Executive Council and therefore he does not know everything that is going on, but I do think that they would give him necessary information. I also think that he should be in the Executive Council, because he represents the largest industry in the Colony. I understand that last year he was going to be put in the Executive Council, but a gentleman who sat on this side of the House was in some peculiar manner taken care of. I won't say that he was bought because that would be out of order. But everybody can think anything that they like. But I want to say right here now, that it would be very interesting for the people of this Colony and the people in general, to know exactly the conditions governing that whaling station that the Norweigans are so interested in, and the facts about that ship that is now on its way for the Labrador. I know that the Minister will be only too glad to give me the information when he gets it, but I doubt if he knows it now. Nobody would be more glad to see him with a seat in the Executive Govern-

ment than your humble servant. I think that when there was a vacancy in the Executive they should have given the Minister the seat, which on good authority I heard was promised to him. But Mr. Duff got it with a few littl things tacked on. I won't say that he was t ought but I can think what I like. That is the kind of pol.tics that we have to-day. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the man who should hold the first place in this Colony, is gone away on a holiday the Government appo:nts a memt er from the opposition ranks in his place and then they call that clean Government. "Clean up and keep clean." It is impossible to keep clean when you never tried to house clean.

What has this Government done for the fisheries of this country. I have all that I own in th s country, but I soon won't be able to give my family shoes to wear on their feet, they will have to go t arefoot to school because they won't have the necessaries to wear. And still this is the very Government that told us that they were going to give the fisheries a square dear. They have not even tried to give them a square deal. The Pr me Minister did not give a square deal to this country when he put the duty on lines and twines to protect the Colonial Cordage Company. And the Prime Minister told me yesterday that I did not know what I was talking about. I may not be as educated as other people, but I don't want the Prime Min ster or anyone else to tell me that I don't know what I am talking about when I am discussing the fisheries, that has been my life's work.

But I helped to bring the Monroe Government into power and I will help to put the Monroe Government out of power, and I hope to have the opportunity at an early date. This Government sir, is incapable of coping with the conditions of the country at the present time. They are absolutely incapable. But I will say this that I believe that the Prime Minister was sincere when he started out on his political campaign, though I will not say why I think that he fell down on the job. But he did fall down on the job and he knows it. He admits it. He stated on opening day that his ranks are so depleted that he cannot put through the drastic legislat:on that is necessary for the welfare of this Colony.

Now sir, it would be very interesting to know just why the legislature was held so late this season. I understand from somewhere, sir, that it was because some resolutions were to be drafted .n connection with the Gander deal, and that a bill was going to be put through for the development of the Gander. That is the reason why this House had to postpone this session until this late date. Now it seems to me that we are giving too much consideration to foreign companies in this country. If these concerns have not got their legislation ready why don't they have it ready. I don't see why we should have to wait on them. We are a fishing colony, first, last and all the time. I wonder if I or any concern in any other country went to the Prime M nister of that country to say that they wanted him to delay the opening of the House until they got certain business through, I wonder what answer they would get. I am afraid that they would be told to mind their own business.

"Several bills for the promotion of industr al development, etc." That is the next matter that is referred to in the Speech from the Throne. That Mr. Speaker, is a very important clause. But sir, the next paragraph is I think that most important of all. "Admission free of duty into the Colony for a period of twenty years, etc." I think that we have given away enough of this country and enough of free entries into this country of articles for those concerns who come in here to do business, for a period of twenty years. I

think that we should give very careful consideration to the matter before putting a bill through this House that will admit free of duty whatever these concerns think ought to come in free of duty.

For it is one thing sure that they are not going to pay any more wages than they are compelled to pay. I say that, I don't care what industry comes to the country. We should go very carefully as to how we would frame those bills and pass them in this House. In saying that I am not talking alone. There are many people and people of intelligence who are now stating the same thing,—that we should be very careful as to how this bill is drafted and passed. Admission free for twenty years!

(Reads from Speech from Throne.)

I trust that the Government of the day will be very careful with this matter. I don't want to knock any industry, which is for the good of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. But I don't want to vote for anything that is for the foreigner absolutely. I am first, last, and all the time a Newfoundlander. I was born a Newfoundlander and I shall die a Newfoundlander.

(Reads from Speech from the Throne: "A Bill will also have to be introduced," etc.)

That is another very important business, Mr. Speaker. I think we were assured by the Minister of Justice, whether for himself or for the Government I don't know, that nobody admitted the possibility of the export of pulpwood.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I said that surely no one contemplates free export of pulpwood. As a matter of fact we have no knowledge whatever of what they are going to do.

MR. LAKE—I am very glad to hear that from the Honourable Minister of Justice and at the same time I am surprised to hear that he does not know anything about the nature of the bill .I understand we were told that is the reason why this House was delayed in opening until the 11th of May, because you weren't ready with the Gander proposition. As if the House and the people should wait on the Gander. We should be very careful how we handle situations in the future. We have had enough "Ganders" in the past. We haven't got much in the country now. It has been taken up by these, in the past I am afraid too, how things may be with the Labrador. I don't pretend to be a lawyer but at the same time as far as I can gleam from the information which I have received I have my doubts if any of those who have got grants on the Labrador have lived up to their agreements.

MR. SULLIVAN—They could not live up to them when it was not known if we owned Labrador.

MR. LAKE—That is the point. But wily politicians can very easily fix matters so that those interested may not be affected by their not living up to their agreements when it is the friends of those wily politicians who own grants on the Labrador. When Labrador is sold or whatever is done with it I am afraid that these will step forward and demand their rights or claims and I am afraid that a great deal of Labrador will be found to have been given away and I hope that the matter will be dealt with very carefully so that it be ascertained whether those people have any real rights on the Labrador by which Newfoundland may lose so much, especially in view of what I have remarked with regard to their living up to the agreements of their grants.

MR. SULLIVAN—As far as I am concerned they will get justice and that's all.

MR. LAKE—I trust that they will get justice and no more. I want to impress what I am stating in-

delibly upon this House and this country, that hungry speculators whoever they may be will be dealt with strictly and fairly and according to the best interests of this colony. But I have my doubts. I only wish that I had the gift to eloquently express to this House exactly what I feel about the Labrador from what I have gleaned within the past few months, but words fail me. I trust however that a word to the wise is sufficient and I trust that there are other gentlemen in the House who may handle the situation. I trust it will be handled wisely and well, but I have my doubts because there are hungry speculators and wealthy speculators in this colony and perhaps in this House and they have friends and these are anxious to benefit themselves. If handled properly, instead of losing Labrador to hungry speculators, it might be sold to pay off our national debt and then taxation might be reduced, so that our fishermen could live. I have heard it said that it is impossible for the fishermen to live to-day, and heard it from a business man on Water Street and I think he knew what he was talking about. It is to-day a very sad state of affairs, when that it stated.

(Reads from Speech from Throne.)

It would be very interesting to know just how they are framing that Bill. I suppose they are watching the movements of this House to get its feeling. I understand that there are now in the colony a large number of men interested in the Gander, part of a large corporation, and I trust that the Government of the day has now its detectives out, as it has in Conception Bay, as quoted by the Minister of Posts, I suppose for smuggling business. I trust that the Government is detecting now to find out what is doing about the Gander proposition. I would not like to hinder that concern or any other, from benefiting this colony, so far as it is beneficial to Newfoundland, I am here to assist that or any corporation. But we know from the past what has been done about timber lands in this country. I don't know whether I own the place on which my house is built, so much has been given away, to hungry speculators. I was very glad to hear from Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Higgins that everything possible will be done to protect the rights of Newfoundland on Labrador. I think that it would be very unfortunate, and I think that the Minister of Justice would think it so and very disappointing to him since he has been so much interested, if he were to see or his children were to see, that what he had worked so hard for, and I say this in all sincerity to the minister of Justice, for I do believe he would be very sorry, I say what he had worked so hard for, Newfoundland's rights on the Labrador, were given away to hungry speculators and I trust that while he is Minister of Justice and even when not in his legal capacity, that he will use his best endeavours to see that Labrador is not made away with, so to speak, by hungry speculators and politicians and their friends. I know I have nothing on the Labrador or anywhere else except the land on which my house is built and I don't even know if I own that, I would not be surprised if that has been given away in the past.

(Reads from Speech from Throne.)

It doesn't mention any particular corporation. It says a corporation of the United States of America. When that Bill is submitted I trust that it will be in the best interests of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders for if it is not I shall oppose it to the best of my ability, as I will oppose anything that is not right. But at the same time I shall vote for any measure that I see fit so long as I have not got to vote for a Prime Minister or a Government who will

say to me you will vote this way or will vote that way. Having forgotten it yesterday, I now beg to congratulate Mr. Cahill on the excellent effort he made on proposing the motion for an Address in Reply. It was a very bold effort but there was nothing in his speech whereby I should take off my hat to him. However, if there had been anything in the Speech from the Throne worth while I believe Mr. Cahill would have done better. The Speech from the Throne might be characterized as an apology on the part of the Government, except that it stated that we had acquired 110,000 square miles on the Labrador coast. We all knew that and we also knew that the codfishery suffered considerably through decreased prices . I would also like to congratulate Mr. Power, the seconder of the motion, as I think he did very well. I was hoping that the Speech from the Throne would give us some information as to the development of the paper-making industry on the Humber. I was sorry to hear that the N. P. and P. Company had a very poor year ,despite the fact that we are told in the Speech from the Throne that the company had reached a daily output of four hundred and ten tons daily, the cause being that some of the machines had been closed down. Now I want this country to know that unless the machines at Corner Brook are kept running continuously the quicker will this country be called upon to pay the interest on the ten million dollars which we have guaranteed on the Humber. I trust that when the Gander proposition is brought in here that we will not have any more interest charges to meet. The fishermen of this country have enough taxes to pay already on seventy-three millions of dollars and an extra tariff on lines and twines in order to increase the profits and dividends of the Colonial Cordage Company. I know my friend Mr .Cahill opposite would have done much better if he had a Speech upon which to base his remarks, for as it was he had practically nothing to build on . As the Leader of the Opposition said on the openig day, if there was a black border around this Speech from the Throne one would be inclined to consider it as the Government's obituary notice. Every year since the Monroe Government came into power they have been borrowing money and are going to borrow more this year. Still the Prime Minister of the day told this country in his Manifesto three years ago that he was going to enforce rigid retrenchment and the utmost economy. The Prime Minister in his Manifesto also bitterly assailed and criticized a previous administration for borrowing and referred to the members of that Government at satellites. Now I should like to tell this House and this country that the unbridled waste and extravagance of public moneys since June 1924 was chiefly due to the Prime Minister and his satellite, and the satellite's name I dare not mention here because he is not a member of this House and never can be a member, but we all know who he is too well. The Prime Minister talks a great deal about road-building under the Highroads scheme. Was there ever such a disgrace perpetrated upon the people of this country since we had Responsible Government as this Highroad building. Certain gentlemen, called the Highroads Commission, we are told were working without pay and to-day we have a statement tabled in this House showing that Mr. Hall, Chairman of that Commission, was paid last year $1,000.00, and $400.0- as Commissioner, and this same man is already paid over $5,000.00 a year from the coffers of this country and out of your pocket and mine, Mr Speak.er. I say this is a disgrace and a crying shame. Yet the Prime Minister talked so loudly

about the wicket waste of the previous administration in his Manifesto. The hard part about it is that we, every member of the Monroe party in -1924 were supposed to preach that kind of stuff to the poor deluded innocents, who swallowed it all down, bait, hook and sinker. Mr. Speaker, I think it was a wicked waste for the Monroe Government to have ever come into being. We would not be called upon to pay the interest on seventy-three million dollars of a public debt to-day, if we had no Monroe administration in power. It would be very interesting to read what kind of a Manifesto the Prime Minister would write to-day. He did not frame the last one, in my opinion, although he might have written it. I do not think he could have sat down and deliberately write that stuff. He may be changed now, but I believe three years ago he had honest intentions; but he fell, and I do not want to say where or how he fell, to the great cost of the taxpayers of this country. I notice by a statement on my desk that the "Evening Telegram" received $5,457.00 for patronage from the Finance and Customs Department and Liquor Department since January, 1926. No wonder the "Evening Telegram" people would write stuff for the Government. I suppose it would be unparliamentary to say that paper and its management were bought, but I can form my own opinion and the people of this colony can do likewise as to whether the "Evening Telegram" was bought or not by the Government.

I do know that they received $5,457.00 from those directions, and how much more I am not prepared to say. Even the Daily News, and I am sorry Mr. Puddester is not here for this—those paragons of virtue—those men who would not take a drink or touch a bottle of liquor, take $256.85 from the Liquor Department. Talk about hypocrisy.

HON. THE SPEAKER—A member has no right to make satirical remarks in reference to other members of the House. You will kindly abstain from doing so.

MR. LAKE—I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. This paper which prints this advertising, of which Mr. Puddester happens to be a Director, received $256.85 from the Liquor Department. Now that is something for the people to put in their pipes and smoke. I thought the Daily News would sneer at the idea. I know some people whom they have spotted going into the Liquor Control Department, and still they take that sum from its coffers. Before their party came in power they denounced the liquor business for all they were worth. And the Monroe administration were going to cure the evils—as I told the people in my district, and I believed it, that the law was going to be enforced. And while I see something in this Manifesto about Prohibition, it was interpreted to me in the way the Monroe administration then intended, and I didn't see the difference.

(Reads)

I understand, according to my reading of the Monroe Manifesto that Prohibition was going to be enforced, and was convinced that it would be until the Liquor Act was brought in. In fact it was brought in during my absence from the House, so I didn't get a chance to vote. I went home, believing that it wasn't coming up. If I had been here I would have voted according to my conscience, and not cared what the Daily News or anyone else said. The Bill was brought in during the first session, and I understood it wasn't coming in. I would have opposed it, and that meant that I would have left the party two years before I did. And that is going to drive the Monroe administration from office—if not this year, the next, for there are only a few short months left, and one of the things to help in

that will be the silent women's vote that they hadn't reckoned on and that did such work in St. John's East.

I was wishing to call the attention of the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to the amount voted last year for building branch telegraph lines in this country—$100,000.00. I made the statement here last year, and made several such in the Monroe administration, that we needed some improvements greatly in Burin in the shape of a line from Garnish to Bay L'Argent. I explained the need to my hon. friend, and I believe that he was in accord with my wishes, but nothing has been done, and I trust that this year the Government will see its way clear, in the interests of the fishery of this country, and particularly of Burin district, which is a large producing district, and the revenue accruing will justify the expenditure. I have some figures here, but don't know whether I can locate them or not, which I received from the Postmaster at Grand Bank, as to the amount of revenue collected in Grand Bank last year, and I think something like $3,000.00 was paid in there for postage alone, to say nothing about telegrams; and I think it is due to that important town and district that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs should do his best to see that this line is built from Garnish to Bay L'Argent. I should like to locate those figures for the benefit of my learned friend.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—The important thing for you now is to vote us another hundred thousand this year to do that.

MR. LAKE—I should be pleased to do that, and you know that that line is greatly needed, and without it I don't know what they are going to do. I trust the Government will erect it and loop up the district—it has been recommended for years. I feel sure that the Government are not small enough to hold back from the important district of Burin, especially from Grand Bank, which produced 180,000 quintals of fish last year, anything of material advantage, simply because a very small chap like myself left the Monroe administration. . If they do they are smaller than I thought.

I simply mention these points, Mr. Speaker, because I have no other chance to air my views to the Government, except on the floors of the Assembly. I would like to suggest to this Government and to any other Government that the Executive when elected to power should take the yacht "Daisy" and make a trip north or south around the Island, coming back to St. John's again, within one month after their election, visiting the important towns, so that they would know to what they were voting the money. It would be a few weeks well spent, and the people would be very well pleased, and think that the Government is trying to do something in their interests—at the present time we vote money and don't know to what we are voting it. I am sure that the Colonial Secretary is convinced of my statement after his visit to Burin last year, whether that visit was official or not, and that he feels well repaid from the information and knowledge gained on that trip, which could not be gained in any other way. I believe it will have an everlasting effect as long as he is a member of this or any other Government, as he saw at first hand what the district is doing. I feel sure that to-day that hon. gentleman knows what Burin district needs in essentials, and that he is man enough to do it, even though I am in opposition. The hon. gentleman came to me when I was very busy, it was in the summer of 1926. I am very sorry that I could not give him more of my attention. He saw me with my jacket off trying to produce something so that I could pay the taxes in this country. The Colonial Secretary saw the conditions

under which the people live night and day. He saw the pier in the town of Fortune in a dilapidated condition, having been washed down by the storm. He saw that the harbour needs dredging, and still when we come in here and ask the Government to give us enough money to build a pier we get very little response, and the people of the town of Fortune must suffer. I hope, sir, that while we are waiting for an election that the Government of the day will see its way clear to help the district of Burin in some small way.

The present administration, Mr. Speaker, came into power in 1924 with the Government 25 members and the Opposition 10 members. In March 1925 the ranks of the Government were depleted by one, that one being my hon. friend Major Cashin. In May 1926 five members left thte Government ranks, of which I happened to be one. In January 1926 an Opposition member was removed from this House, we know not how. In October of the same year an Opposition member was favoured by a seat in the Government ranks, in the person, of Mr. Duff of Carbonear. Mr. Duff did not leave the Opposition ranks and go over with the Government while this House was in session. As I told the gentleman yesterday that I thought it was what I would consider a cowardly act to leave the ranks of the Opposition and go over with the Government while the House was out of session. As I stated here this afternoon he went over to the other side for what reason I know not. But one thing I do know and that is that he received at the hands of the Government an executive seat which had been promised to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Then in November the Government sustained further losses when to their great surprise, though not a surprise to the outports of this country, they lost Fortune Bay in the by-election. In April this Government after beating about the bush for two years or more decided to open the district of St. John's East. What was the outcome? St. John's East registered once more against the Government in the person of my hon. friend Mr. Brophy. He was accorded a right royal welcome by the people of St. John's East, who had chosen him as their representative. Now, Mr. Speaker, from all this it is very evident that the people of this country have lost confidence in the Monroe administration, and the whole country is demanding that we have an election in the Fall of 1927. I am sure, sir, that a spring election would be detrimental to the interests of this country. And I want to state here and now, sir, that I told a gentleman in the Government ranks when he asked me the day I left the Government what I was going to do in the event of a want of confidence vote, I told him, sir, and the gentleman is present and can corroborate my statement, that I would vote for the Government as I did not want a spring election. I state that without fear of contradiction. Now, sir, it seems that we are going to be faced with a spring election next year. I do not profess to be up in constitutional law, but I do know that this House must automatically dissolve on July 1928, and this country will be without an Assembly unless there is a general election in the spring. I am convinced this year, as I was convinced last year, that this country does not want a general election in the spring. But, sir, I believe that the people of this country want an election in the fall, and I trust that the Monroe administration, and I believe that the Monroe administration will see that it will carry out the wishes of the people of this country.

This country, Mr. Speaker, is in such a condition at the present time that we should have stable Government, and that we have not. The Gov-

ernment has not a majority strong enough to carry out the drastic legislation that is necessary. As we have been told in the Speech from the Throne that there are several important bills for the promotion of important industries in this country, and the Government should be strong enough to carry them out. I say that, sir, in all sincerity. I do not wish, sir, to cast any reflection on the hon. gentlemen opposite me, but I do think, sir, that this Government is not strong enough to carry through those measures which the welfare of the country demands.

I feel sure that the members of the Government know that they have lost confidence in their own administration and that they would like to see this House close at the earliest opportunity. Personally I would like to get back home to my district and have the business of the country go on as usual, but I do not think we should allow any legislation to be put through here that is not in the best interests of the Colony. The Monroe Government have lost the confidence of the people, as shown in the by-elections in Fortune Bay and St. John's East, and having lost the confidence of the people, if they were manly they would go back to their districts the coming fall and have their constituents pass judgment on their actions for the past three years. This House automatically ceases to exist in July 1928, whilst a spring election in 1928, as has been previously pointed out, is a poor time to hold an election because the fishermen are at the fishery. Therefore, I say, if the Government had the courage of their convictions they would proclaim a general election for the fall of 1927 and have a stable Government elected, whoever they may be. I am prepared to take my chances. If I am defeated I shall be satisfied and probably relieved from the burdens of being an outport representative. I am glad to have the honour of representing in this House the district I was born in. The people of Burin district can decide as to whether or not I made a mistake by leaving the Monroe Government. I feel satisfied as to what their answer will be, because I told them I could not stay with a party which I had no confidence in, and I am sure there are gentlemen on the Government side of the House to-day holding the same view, as I heard them express their thoughts on many occasions. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that I have done my little bit on the motion before the chair, and I trust also that the Monroe Government will see that for the balance of their term tha t the country is treated fairly and squarely. Mr. Monroe in his Manifesto promised that he would clean up, keep clean and give a square deal to all. Mr. Monroe has not kept his word and he knows it. No doubt he found it very hard to clean up and keep clean. It was a difficult task for him and a task greater than he ever anticipated. When of their term that the country is 1924 he had the confidence of the people, and I believe that he intended to make an honest endeavour to make clean the public affairs of this country, but he has failed, through no fault of his own, perhaps. Go to any department in the civil service to-day and you will find all of them overcrowded with officials. The Prime Minister should have cleaned up and cleaned out the useless officials in these departments, and if he had done that and thereby given the fishermen and the working classes a chance to live in this country he would have had no depletion in the ranks of his party, and if he had cleaned up there would be no doubt at all about keeping clean; but when he did not keep his house clean at the start he found it a hard job afterwards, and now he has got it in a terrible mess and he knows it and realises it. I think it would be a square deal to everybody

if the Prime Minister would grant a general election in the fall of 1927. The further off he puts this thing the worse off he will be. I believe that Mr. Monroe felt that he had lost the confidence not alone of this country but of his own party in 1926. I do not think he will deny that statement because I believe he is sick and tired of office, not through any cause brought about by himself, but because he was being used in many ways over which he had no control. He stated in his Manifesto that he was an ordinary plain man in public life. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be fair to any member on the other side of the House. I do not want to be unfriendly with any member in the Government ranks. I would like to bring under the notice of Mr. Browne, member for St. John's West, the fact that last year he promised to bring in here at this session of the House a new Compensation Act for the protection of woodsmen and labourers, and I trust that the matter has not escaped his mind, as I feel sure that he is quite capable of drafting a Bill such as would be suitable and in the best interests of the men concerned.

No doubt a Compensation Act for these people would be a good thing. I feel satisfied that there would be no objection here about giving Mr. Browne a little compensation too for drafting such a measure, and I presume he would not be lacking in accepting it either. Again, Mr. Speaker, I must repeat that I do feel that the Monroe Government have lost the confidence of the people of this country and the only way they can redeem thmselves is by giving the country a square deal and going back to the polls in the fall of 1927. In conclusion, I hope that the Prime Minister will wind up his political career by giving the people of this country a square deal.

On motion the debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Italian airman, De Pinedo has arrived in Trepassey and I have sent him a message of welcome and congratulation from the people of Newfoundland. I was going to move that this House adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, Tuesday being a whole holiday. I thought that some of the members might prefer to get home and might not like to come back until Wednesday. And a day or two won't matter very much, as it seems we shall be here all the summer. It is very evident that the Opposition has decided on a policy of obstruction. Some of the Opposition may find and it seems that they do find it a little difficult to fill up the time while they are on their feet. As far as obstructing goes we can stay here as long as they can, but if they imagine that the policy of obstruction is going to alter our opinion about an election in the fall, and that we are going to be stampeded into deciding to have an election in the fall as a result of their extreme measures, I want to tell them that they are entirely mistaken. We are resolved to stop here as long as it is necessary, to put through the legislation, in spite of the obstruction of the Opposition.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I wish to take exception to what has been said by the Prime Minister. There has been no legislation brought before this House yet and therefore there can be no obstruction. Every member in this House, no matter on what side he may be, has the perfect right to speak as long as he likes in reference to any subject that may be brought up before this House, be it the Address in Reply or anything else. But I take exception to what the Prime Minister has said and I wish to contradict it. There has been no obstruction so far because there has not been any legislation

brought in to this House, none whatever.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion to adjourn, as I have been one of the members of the Opposition who have spoken in this House so far, I want to say that I strongly resent the remarks made by the Leader of the Government. It is a perfect outrage for this House to be meeting at this time of the year and it is another outrage to be adjourning this House over until Wednesday. The Government is playing a scheme of delaying, whatever it may be for. But there is nothing to be gained by it. And you will have to put up with what the Opposition has to say uncomfortable though it may be for you. And if we don't speak now we will have no opportunity to speak otherwise. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries in retorting to the hon. member for Burin, said that if we can stay here others can stay here to. Well sir, why didn't you and your Government open this Legislature at the proper time so that you could remain here.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, as I am one of the members whom it has been inferred have held up the business of this House, and as I am one of the members who spoke for the greater part of two days on the Speech from the Throne, I want to take this occasion to resent the imputation of the Prime Minister that I am here simply for the purpose of obstructoin. If anyone is guilty of obstruction to-day it is the present administration. They have obstructed the meeting of this House for three months, and one cannot see any adequate reason for it except to suit their own purposes and convenience. They are obstructing the progress of the Colony to-day in that they are trying to hang on to office, in spite of the fact that, as they admit themselves, they are not able to control the situation, and not able to deal with the conditions in this Colony today. And then they have the audacity and the impudence to accuse this Opposition of being obstructionists. Sir, if we chose to stop here till the crack of doom, we would be no more than doing our duty to this Colony; we would at least be doing our best to rid this Colony of an administration that is not capable of handling its affairs. And yet we have to sit here and listen to insults thrown across this House by the Prime Minister himself. What the Prime Minister conceives to be the attitude of the Opposition is of very small moment to us. We intend to follow whatever course we may adopt, no matter what he may say about it. He has told us that he is prepared to stay here as long as we are. By that very admission he shows us that he intends to be a stumbling block in the path of progress, that it is his intention to hold on to office like grim death whether his administration is good bad or indifferent; whether he ought to resign or not; whether he ought to go back to the people of this country and answer for his deeds or not. Now sir, we intend to stay here as long as we choose, and I believe that ever member on this side of the House intends to do his duty by this Colony. I am sorry that the same cannot be said of the Prime Minister or his associates. Obstruction: after the Prime Minister announces in his manifesto that this House should be opened early in the year, in order that the public business should be disposed of at such a time that those whose duty it is to be here, and conducting the affairs of this Colony, could get away to their different vocations, we have the spectacle of this House being opened on the 11th day of May, when the fisheries of the Colony are already begun for the season. That is the sort of insult that we have to put up with here in this House. And it is an insult that reflects upon the people of

this Colony. If the Prime Minister imagines that his position to-day, is justified I would like to inform him that only he and his immediate associates believe so. And I am satisfied that the people of this Colony today are behind the Opposition in its attitude. We are not trying to hang on to office; we are not trying to get into office; all that we want is that this country be given an opportunity to put into power a Government numerically strong enough to conduct the affairs of this country and to put through that legislation which the Prime Minister himself admits is necessary, and which he further admits his Government is too weak to enact. I trust sir, that we shall not hear any more of this. The obstruction, whatever it may be comes from the Government side of the House and not from the Opposition side.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was absent from this House when the Prime Minister stated that the members on the Opposition side were merel yobstructionists. I want to tell the Prime Minister right here now that his Gov't is a disgrace to any self-governing Colony under the British flag. Your Government sir, has been smacked in the face by the people of this country. The members of a Government sir, are the servants of the people not their masters, and the people of this country have told this Government in strong and undeniable language that they don't want a continuation of the disgraceful conduct of this Government that has been going on in this country during the past three years. The present ministers of the Crown have prostituted their positions in every shape and form. I want to state that if the Prime Minister was a cabinet Minister in the British Government he would have been thrown from office inside of twenty four hours. Why? Because he is a Minister and at the same time indirectly accepting profits from the revenue of this country.

HON. THE SPEAKER—These statements are out of order. Confine yourself to the motion before the chair.

MR. CASHIN—I understand sir, that the Prime Minister has stated that the members of the Opposition in this House are obstructing the progress of the Government in this country. Now I want to tell the Prime Minister that I am a better Newfoundlander than he is, or than any member of the Government to-day, that I have done more for Newfoundland than any member in the Government to-day. And I defy the Prime Minister to come in here and accuse me or any member on this side of the House that we are obstructing the progress of this country. The people of this country want an election in the fall and I want to tell the Government that they are going to have an election in the fall, if that is any news to them. I say that every man in the Government to-day, is paid to stay there.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I want to say that I am one member on the Government side, that is not here because I am being paid for it. I want the member for Ferryland to withdraw that remark, or I will move that he be censured by this House.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER—I sustain the point of order raised by the hon. member for St. John's West. The remarks of the hon. member for Ferryland are most unparliamentary. He has been very intemperate in his language and quite offensive in the expressions he has used towards members of this House. Not alone is this so but he persists in his objectionable course and apparently thinks that he can defy with impunity the Ruling of the Chair. If necessary he will be made realise that the contrary is the case and that his deplorable conduct will

not be tolerated under any circumstances. I therefore require him to immediately withdraw the statements he has made.

MR. CASHIN—What procedure is it necessary to take?

HON. THE SPEAKER—I do not intend to enter into any controversy with the hon. member for Ferryland. I make a specific ruling with which I direct him to comply at once. Have I to again impress upon him the fact that one of his duties as a member of this House is to conduct himself with decorum and decency in debate.

MR. CASHIN—I regret very much that I have been indecent. That is the first time I have been told that I acted indecently.

HON. THE SPEAKER—The hon. member will cease further argument and immediately carry out my direction.

MR. CASHIN—Very well, sir, I take back what I said.

Mr. Russell gave notice of Question.

Mr Grimes gave notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn until Wednesday, May 25th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 25th, 1927.

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

Mr. Moore gave notice of Question.

Mr Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of Question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few observations on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would first like to congratulate the Minister of Public Works on coming from the Burgeo bye-election with victory perched upon his banner. Mr. Chambers won by a substantial majority because of his personal popularity in that district and because it was a bye-election; but if that had been a General Election the tables would have ben turned on him and he would have never came back victorious. I must also congratualte Dr. Mosdell on the splendid vote he polled last Fall in the bye-election in Fortune Bay and thus gained for himself a seat in this House; also I must heartily congratulate Mr. Brophy, the popular boy of to-day, who got such a tremendous vote in the recent bye-election in St. John's East. It was the biggest vote ever polled in any district in this country. All credit to this young man and I hope that he will have a brilliant career and that the electors of St. John's East will have good reason in the forthcoming General Election to again return Mr. Brophy to this House. When this House closed last year it stood 17 to 18, including the Speaker, in favor of the Government. At the present time the House stands: Government, 19; Opposition, 17. Since last session of the House the Government has been successful in landing one man from this side of the House. That episode did not occur on the floors of the House or while the House was in session; it was done between sessions. Mr. Duff criticized the present Government for three years in this House and then saw fit after the House closed last year to cross over and join forces with the Government. For what reason I do not know, but that is best knwn to himself. I know if I had left the Opposition ranks and joined up with the Government without giving my position I would feel ashamed to sit in the House to-day. I consider it was a very unmanly act on the part of Mr. Duff, and while Mr. Duff has

the word honourable attached to his name, I think that his act was more dishonorable than honorable.

This is a late season of the year for this House to open. The month of May is no time for this Assembly to meet to transact business. When the Prime Minister came to this country as Leader of a Party in 1924 he promised in his manifesto early sessions of the Legislature, and that we have got an early sesion there is no mistake. Why was not the House opened before May 11th? Was it to allow Captain Winsor to go to the sealfishery? No, sir, rather was it because of the very fact that the Prime Minister and his party were afraid to open the House and were afraid they would not stand throughout the first day's sesion. Mr. Speaker, a big change has taken place since we last met in this House. The Prime Minister came back here in 1924 with twenty-five men and every time he rose from his seat to speak he was lauded by the gallery; but to-day the Prime Minister and his Party is damned by the people in the gallery. It shows how the tide has turned, and it shows how the Prime Minister and his colleagues have been turned down by the people of this country for failing to attempt to carry out what they had promised to do. I remember the summer of 1924 when we sat here. There was then twenty-five men on the Government side, ten members in Opposition and one Independent. When the Opposition members rose in their seats and criticized the Government their remarks went practically unheeded; but when the Prime Minister spoke he got a great ovation from the galleries, in fact he could get up and say almost what he liked, because he had come back fresh from the polls with twenty-five men in his Government, and everything looked rosy. One of the things that made the Monroe Government unpopular was that practically all the money that they borrowed was spent in the Southern Districts of this country. The Highroads went a long distance towards killing the Prime Minister and his Party. They spent two million dollars on Highroads within the past two years, and they spent it on Conception Bay only.

All the influential districts in the north of the country got nothing out of that money. Not only that but you were authorised to spend two million dollars on highroads but you went one better and spent two million two hundred and twelve thousand. Where did that money come from? At the same time we representatives of outport districts, districts in the North, couldn't get one hundred dollars to repair a bridge or put a bridge in a condition safe for traffic, safe for motor cars or teams or anything else. The Govenrment is not only unpopular in St. John's East, but it is unpopular all over the country, partcularly in the North, and were you, Mr. Prime Minister, and Captain Winsor to look for that same support in the North which you did get, you wouldn't get it to-day. I guess you know that, you hear it in letters from the district and on every hand. In Twillingate District since your party came into power we can't get money for anything. We can't get auy money beyond the grants. We can't get any special money. But money can be spent and wasted on highroads. Yet it is in the North that the country gets its revenue. If the men in the North all stayed away from the fishery where would you get your revenue. I wired and asked the Minister of Public Works some time ago to try and get a bridge at Botwood repaired so that motor cars could go over it without running any danger, and the answer came back that there was no money. At least thirty motor cars a day go over it. That is what happens and

how the people in the North are treated. The people are not going to stand for this. I, for one, as a representative of the district of Twillingate, am not going to stand for it, even if it is going to end up in an open fight across the House. I mean by that just what I say. Talk about people being dissatisfied; the next thing we will see in this country is a revolution if the people are allowed to half starve as they are to-day. It is a disgrace the way things are handled by the Monroe Administration. You know it; you all know it. There is hardly a member on your side of the House who can say to-day, that he can go and bring back his district; hardly a man. Why is this so? Because you know you haven't done right by the people. St. John's East passed a vote of want of confidenc one month ago and that speaks for the whole country; the whole country says the same. Mr. Speaker, it is pretty hard for representatives on this side of the House, representing large and influential districts to be asking the Government and those in charge of Departments for money for local roads and bridges and not be able to get it, while we know that there are motor roads being built in the southern part of the country just for the benefit of those who can afford to buy a motor car and run over them. It is not good enough. Last year I went down in my district to a place called Round Harbour and it was in wet weather and a large rock rolled out of the cliff and cut off the water supply. It lodged right over the well where the people get the water supply. And we couldn't get one dollar to have that rock removed, in order to let the people get their water. We were told that there was no money left in the grant for the district. We knew that, but that was a case of emergency. I had to tell those men to go and remove the rock themselves and I would try and see if they could not get paid for it afterwards. We are still waiting for the money for that. You have been long enough handing out money for other districts, give ns some to spend in our own. The people of this country to-day want a change. The quicker they can get you out of power the better. If they had an opportunity to go to the polls to-day nothing would please them better. And you, Mr. Prime Minister, knowing that as you do and knowing that the whole country knows it, it is your place to go to the Governor and resign and say that you will give place to some other man, and have a dissolution and go to the country in the Fall and see what happens. But you won't do that. You will hang on to office as long as you can.

What reason you have for this I do not know but I have my own opinion. A great number of people in this country to-day are starving. You have half a thousand people in this city to-day starving and still you will not do anything to help them. They came to the bar of this House the other day to ask for something to be done and nothing is done. They are still in the same position. These people are decent citizens. They want work. They don't want to starve. And we don't want to see them starve. At least the members on this side of the House do not and I think there are some on the other side who do not. Why, then, is something not done for these people. A day of reckoning is coming, however, and you will know it when that day comes. You came to this country with a manifesto by which you promised to clean up and keep clean and give a square deal to all. You were going to give the labourers employment, you were going to have better wages, and make this country a Paradise, but as a speaker said here the other day you have made it

a fisherman's hell. Practically everything is stopped; business is almost gone to the wall; everything is gone down. Why even the House of Assembly clock stopped and the hands dropped off a few days ago; everything is going to the bad in the country and that was a sign of the condition everything is in. But we wouldn't dare say that to you in 1924 or any of your party because you would say that we didn't know what we were talking about. You came into power and sat in your places and the first thing you did was to clean out the coastal boats. You cleaned men out of the coastal boats, men who had been there for twenty years, and found to be good men and experienced. Let us take the Prospero first. You removed two officers on that boat who had been there for twenty years; Saunders and Peckford. What did you have against these men that you had to clean them out? What did they do? Did they try to keep you from being elected in Bonavista? No. These men didn't talk politics. No, but somebody else wanted a job and you and Captain Winsor had to make a job for them. Then you went a step further and cleaned out the Malakoff. For instance you went and took Captain George Howlett, the Chief Officer, out of it. He is a man who has several years with the Ethie and one of the finest men the country could produce for the job on that service. He had to go and another man be put in his place who was a heeler of the Monroe party. Then you took out Mr. Way. I heard there was something against Way about his talking politics. But what did he do? You put a rabbit catcher then in his place; a man who came right out of the woods up in Bonavista Bay. That is a nice way to start to do things. Revenge. But don't worry the tables will be turned. The man who supports the Opposition in Bonavista Bay has no more chance than a snowball, you know where I mean. But the man who supports Captain Winsor or Mr. Monroe is good enough. If he wants to go to work or if he wants to go anywhere he gets a pass and he is alright. Down in Bonavista Bay the sum of eleven thousand dollars was given out in able bodied poor relief last Fall. That was on the North side of Bonavista Bay. Is there no man on the South Side of Bonavista Bay who needs relief? And some of the men didn't need it. But some had to half starve because some can get it from Captain Winsor. The sum of ten thousand eight hundred and odd dollars was given out on able bodied relief on the North Side of Bonavista Bay last fall while on the South Side where it was far more needed they got nothing and had to live through the winter and do the best they could. I say to Captain Winsor that he took advantage of his position as a Minister of the Government to help himself politically.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point or order; I object to the statement just made.

HON. THE SPEAKER—The Hon. Member for Twillingate is out of order. I request that he address his remarks to the chair and avoid personalities.

MR. BROWN—I would not wish to insult anybody, but what I say is correct because these men got money.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I rise to a point of order. Mr. Brown stated that I used my office. What I did I was ordered to do by the Executive Government of the colony. It is also an untruth to say that I spent eleven thousand dollars. I didn't spent five thousand and what was spent afterwards was spent under the authority of the Executive Government by relieving officers.

MR. BROWN—I want to ask Cap-

tain Winsor if he didn't ask the Executive Government if he could spend that amount of money.

HON. THE SPEAKER—I want to draw the attention of the honourable members to the fact that this is merely an exchange of personalities. Comments of that character are out of order. If the honourable member wishes to discuss the matter of relief expenditure he may bring it up when Supply is before the House.

MR. BROWN—I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Is it good enough that a man representing one district in the country can, if reports are correct, almost do as he pleases as regards getting men on the coastal boats. Is there no other district in the country bringing in revenue besides the district of Bonavista. I only know of one man from the south side of the bay on the coastal boats. Why can't the representatives of other districts get a chance to put men there as well as Captain Winsor. The whole bay is talking about it. It is time the members on this side of the House put on their war apparel and made a war. There is political demoralization throughout the country. The people are sick of the Monroe Government and are asking us all to bring about an election. If it is not there won't be enough money in the country to go trouting let alone cod-fishing. The "Nerissa" left the other day and couldn't bring all the men out of the country that were ready to go. There was a man from Bonavista going to Boston and they hadn't got room on the boat. The reason men are leaving the country is because of the experience of men who go fishing. There is no encouragement. There is nothing for them only to leave this country, and if things were handled right this country could be made a paradise for fishermen as the Prime Minister stated in his Manifesto. Talk about giving out able-bodied relief. If something is not soon done you won't be able to borrow money fast enough to pay it out in able-bodied relief. I have a reply to a question of mine here now asked in this House as to the amount of able-bodied relief given out in each electoral district, 1926-1927.

(Reads.)

Bay de verde which is represented by my honourable friend Mr. Puddester, got no less than $12,025 and the Highroads Commission spent money down in that district. Work was given on highroads on the one hand and money paid out in able-bodied relief on the other hand in the same district. Bonavista, $16,000,—put the other eleven with that and see what is will come out. That district did quite well on able-bodied relief. In Mr. Sullivan's district there was spent somewhere around $20,000. When are the people of that district going to work Don't they do anything at all? The people of Twillingate don't want to accept able-bodied relief unless they have to. They want to go out and get work. They would go at anything rather than accept able-bodied relief and when they did ask they couldn't get anything. I think it most unfair that districts further south which have got their share of this highroads money that has been spent must now come back and ask the Government to give able-bodied relief. It is not fair to other districts which are greater producers. The No th and Southwest coasts are the most productive parts, and still Placentia, which is not so productive, and other places south which are not, (although Burin may be) can get almost what relief they want. I must say that as far as I am concerned personally, in the matters that I have taken up with the Poor Commissioner, Mr Brownrigg, with regard to relief that I have got every satisfaction and was treated gentlemanly and fairly in every way. I have no kick with him.

But there has been some trouble with one or two of the relieving officers in the district. Men couldn't get relief. And this shows that this important outpo:t district with a population of 20,000, only had $7,579. Bay de Verde with a population of 10,000, got $12,000.

(Reads from statement of relief paid.)

Now, I am coming to a very important part, the logging business. In the summer of 1924 the Opposition introduced into this House a logging Bill, or in other words introduced a Bill to cut out the system known as subcontracting, and I think Mr. Sullivan brought in figures to show that subcontracting was more remunerative than contracting. I want to tell you that it is not; it is, only in very good cases. There are some men who go to the lumber woods and make fairly good money. There are crews of say five, and only one crew out of ten makes a decent wage and they call it a cursed system. The subcontracting system at the lumber woods is nothing short of slavery. It relieves the company of responsibility altogether. The person who contracts to cut may sublet to another. The price paid per cord is such that they can't make any money on it unless they make slaves of themselves. I have been talking with hundreds of men who have come from the lumber woods and they say that all this can be put down to the subcontracting system. A man goes out before day and has to stay till the stars are out before he can make two dollars or two fifty a day. When you consider that, how long can a man stay in the lumber woods and keep at that kind of thing? The people of the country ought to rise up against that. The Government should not allow these companies to be relieved by subcontracting of any kind of responsibility. Some of the camps are not fit for men to live in. They are leaky, and if I may say it, lousy, and everything else. There are inspectors but it is not much use in an inspector reporting a camp in poor condition and going off instead of saying "This camp must be put in proper condition, and I'll return immediately and see that it is." Conditions n the whole in the lumber woods are disgraceful. Here are the reports from the lumber camps.

(Reads.)

"Conditions are very good." There should be no "very good" in a thing of that kind. It should be "good" or nothing and it is the inspector's place to see that it is good and if he doesn't see that it is good, it is the Department's place to kick him out.

(Reads.)

He says, "the quality of food is fairly good." Just imagine a camp inspector putting in a thing like that in his report—"fairly good." A man logging is charged $18 to $20 a month for board and then this man comes and says that the quality of food is fairly good. That is the eastern section of the Humber. And here is another question, Mr. Speaker—these contractors charge the men 50c. a month for a doctor, which is contrary to the Act, which calls for 40c. The men are charged 50c. a month, whether they ever see a doctor or not. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines is not here—I wish he was, for I know that if he knew the conditions he would be one of the first to set them right—I have every faith in Mr. Walsh, and know that he would do anything to set matters right. Nearly everyone coming from the lumber woods brings the same story—if a man is sick he has to stay in camp and never sees a doctor unless he is moved to hospital. Camp inspectors should be wiped out entirely, except for one sound man who cannot be bribed. The greatest kick is about the inspectors going to the camps and living in the "fore peak"—and you know what that is.

The first place they go is the foreman's quarters, and they converse with him instead of going to see the men and see their condition. I have heard of instances this winter where they never see the camp at all, but spend all their time with the foreman until they went away. And that is not good enough—they should be thrown aside and better men put in their places. When the Logging Bill was brought in, I think Mr. Sullivan was one of the first men to criticise it and to help give it its death blow. Then the Prime Minister decided to appoint a Commission to enquire into the problems of the loggers—I thought there would be three or four men from this side on that, and that I would be one of them, having some knowledge of **the subject,** but when he made his statement and I asked for the personnel of the commission he replied, "Mr. Warren"—one man to be a commission of investigation! That gentleman went out, but didn't see one out of every hundred loggers—did he expect the men to walk eight or ten miles to his private car for nothing? I think it wasn't handled right, and no satisfaction was given to the loggers or to me. The men didn't get a fair show, and the Commission was no good. The men who gave evidence were employers or contractors—if he wanted to find anything about the men, why didn't he get it from the men themselves? That failed, and nothing has been done since to encourage these men; nothing done on their behalf, and the Logging Act is not carried out. I believe if the Minister of Agriculture and Mines knew the conditions they wouldn't stand 24 hours—since I have known that gentleman I can say that I believe him to have sympathy for the working classes. I appeal strongly for these loggers—something should be done to set this right, and that immediately. Camp inspectors shouldn't wait until November to go in the camps, because they are working all the year around. They go in and report that they need to be papered, or that the roofs want to be fixed, and other things of that sort, and I have known where after the report these conditions have been going on all the winter unremedied. Only that it would make it hard for a man who doesn't happen to be a friend or supporter of mine I could mention a name of such a case, where the men had to go on and eke out an existence for the winter in dirty camps.

Getting back to the question of sub-contractors again. I believe they ought to be cut out entirely. They were brought about in the beginning by the A. N. D. Company, of which Mr. Sullivan is aware. In 1921, after the previous year and when a strike took place because of a cut in wages everything looked black for the men in the Fall. The supply of men was greater than the demand, and the men had to get something to do—the A. N. D. Company, seeing men so plentiful, took advantage of it and adopted the sub-contractor system, giving them a small price. The men went in the woods and made no money, in eight cases out of ten. I myself was in Millertown Junction when nine men came down from Millertown, and not one of them had enough money to buy his dinner—I interested myself in getting them over the line, and I think two of them came from Mr. Cramm's district. That has been going on for two or three years, and is still going on and no one is taking any interest in it. There will be a few more millionaires in the Old Country and corpses in this country, for the loggers can't work under present conditions and live another five years. I hope and trust that something will be done in connection with this and if not the loggers will have to do something themselves.

Now to get to another point, something must also be done for the fishermen of this country—for the thou-

sands of starving families in the country. It was just a few years ago when Capt. Winsor said he was going to go to Port Union and bring Coaker and land him right here in town—if he went to-day there would be no fear of not bringing him. What is the cause of the fishermen not going fishing to-day—is it Coaker? Before very long in this country the Government will find out what it is to have our men going to the United States and Canada enriching these countries. Not a man on the other side of the House speaks in the interests of the fisheries, to encourage the men who are the bone and sinew of the country. I am a son of a fisherman and know what I am talking about. I have spent years fishing, both in this country and on the Pacific Coast. These are the men who produce the revenue, and after all they are the only men who are not getting some kind of half decent deal.

Now it is true, Mr. Speaker, that Corner Brook gives employment to a great number of people but conditions there are not what we would like them to be—they are not so good. It was only yesterday that I received a letter from Corner Brook saying that the longshoremen there are working a 13 or 14 hour shift, and at the same time 100 of them can't get employment. Now the Government has something to do with Corner Brook, and Mr. Power is the Government director, and I would like him to get in touch with that Company and ask them if they can't fit these men on in two shifts—two seven or eight hour shifts would give employment to all instead of working one crowd long shifts of 13 or 14 hours. There is a big kick in Corner Brook about it—some of these men out of work are living there with their families. There is very little encouragement in this country for anyone—very few men can start in to work and make any money; there is no encouragement for them. If a man can get a job on the Railway he is alright. I understand the Railway sunk about $750,000 last year—I make no wonder if they sank that much more, because they are losing freight and passengers as fast as they can do it. The freight rates are too high, and it is no use to look for a reduction, but it is not good enough just the same. If a man wants to ship a hundred fish drums from Bonavista Bay he has to pay the "Prospero" 50c. freight on each—it is outrageous. What encouragement is it to have to pay 50c. for an empty cask, when the boat is coming up almost empty and refuses to take them unless they pay that? I have known schooners to come and take the casks, and the railway lose the freight. A man who pays 50c. a cask can't make 30c. clear on his drums. Another thing in connection with the railway is the steamer "Malakoff" running around Bonavista Bay to-day and instead of taking freight she is loading up with railway ties and coming home. What about the passengers who can't catch their train? I came up on the Malakoff two weeks ago last Saturday past and we were eight hours delayed—many miss their trains because of this. And if that ship is bringing passengers and is delayed they have to pay for their meals—then they go to Port Blandford and miss their train. Why not give a schooner a chance to do that work? You are spending your money in the wrong direction. Take 20c. off fish casks coming into St. John's and give schooners a chance to bring in railway ties. Everybody is kicking about it and it is not good enough. When the general public kicks the the thing should be discontinued.

Mr. Speaker, I asked a few days ago for the expenditure of the S.S. "Watchful" on the Labrador service last summer and I got an answer tabled to that question which stated that the "Watchful" cost some $24,000 including the Labrador service. I sup-

pose it is out of order to suggest that is not a complete answer. In an answer from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a question as to how the "Watchful's" expenditure compared with the "Earl of Devon" I learn that she is a cheaper boat to operate. I spent too many years on boats of that kind to have anybody make me swallow that—she is one of the most expensive boats that ever came to the country, and carries a larger crew than the other and burns as much coal again. I spent years on these kind of boats and know just what they can do in speed and coal burning, and for anyone to try to make me believe that the "Watchful" is a cheaper boat than the "Earl of Devon", they are trying to make me believe something that I am not going to swallow. I should like to ask the Prime Minister if there is any other expenditure than that given in the answer.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Absolutely none. That is the answer as Mr. Russell gave it to us.

MR. BROWN—There there is something wrong about the "Watchful" being a cheaper boat than the "Earl of Devon." If she is cheaper why did the Government get rid of her. That is something the Government can't explain.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We hope to do away with the Northern Labrador service altogether.

MR. BROWN—I am afraid you can't do it; you don't know what pressure will come to bear on you. If she is a cheaper boat why sell her? Why not put her on another route, such as in the position of the "Malakoff?" The reason why she was sold was that she is too expensive to run, and you come back and try to tell us she was cheaper. I won't believe anyone who tells me that.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I didn't say that. I said she was cheaper than the Earl of Devon the previous year. The figures given are correct.

MR. BROWN—I fail to be convinced, Mr. Speaker. Why was she sold—if she was so cheap to operate? I might have asked someone to go in with me and buy her and make some money. And whatever she cost she gave the Government quite a fright. And they sold her for as little as nothing. If you had to buy any old steam trawler in the Old Country you would have to pay fifty or sixty thousand, and the "Watchful" was sold for $12,500.00. There is a nigger in the wood-pile somewhere.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that since the Monroe administration came into power the members of the Opposition have had no show, either in their districts or anywhere else. We naturally resent that, and the people resent it, and the time is not far distant when a change is coming and what is being done now will be undone to some extent. The political heelers placed in positions while men in Opposition are ignored will have to pay the price when that time comes and go back to where they came from, and others put in their places. We will only be giving equal rights to all, but I know that the Government never gave them. It will be champagne to our real friends and real pain to our sham friends.

MR. ASHBOURNE — Mr. Speaker, before taking up the debate on matters contained in the Speech from the Thorne, I wish to voice my disapproval of opening the House of Assembly at such a late date as the 11th day of May. I expected some explanation from the Prime Minister as to why the opening was delayed so long—no such pronouncement has been made and it is up to us to draw our conclusions. It suffices to say that we are here on the 25th day of May and this is the seventh afternoon of sitting. I sincerely hope that the Government will sit on Saturdays and hold night sessions to expediate the business of the House.

Mention has been made of the length of time which speakers have devoted to debating the Address in Reply. I think myself that it is an admirable time for members of the Opposition to speak, in order to show the Government the stand that they have taken upon certain matters, and also to impress upon the Government the prime necessity of carrying out its pledges, even at this late date, that they have given to the people who put them there, and who expect them to carry out their promises. Before going further, I would like to add my congratulations with those which have already been tendeerd, to Mr. Chambers, Dr. Mosdell and Mr. Brophy, for having been returned to this House of Assembly to represent their various districts. To a great many in St. John's, no doubt, Mr. Brophy's return was a surprise, but as regards the outports, it was no surprise, and according to the opinion voiced in the outports to-day, as far as I have heard it, the consensus of opinion seems to be that the Monroe party has been judged as incapable of managing the affairs of the country today. The time has come and rightly so that the people who go to their constitutents and make pledges, and do not carry them out, and are not sincere when they make those pledges he time has come when these people should be driven out of power, and when that Government goes get another Government, and if that Government does not carry out their pledges either, fire them out until we get down to some sort of stable Government in this country. No wonder to-day there is a feeling of pessimism abroad in this land of ours. The people are asking whither we are drifting. What is going to happen to the colony? No wonder! The great duty of a Government is to govern, to carry on the government of the people, by the people and for the people. That is what Newfoundlanders are looking for to-day. They are looking for a Government that will carry on the affairs of this country in the interests of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. To do that, one of the greatest necessities is retrenchment and to cut down, and that is what the people were expecting from the Monroe Government, when they returned them to power. The Monroe Government had a great chance to hold office in Newfoundland for eight years, but to-day that government is discredited, and the reason is, because they have not carried out their promises to the people. Instead of rigid economy and retrenchment we have seen practically no desire on the part of the government, at least no sincere desire, to retrench or cut down. The trouble with this land of ours is that the cost of carrying on the government is too great altogether, and the people are asking when are we going to get a government who have faith enough in Newfoundland, and who will be sincere enough to go in and apply the axe. To-day it is becoming a vital matter of life and death, a matter of survival. If we find that this country cannot carry on as we are doing now, and it is quite evident that it can not, then the only thing to do is to reduce. Reduce the cost of government, cut down civil servants' salaries if necessary. You will get plenty of men to fill their jobs. I grant you that you may not be popular, but it is what the people of Newfoundland to-day are looking for. The first item in the Speech from the Throne deals with the Labrador. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that we shall ever need another loan in this country. I have heard it said that, if it had not been that the Labrador Boundary award was in our favour, it would be very doubtful if we could ever raise another loan. Now we have the Labrador, and the next question is, what we are going to do with it;

whether we are to develop it, or whether it is going to be sold. Some people are asking that, if it is sold, won't we be in the same state ten or fifteen years time as we are to-day, and then we will have no Labrador. It seems to me that the Labrador can be just as useful and as profitable to Newfoundland as it could be to Canada. At any rate it should be our greatest concern. It is incumbent on the Government of Newfoundland to-day and on the members of both sides of this House to see that Labrador shall be used for the benefit of Newfoundland, and not for the benefit of speculators.

The next item relates to the codfishery. There is no hope for the codfishery in this document, absolutely no hope. Here this afternoon the Prime Minister says that the chances are that the Government won't send a steamer to Northern Labrador this year. The fishermen of Newfoundland are disheartened. The reason is, because they realize that nothing has been done to aid them, and they expected something from the Monroe Government. The fishermen considered, as Mr. Monroe was a fish exporter and knew something about the fish business, that he would take matters in hand, and that he would see that the fishing industry and the whole codfishing business of Newfoundland would be gone into thorouhly. And now the statement of the Prime Minister that there will likely be no steamer this year for Northern Labrador will not be expected by the toilers of the North who go down to fish in the deep waters. He has not kept faith with them when he promsied that the fishery should be his greatest concern. The trouble today, sir, is that the present government of Newfoundland is not a government for the common people.

We see to-day the codfishery languishing, it is dying, and nothing seems to be done about it. Thousands of our young men, our best men, are leaving the country, and it should be a matter of great concern to the government. I had hoped that this Speech from the Throne would have contained some heartening news to the toilers of Newfoundland. Newfoundland is a fishing country. The fisheries are her mainstay, and you cannot gainsay it, and while practically everything else has been gone into we find that nothing has been done for the fisheries. To-day you find that very many of the supplying merchants on Water Street are very pessimistic as regards giving out supplies for the fisheries. I think that it was Mr. Long who made the remark last year that it does not pay to catch codfish. Why is it? Does it defy solution? I claim that it does not, sir, after the thing has been studied correctly. Standardization and co-operative marketing would to a great extent eliminate some of the evils of the present day in regard to the codfishery industry. I myself am a firm believer in co-operative marketing. I do not see why it cannot be arranged as regards the Shore fishery, it certainly could be arranged as regards the Labrador fishery. The Newfoundland fishery business is a gamble; one of the biggest gambles in the world and the disheartening feature about it is that to-day thousands of our fishermen are abandoning the fisheries, our fishing schooners are going coasting, and our best men are leaving the country, whilst to all intents and purposes that does not interest the Government one iota.

(Reads.)

I would like to bring to the attention of the Government the fact that a great many people in Newfoundland consider that now when seal skins and oil are low in value, it would be a good time to have a close season on the catching of seals by steamers. It might not be practical

in that the Norwegians would probably send their steamers over here, and also the Canadians might prosecute the seal fishery while we are having a close season. At any rate, sir, the fact that there are so few seals caught now on the average compared with years ago, seems to indicate that something as regards the seal fishery needs to be done. The wholesale slaughter, the sweeping of the ice floes by the slaughter of the young, is a matter that should be taken cognizance of by the Government. The duty of the Government is to take hold of all the fisheries and do something for them.

I believe that the consigning of our fish abroad is to no little extent responsible for the loss of a great many of the fish exporters of Newfoundland. History has shown us that if a man keeps on long enough at the fish business the chances are that he will eventually go to the wall. Last summer policemen went around to the various firms in the country, asking the merchants whether their cullers were being sworn in as required by law. What is the good of having men sworn in to cull fish if they are not told by what standard to cull it. What would be the standard for a No. 1 article for one market, may not be the standard for some other market. Until a standard is laid down for culling it is my opinion that the culling will be a farce. To-day the outports are in an impoverished condition, and the duty realized by the Customs has fallen off on account of the lower value of cotton we are told. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is on account of the small earning power of the people of the outports to-day, and I speak of the outports as being the bulk of Newfoundland, although, no doubt there are many in St. John's to-day who cannot afford to buy the bare necessities of life. Since I came into this House this afternoon I have received a telegram asking me to get some work for some men in the country.

(Reads telegram.)

Men to-day are leaving the fisheries and they want to go to the interior to work. If the Government has no faith in the codfisheries of Newfoundland, or the fisheries in general, then some other avenue of work should be opened up to the people. If they have faith in the fisheries, perhaps some plan might be evolved whereby the men might be encouraged to go fishing, by promising or guaranteeing that they would make as much by going fishing as if they went to the country to work.

The matter of a bonus on codfish has been spoken of . But as regards a bonus on fish the man who gets a lot of fish gets a lot of money so to speak, while the man who gets practically no fish gets very little benefit from the bonus and it is the man who does badly at the fishery that needs the most.

Buchan's Mine seems to be the bright spot on the horizon. But it is doubtful whether that will be able to take care of all the people who are out of employment and who are not willing to go to the fisheries because they cannot make a living out of it. The future of Newfoundland may lie in mining. But we are told here in this Speech from the Throne that in connection with this project, for a period of twenty years certain articles will be allowed in duty free. Imagine a company with the prospects that this company has, as we were told by the Prime Minister himself a few days ago. Imagine giving Buchan's Mine free entry for goods into this country for a period of twenty years. Why, sir, it is ridiculous. Two years, or at the most five, in my opinion, should be ample and no further number of years should be allowed. Here we are in May month, and it looks as if we are going to be here for some time to

come, and I should have thought that some pronouncement would have been made by the Prime Minister, as regards the intentions of the Government, as to the time the people of this country may look for a General Election. In 1924 this House was called into being on the 9th day of July. The House can function for four years. Therefore on the 8th of July, 1928, this House of Assembly exists no longer. If the Government does not intend to have an election in the fall then you evidently have made up your minds to have a spring election. A spring election is very undesirable and unpopular. Nobody wants a spring election; it disturbs trade. I think that to-day it would be very wise for the Government and the Executive to get together and let the country have some statement as to when they can expect a General Election.

I am very sorry to inform this House that as regards the herring industry the prospects are very poor indeed. It seems that there are fewer herrings being consumed every year, and as far as Green Bay is concerned the herring has been the means of giving a good many dollars to a good many fishermen. Unfortunately, there is practically no demand today for split herring, and the fishermen are not being encouraged to put them up. In fact I have been told that if the men do put them up they may not get any more than $2.50 or $3.00 a barrel for them. In fact one man who had split herring here during the winter has not been able to dispose of them up to the present, and a few days ago was offered only $3.00 a barrel for them in trade; no cash at all. There is one thing that I hope will not be in the estimates this year, and that is the vote for inspectors going around inspecting split herring. I would suggest that the Government would do well to take the advice of the Opposition sometimes. It can't hurt them. Of course the Government will say that that is for the members of the Fishery Board to decide. A few men go down and meet for a few hours during the year, and the Government is only too ready to throw all the difficulties and r sponsibilities on the shoulders of the Fishery Board, problems that they should face and solve themselves.

MR. SULLIVAN—Is it not necessa y to have inspectors?

MR. ASHBOURNE—I maintain it is not, because I do not consider it enhances the value of split herring, and exporters have to pay money when the herring are exported that could be paid to the people who pack them.

MR. SULLIVAN—Do you think that it will be any better without them

MR. ASHBOURNE—They can be sold just as readily I believe.

Mr. SULLIVAN—Then inspectors are not good for anything.

MR. ASHBOURNE—That does not follow at all. As regards the products that are put up in tins it is only right that it should be inspected. But the man that buys split herring can have the barrel opened on the wharf himself and see the quality whether it is good or bad, and if it is certified as No. 1, and the man opens it and finds that it is not No. 1, the inspector's certificate is not worth a snap of your fingers. It is a farce. So therefore I hope that the salaries of the split herring inspectors will be cut out of the estimates this year. I understand that the Canadians are taking up the matter of standardization as regards codfish, and I do not see for the life of me why it is that this Government that was elected by the fishermen of this country has done nothing for them as regards that industry. It may be because the Executive Council has not the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in it. As I said before, I think that is a grievous error. Here we are a fishing country and very few people seem to have faith in the fishing in-

dustry. What are we coming to? We don't know where we are. It does not pay to catch fish, but what are we going to do? And still the Government seems to be content to do nothing about it.

The fishermen of Newfoundland are not looking for a fortune out of fish. But what they do want is a living. That is what they are not getting to-day. He does not mind paying $10 for a barrel of flour if he can get $10 for a quintal of fish. But what hits him very hard is to have to pay $10 for a barrel of flour and only get $4.50 for a quintal of fish. Why is it? We are told that a great many of the fish exporters of Iceland are losing money. Some people claim that there is too much fish being caught. The fisheries of Newfoundland are as good as they are in any part of the world, but the trouble is that the cost of living is too high here and naturally that reacts upon the price of fish. It is not so much the amount of money that the fisherman has to pay in duty for his outfit, as pork, beef, gasoline, flour and kerosene are on the free list; but it is the general high cost of living. For instance, take a fish exporter in St. John's. Look what it costs them to pack a cask of fish on account of the high cost of living. Say they pay $4.50 a quintal for fish and it costs them 50c. a quintal to pack that fish, but if the high cost of living could be brought down to such an extent that the firm could manage to pack that fish for 30c. a quintal, then the difference could go to the fishermen, and instead of getting $4.50 a quintal for their fish they could get $4.70. But there are a great many people who do not see it in that light. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of our Government to tackle our codfish problem right away. The Government may make mistakes in grappling with this matter, but it is better to have tried and lost than never to have tried at all; and to-day the people of the country are looking to the Government to lead the way and do something that would be advantageous for the fisheries and the fishermen. We are told by the Prime Minister that it is a very difficult matter to retrench and that there are a great many people around Government departments looking for money. But, Mr. Speaker, the Government is supposed to be as a watch-dog for the people, and the Government has no right to give out money to this fellow or that fellow who happens along upon request. We should cut our garment according to our cloth, and as the country cannot bear the present high cost of Government it is time to cut down expenses. Reduce the salaries of civil servants and do away with some of the officials entirely. If you are sincere in your desires to run the Government in the best interests of the people, now is your chance to show it; but the sad part about the whole situation is that the Prime Minister knows full well that drastic legislation should be enforced in the way of retrenchment and he admits that he cannot do it, and the reason, I maintain, is that he has put it off until it is too late. According to the report of the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board, tabled in the House, we are spending over a million dollars for liquor. Now, Mr. Speaker, can we in Newfoundland afford to spend such a huge amount of money for booze? I contend that we cannot. In my opinion the granting of the franchise to women is going to have a tremendous effect upon the liquor question in Newfoundland. The women are going to make their influence felt, and to-day instead of making it easy for people to get liquor and spend their money, we should try and get them to see that the money spent for liquor is money thrown away. There is no wonder that in the outports to-day there is such a cry and clamour against the present Government.

There are a great many people in this country at the present time looking for work and cannot find any. They ask for bread but they are not even given a stone. A few days ago a delegation from St. John's appeared before the Bar of this House asking that something be done for them in the nature of employment. I wonder what the people outside of Newfoundland think of us when they read in the papers that between 100 and 200 motor cars have been imported into St. John's so far this year and that about $90,000.00 were given out in relief in St. John's a few months ago? There would be many delegations to come to the Bar of this House if all the people of Newfoundland who are out of employment were able to put in an appearance here. The fishermen of the outports are not looking for fortunes from the fishery, but they are looking for some relief or help at the present time as regards the fisheries. Time and conditions have altered and circumstances have made it necessary when even an industry such as the codfishery should receive some consideration and support; and where can the Government spend money that will give better returns than on the codfishery? Since the opening of the House the remark was made that it was hoped that the leaders of the different groups would find out from their groups their ideas and talk for them. I consider that we have had a one-man Government in Newfoundland too long already. The time has passed when you can have much faith in any one man and the quicker we realize it the better. One man may be sincere, but unless he has others behind him who are prepared to back up the stand he may take he is only fighting a lone fight. In Newfoundland I think we have been too apt to look at the leader of a party and expect great things from him and say that because such and such a man is a party leader that we are going to be in for good times. What we want and what the people are asking for is retrenchment and a Government that will retrench and cut down expenses drastically and not fear going back to the people to give an account of their stewardship. I believe that any person that comes into power and carries on the Government for the people and has that singleness of purpose and sincerity in his heart to do the right, that the people of the country will reward him according to his deeds. There is no use going out and talking to the people and telling them what you promise. It is what you do that counts, and we are to be judged by our deeds, not by our creeds, both here and in the hereafter. That is why the Monroe Government is so unpopular to-day throughout the country. They have not done what the people were expecting them to do. We have too many non-producers in Newfoundland to-day and the cost of the Government is too great. But how is that situation to be overcome? I think in this House that the first thing to be done is to have the Budget brought in to see how much money this little country can raise by fair taxation, not harsh taxation or class taxation, and then bring in your Estimates afterwards and see how you are going to spend it; not bring in your Estimates and then take chances of getting it. It is very easy to sit in your offices in St. John's and think everything is going along nicely in Newfoundland, but, according to the outports that I have come in contact with, by the producers of this country, there is going to be a rude awakening for the present Government, as things are far from rosy hued. I believe that the Government to-day is unaware of conditions in the outports in the main. There are not enough outport representatives in this House There are too many men belonging to St. John's and it is time that the outport men got together and got men

from the outports to represent outport districts.

We come to the Gander. I had hoped to see that something would have been done as regards the Gander before this time. It is in proximity to Twillingate District. I sincerely hope that if the Government has to build a railway down to the Gander that there will be put there a pulp and paper plant, because then the timber from the Labrador could be freighted down there. I maintain that not another stick of timber should be exported from Newfoundland or Labrador in its raw state.

There are men out in the outports to-day who feel that they cannot go fishing this year. They have families to maintain, and what is $200 to $300 to keep a family going for twelve months and feed, clothe and educate them? How far would it go with the honourable members here?—$200 or $300? And still that is about the average earnings of the fishermen of this country. The cost of Government, as I said before, is excessive and the people don't seem to be able to get anybody to come in here and cut it down; but a time is coming when they will. In times of great national crisis there are not lacking men who will be found to step in any breach, and I myself have faith that there is a Providence that shapes our ends, rough hew them how we may, and if it were not for that, to-day I should be very pessimistic myself indeed.

The people of Newfoundland sent us here to look after their interests and to work on their behalf, and what are we doing about it? The Prime Minister must not hand out money to people because they come and ask for it and become persistent. We can't afford to have a lot of these expenditures being carried on to-day, and why does the Government do it? It is time that this sorry scheme of things were changed. I believe myself that the crux of the matter here with us in Newfoundland is, that as regards the fisheries, the people of Newfoundland, and the fishermen especially, expected Mr. Monroe, being a fish merchant, to influence the Government to do something for the good of the fisheries. I maintain that practically nothing has been done and the people are greatly disappointed to-day with Mr. Monroe. As I said before, the Monroe Government had a chance to be in office in this country for eight years, but I don't believe to-day that it could go to the country and get half a dozen men returned.

There is not very much in the Speech from the Throne to talk about anyway.

People can't afford to get enough to eat for themselves and their families to-day of the necessities of life and here we are launching out on big schemes, such as the tourist policy, building a big dock, a big hotel, and the fishery is being neglected. I am sorry that the Colonial Secretary is not here because a few days ago I had a message from the Relieving Officer of Twillingate asking me if there were any free passes that I could get in order to get men into the country to work; that they couldn't go in there unless they had free passes. The men are anxious to work if they can get work. They do not want to live on the Government or by relief if they can get honest work instead. Many of these men have been to the fishery but have been so discouraged that now they want to get work in the country, and the only other alternative is for them to leave the country.

I don't know whether or not some plan might be evolved whereby men might be encouraged to go back to the fisheries. It would revive hope if it could be shown to them that in case they didn't do well at the fishery that their earnings might be brought up on a parity with what their earnings would be in the country for the same

length of time. I merely make that as a suggestion.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say a few words on the subject matter before the chair. Before entering upon the main subject I would like to remark one matter. It is not very pleasant to be here on the 25th of May speaking on the Speech from the Throne. I am sure in saying that I voice a feeling on both sides of the House. No one wants to sit here and talk when it is coming on to midsummer, on the Speech from the Throne. Yet is the long established prerogative, almost, of the Opposition to talk on this I regret that the Prime Minister did not avail of the first opportunity to give an understanding to the House that an election will be held in the fall. It mustn't be supposed that an opposition constituted as we are with seventeen members is going to sit down and allow legislation which the Government may find necessary to bring in to pass unchallenged. That would be a matter without precedent in the history of this House. I was not here on Friday but I understand that the Prime Minister stated that he thought the Opposition was bent upon obstruction. I don't know what brought it up or why he said it, as I was not here at the time, but I understand some who spoke last spoke at some length and it looked to him like obstruction tactics. I would like the Prime Minister to put himself in the place of the Leader of the Opposition and consider himself for a moment on this side of the House and consider conditions as they are. I wonder would he be willing to let the Government of the day come in with whatever legislation they liked; pass it and close the House, while he sat stlil and offered no criticism. I don't think that would happen. The Prime Minister and the Government must expect criticism from this side of the House. I don't want to be classed as an obstructionist. I don't like obstructionists. I would much prefer to be attending to my business than to be in here talking on the Speech from the Throne; but I feel it incumbent upon me as representative of a district and as a member of this House, to take my place here and criticise, when it is honest and just criticism, and I think we have ample reason to criticise the present administration. I may say to the Prime Minister if you are really in earnest in your assurance that you want to serve this country, as it is said you are, and as a great many people believe you are, if you are, I see no better way than to give an assurance that this House will dissolve when prorogation will take place. It is the manly thing to do, and the straight thing to do, and I cannot see that you can find any argument against doing so. I have not the slightest doubt that every member of the Opposition will co-operate in every way in passing legislation and passing supplies. But you must remember that, perhaps through no fault of yours, a very serious condit on has arisen as regards the position of the Government. The composition of the Government to-day is not what it was two years ago. It is not what it was one year ago. The Prime Minister was honest in stating he was not in a position to bring forward any drastic legislation. I presume the Prime Minister felt that we needed drastic legislation, and I agree with him. In serving the country, it will be necessary to bring in drastic legislation. The Prime Minister admits that he is not in a position to bring in and pass drastic legislation. That is a serious admission and a serious state of affairs in this country. Does he then wish to carry on in office if he cannot pass drastic legislation?

And I can't see for the life of me what purpose can be served by the Leader of the Government, and by the Government generally in attempting to pursue that course—absolutely no

good purpose. You have to appeal to the electors sooner or latter, and a few months here or there can't matter so why not do the right thing. No one would begrudge the Government staying in power if they were strong enough numerically, it would be the right thing to do, and I say that it is a pity that a Government in any country cannot stay until the end of its term, but if the position arises that they can't do so, as it has under the present administration, what is it going to do. I sympathize with the Prime Minister; I know that he is not in a position to bring in legislation, not even necessary legislation, and being in that position why does not a gentleman like the Prime Minister, who is an independent man himself—after all I don't want to be personal, but I do think he is sufficiently strong-willed if he made up his mind to do it—accede to the request of the Leader of the Opposition to go to the country, and all his troubles will disappear. I don't say that in the form of threat that we are going to hold things up, but we are going to do the natural thing, and take advantage of our strength. What does it matter whether we go to the country in the fall of 1927 or the spring of 1928, you will have forgotten it ten years from now, and will have the consciousness of having done what is right in the best interests of the country. It might be said that it is only natural for us on this side to want a general election, and that may be true, but it must be remembered that we are the servants of our constituents, and it is what they expect of us; if I were to consult my own personal feelings, I don't care very much whether the election is in the fall or the spring, I can manage to live, and perhaps when the election comes I shall be defeated and not have a seat at all. There is no greater calamity, politically, that a Government cannot bring down legislation which it deems necessary and expedient—it is a very serious state of affairs. We can't help it, we can only challenge this course. It is our duty to criticize legislation, and if we wanted to we could stay here all the summer—I understand the Prime Minister intimated that he could stay here as long as we, but I think he would get very very tired in a short time. I think the constitutional aspect has been pointed out before, the life of the Government would expire some time about the 9th of July, 1928; I think the election Act provides for four years from the date of the Proclamation as the life of Parliament, which means that if there is no election in the fall of 1927, we will have to have an election in the spring of 1928, or there will be a period during the summer of 1928 when there will be no existing Parliament; that is undesirable, perhaps if there was some great crisis, such as a War, it could be covered by such a measure as the War Measures Act. But here is a Government not able to pass ordinary legislation, not even able to pass Supply if the Opposition so wishes, and I don't think that is going to happen—we don't want to obstruct the Government, but we feel that it is our duty to see that that assurance is given this House before we are prepared to assent to legislation that otherwise we might not possibly concur in.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, like others who have gone before me, to refer to the personality subject of the Assembly as compared with when we closed this House last year. First, I am reminded that an old friend of mine, Mr. Duff, who was sitting over here last year, is now sitting—I won't say comfortably—in a chair over there by the grate. It was a great disappointment to me when he decided to forsake the good old Liberal party; I thought he was the last man to forsake it and join his erstwhile opponents; no man was stronger in his condemnation and criticism of the actions of the present administration, and even at our last

meeting we had no reason to believe but that one of our most loyal members was Mr. Duff. A day or so afterwards, however, I saw him in company which suggested that possibly he would be sitting in new company when we sat again, and his appointment was gazetted a few days later. I am sorry for his own sake because I don't see how he could better his position by joining them. It must be admitted that the present administration is a dying one, and how could Mr. Duff go over to a dying administration. Imagine any person getting aboard an old ship that is scuttled and sinking, and jumping off a new ship to do so.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is not launched yet.

MR. HIBBS—No, but we propose to launch it in the fall of 1927. I am sure that Mr. Duff's constituents in Carbonear had every faith in him prior to his conversion, but if I am to judge by what I heard from some of his best friends, I am sure his position is a very very unhappy one; sometimes in an unguarded moment we do things that we afterwards regret, and if we only knew what is in his heart just now I know that he would be over sitting in his old seat that he was in the last time we sat. It is customary to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Speech from the Throne, but before doing so I think perhaps I should follow the precedent set me and congratulate the new members on this side of the House. I don't know whether they think these are all sincere or not, but they might place a wrong construction on it if I did not do so. Dr. Mosdell has secured a great victory in Fortune Bay, particularly so because the gentleman who had the honour of representing that district and now holds an exalted position threw in, I understand, his weight with the Government candidate previous to his appointment. Now I will say that if Fortune Bay had voted for Mr. Dunfield as far as he is personally concerned they would have made no mistake because he would have made a worthy representative, but unfortunately he was on the wrong side, and I can't conceive of any man, no matter how popular or clever he is, going in any district, with the exception of Burgeo and LaPoile, and winning for the present administration. Mr. Chambers won there, and I would be scared if he went to Fogo against me, for he is a very popular man. He did a great deal for his district, and while they knew that the Government of which he is a member was dying, and that he would die with it if he didn't do the right thing and leave them, they said to themselves that he was the Minister of Public Works and they could get as much as possible out of the Government; however, he has won, and I congratulate him. It must also be remembered that it was a three-cornered fight in that district, and that the independent candidate mixed things up, that if he had not been there the Government majority would have been considerably reduced. I had much pleasure in being identified with campaign in St. John's East where Mr. Brophy won what I regard as the greatest victory in the history of Newfoundland politics. It was a hard fight—it was in close proximity to St. John's, and all the prestige of the Government was thrown in. It was a whirlwind campaign, and a hard fought one, but the one outstanding thing is that the people expressed their sentiments through the ballots, and that is one of the things which the Government and the Prime Minister should take into consideration. Mr. Brophy, I feel sure, will do honour to that old and historic district, and to the memories of the members who preceded him.

I feel sure, sir, that he will prove a worthy colleague of the two gentlemen who represent that district at the present time in the persons of the Hon. Minister of Justice and

yourself, sir, and I am sure that the same harmony will prevail because his interests are your interests. I want to congratulate Mr. Cahill, the mover of the Address in Reply. I do congratulate him, sir, because I say that any man, and gentlemen on the other side of the House, who could under similar circumstances muster up sufficient courage to come in here and apologise for that speech from the Throne deserves to be congratulated. In fact I will go further and say that he deserves to be decorated. Mr. Cahill, no doubt, was selected because he did so well on a former occasion. As Mr. Halfyard said the other day, when a person commits an offence against the law, he gets a good criminal lawyer to defend him, and I don't think the Government made any mistake in their selection. I think that Mr. Cahill did very well considering the material he had to work on.

There is much, however, in the speech that I would like to criticise, particularly the latter part of the speech. It is very well when everything is going alright and under ordinary conditions, and even then it is quite an ordeal to get somebody on opening day to propose the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Usually a gentleman is selected to make his maiden speech on that occasion. But the Government would not take any risks so they selected Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Power who, I think, was making his maiden speech, did very well. There is not very much to criticise about his speech because it had industrial tendencies. He talked about St. George's coal fields. He has an interests in that particularly as he represents that district. Now I want to say a word or two about this Speech from the Throne.

The Speech from the Throne opens by telling the country or telling this House at least that since last session the dispute between the Canadians and Newfoundland in connection with the Labrador boundary had been settled. Well, we know all about that. That is no news. I would like for something with more interest in it than that to be presented to us in the Speech from the Throne. It has been traditional, Mr. Speaker, for the Speech to be delivered on opening day, and usually containing a forecast of what the Government proposes doing that session. But this is absolutely a barren, meaningless thing. Nothing in it what ever. It merely tells something that we already know. It does not open up some hopeful vista for the future. It doesn't tell us what the policy of the Government is going to be, or what we are to expect from the Government. In past years the Spech from the Throne did tell us these things, but recently the Speech from the Throne is similar to the Budget Speech. The budget speech, as everybody knows, in this House of Assembly for the past few years has been nothing more or less than a political document—Propaganda. It is not meant to convey to the House of Assembly and to the House of Parliament, any idea of the proper state of the finances of the country, it is merely used to prop up and bolster up the Government that the Finance Mminister happens to be a member of, regardless of whether it has any foundation in fact. So is the Speech from the Throne. The whole traditional purpose and objective seems to be lost sight of. For the Speech from the Throne we get something that does not contain anything in it and is not worth reading.

Reference is made here to the Labrador dispute. The Government through their papers have taken great credit to themselves for the favourable decision on the Labrador question. I want to say right here that it would be far from me to discredit in any way the gentlemen who have been associated with that award. I

would congratulate his Honor the Minister of Justice, because it happened that during his regime it was his place to sit at that great court. It was an historical occasion, something that his name will be connected with down through the ages, and so I congratulate him, and I feel that the case was well handled by him. He is a very able man, and I feel surer that he availed of that one opportunity which only comes once in a lifetime, to do credit to himself and the country he represented. But, sir, I would also like to point out that all the credit does not belong to this Government. As a matter of fact very little credit when we are honest about it.

Of course it would take some little time to review the history of the Labrador boundary dispute. It covers more than a quarter of a century. I think it is only fair that in this House to-day we should pay tribute to the memory of the late Martin Furlong. I did not have the honour of his acquaintance, as he was before my time in politics. But I do know that he played a very important part, and got very modest remuneration for his services. I also wish to speak of the part played in this great controversy by the late administration of which I happened to be a member. I think that it is only fair that today we should review what was done by that administration in this respect. In 1920 the administration of Sir Richard Squires decided that an effort should be made to gather data and evidence to support Newfoundland's case, that had been going on for some time before. But they decided that there should be more energy put into it and that it should be more determined. The recent evidence shows the wisdom of that action. Well it will be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that on that occasion we engaged the services of the Hon. Sir Patrick McGrath. Newfoundland's case from this date was practically placed in his hands. I remember how much criticism that Government was subjected to at that time because they selected Sir Patrick who was a political opponent of that administration, and it was the opinion of a great many of our friends that we should not have placed the matter in his hands. However that may be, sir, it is to the credit of that administration that they placed principle before politics in that case. That went on until 1922 when the present Administration came into power. And I say, sir, that the present Administration was not deserving of very much credit in connection with that. The reason is this, that the present Administration came into office in 1924. They evidently did not have a great deal of faith in our cause. However, probably the Canadians also had not much faith in their case. It was in the lap of the gods, so to speak. But the evidence of the facts shows that they were somewhat sceptical, because the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Colonial Secretary proceeded to Canada for the purpose of negotiating with the Canadian Government with a view to the sale of Labrador. In fact we have had correspondence tabled in this House showing that the Prime Minister and the Government made an offer to Canada of the entire Labrador peninsular for the sum of $15,000,000.

This correspondence showed that an offer was made for the sum of $15,000,000.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Oh, no! All that was said was that if they should choose to make any offer, it would be brought before the Executive Government, and, if the Executive approved, it would be brought before the Legislature. It was not the entire peninsula, but that portion whch came under dispute.

MR. HIBBS—Was not the sum of $15,000,000 suggested by you?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It was spoken of by them; never by us.

MR. HIBBS—I suppose then, I will have to blame Mr. Puddester as Editor of the Hansard. If I remember rightly, I read in the Hansard quite recently that letter with an offer of $15,000,000. Was that amount mentioned originally or suggested by them?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Yes.

MR. HIBBS—I will see the correspondence at the earliest opportunity and see if I am so far misled as it would appear. The impression I received, I feel sure, was that negotiations were on that basis. I think we are in a much better position than we would be if we had sold Labrador. The point I desire to make was that the Government can take no credit for the favourable decision with regard to the Labrador. It is a fact that if any kind of a reasonable amount had been given at that time, the proposition would have been brought before the House to sell the Labrador.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Terms would never have been come to, because the Canadians wanted to include the entire coast, and the Newfoundland Legislature would never consider that.

MR. HIBBS—Then your visit to Canada was fruitless and absolutely hopeless from the beginning!

I notice that another paragraph in the Speech refers to the Codfishery, and this year we have been given three and a half lines, whereas last year you did much better and gave four lines to the most important industry of Newfoundland. That is a matter that has been referred to by other members on this side of the House, and Mr. Ashbourne, who has just sat down, is a member, as competent perhaps as any man on this side of the House to speak on the fisheries. It would then be superfluous for me to repeat what has been said. In talking on the Speech from the Throne, if one talks at any length, one can only repeat what has been said before. As the Opposition has no intention to merely talk against time and hold up this House, there is not much purpose to be served in my repeating other people's remarks. I cannot, however, pass over the fact that the fishery has been dismised in the Speech from the Throne with a mere four lines.

(Reads from Speech from Throne)

I wonder what object is there in having that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne. That is something we all know. It is insulting; almost disgusting to the fishermen of this country to find a Government that promised those fishermen so much for the fisheries in 1924, coming in in 1927 with a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne making such a reference as that. We all know that. "The fishermen suffered considerably from decreased prices." But what did the Government do to enhance prices. I am not one to say that a Government could merely by a snap of the finger raise the price of fish, but I do think that some effort could be made by the present administration more than has been made. Last year in speaking on that subject I went into it at some length and repeated the history of the fisheries down through the last 125 years, and I did suggest at that time to the Prime Minister the advisability of doing something that we have never done before. We have gone along so long in the old rut. Surely then it is only reasonable to suppose that like other countries we should make an effort to get markets for our produce. I suggested that Mr. Aaron Shapiro, perhaps the greatest expert on co-operative marketing in the world, be invited down here. I can say now with authority that Mr. Aaron Shapiro would be very glad to

come to Newfoundland. The expense would be very small, and we are not so wise but that we might benefit by advice. I think the Prime Minister might consider the matter of bringing this expert down and getting advice.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—A man was procured.

MR. HIBBS—I understand that another man did come down and before this House closes I hope the Prime Minister will give the benefit of the advice given by that expert to us. I think it is only right that the people should know what he has done. I am somewhat of a layman as far as the codfishery is concerned, but I think a mistake was made by not getting Mr. Shapiro. He is recognised all over the American continent as being a great expert on co-operative marketing. Nova Scotia has seen fit to invite him there to get the benefit of his advice in connection with the marketing of apples from Annapolis Valley, and I think that they are acting on his advice, and they find the advice given very practical. I feel sure what applies to the province of Nova Scotia in connection with the marketing of the apples also applies to Newfoundland with regard to its fish.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Province of Nova Scotia did not engage him with regard to its fish, did it?

MR. HIBBS—The marketing of fish is not in the same position with them as with us. I do feel that if the Province of Nova Scotia were as dependent on the codfish industry as we are, that they would have invited him to consult with regard to codfish as well as with regard to the apples from the Annapolis Valley.

I understood from the Prime Minister that negotiations were going on between this Government and the United States with a view to getting our fish into the United States and removing the tariff wall placed by the Fordney Tariff. I don't expect at the present juncture he will give away all the information he has got, but I do hope that before the House closes he will be able to give out some information.

I will, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, go back to the matter we were discussing a few moments ago. Some one has just sent along a copy of Hansard, and I want to see if the Prime Minister's statement is critically correct. With your permisison, Mr. Speaker, I will read.

(Reads from Hansard)

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that nobody will blame me, in view of that, for saying here this evening that the suggestion of $15,000,000 came from the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What we were remarking was that it was not from the Government.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move adjournment of the debate.

On motion the debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion the remainder of the Orders of the Day were deferred.

On motion the following members were appointed a Library Committee for the session: Mr. Puddester, Mr. Cahill, Mr. W. J. Browne, Mr. Ashbourne, Dr. Mosdell.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— I beg to move that the House rise and do now adjourn until to-morrow at three o'clock.

MR. SCAMMELL—On the motion to adjourn, may I ask the Prime Minister on what date the increased rates came into effect on the coastal boats, and what notice was given to the general public? I rise on this particular point because I have just received a telegram from sixty men on the "Prospero" at Exploits, bound for Hampden and Sopp's Arm. They had no notice of the increased rates, and they are anxious to know if something cannot be done about it. These men came some distance to Exploits and only when they got on board they

found out about the increased rates, and I think it very unfair and hard on them if notice has not been given. I ask the Prime Minister to find out the facts re this matter and let us know them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I shall answer the question to-morrow.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 26th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Lake, from Grand Bank, re roads.

Dr. Mosdell, from Morrisville, re roads.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Highroads Commission for the year ending February 28th, 1927.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to resume my remarks of last evening before adjournment. When we adjourned last evening I was making some reference to negotiations that were carried on between the Prime Minister of Newfoundland and the Prime Minister of Quebec with reference to the sale of Labrador, and statements which I made were challenged by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice who thought I was incorrect in some degree. I will read for the benefit of the House a letter dated March 4th, 1925, from the Hon. the Prime Minister to the Hon. Mr. L. A. Taschereau, Prime Minister and Attorney General of Quebec. I wish to pursue the matter with your permission, Mr. Speaker, as I don't wish to be misunderstood, and I want to endeavour to make the point which I started out to make when I took up that subject last evening. On March 16th, 1925, according to correspondence tabled by the Prime Minister last year the following letter was received from the Attorney General at Ottawa, of Canada; this is a reply to the letter which I read last evening:

(Reads)

It would seem from that letter, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney General at Ottawa was of the same opinion as I, that the proposal was made by the Prime Minister and Attorney General and Colonial Secretary to sell the Lebrador. The matter, it is true, would have to come before the Executive Council and before the Legislature but that doesn't alter the fact that the Prime Minister had in his mind that the sum of $15,000,000 would be a fair and equitable figure to charge Canada for our possessions on Labrador.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Not for our possessions; for the territory in dispute.

MR. HIBBS.—If we were to sell Labrador to-day I presume it would be always considered that no sale would be made except subject to our fishermen's rights on the coast. I know the present Government is just as desirous as any Government in the past to protect the fishermen's rights on Labrador, but the point I wanted to make is this that you would not to-day think of selling that portion of Labrador for fifteen millions.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It was not known that it was the property of Newfoundland then and it was a very delicate question that had to be decided as will be seen when we go into that matter later on.

MR. HIBBS.—At the same time in

fact it was our property then as it is now and it was only a matter of having the despute decided. I received some correspondence some time ago speaking of the possible value of the Labrador. We all want to get some idea of what this vast territory would be worth in the event of our disposing of it and that is a matter of interest to us all. The man writing it comes from————, and he sent me this letter unsolicited, thinking that I would be interested in getting his personal opinion on the lumber on Labrador on that part of it with which he was acquainted.

(Reads extracts from letter.)

When one comes to take into consideration the fact that people, who are more familiar with the Labrador than anybody in this House, are of the opinion that not less than sixty thousand square miles of Labrador is well wooded, to say nothing of the vast water power which that territory possesses, it is not unreasonable to say that the territory in dispute would be worth one hundred million dollars I k.now it is not wise to make a rash statement, but I would like to point out that during the past few months the American and Canadian papers have been shouting that the Labrador was worth between two hundred and two hundred and fifty million dollars. Supposing we were to boil down to say one hundred millions. then my point is that the offer made by the Prime Minister and delegates from the Prime Minister's office in which the sum of fifteen million dollars was mentioned as a basis on which negotiations might take place was an exceedingly low one and the Prime Minister and his associates made a mistake. It shows how short-sighted they were and it shows possibly that they had no conception of what they were dealing with when they offered for fifteen million dollars such a vast territory which is now estimated to be worth between two hundred and two hundred and fifty million dollars. I believe the Prime Minister is honest enough to admit that he made a mistake and I know that he dreads to hear the words fifteen millions mentioned; but if Canada had been wise to accept that offer of fifteen millions as a basis of settlement, they would be eighty million dollars better off than what they are to-day, that is, provided the property would be sold to them. Last evening after referring to the Labrador and before I had the Hansard brought in which caused me to resume that Labrador question I was dealing with the sealfishery. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few more words with regard to that once great fishery. I referred to it last year at length and quoted some official figures down through the years from 1825 to 1925. I pointed out then that that fishery was fast declining and within a few years from now the sealfishery will be a thing of the past, if the catch drops off as it has during the past twenty-five years. In dealing with the sealfishery the Speech from the Throne says: "The sealfishery, just concluded, has been above the average of recent years, but the lower values for oil have resulted in poor returns to those who undergo the hardships of this precarious work." That paragraph is absolutely meaningless. Last year and each since the present Government came into power something similar was said about this industry in the Speech from the Throne. We merely get a bald statement this year and one that we are all familiar with. What the Government and the trade must do is to get down to business and try and revive that great industry and try to bring it back to something near the magnitude that it had reached in former years. As far back as 1830, almost 100 years ago, one of the greatest sealfisheries on record was enoyed in Newfoundland

when a catch of 683,836 were brought into the country. When you come to compa e this with this year's catch of 180,000, a catch which the Speech from the Throne says, "Has been above the average of recent years," then you will see how far this industry has fallen back. For a number of years after 1830 the annual sealing catch reached an average of 500,000 seals, whilst in recent years we had the catches as follows: in 1924 the amount of seals brought in was 129,000; in 1925 the total catch was 127,000; in 1926 we had 200,000 and this year 180,000. The next paragraph in the Speech from the Throne refers to the paper-making industry and says: "The development of the paper-making industry shows a marked progress, and the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company has reached the large output capacity of four hundred and ten tons per days. The Anlo Newfoundland Development Company has added another paper machine to its plant, reaching the satisfactory capacity of three hundred tons per day." Now I want to point out to the Government that a daily output of four hundred tons per day had been reached a year ago and there is nothing new about what they tell us in that paragraph. I would like for the Government to be more progressive and give us some hope for the future and not what happened in the past when next they present a Speech from the Throne. If the Government has got a policy, let us hear what it is. We are sick and tired of hearing the same old thing over and over again. Do not be padding out what has happened in the past and use it as a kind of propaganda. If you have nothing to put in the Speech better abandon it altogether. Mr. Speaker I would like to know what is going to be done in connection with the Gander proposition. I understand that a Bill will be brought before the House later on in the session when we will have a chance of discussing it fully but, as one who is interested very much in the Gander proect and because it happens to be in the district that I have the honour to represent, my attitude will be to oppose any attempt whatever to export raw pulp wood from those areas, as I think if such were permitted it would be a crime against Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. Nothing short of a mill such as we have at the Humber and nothing short of a town such as we have at Corner Brook should satisfy the Government when that Bill is brought in here. They should not submit to anything else and if the Government is unwise enough to bring in a Bill giving that corporation the right to export raw pulp wood from that centre I believe that it will meet with the strongest opposition from the members on this side of the House. I have not discussed the matter with my colleagues, but I know they will oppose it as will also many honourable gentlemen on the Government side. Our people in Newfoundland have been slaves long enough by being hewers of wood and drawers of water for other people. The Humber, although having one of the greatest mills in the world erected there and although it is one of the greatest industrial centres in Newfoundland, has fallen far short of what was expected of it. Newfoundlanders have not got the square deal which they were promised and if there was one place more than another in which the Prime Minister promised a square deal it was in connection with the industrial matters at the Humber. The place up there has been swarming with Canadians, Englishmen and Americans to whom every job worth while has been given. It is only recently that a Newfoundlander has been able to get a job there at all. A statement to that effect was made in this House last session and the previous one. The

Government attempted to disprove it but it has never been successfully contradicted. I am in receipt of dozens of communications telling of the gross discrimination practised at the Humber and how outsiders are given all the choice jobs and superior positions—positions which Newfoundlanders are quite capable of filling. Newfoundlanders have been barred out in order to give place to the foreigners. I have no animosity towards foreigners coming in here just as they go in any other country; but I do say that if Newfoundland has pledged her security to the extent of ten million dollars to start an industry for Newfoundlanders, surely it is Newfoundlanders who should reap the benefit and not people from other lands. Now in the case of the Gander conditions are going to be worse, if present reports are true. I understand that before this session closes a Bill will be brought in here and in which the people who are about to operate in the Gander areas are asking for the right to export raw material. I repeat again that as far as I am concerned I feel it my duty to oppose that measure, and I have not the slightest doubt that if the Government takes a firm stand in connection with that proposed enterprise that the company will erect a mill there. I presume, however, that they have mills in the United States and Canada and that it would be much better for them to use the timber of the Gander to feed their mills abroad. That will mean that our people will cut the wood and be the slaves and get the smallest pay for their toil under the pernicious subcontracting system. If such conditions obtain, the result will be that all that valuable timber will be denuded in a few years, there will be no mill there, and Newfoundland will have nothing, but the people in Canada and elsewhere will be the richer out of our natural wealth, which is, after all, Newfoundland's heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I have not read anything in the Speech from the Throne respecting this much talked of retrenchment. That was a thing the Government used to be very strong on. They promised three years ago before they took office and since that they were going to administer the affairs of the country with the utmost economy and that they were going to cut out all useless officials. I remember distinctly that some members of the present administration claimed that the Post Office was the dumping ground for a lot of political heelers of the late administration, that two officials were doing the work of one and that as soon as they would get in power they would start weeding out in the different offices. Now I happen to have a few figures here to show how this weeding out process was carried on by the present Government. It will be interesting to know that when they came in power there were as sub-heads in the different departments sixteen officials. The Government were not in office one year when that number was increased to twenty-four officials. I have another list which shows that the number of officials in a department was increased from eighteen to twenty-four. Altogether there was a total increase of officials in the Post Office of twenty, twenty more had their salaries increased and we also find that promotions were made on the recommendation of that Commission which comprised the Finance Minister, the Minister of Posts and Mr. Berteau, Auditor General. Take the East End Post Office for instance. During the term of the Liberal administration four or five officials did the work. To-day there are eight people doing it. Three years ago eight mail clerks did the work on the main line of railway. To-day there are fifteen officials doing it. Now has the trade with the Post Office in the hand-

ling of mail matter increased to such an extent as to warrant such an increase of employees and expenditure, or is this what the Government meant by retrenchment? I am inclined to think that the present Prime Minister was no more honest than those who preceded him.

MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—We have less officials to-day than we had when I took charge and I will bring here a statement to prove my assertion.

MR. HIBBS—I shall be glad if the hon. minister will bring along that statement and noboby will be more happy to see it than myself. I have the names of the officials that I have referred to and I could read out their names to this House; but as long as the minister is prepared to bring down an official statement I shall refrain from reading the names, and, perhaps it may be that the Minister did grow a bit repentant. We were disagreeably surprised on opening day to hear from the Prime Minister that this country is to be faced at the end of the fiscal year with a large deficit. Of course, we had heard that before, but the Government press repudiated this and said it was wrong and tried to convince the people of this country that practically no deficit whatever existed. It was astounding to some of us to hear the Prime Minister admit that there would be a deficit of $1,500,000.-00 on current account together with a deficit of $750,000.00 on railway account, or a total deficit of $2,225,000.-00. Now the only person in this House who it seems is unconcerned about that deficit is Mr. Cahill because he referred to it in his speech as a modest deficit. Well, if Mr. Cahill considers that a modest deficit, I would like to know what he would call an immodest one. Certainly any man who would get up and make such a statement is not a very modest man. Now I regard the Speech from the Throne as being somewhat similar to the Budget Speech and both these documents have been abused within recent years, in my opinion. There was a time when the Budget used to give a fair outline of the country's finances and a fair estimate of the revenue and expenditure for the ensuing year, but last year's Budget estimated the revenue for 1925-26 at $10,806,283.30 and expenditure $10,744,761.00. During the recent political campaign in St. John's the "Evening Telegram" newspaper, trying to offset the argument that had been used in connection with the financial condition of the country, came out with a statement, supposed to be on the authority of the Auditor General, showing that there was a deficit at the end of that year of $81,000.00, which added to the surplus that the Finance Minister estimated last year, namely, $61,000.00 makes a total deficit, apart from the deficit on the railway of $750,000.00, of over $140,-000.00. So that in reality we had a total deficit for that year of roughly a million dollars. It shows very clearly how absolutely unreliable Budget statements are. Speaking of the year 1926-27 the Finance Minister stated here that we would have an expenditure of $9,764,394.84 and he estimated the revenue at $10,365,000.00. He estimated a surplus of $300,000.00, but according to the statement of the Prime Minister in this House on opening day this surplus has been converted into a deficit of $1,500,000.00, not including the deficit on the railway. The time has come when the country should know the truth about its financial position and if our revenue has fallen short the problem has got to be grappled with.

Now, in spite of the fact that you have increased the duties on commodities in the country 15 per cent., that is the condition to-day. You have the same vast deficit. I might name a few facts. Not only do we find taxed commodities of life, but material used by every fisherman. Take lines, twines

and such like. There was a matter brought to my notice a few days ago showing very clearly how the tariff affects other fishing implements—I refer to grapnels, anchors and other such articles used almost exclusively by the fishermen. The old tariff duty on anchors, grapnels, chains and that sort of thing was 10 per cent. The present tariff has increased it to 14 per cent. That is not the worst. Here in St. John's a few years past two or three iron working factories, we might call them, I refer to iron workers like Mr. G. Snow and Mr. Feaver, carried on, during the winter months, the work of making grapnels, and the price called for, under the tariff, made it absolutely impossible to carry on at that business.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Snow carries on his business still.

MR. HIBBS—I know he carries on business, but Mr. Browne cannot tell from walking along the street how many workmen are employed and does not know what kind of work they do. There was a time when they made grapnels in the winter. They cannot do so now.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Does the hon. member state that they are prevented from doing business by the tariff?

MR. HIBBS—What I want to point out is that the raw material is taxed 20 per cent., in spite of the fact that there is 10 per cent. to 14 per cent. still on raw material. Take a firm like Bowrings. They can import grapnels and sell them cheaper than they can be made here.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Do they pay 14 per cent. or do they pay 10 per cent.?

MR. HIBBS—The point is that the charge was 10 per cent. for raw material and it was increased from 10 per cent to 20 per cent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Do you claim that there is no protection for the local market?

MR. HIBBS—The point which I wish to make is that on account of the increase from 10% to 20% they have been unable to carry on the business.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It was 10% and is now 20%.

MR. HIBBS—Yes and when the matter of cost was figured out it was found that the business could not be carried on at all and it was impossible to find any workmen that will make grapnels. It is of no advantage to the fisherman for they can't get grapnels made at St. John's and have to buy the imported ones. Another point I would like to mention is that the duty on the whole thing has gone up 4%. I think the attention of the Minister of Finance should be called to this and ask him to give the matter his earnest consideration and I would ask the Prime Minister—as the Minister of Finance is not present—when you are going through the tariff not to fail to consider this and look into the matter and have the increase reduced down to the original duty of 10% because it will give these people a chance.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I can promise the hon. gentleman that we will look into it.

MR. HIBBS—Thank you. I have not had an opportunity to look into the report of the Board of Liquor Control as only this afternoon I glanced at it in the publication of the daily press but I notice that the revenue derived during last year show an increase in duties paid to the Commission I think something like $850,000. There is $395,675 of profit to which is added $450,000 duty, making a total of $845,000.00. I would like to ask the Leader of the Government if he will kindly state if he regards the liquor system has been a blessing to the country or the reverse.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It would hardly be a blessing to any country, I think.

MR. HIBBS—I think, I consider the Government has been committing a crime to collect $850,000.00 for liquor. It is an outrage. I am convinced that if a private individual carried on such a business he would be put in jail. The Government should take immediate steps to bring in a bill to revise the act. It is an outrage.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What would you suggest?

MR. HIBBS—Reduce the consumption, say from a bottle a day to a bottle a week. You will not require such a large staff and the expenses will consequenty be reduced and the Government will have done some good for the people of Newfoundland. You know the effect of liquor on the city and the country. You trade upon the weak minded people of the city and elsewhere and the Government reaps a profit of upwards of $845,000.00 for something we could do without. It is not a necessity, you cannot call it a luxury, because it is not. I am not a prohibition fanatic but at the same time I am not a hypocrite. Now in the report Mr. Mifflen, Chairman of the Board of Liquor Control, makes the following statements:

(Reads)

Well I want to say something about that. What right has Mr. Mifflen to use such words outside of his office and to talk that way in a report. He is making insinuations, he is casting reflections. The liquor that is sold at the controllers is not fit to sell. They are buying stuff that is worth 10c. and selling it for $1.50. It is plain profiteering. When you import such liquor and make such a vast profit off it I say it is profiteering. Most of the liquor imported by the Board of Liquor control is not good—most of the stuff that is brought into this country is not fit to drink. And then I don't think you should allow the Liquor Board to do as they please and we find so and so on the paper and we are to swallow it. During the past few months there is not any doubt but that several deaths occurred in the city of St. John's as a result of consumption of liquor, and it is reported that that liquor was purchased at the Board of Liquor Control. A well known doctor of this city made a statement a short time ago that several of his patients died as a consequence of drinking liquor. In fact, in one case a bottle of liquor was found in the bed with the patient where she lay dying.

MR. BROWNE—If you found a medicine bottle there you wouldn't say that she died of drinking medicine, would you?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —But seriously speaking, I have heard of cases where it is said that liquor has saved lives.

MR. HIBBS—That may be true in some cases but there is no doubt that most of the liquor imported into this country is bad. And it is upon the weak minded and poorest people in the country that the burden falls. You issue a report and show that you have taken out of the pockets of 80% of the people of this country the sum of $850,000.00 Then the large sum of $65,000 or thereabouts was taken from the people through the courts for fines. I would like to know how much of this sum was taken from the citizens of St. John's.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Very small proportion. Most of it was collected from the people of the West Coast for smuggling.

MR. HIBBS—Small percentage but still it was out of the pockets of the people.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —These people on the West Coast can well afford to pay.

MR. HIBBS—I do hope that the Prime Minister will make up his mind to bring in active legislation to reduce the system of a bottle a day to a bottle a week and I think I express the sentiments of this side of the

House when I say, though I have not discussed it with them, that by so doing you will be doing something worth while for the people of this country. God knows but the people may return you again some day. I noticed from the statement of the revenue in Canada, I haven't the figures here now, but by the reduction of taxation in Canada an increase in the revenue was brought about. That is brought about by the fact that when duties were lowered many commodities were purchased by the people. The people found that they could purchase more. Our profits and revenue are low because of the increased duties—it is working the other way. The question is whether it is better to pile on duties and taxes or not. Very few people are in a position to put money aside but they spend all the money they earn, over and above fifty per cent of the people at any rate. You spend every cent you have to buy the commodities and necessities of life and even they are taxed 50%.

Before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a reference to a portion of the Speech from the Throne with reference to which there has been much talking—I refer to the Highroads Commission. In my opinion the Government well realize, if not this year then in a year or so, the road policy upon which they have based their hopes has not turned out as hoped. I do not mean to knock the policy of road-making but I do intend to refer to the system. We have been too extravagant—too much money has been spent in building roads in this country. We have not expended the money efficiently. If you were to look up the expenditure in connection with the Highroads Commission to date and take an estimate of the figures you will find that no one mile of reconstruction of the roads has cost less than about $7000.00. It is out of all proportion. Then ,again, there is another instance of extravagance. An enoromus amount has been spent by the Commission for the hire of cars to take the persons in connection with the supervising over the road. Why could they not buy small motor cars instead of hiring expensive cars. In one case $3,700.00 was paid for the hire of a motor car—enough to pay for four motors cars. Why not the Highroads Commission or the Eexecutive Government arrange to purchase a Rugby or Ford Sedan for this purpose and thus save this heavy expenditure of hiring a powerful car and paying from $30 to $40 a day to drive them all over Newfoundland. They would not do that in the United States. They would regard it as extravagant. This is only one of the many instances of extravagance taking place during the past two or three years. I would like to see good roads throughout Newfoundland. When you come to make them, you find that it is a very expensive proposition. To keep these roads in repair will cost about $400 a mile, and when you come to consider the number of miles, it will be about a quarter of a million dollars to keep them. Perhaps not this year, but next year or the year after. Each succcessive year will cost more. This does not include the interest on the $2,000,000. The expenditure was $220,000 over the amount allowed. I want to know by whose authority that was done. I understand that the Act of 1924-25 allowed $2,000,000.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — An extra $160,000 was allowed.

MR. HIBBS—Still there is a difference between $220,000 and $160,000 to be explained.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—The report on the table of the House, I think, will explain that and sets it out in full.

MR. HIBBS.—I have not had an opportunity as yet to go into the Report, but, with your permission, sir,

I shall have more to say on this subject later.

One word in connection with the Dock. When we go up there we find that it is a very fine job, but when you consider the cost, it is going to be a difficult proposition to make it pay. I heard a statement made that if the Dock was filled every day of the year, 300 days, and a reasonable profit made, it would not pay.

With the tremendous overhead expense, the interest on the two and a quarter million dollars, I think it is from two and a quarter to two and a half million dollars, and running expenses of the dock, it is absolutely impossible to make it a paying proposition. I remember I was in favour of it when it was introduced. The Prime Minister pointed out that in the opinion of the experts, that it would cost from $100,000 to $500,000 to repair the old dock, and then it is the same size and he explained that we would not be much better off. We were told that the Dock could be rebuilt for about $1,080,000, and would then be capable of taking very large steamers. It looked to me as if it would be useless to spend from $100,00 to $500,000 to repair the dock when it would bring no one any good, but since for the sum of $1,080,000 the dock could be re-constructed and could become a source of revenue for the Colony, it seemed at the time advisable to proceed with the re-construction and burden us with a two and a half million dollar dock that we can never pay, and on which the people of this country must pay the interest. It shows no business foresight whatever. If every action of the Government is bringing the same returns as the dock then it is little wonder that Newfoundland is in the position that she is in at the present time. It shows that bad business management, that the present Government came into office to do away with. They have deceived the people. Now I don't propose to take up the time of this House any longer, but before taking my seat I just want to say a word or two about the dissolution of this House that was discussed yesterday. Now I feel that the Prime Minister and every member of his party is anxious to dispatch the business of this House as quickly as possible. That is what we came in here for. But at the same time every member also owes it as a duty to the country and the people who sent him here, to express himself with regard to public affairs. But if a member talks and is not listened to and his recommendations are not accepted by the Government what is the use talking.

Now I feel that the conduct of this Chamber during the next two or three months rests with the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister will be fair and reasonable not only to the Opposition but also to the country at large, and also to himself, he will give the assurance to the House that this session will be the last session of this Government unless, of course, they are returned again by the people. Nobody, as I said before, wants to embarass the Government, or to come in here and hold them up by preventing the passing of legislation. We want to co-operate with them. But we can't do that if the Prime Minister intends to hold on to office as long as he has one solitary man of a majority on his side of the House. I think it is sheer folly. He admits himself that he is not strong enough to pass drastic legislation. I presume he means by drastic legislation that is contentious. That is a frightful position for the Government to be placed in, to see their duty and not to be able to perform it. This is going to reflect down through the ages, and the Prime Minister's name will be tarnished by that. What does it matter to him whether we have an elec-

tion in the all of 1927 or the Fall of 1928, or rather the Spring of 1928. Of course it is out of the question to talk of an election in the Fall of 1928 because then we will have four or five months when this House wil be without a parliament. No matter what crisis might arise no parliament can be called. That is not constitutional.

And as it has been said so often before the spring is an unsuitable time for an election in this country. The people don't want it, and after all the people rule. The voice of the people is the voice of God. And it must be respected. What reason is there for trying to cling on to office. No one will say that the Prime Minister is trying to hold on to office for the mere salary. because we all know what sacrifices he has made in taking over this office of premier. The people want an election; why not give them an election? Nobody knows how it is going to result. Maybe he will come back again with a majority. I hope then that he will stay in for four years, and I hope that whatever government gets in that they will be able to remain for their full term of office. But under the present circumstances there is nothing else to do. The Squires Government might have stayed in office until the fall of 1923, but they choose to go to the country in the spring of 1923, because the legislation which the Government bad to pass needed a mandate from the people. They went to the country and the country sent them back again.

I heard a gentleman state the other day that the Government had the rattles in its throat. Indicating that it was on its last legs. It is sufficient to say that the Government to-day finds itself in a very awkward position. The Government has got to come in here to-day and pass legislation at the suffrance of the Opposition, because there are sufficient men on this side of the House to hold up legislation if they so choose; and Mr. Halfyard reminds me that some of the members of the Prime Minister's own party would not support him if he tried to pass any drastic legislation.

However, the Prime Minister is a very sensible man and he knows what is the best to do. Since he finds himself in a critical position, then I would say that he should take the earliest opportunity of showing this House what he is going to do, and not keep us in suspense. Otherwise the Opposition would not be inclined to assist you very much in putting legislation through. It would not be in their interests or the interests of their constituents to do it. I hope that the Prime Minister will make some definite statement in this House as to what he intends to do. On opening day he made such a statement, but I think that it would be nothing short of folly to try to hold on to office under the present circumstances.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I propose to make a few observations in regard to the subject matter now before the House for discussion. Annually we are treated with the Speech from the Throne which is supposed to contain the policy or the future policy of the Government. Before dealing with the Speech from the Throne, I feel that I should fall in line with the other gentlemen who preceded me in this debate and extend first to my friend the Minister of Public Works my very hearty congratulations on his re-election to the position of Minister of Public Works. No doubt the Minister will agree with me that the cause of his re-election did not depend so much on the popularity of the Government which constitutes the dominating factor in Newfoundland to-day, but was due principally to his own personal popularity. Secondly, I would like to extend my congratulations to Dr. Mosdell, the

newly-elected member for Fortune, who has taken up the duty once performed by the present Judge Warren. Thirdly, I feel that it behoves me to extend to my friend Mr. Brophy my hearty congratulations on his election in St. John's East. I feel that I a better prepared to extend my congratulations to Mr. Brophy in view of the fact that I personally took a prominent part in the bye-election which took place in St. John's East. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that bye-election should have taken place two years ago, and it would have taken place two years ago if the circumstances existing to-day had existed two years ago. But the Government found themselves in an unhappy predicament that unless they opened St. John's East and held a bye-election there the Government would not be a Government to-day, that unless they opened St. John's East and had a bye-election there a breach would come from within their own ranks, and I would like to draw attention of the House, and with your permission Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few short comments on the procedure leading up to the bye-election in connection with St. John's East, and during the bye-election it was stated on public platforms by those who took a prominent part on the Government side, and it was also stated in the public press which are the Government organs, that the bye-election was principally brought about by members sitting in opposition to the Government. To prove my point with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will just read a short article which appeared in the "Evening Telegram" on March 8th. The peculiar coincidence about the article is this, that March 8th happened to be my birthday, and I thought that possibly the "Evening Telegram" in an indirect way would be extending me compliments of the day.

(Reads.)

Mr. Speaker, as I read that article I take it that the Government in that paper thrown to the public and insinuates that the Opposition, the members who are sitting on this side of the House were responsible in bringing about a bye-election in St. John's East. And I tell the author of that article now through the medium of this House, that the article is a deliberate falsehood. Two years ago, in 1925, a vacancy first existed in St. John's East. A petition was presented to this House by members of the Opposition asking that this district be opened, and the Government turned it down and we let it go at that. Two years expired. I say now that if it was constitutional to open the district in 1927 why was it not constitutional to open it in 1925? The Answer was simply that whilst in 1925, in the early part anyhow, shortly after Mr. Vinnicombe got the position of Commissioner on the Board of Liquor Control, the Government had a majority in this House of 25 to 11. They were afraid to open it then. But things happened between 1925 and 1927. And they thought that after that obstacle had been put away, that they could open the district and win it hands down. Consequently the author of this article comes out and insults every member on this side of the House. And I want to tell them through the medium of this House, that this evening I am able to throw that insult back in their face because we licked them in the election in St. John's East. Why? It is just as well to tell you. Because you came into power in 1924 pledged to certain promises not one of which the Government or the members of the district of St. John's East attempted to perform. Consequently on going through the district I found nothing but broken promises from beginning to end. That, sir, is the reason why the Government to-day has been de-

feated in St. John's East. Some one may say that it was because it was that Morine was in the party. I exone:ate that gentleman to-day. Mr. Morine is not half as unpopular today as the representatives of St. John's East themselves. And I have canvassed practically every house in the district. We have been told of the tactics that took place in connection with that election.

Two articles appeared, one after another in the "Telegram" and it is quite evident that both of them were inspired by the Minister of Fnance and Customs who by the way is not here this afternoon, because the articles published co:respondence between him and the firm of which I was a member, and they would not have been published unless they had been received from his department. It was followed up the next day by an attack on one of my family who has passed away. That article is here and I am going to refer to it now. That matter is going to be b:ought to the attention of the House this afternoon. I refer to the item of $1,100 which was paid by me to the Customs and which was owed by my father. A most contemptible act to attempt to dig him out of Belvedere ,and drag him in as an influence in the election in St. John's East. The article goes one scurrilously.

(Reads.)

Mr. Speaker, the author of this article, in the person of the editor of the "Telegram," who is responsible for it because he is the editor at the present time, is a civil servant in the employ of the Government. He fills a position in the Upper House and knocks at the door three or four times a year, to summon the members of this House to the Upper House, and when he is not doing that he is dragging people who are dead and gone into disrepute, and trying to ridicule them before the public. And then we are told that this Government is decent.

This is the most indecent Government that ever took charge of affairs in this country, and there is the proof of it. If I, sir, to-morrow was in any way connected with a Government that attempted to desecrate the dead I would sever my connection with that Government immediately. My father was in politics in Newfoundlaid for thirty-five years and the least they might have done was to let him rest, when he had passed away. Mr. Speaker, I regret that on opening day I was unable to extend the usual congratulations to the Mover and the Seconder of the Address in Reply. I would be out of order if I read the speech made by the Member for Harbour Main. But I take personal objection to the last part of it. I refer to what is called there Tammany tactics. I am not quite conversant with the history of Tammany. But it is sufficient to know that Tammany is an institution composed mostly of Irishmen, and they have produced such men as the present Governor of New York State and the Mayor of New York City, and if their tactics are disreputable then the people of New York State should not ask them to continue in office. Furthermore, Governor Smith who is now running for the highest office in the United States and that is President, has always stood by the Irish race and tries to promote their welfare. I am surprised that the Prime Minister himself an Irishman by birth, allowed the hon. member to get away with that kind of a slur on the country. Then he goes on to denounce the tactics of that type of people in St. John's East.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Speaker, I did not speak of any particular people, I spoke in general, and if there is any gentleman in this House who is foolish enough to make the cap fit his own head I cannot help that.

MR. CASHIN—I am going to make the cap fit your own head. The people may be mislead sometimes. The people were misled in 1924, and I helped to mislead them, because I was a member of that administration that went to the country pledged to do certain things, and not only did they not do them when they arrived back into power, but they did quite the contrary, and now the cap fits your own head.

(Reads.)

The members of the Monroe administration have made fools and tools of the people, and the people have realised it to-day. They realised it three or four months ago, and, Mr. Speaker, I venture to prophesy that if any member of the Government ranks went back to his district to-day, outside one or two, to represent the Monroe administration, he would be driven from it. And I am sure that every member on both sides of the House will agree with me in that. Then we are told by the Prime Minister that the object of the Opposition is to obstruct and not to construct. But I will be sporty with the Prime Minister. If he can show me one constructive sentence uttered by any member of the Monroe party I will go out and let them put through their legislation without any further controversy. They talked a lot about legislation when they tried to delude, and succeeded in deluding, the people of this country in 1924.

Now we have heard a lot about deficits. I am going to spring one on the House now and I will challenge contradiction.

When I speak on deficits, I may remark, and on revenue, I feel that the Minister of Finance should be here. If he is not interested in what takes place here he might learn something by coming in here.

In 1925-26 you had a deficit of over two million dollars apart from the railway, and I can prove it, according to your own figures, and there is not a member on the Government side of the House who will contradict me, and I am going to prove it now.

According to figures tabled in this House last year and this year by the Finance Minister, according to their own figures, and if they are not correct it is the Government's fault and not mine, the deficit exclusive of railway operation for the year 1925-26 totalled the amazing sum of $2,025,-299.45. That is exclusive of railway operation. $2,025,299.45 and contradiction defied. In addition to that you have a deficit of over $700,000 on the railway.

I am glad to see the Prime Minister just coming in and I will repeat for his information what I have been saying. I stated that the deficit which you have been publishing in the papers as $81,000 on current account for the year 1925-26 is absolutely false and that the actual deficit according to figures tabled in this House by the Minister of Finance and Customs for the fiscal year 1925-26 is $2,025,299.45 exclusive of the deficit on the railway. And as I said a moment ago, contradiction defied, and according to your own figures. How do I arrive at that? In answer to a question asked by me during the last session of the House, on April 9th, 1926, the total revenue received from all sources, exclusive of the railway, from July 1st, 1925, to Dec. 31, 1925, was $4,652,807.53. And for the same period the total expenditure was $3,-789,905.00. We had a surplus then for that six months. Now in reply to a question asked there was tabled in the House yesterday by the Minister of Finance a statement showing that the total revenue from all sources, exclusive of the railway, for the period from January 1, 1925, to June 30th, 1926, amounted to the sum of $5,099,-743.75. Now having added this amount to the total revenue for the previous six months what do we find? We get

a total revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, of $9,752,551.28. That is the total revenue, according to your own figures. Now we have got to get at the expenditure for the period from Jan. 1, 1926, to June 31, 1926. We get a total expenditure on current account of $7,987,945.73. Add that amount to the total expenditure of the previous six months, that is from July 1, 1925, to Dec. 31, 1926, the amount of $3,789,905.00. Add these two amounts together and we find that the total expenditure for 1925-26 was $11,777,850.73. It is a very simple sum in subtraction now. The revenue amounted to over 9 million and the expenditure to over 11 million. Subtract one from the other and we get a deficit of $2,025,299.45.

Around this country some time ago $81,000 was published. For the same fiscal year 1925-26 the deficit on the operation of the railway on current account was $741,557.73, which gives the modest deficit for all business affairs of the country, including railway and everything else, of $2,766,857.18, and according to figures tabled by the Government in this House, I defy successful contradiction. Think then of the Prime Minister coming in here on opening day and forgetting that we have any such deficit as existed in 1925-26, and telling us that we are going to have a deficit of a million and a half. I say that we are going to have a deficit of over 3 million for 1926-27, and that makes up over six million for two or three years. $81,-000! And then we are told by the Prime Minister himself that he is unable to bring in drastic legislation. No more drastic legislation can be brought in by the present Government because as a result of their administration during two years there was lost six and three-quarter millions, practically in this country, and they have got to borrow seven millions to what they owe, to-morrow. And I make this point right here and now that my estimate is absolutely conservative and below what actually will be the amount. I am going to show how I arrive at it. You had a deficit for 1924-25 but you didn't show it. You took a bite from 1925-26 to make a surplus for 1924-25 but you can't take another bite this year and you were found out then. But I will go on in connection with the year 1926-27. In the budget speech delivered last year in the cooked budget last year, the Finance Minister estimated the revenue for the fiscal year 1925-26 at $10,069,000. Therefore we find him short on his estimate over three hundred thousand dollars. He estimated the expenditure for the same period at $10,007,000, leaving him a surplus of something like $61,000, whereas actual figures show that the expenditure was over eleven millions or he was out in his estimate one million eight hundred thousand dollars on last year's budget, or a total under estimation of two million eight hundred thousand in one year. And then we don't need any new Government and don't need anyone to tell the present administration how the finances of this country should be run. No, they know it all. Let us take the fiscal year that is going to end in two months time. We discover that the total revenue received to April 30, 1927, amounted to $6,490,961.39 while the total expenditure for the same period was $7,309,765.72 or at the end of April 1927 we are in debt with a modest deficit to the tune of $818,-804.39. Let us suppose for argument's sake that the months of May and June will give for 1927 the same amount of revenue as in 1926, then where are we going to find ourselves. We won't get the same amount but let us suppose for arguments sake that we will and we find in that case that our revenue will be $6,490,961.33 plus $2,400,450.39 or a total revenue of $8,891,411.72, then in order to estimate the expenditure let us suppose for the sake of

argument that the expenditure for May and June will be the same as for May and June last year. What do we find then? As a matter of fact we will have the additional payment this year of interest on five million dollars, but for argument's sake let us forget the interest. The expenditure for these two months was $4,435,932.36, and the expenditure up to April 30 which we must add to this was as I said $7,-309,765.72, giving us a total expenditure at the end of next June of $11,-745,698.08. Consequently we are going to get another deficit for the year 1926-27 exclusive of railway of $2,-854,286.36. Figures were tabled by the Prime Minister, here, in answer to questions asked regarding the operation of the railway up to February last year which showed a deficit of $418,830.22 and the Prime Minister estimated that $750,000 wil be lost on the railway this year. Let us say for arguments sake that only seven hundred thousand is lost. We will give them the benefit of any doubt to the extent of fifty thousand. Where are we going to be then? We will be approximately three and a half millions short on current revenue for 1926-27. Add these two years, last year and the present year, and we find that in two years the present administration have gone back six milion dollars and haven't told the Opposition anything about it but came in and said that they had a modest deficit of $81,000. I would like to know what they would call an immodest deficit. I don't need any gentleman in this House to tell me anything about the revenue of this country. Here are the figures and I defy anyone to contradict them including the mover and seconder of the address in reply. What are we going to do about it?

"What has happened since this time last year?" We left the House last year with seventeen on each side of the House exclusive of the Speaker. Since that transpired one member who sat on the Opposition side has crossed to the Government side. He did not cross. I am wrong. If he had crossed this House while it was open I would have admired him because he would have done it on principal, but he waited until the House closed and then took advantage of the fact and sneaked across after telling Mr. Hickman the previous evening in my presence that he would stand by him 'til the cows came home. Evidently the cows came home pretty early.

We have had since this House closed last year a very poor fishery and we are told in so many words that this country can no longer depend on the fisheries. The Prime Minister in his manifesto of 1924 very distinctly states that the fisheries will ever be the mainstay of the country. In 1924 the Prime Minister stated in his manifesto, which was broadcasted to the people of Newfoundland, that if conditions warranted he would be favorable to giving a bounty on fish. How that bounty was to be paid he was prepared to leave it to a Select Committee. To-day the question arises was it necessary or unnecessary for the fishermen of this country to receive a bounty on their catch of fish for the year 1926. Now let us compare the year 1926 with the year 1925 and see where we get off. In 1925 the shore fishermen caught somewhere in the vicinity of eight hundred thousand quintals and the Labrador fishermen caught about four hundred thousand quintals. The total value of these two catches would approximately be eleven million dollars, or in other words the fishermen of Newfoundland earned eleven million dollars. In 1926 the shore fishery was worth five and a half million dollars in round figures and the Labrador fishery was valued at about one and a half million dollars. That means that the fishermen of Newfoundland earned about seven million dollars for the year 1926 and it means that for that year the fisher-

men earned four million dollars less than they earned for 1925. Now did conditions arise during that period whereby the high cost of living was reduced by the Government to the extent of four million dollars? No, I think that every person within hearing of my voice this evening will admit that no such conditions arose, but that rather did the cost of living increase. Consequently, the Prime Minister, because of what he had promised in his manifesto and because of the decrease in the catch of fish last year, should have taken this matter into his serious consideration with a view to helping out the fishermen, but instead he did not even suggest or attempt anything that would in any way help to tide them over their difficulties. Rather did the Prime Minister and his colleagues slap the fishermen in the face so to speak and told them "we used you in 1924 and we are finished with you until the next general election."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I am voicing the sentiments and the feelnig of the entire electorate of this country when I say that not a single Monroe member will ever again dare look at the fishermen straight in the face when a general election comes round. If they do they deserve all that they get. Now, what happened to the fisheries of this country? Instead of encouraging them the present Government discouraged them by their Revenue Bill of 1925. The other day when Mr. Lake made a statement about lines and twines the Prime Minister told him he did not know what he was talking about. In 1925 an extra duty of fifteen per cent was put on lines and twines—ten per cent duty and five per cent sales tax. I know that to-day I can import lines and twines, provided that the duty was off, considerably cheaper than the Ropewalk people are selling them for by fourteen per cent. The other day I cabled abroad for a quotation for one hundred dozen of eighteen pound steam tarred cotton lines for handlining and eighteen lines for trawls and I got an answer for $770.00; whereas for the same article the Ropewalk quoted $900.00. Now I am not attacking that corporation because the Prime Minister happens to be a Director or a Shareholder, but I am attacking them on the grounds that that Company was making large profits prior to getting extra fifteen per cent protection, and any Company that can water its stock so frequently does not deserve encouragement at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. This Company was incorporated about twenty-eight years ago when a man received six shares for $200.00. To-day these shares are worth $2,700.00 for the $1,200.00 invested. So it figures out that if a man on the street who bought a watered stock received fifteen per cent on his investment, the original shareholders receive forty per cent. and to that fact I also defy successful contradiction. Now, sir, I consider that this is indecent legislation no matter what corporation or concern is involved. The Government is encouraging the fisheries by giving this huge sum of sixty thousand dollars a year to this Corporation as further protection and then tell the country they are having decent Government. I have heard and know something about plutocratic Government and I think the cap fits the present administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to put forward a suggestion, one which I feel will not meet with the approval of the Prime Minister. If I were in power to-morrow, I would bring in regulations regarding the exportation of salt codfish. Why? In order to keep the merchants of Water Street from becoming commercially insane. Twenty five years ago the greatest bulk of our codfish went to the different markets abroad in sailing vessels. To-day the fish go in

steamers and on which there is decreased insurance and freight rates. But the great trouble is that the steamers, each take a cargo of between twenty and thirty thousand quintals and they sail with n a week or two of each other. The whole lot of this fish is sold on consignment and practically arrive together with the result that the price slumps. What happens today if Pr nce Edward Island sends here two hundred thousand barrels of potatoes on consignment? The price would go down of course. The same applies to the price of fish or any other product, and, as I have already said, I would enforce regulations regarding the exportation of codfish in order that the markets would not be flooded l ke they are at the present time. That would tend to keep up the price rather than lower it, and the fishermen indirectly would receive the benefit from it. Now with regard to the cull of fish. A great controversy arose last year over this much vexed question and there is not a merchant on Water Street to-day who seems to know when a fish is number one or number two. They all seem to differ in their opinions, but when they are exporting the fish they do not differ. I would enforce regulations that fish should be culled because under existing rules I can buy fish as number two or three and there is no law to prohibit me from exporting it as number one and this kind of thing is being done on Water Street to-day and I know it. Now, Sir, that tends to degenerate the markets abroad and the merchants here are responsible and not the cure which the fishermen here are supposed to give it. The fisherman brings his product to the local market and tries to get the best price he can for it, and he is not to blame in the least for what happens that fish after he disposes of it. Last year it happened—what never occurred before in this country—that many fishermen who came to St. John's with their fish could not sell at any price and they had to take their cargoes home again. A fisherman's Paradise how are you? It was truly termed the other day by a member of the Opposition a fisherman's hell and I entirely concur with that gentleman's statement. It would have been much better if the Prime Minister in his speech the other day had been frank to both sides of the House and told us the truth about the financial condition of the country. if he did we would all be prepared to get together in endeavouring to bring about some constructive policy that might upright the old ship of state; but instead of that he told us that our financial condition was not half as bad as it actually is. The first paragraph of the Speech from the Throne deals with the Labrador Boundary. The question has already been ably dealt with by several gentlemen from this side of the House and it is unnecessary for me to comment on it. Some gentlemen differ as to who was responsible or who was not responsible for winning it. I say that the present administration, by accident, were in power when the decision was awarded, but this Government and the newspapers supporting them did not give one word of praise, after the award had been given, to those who had been connected with the Labrador Boundary before the present administration were thought of—I refer to the late Mr. M. W. Furlong. Mr. Furlong spent a number of years working on that case and the press never said a word about it. The only intimation of him was a letter that appeared from Ferryland district and drew attention to the fact that Mr. Furlong had done considerable with winning, but the present Government, true to their record, ignored and forgot the great deeds done by those people who have since passed away. The Government wanted to take all the credit to themselves in spite of

the fact that they were prepared to sell the Labrador territory a few years ago for fifteen million dollars. Now you have got the Labrador Boundary what are you going to do with it? We will hear from the financial papers that our borrowing powers will be enhanced by the acquisition of the Labrador, but under the circumstances will our paying qualities be enhanced to enable the fishermen to pay the national debt or would it be better if the Labrador had gone to Canada. The question now is what future Governments should attempt to do with regard to the Labrador Boundary.

During the recent by-election in St. John's East, the Prime Minister heard me, I said that if I could do it to-morrow I would let Canada have the Labrador Boundary, exclusive of the three mile limit, for the national debt of Newfoundland; and I would do so to-morrow and what would happen? You would have about $400,000.00 duty taken off and the result would be a reduction of 4 or 5 per cent. taxes, and then the Government, even the Monroe Government, would have something to feel proud of. But if we hold on to it and hold out for a price, what will be the result? What of the people of this country? Look at the present financial position. Here we are $6,000,000.00 in the hole. You could borrow money to pay that and increase the national debt. You will have to raise a loan of $8,000,000.00 if you want to have anything, and part of this amount at any rate should be placed on the local market. In reply to a letter which I received from the Minister of Finance & Customs, in which he states that it was useless to consider placing a loan on the local market because it wouldn't sell, I wish to place on record now that that statement is absolutely false and untrue. In 1918 or 1919 the Coalition Government raised a loan or two, I know there was at least one, and had no trouble to sell it. Last year $5,000,000 loan was not advertised in the public press of this country but sold, and as far as the people are concerned, was sold secretly to the Bank of Montreal at 96 and five eights and was sold on the following day in London at ninety nine. This means that $225,000 was lost to the people of Newfoundland. Why wasn't a loan of $1,000,000 at any rate raised on the local market. I know one party who was anxious to buy some of this stock and went to Mr. Paddon and he told him that they had already sold it in London and it was sold in London at ninety nine. You could get ninety nine for a loan here because of the advantages which it offers. But the people of this country were not given the chance to save the money for the country, but it was allowed to be sold to outside investors. Still you say that you are square and tell us that you are a trustworthy Government. Why, if you can point out one decent action that you have done I will take back everything I said before.

I notice that in the Speech from the Throne it is stated that the Income Tax is going to be re-imposed. That is one piece of legislation that I have advocated from the beginning. When the Tax was removed in 1924 I opposed it from the start. I opposed it on the grounds that it was class legislation. And why? In 1924 when the Bank Tax and Income Tax were removed by this administration, the Bank Tax was bringing into the revenue of the country about $125,000, or these two taxes together brought into the revenue in the vicinity of $400,000 to $500,000. And where did you get then? The Budget would not balance: it was made to balance. You had to get money somewhere, so in place of the Bank Tax and the Income Tax there were taxes put on all the commodities of life—lines, twines, tobacco, clothes and everything else

that is used by the common people of the country and still you find yourselves $6,000,000 short, and you come in here with long faces and first tell us, in so many words, that you are up against it, then plead for mercy and then tell us untruths regarding the finances of this country. The Auditor General's Report, Mr. Speaker, is a farce from beginning to end. That is one department that, under the existing circumstances, should be wiped out because it is its duty to tell the correct financial position of the country, and that it has not done.

The Government intends to have the Income Tax re-imposed. I am in favour of the re-imposing of that tax in this form and subject to the condition that you do not tax the man with a salary of $2,000.00 and a family—start with $2,500.00 and upwards. These are the men that you should collect from—somewhere in the vicinity of $400,000.00. The Dominion Government of Canada for Income Tax alone has added $57,000,000 to the revenue of the country. What we want is not to bring about this class distinction. The Government of a country should be of, by and for the people, and instead of that we have a crowd of plutocrats.

It is a fact that during the recent by-election in the East End, the Government sent into the out-lying fishing settlements and told the inhabitants that unless they voted for the Government candidate that they would get no supplies this year. A clean Government, how are you. Why, it is enough to sicken any decent man —to keep him from going into public life again. Actually sent agents into these fishing districts of Newfoundland and said that.

That reminds me of the Besco Contract. The contract which the Prime Minister himself says he never saw. He read his speech when introducing it to the House last year and still he says that he never saw it.

At the present juncture it will be impossible to go into details in connection with this matter because one is accused of obstructing legislation. There is no legislation here to obstruct. Up to the moment, and after the legislature was called together to face the country this year there was no legislation drawn up. You opened the House three months after it should have been opened. You opened it at that late date because it suited you, politically.

In the Fall of last year when your candidate was defeated in Fortune Bay the challenge to open up the East End was not accepted. And when it was announced in March that the by-election was to take place April 21st, no legislation had been gotten ready. You went down to ignominious defeat and suffered condemnation at the hands of the people. You went into this District in 1924 and made all sorts of promises which you have not attempted to carry out and this is the result. The people are having none of it.

If I was employed in the service of the Prime Minister for four years and stipulated that provided I carried out my duties in an honest and trustworthy way my employ was secured for four years, and if I fell down on the job what would he do with me? He would fire me.

The Prime Minister and his Government have fallen down on the job. They went to the country in 1924 and made elaborate promises which they told the people that if they were elected to office they would carry out. But they have failed. Why, they have not attempted to carry out one promise contained in their elaborate manifesto. Expenditure and taxes have increased, and the Prime Minister is going to have to contend with an increased expenditure of a quarter of a million more, and what is he going to do about it? Does this Government want to stay there, or is this

the reason for the present administration staying there. May be there is some reason and I would like to hear it. The only reason that the Prime Minister threw out on opening day was: "I have found out that it is a difficult job to clean up, but I consider that we are as good as you fellows over there. We are going to stay here and we are not going to give them the Government." I want to ask him who asked him for the Government? I would not take it as as it stands at the present time. The present Government is in the greatest financial mess and I make this statement that there are a great number in it to-day who don't know and don't care. And I will assert that the statement made here this evening was unknown to any member outside the Executive Government, the statement concerning the financial conditions of this country.

Let us take the loan that was raised here last year. What happened to it? And then you brought in an item that you will not have to pay for the next twenty years, perhaps not even then. You brought in a loan bill for five million dollars and it was voted for specific purposes.

(Reads)

Reference to this Railway purchase loan will show you that you did not know what you were talking about, because the railway purchase loan is this, that when the loan bill went through this House for a $2,000,000 guarantee of bonds, we were told that these bonds could be raised in sterling or in our own currency. These people took the position afterwards that they would be raised in sterling on the other side. And each year it depends on what the sterling pound is worth as to what interest will be paid on it. And they came in here and had a great hurrah about this.

The Labrador Boundary question had taken $75,000, and that I suppose has been taken out of the million dollars voted for Public Works. Mr. Speaker, when we voted for that Bill last year we were given to understand that the amounts voted were to be devoted to specific work. The Colonial Secretary was asked that a sum of money equivalent in proportion to what my district was entitled to be allocated, and it was turned down. The excuse was that it had been received through the avenue of the High Roads Commission. But when that money was voted there we were told in this House that recommendations were going to be considered from the representatives of the various districts, as to how that money was going to be spent in the various districts. That was ignored once those doors were closed. Some districts got it. Burgeo and La Poile did not fare off bad. It was easy to know that there was a by-election in the air. That district received between fifteen and twenty thousand dollars. Five or six thousand dollars was spent on snow shovelling in St. John's East.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—And $90,000 in the city.

MR. CASHIN—But where is the balance. What is the proper routine when moneys are voted in that way in this House. Accounts should be opened for these various works, and the money spent after the loan has been raised should be charged in these accounts, which is not done. The only excuse is that it has been done by previous Governments. And then they talk about carrying out the affairs of the country. in an honest, industrious and intelligent manner. I say now sir, without fear of contradiction that no minister of the Crown at the present time knows the first thing about the management of the affairs of this country. Surely they would not give me as an example of a good business man, the Finance Minister who estimated a surplus last year of $61,000 and it turned out to

be a deficit of $3,000,000, and for the previous year he estimated a surplus and he had a deficit of nearly another $3,000,000. Now, Sir, with regard to this revenue and expenditure, and there are few members in this House that have followed this matter up as closely as I have. That is one big thing that I have followed up very closely since I became a member of this House. I have asked peculiar questions in peculiar ways in order to check up and find out whether the sums are correct. And I make that statement again, and I make it with regret, that this country is in a financial mess. If so why does not the Prime Minister and the Government come in here and lay the facts before us, and say "It is up to you to help us." But instead of that the Prime Minister came in here the other day and told the members of this side of the House that they were obstructionists, and were hindering the promotion of legislation on this side of the House. Who has hindered the progress of the country during the past three years? Who has brought about the conditions of affairs where we have a $6,000,000 deficit to-day to face? I am going to tell you.

When you came into power in 1924 you had a dificit of one and a half millions to pick up. You picked it up out of a loan. Then you borrowed $6,000,000. You have to pay five or five and a half per cent. on that. That is over $300,000 more interest annually. Last year you borrowed another $6,000,000. That is another $300,000. Every year since you have been in office you have been borrowing money. Last year you borrowed $5,000,000. That means another quarter of a million interest, which makes over one million dollars in interest alone since you came into power. This year you will have to borrow another seven or eight millions at five per cent. According to the figures before us to-night there has been a public expenditure of one and a half million dollars for three years. And the revenue has decreased accordingly. And why? Because every member of this House will agree with me when I state that people buy goods when the market is down. When the prices are up then they buy just sufficient to keep body and soul together. And the people are not purchasing as they did before the new tariff came into existence, and that is why the revenue is gone down and the expenditure is gone up.

Now as regards Besco. One would gather from this Speech from the Throne, that it was the Government to whom the credit was due for having made a contract with Besco this year. As a matter of fact they only renewed a contract that has been going on for years. Besco would not have kept that mine open if they could not sell the products of that mine. But with regard to the Besco contract it was a most iniquitous contract.

The Executive Government brought a Bill into this House, but a vote of want of confidence was passed on them by their own Party and the Bill was thrown out. Then there was a Bye-Election in St. John's East and during which attempts were made by the Government to threaten the miners of Bell Island. The Government told them through their press that unless Barter was elected there would be no more work at Bell Island and they thought the miners were gullible enough to swallow it. The Government had nothing whatever to do with that contract, but they evidently forget the fact that Besco to-day is in the hands of a liquidator and that any contract they make with Besco is made with a defunct Company and not worth the paper it is written on. Still the Government are prepared to give all kinds of concessions to Besco any day. Why? Is it because they get a

superior article of coal? No, because there is nothing worse than the coal that they purchase from Besco. The Prime Minister told us that their coal contains six per cent. ash. I contend it is more like twelve per cent. ash, and to supplement my statement ask the engineers and firemen of the locomotives and coastal steamers. Still we have the Government stating that they are going to stay here and continue that class of iniquitous legislation and giving away the taxapayers money. Now I maintain that the railway, sir, if properly handled and efficiently and economically operated, can pay this year, notwithstanding the fact that it was $400,000.00 short at the end of February and that $50,000.00 was thrown away a few days ago on coal to supply the railway. Now what have the Government done to improve the railway? They re-railed the first division to Clarenville and I must say we did not get too good a bargain in the purchase of those rails. The ones you are getting from Besco are not too desirable either, and it would be advisable to see that they are properly inspected. The steamboats get a subsidy of between $350,000 and $400,000 for operating for the Post Office, and last year they only showed profits of about $20,000.00; whilst yesterday passenger rates for fishermen going north were increased by fifty per cent. Only this morning I met a man at my office. He said that last year it cost $7 for a man to go to the Groais Islands and to-day he said it cost him $10.20 per man. Still yesterday the Prime Minister could not tell Mr. Scammell whether that kind of thing had been going on or not. I feel, Sir, that the Minister of Finance and Customs owes to this House and to this country to come here and attend to the debates of this House. I want to give him a few lessons, and if he refuses to come in here now probably he will refuse to come in here if a vote is taken. I want to knock in his head the large deficit that exists. I hate to be saying anything behind a man's back that I would not say to his face. I take it now, Mr. Speaker, that he is afraid to come in. Well, I am going to wait until he does come, supposing we stay here until Christmas. It is a lovely state of affairs when a Finance Minister is either ashamed or afraid to come into the House, and still you want to continue your degrading legislation. In my opinion, if the members of the Opposition did what was right they would not allow an item of legislation to be touched until the Finance Minister is told the truth, and if he does not come to hear it we should leave our seats and let the Government do as they like. As long as the Finance Minister can sit outside in the Government room and play cards I intend to stand here reading books until he puts in an appearance. I want to tell the country the correct financial position, although the Finance Minister is the one supposed to do it. When I criticized last year's Budget the Prime Minister called me a financial wizard, but neither he nor any of his party can sneer at me to-day because they are not able to do it and because they know that what I said of last year's Budget is unfortunately only too true. It is very evident, Mr. Speaker, that the Finance Minister is not going to be asked to come into the House and it is evident that my request has been ignored, and I will leave it to those who are in the House at the present time to take notice that the Finance Minister is too cowardly to come in and hear the truth. I realise that the Government has taken a defiant attitude towards my remarks. Why? Because I helped to trim them from the big chief down. I presume the Finance Minister will be in his seat to-morrow and I will be here too and I intend to repeat to-morrow what I have said this afternoon. I have a

lot more to say but I am not going to say it while he is absent from the House; but I am going to say that he inspired that article that appeared in the "Evening Telegram" against one not able to defend himself, and also threatening that if I said anything derogatory to the Government to-day that other stuff would be dragged up against me. They can drag up all they like for what I care. I am here now and the Finance Minister is afraid to face me. He would be in the same position if he were facing someone in an election in St. John's West. We were told in the bye-election in St. John's East that some of us were too cowardly to face a Government on a platform. I do not know whether the Prime Minister would say that to-day or not because I think he and his party got their medicine in that fight. If I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I say that the present administration are the most dishonest bunch that ever took office in this country, and as such should be immediately thrown out, not by the Opposition but by the people of the country as a whole, because they are absolutely incapable of transacting the affairs of the country. They have made an ignominious mess of Newfoundland. A few years ago this country was in fairly good circumstances, comparatively speaking, but the present Government came into power and deliberately went to work and used their positions for their own personal advantage. It is very easy to see why the Government do not want at the present juncture to go to the polls and ask the people of Newfoundland for a free entry and a further lease of life. They feel now that by sitting still and saying nothing while Finance Minister is afraid to come in here they will tire us out. The Prime Minister made an assertion to that effect the other evening. But two can play that game. They ought to be proud of themselves to know that their Finance Minister is afraid of a poor little creature like me. I wish they had to bring him to Bell Island. There are people in the Government who are laughing at me to-day, but they have every reason to cry in some respects. The people who are laughing were behind the "Evening Telegram" in their attack, and that paper should be the last in Newfoundland to attack that gentleman. But stabbing in the back is all they are able to do. We were sneered at last year in this House by the Minister of Justice retorted that the Opposition candidate would be snowed under. I want to tell the Minister of Justice now that he and his associates did not know how to run a campaign. The results showed it, but the Minister did not figure that out. Why? He was afraid to open the district in 1925 or last year, but he waited until 1927 to do it, and even then it was not through his good wishes it was opened. It was done when he was forced to open it and his Finance Minister was betting against him at the end of the campaign. In moving the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker, I promise the Finance Minister that, whilst I am only half finished with him, I will give him a good many lessons before I am through.

On motion the debate was adjourned to to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Friday, May 27th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 27th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Scammell, from La Scie, re a telephone line.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Randall gave notice of question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, when the debate adjourned last evening I was speaking to the House with regard to the deficit on revenue for the year 1925-26 and for the year 1926-27. The Minister of Finance and Customs did not see his way clear to attend and listen to my remarks, but I see this evening that he is present, so I propose for his benefit to reiterate some of the statements that I made yesterday. We notice in the Speech from the Throne delivered here on May 11th a paragraph dealing with a deficit which reads as follows:

(Reads: "There will be a deficit on current account, etc., ...to cotton."

The Speech then goes on to say what methods the Government may take in order to try, or not to try, as the case may be, to offset that deficit. During the recent bye-election in St. John's East assertions were made on the public platform, as a matter of fact I personally made them, that there would be a deficit on current account of over three millions. Today I propose, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to read to the House a letter inserted in the Evening Telegram and signed by Sir John Crosbie, Minister of Finance and Customs, in which he states that the deficit on current account for 1925-26 was only $81,896.51, and I make a statement here now that that statement is false and I propose to prove it. With your permission, sir, I will read parts of this letter.

(Reads)

It is unnecessary for me to go much further with that letter, but I recommend that statement made by that famous British statesman to the very earnest consideration of the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs and the Members of the Monroe Administration. As I mentioned the letter states that the deficit was $81,000 and odd, and I make the statement here now without fear of successful contradiction that the actual deficit exclusive of railway amounted to $2,025,299.45 for that year, and I shall prove it by the Minister of Finance's own figures tabled in this House. So I propose to reiterate my statements of yesterday for that gentleman's consideration. According to figures tabled by the Minister of Finance and Customs the deficit as I said a moment ago reached the amazing amount of $2,025,299.45, made up as follows. In answer to questions asked by me on April 9th, 1926, which answer I have kept since last year, the total revenue for the six months of the last half of 1925 amounted to $4,652,807.53 and the total expenditure to $3,789,905.00. Consequently we had a surplus for that six months. In reply to a question on the order paper of the opening day of this House I was informed that the total revenue from all sources exclusive of railway from January 1, 1926, to June 30, 1926, amounted to $5,099,743.75. Add that five million and odd to the total revenue for the previous six months of the last half of 1925 and you will get your gross revenue which I may say is correct according to the Auditor General's statement in the Minister of Finance's letter, that is $9,752,551.28. Now for the period from Jan. 1 to June 1926 the total expenditure on current revenue was $7,987,945.73. These figures were tabled in this House by the Finance Minister himself and in spite of that this letter appeared to attempt to mislead the people of the country. Now we will go further. For the period from Jan.

1 to June 30, 1926, the total expenditure was seven millions odd as I said, and we add to this the total expenditure of the previous six months, and we get the gross expenditure on current account for the fiscal year 1925-26, that is $7,987,945.73 plus $3,789,-905, or $11,777,850.73.

The Auditor General knows to-day that that statement is incorrect and the Finance Minister knows that that statement is incorrect.

We found that the gross revenue was $9,752,551.28. We therefore get a deficit exclusive of railway mind you, by subtracting this nine millions and odd from the eleven and odd expenditure of $2,025,299.45. The railway lost for the fiscal year 1925-26 $741,557.73, and so we get a gross deficit on all business affairs of the country for the fiscal year 1925-26 of $2,766,857.18, and and I defy the Minister of Finance and the Auditor General and any other general responsible to the present Monroe administration to contradict it. The Finance Minister in his budget speech last year estimated the revenue for the fiscal year 1925-26 at ten million and sixty nine thousand. He estimated the expenditure at ten million and seven thousand, and I think he is a little short in his estimate regarding the expenditure. His estimate would leave a surplus of somewhere around 61,000. The Finance Minister's figures show that the gross expenditure was over eleven millions, or he was out in his estimate one million eight hundred thousand on last year's budget, or a total underestimate of two million eight hundred thousand approximately.

Let us take the fiscal year ending June 30th a month and a half from now. We have been told that the total revenue received to April 30th, 1927 was $6,490,961.33, and the total expenditure for the same period amounted to $7,309,755.72. At the end of April therefore you had a deficit of $818,794.39. You have another two months to go from that. For the sake of argument to judge where we will be let us say that you will get the same revenue and have the same expenditure as last year. There will be more expenditure amounting to two hundred and fifty thousand dollars interest on your loan last year, but I will give you the benefit of the doubt. We find then, calculating on that basis, that your revenue will be $8,891,411.72 and your total expenditure $11,745,-698.08. Therefore you will have a deficit for the year 1926-27 exclusive of railway of $2,854,286.36. On opening day of this House the Prime Minister stated that he estimated the loss on railway for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, would be approximately $750,000. I am going to take fifty thousand off and make it seven hundred thousand. Add that to the $2,-854,286.36 and we find we are going to get a deficit for 1926-27 of approximately $3,554,286.36. That is a modest deficit. There is a modest deficit of over six million in two and a half years. I feel that a thorough investigation of the work of the Government and of our present state of affairs should be held at the present time and at once because they have deceived and attempted to deceive the people. I defy the Minister of Finance and Customs to deny my statements, and I will ask him directly now, through you Mr. Speaker , if these statements are correct or incorrect?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—They are absolutely untrue.

MR. CASHIN—I say that according to your own figures.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — It doesn't make any difference what you say.

MR. CASHIN—I say that that deficit is correct according to your own figures and I will prove it. If the Auditor General's report of the revenue agrees with mine, it proves that

I am correct there. But in order to show a small deficit the expenditure of one month was withheld and let go into the next year and the Auditor General's report tabled in the House these days is a mere farce because it doesn't show a correct statement of the country. I put it to you that if an ordinary business man hired an auditor who found out that a book-keeper was doing something that could be regarded as crooked with the books, then the Auditor would be in just as bad a position as the man who did cook the books. The Minister of Finance knows and the Prime Minister knows that my statements are correct, and this letter, under the signature of the Minister of Finance, published on April 13th, was done in an attempt to deceive the people of this country, the same as the Prime Minister's Manifesto of 1924, and they did not get away with it this time. Then we find that same paper, at the instigation, I might say, of the Minister of Finance, attacking people who have long since passed out of the world.

HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not happen to be in the House yesterday, but I heard that the honourable gentleman, speaking, remarked that there appeared in the Evening Telegram certain communications instigated by me. I state that is untrue, and I ask him to withdraw.

MR. CASHIN—What I stated is true, because there appeared correspondence between the Finance Minister and the firm with which I am connected, and that could not be got otherwise but through him.

HONOURABLE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That correspondence was tabled in the House last year, and I think you will find it in G. N. Read, Son & Watson's report.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—The Honourable Minister of Finance has denied the allegation made by the honourable member for Ferryland, and he will therefore withdraw his statement.

MR. CASHIN—I regret that, while I might have to withdraw my statement to be in order here, the impression created in my own individual mind cannot be changed. To continue with my remarks regarding the deficit, I should have stated that I hope and trust that before this Assembly closes, it will take the necessary steps to bring before the Bar of this House the Auditor General of this country and ask him to lay the bald facts before the members of the House. Now, I am going to prove beyond the shadow of a doubt, according to the figures tabled by the Minister of Finance, what I have been stating that that $81,000 is incorrect. Here are his own figures. Last year on April 8th, 1926, in reply to a question of mine on the Order Paper, the total revenue from July 1st to 31st December, 1925, was $4,652,807.53, and the total expenditure for the same period was $3,789,905.00. The other day I asked a similar question directed to different months, and here are the Minister of Finance's own figures, and I will read them month for month, and I will ask any individual member of the House to take them down, if he should wish to do so, and see for his own benefit if I am correct or incorrect.

(Reads: Revenue and Expenditure for months of January to June, 1926).

Now, from my question last year, $4,652,807.53 was the total revenue for the half year previous to that. We now find that the total revenue from January to June, 1926, by adding up the amounts on the statement I have just read, was $5,099,743.75. By adding these two amounts, we find our total revenue to be $9,752,551.28, and that is correct, as stated by the

Auditor General. Now the total expenditure of these same six months, from the statement I have read, comes to $7,987,945.73. We add to that $3,789,905.00, the expenditure for the previous six months, which we got in an answer to a question tabled by the Finance Minister last year. The total expenditure for the year is then $11,777,850.73, and then subtracting the amount of the revenue, we find the deficit of $2,025,299.45, and I state that and defy contradiction, or else the Minister of Finance has ben tabling incorrect formation in this House, and if the Minister of Finance gets up now and says that he has tabled incorrect information in the House, I will take back all I have said with regard to his incorrect statement of defiicit, so it is one thing or the other. Now, while the Honourable Minister is in his seat, I would like to remind him of the fact that last year there was passed a Loan Bill of $5,000,000, to be spent in various ways, and to be devoted to various purposes, and I say it was spent illegally and wrongfully by the present Executive Government, and I might say that at the time that Loan Bill was being put through I strongly advocated on the floors of this House that at least one million should be put on the local market in this city. In reply to a question, asked the other day, the Minister of Finance said that considerable difficulty had been encountered previously in placing other loans in Newfoundland, and consequently he did not attempt to place any of it on the local market. I don't know what time the difficulty was encountered on the local market. I think during the Coalition Government the Loan was underwritten in a couple of weeks. We have $28,000,000 in the Savings Bank, which would be as safe in Government Bonds paying 5 per cent. as it is in the Bank at 3 per cent. This Loan was not advertised as is usual and as it should have been.

But this loan which was raised last year was sold, as far as the people were concerned, secretly, to the Bank of Montreal at ninety-six and five-eighths, and they sold it in London for ninety-nine, an increase of two and three-eighths, which multiplied by five million comes to between $120,000 and $125,000. The people of this country were not given the chance to save that money for the country, but it was put into the hands of the Bank for whose benefit the bank tax was removed in 1924. We were told by the Prime Minister at the opening day of this session that they intended to carry on, and would not give up the reins of office because the Opposition were not fit to take it. I say without hesitation that any party would be more capable of looking after the affairs of any country than they are. In view of the existing desperate condition of affairs, financial and otherwise, it is time we got together and see what can be done, show up the present state of affairs, have the cold facts laid on the table of this House, and make them tell the Opposition members the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the finances of the country. In spite of that, they come in here, and have to raise a loan within the next two months for at least a sum of $7,000,000. And why? Because you are $6,000,000 in the hole. You may have one and a half millions to your credit, which brings it down to $5,000,000, but judging by the way things are managed, there must be a number of outstanding bills to pay, and you will have to come in here and ask for a loan to pay these bills, which it should not be necessary to do, if you had carried out the promises which you made when you came in in 1924.

Let us look over their record, and show them up in the true light. I was a member of the Monroe Govern-

ment in 1924, and we brought in an elaborate Speech from the Throne, and promised wonderful legislation. We were going to take off the Income Tax. Off of whom, you ask. Was it off the fishermen? No, it was off the wealthy merchants of Water Street. Very well. We carried on for a year, then it was discovered that we had no money to pay our bills, and we said we have got to put on extra taxes. We took up the tariff, and, as one of the Ministers has said, we would have to eat it before we could understand it. Even the Minister of Finance did not understand it. There was 15 p.c. on lines and twines, extra duty on tobacco, and two cents a pound on oleomargarine and butter; extra duty on clothing, and on every other article needed absolutely by the common people to enable them to live. These taxes were put on to reduce the deficit caused by dropping the Income Tax and Bank Tax.

MR. BROWNE—We did not take off the Income Tax that year. The Income Tax was taken off in 1925.

MR. CASHIN—I may be incorrect in the year, but I am not incorrect in principle. In the first year we discovered we could not balance the budget, and as I said just now, we put a tax of 15 per cent. on lines and twines, two cents a pound on butter, extra tax on tobacco, clothing, and everything necessary to enable the common people to live. And what happened? Under the existing circumstances the common people found it difficult almost to live, and consequently had to cut their garment according to the cloth, and do without necessities of life in many cases, and live on a decreased scale by not buying as much goods, for the simple reason that the prices had gone up too much. If they had not removed the Income Tax they would not be in such a mess, because they would have collected one and one-half million dollars from that source in a year and a half. Now let us see the consequences. I may tread on the corns of the Prime Minister, because he may be a director or shareholder of the Colonial Cordage Company, but that is not my concern. The tariff put a duty of 15 p.c. on lines and twines which is an additional 15 p.c. protection for the Colonial Cordage Co.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You acknowledged yesterday there was a Sales Tax, why go over the same ground again?

MR. CASHIN—Yes, I am going over the same ground again. I am going over it every day, until the tax on lines and twines is taken off, because I don't consider it is right. For now the people who invested money in that concern are reaping the benefit. For example, a person who has six shares paid $1,200, and they are now worth $2,7000. This concern can put watered stock on the market and pay a dividend of 35 per cent. or 40 per cent., and still we had to give them an extra 15 per cent. protection. Let us look at the Butetrine Factory. The Minister of Finance knows all about that. An extra protection of two cents a pound, added to the previous four cents, made it six, and we consume six million pounds a year. At two cents a pound the profit will be $120,000. This much is divided between three Butterine Factories, making $40,000 each from the pockets of the taxpayers, from the poor and common people, and I am correct when I say that it is a class legislation Government, undoubtedly and undeniably so. Although the Minister of Finance and Customs did not control one of these factories, he got in the business since, and I notice that nearly every public institution in this country is supplied by his factory. He supplied between $16,000 and $17,0000 worth to the railway last year, and the other factories did not supply $5,000 worth. I imagine there would be a lot of but-

ter sold, but the Minister of Finance and Customs might thank the Government for the extra two cents a pound. Let us look at another industry, the Tobacco Factory, and let us see what protection they are receiving. Thirty million cigarettes are used in Newfoundland a year, and there is a protection of five cents a hundred on them, or $150,000 a year, which was put on by the Government, and why? Fifty per cent. of the capital stock is out of the country, and provides an easy catch for American capitalists. Secondly, because a company which has watered its stock during the past three years, and can pay a dividend of 23 per cent. to 33 per cent., should not be given protection by any Government. It is the people who are fleeced—taxes are to be paid by those who are not capable of paying them to enrich those who do not require it. These are facts which cannot be contradicted. The same thing applies in practically every institution in which the present administration is interested. The members of the Board of Works take all the patronage to themselves. I find that Mr. Whiteway received $35,000 during the past year, that Mr. Gould was well paid for his services in connection with the by-election and received, in addition to his salary as a member of the Board, something like $3,435, and he has not got an office or a shop, but goes somewhere and buys goods and sells them and makes a profit. Then the large firm of Ayre & Sons, on account of Mr. Ayre's presence on the Board, has made directly $17,000 or $18,000 during last year. It is clear, because they are receiving direct or indirect patronage, and that is the reason why the present Government did not wish to face the people whom they had so deceived.

With regard to the fisheries. I want to impress upon this House that it is most important that the present or future members of this House see to it that proper regulations, which have to be made law, are introduced, otherwise we shall have to forget that there is such an industry as the fishery. We speak of several new industries which may crop up, but even if all these industries are started to-morrow, the people who will derive a living from them will number about 50,000, and the remainder of about 200,000 people will have to depend on the results of the fisheries. It is our duty, and the duty of the Government in power to give some attention to the matter, and at least to see that that great industry is not neglected, and the only way is to go into the matter and attack it from this standpoint, not thinking of how many you harm, but how many you serve. You may harm ten or twelve. How many are you going to relieve? The present administration was ardently backed up by the merchants on Water Street. Why? Because they knew that when they did everything possible to keep the Government in power that they would help them. They adopted filthy methods in their treatment of the people of this country. I refer to one particular. During the recent by-election in the East End, Mr. Berrigan of James Baird, Ltd., and Baine Johnston Co., Ltd., went into the fishing settlements and told the people that unless they voted for the Government they would get no supplies this summer. You would think they gave supplies for the good of their health. These are some of the filthy methods adopted by the supporters of the Monroe Government.

I have been accused, Mr. Speaker, of attempting to draw the line between the two classes. I absolutely repudiate that statement. I believe that capital is the child of labour, and unless both go hand in hand and work for the common good, there will be no prosperity in any country. But when you have dissatisfaction, and the people write to you to do some-

thing to break the present Government, there is something rotten somewhere. It would not be for my interests alone to break the Government, it is the people who put me here, who put every member here, that are bawling to do something to break this iniquitous Government. To-day you find yourselves up against it. You are faced with a proposition which is very difficult to handle. We have had men come here to the Bar of this House to ask for work. I have not heard, but Dame Rumour has told me, that the Government has passed the responsibility over to the Council; but I would say this, that I blame the Monroe Government for the present state of affairs. I blame them for having so many unemployed all over the country. Why? Because they have not attempted to carry out their promises. On the contrary. When they came back to power in 1924, if they had tried to attend to business, to say no, and mean no, and say yes, and mean yes, we would have found a different state of affairs. But they seem to understand every other word in the dictionary but the words "yes" and "no,"" and the result is, they are in the present predicament. There is one thing that I pride myself upon, in being able to say "yes" and mean "yes," and say "no" and mean "no," and I have said that is the reason of the defeat of the Government in the recent by-election in St. John's East. In 1924 the Government candidates made all sorts of promises to the people, but they have fallen down on the job, and the consequence was that they did not return their member. The gentleman cannot complain, however, as the tabled accounts show that he has received the sum of $5,500 and has not gone altogether unrewarded.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Did you say that information was tabled.

MR. CASHIN—Yes, it has been tabled.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to see it substantiated.

MR. CASHIN—That is not difficult. He received $1,500 from the $1,000,000 which should have gone to repair the roads in Ferryland, and he received $4,125 as Supervisor of Construction at the Hotel, making a total of $5,625. He was well paid for being a Government candidate for the East End. I am sorry, Mr. Prime Minister, that you were not aware of the fact. There seems to be a lot going on in your Government which you do not know anything about. You have to come to the House to find it out.

Now that the Minister of Public Works has returned, I will repeat what I said just now about his department. I never say anything behind a man's back that I will not say before his face. The members of the Board of Works have been using their positions this year to get Government patronage for themselves. I refer particularly to Mr. Whiteway, Mr. Gould and the firm of Ayre & Sons.

But they paid them $96,000 or $97,000 out of that amount and we found that their associates benefited considerably. And the sum of $7,500 was paid to Mr. Tait for his services in the United States in connection with tourist work. In Mr. Halfyard's district they only gave him back the four thousand dollars that they took from him last year. Now I wonder if it is not out of order if the Hon. Minister could tell me where the balance of that money is at present.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I could not tell you.

MR. CASHIN—I do not want to be personal, Mr. Speaker, but I think that it is an awkward position for the Minister of Public Works to be in to have to say that after he has been given one million dollars and after paying $75,000 to lawyers he does not know where the balance is.

Before this House closes, Mr. Speaker, I propose to put a question on the

order paper, and it will be rather interesting, asking that the Ministers of the Crown place on the table of this House all the petitions that have been presented to them by members of both sides of this House since they came into power. I imagine that it will be a very hard job, and they will probably have to hire a couple of taxi companies to carry them up here, if they are not already destroyed.

I noticed in the public papers of a few weeks ago that a death had occurred and that the blame had been laid at the door of bad liquor. I asked the Minister of Finance and Customs if the present liquor commission had mixed smuggled rum with imported rum, and the answer was that they had not. I make the statement today, Mr. Speaker, that they have mixed it. And before this House closes I propose to find out the necessary means of bringing that commission to the Bar of this House to answer for that. Why, Mr. Speaker, in other countries to-day, if a man died on account of bad liquor, the person who sold him that liquor or was responsible for selling it, would be arrested on a charge of manslaughter. During the time that the saloons were in vogue in this town, if a man died on account of bad liquor, why the owner of the shop that sold him that liquor would be arrested on a charge of manslaughter the following day. I understand that the authorities have made an investigation attempting to find out who did sell that unfortunate man bad liquor. They canont succeed. There is only one conclusion to be drawn. The responsibility for the sale of that bad liquor lies with the liquor commission, because I say and I can prove it, and I am going to prove it now that they have mixed bad liquor with good liquor. I propose to give an analysis, which by the way I did not receive in this House. But I have interested myself sufficiently in this case to find out things regarding that aggregation down there. Here is the proof. This is the report of a British analyst in England of samples that were sent over by me.

(Reads.)

Is not that sufficient proof from an expert in England that that liquor was dickered with. And they are mixing it to-day, and that is not all that is going on there. Questions have been asked regarding the samples of liquor that have been imported or sent into this country. What became of them? But it would be interesting if the commission were brought up here and made to tell who received these samples. And I propose before this House closes to bring them up here and make them tell it. We were told the other day that the sample bottles were only small. In answer to a question I was informed that some of them were 26 ounces, imported in cases and distributed in case lots. And the Liquor Control Department went so far itself as to play politics. They ordered the employees to vote for Barter in the by-election in St. John's East. A commission that is supposed to be non-political. I want to tell them now that it is all politics. If I were in power to-morrow I would use every effort to annihilate them. They don't know their jobs to begin with. While they have made huge profits they should have been considerably more. I propose now to give them a few hints . I would like the Prime Minister and his Cabinet to listen to them and to recommend them to Mr. Miffiin, who seems to be the autocrat in charge of that department. There is somewhere around 50,000 bottles of rum consumed in this country annually, and on each bottle there is a wrapper, on which you pay twenty cents each. There is a chance to make $10,000 a year. Wipe them out because they are discarded as soon as they are bought. One thousand bottles go to the outports. They get

extra protection—twenty-five cents each. There is another $25,000 you could save. There is $35,000 you could save without going any further into the administration of that department. And then they tell us that they are doing everything in their power to cut down expenditure and increase the revenue. Why it would make a person sick to come in here and listen to the Government talking about what they have done and that they have done the best they could; when, as a matter of fact, they have done absolutely nothing and now all they are doing is trying to take out something else.

Yesterday I proposed to deal with the Address in Reply, and I got mixed up in financial troubles. I only half finished it. I was commenting on the first part of Mr. Cahill's speech, which reads—

(Reads.)

All of which the present administration are guilty of. He told me that the cap evidently fitted him, but I made the cap fit him.

(Reads.)

I agree with him in that respect. And I am going to say here now that the present Government or their agents during the recent by-election in St. John's East offered money for votes. They went from one hundred dollars to ten dollars. A hundred dollars was the highest they offered, and they did not even come down to the simple dollar. And the rum was well looked after too.

(Reads.)

It certainly did not last. And I am glad that the hon. member in making that speech realised that the inuendoes, the false promises and the false prophets were within his own ranks. Why no greater false prophets than the present administration ever went to the country. And I was with them. But I dissociated myself from them as soon as I could. But I have to accept a certain amount of the responsibility for being asked to join them. They have fallen down on every promise. What about reduced expenditure? What about a bounty to fishermen on the amount of fish caught? Was not that part of their programme? Mr. Cahill's speech refers absolutely to his own administration. And the hon. member knows himself to-day that he would not have a ghost of a chance to be elected to-day under the present administration.

(Reads.)

Absolutely correct, and in 1927 or 1928, whenever there is a general election, and as far as I am personally concerned I do not care whether there will ever be one, but as far as the people are concerned I feel that it is my duty to have one, and I will use every effort to bring it about. I feel that when I return to my district that they shall vindicate me for my action in 1924. I feel that I have been vindicated already, inasmuch as I took a prominent part in the by-election in St. John's East, and the people by electing Mr. Brophy, with whom I was associated, have exonerated me for my action in the past.

(Reads.)

They promised everything on the face of the earth and the result is your defeat to-day. And you find yourselves in a ridiculous position. You come in here with a deficit of $6,000,000 for two years. And you canont deny that statement to-day, because I have calculated that from the figures that were given me by the Finance Minister himself, month by month. The duty of your Government was to go to the people and tell them what you have done, and that is the one thing that this Government failed to do. When they went back to the people to seek their confidence they should have told them what they had done. Instead it was a case of telling them what they did not do. They were unable to tell them that, but they told them what they were going to do.

They took upon themselves the credit of having won the Labrador case, for the establishment of Buchan's Mine, which was quite ridiculous; the Gander, which has not yet arrived. And in the Speech from the Throne to-day they say that every paper machine in the country is working at full capacity; and I say without fear of contradiction that owing to the demand for paper in the United States decreasing to such an extent, they have found it necesary to cut out one of the machines at Corner Brook.

And that is another problem that will have to be dealt with very soon. What is the Government's position regarding the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company to-day I was a member of this Legislature in 1923—that was my first step in public life. I voted for that deal; but I regret to say that the outcome on the Humber has not been what we thought it would be at the time.

In the early construction period the Armstrong Company spent lavishly and unnecessarily. And I feel that we as a Government erred at that time in not seeing that a proper representative in the way of an experienced engineer was sent there to see that Newfoundland's interests were protected. Because to-day we are placed in a very critical position with regard to this, and if any one loses apart from the principal shareholders, it will be the Newfoundland Government. And goodness only knows after the report of that company is tabled in this House whether it will not be found that Newfoundland is responsible for five million more in the way of guaranteed stock in that company, for which we are responsible. I would not say a word in this House about these matters if you had to be honest with us and told us the truth. But I do say this, that far from telling us the truth they have endeavoured to deceive the public as well. The Auditor General's Department in my opinion is nothing more or less than a farce and it should be wiped out, if they do not carry out their duties in a more satisfactory manner than at the present time. Evidently anything that the Government puts before these people is certified and a proper audit is not conducted. No Auditor General in the face of the figures that have been tabled here by the Department of Finance and Customs can come in here and tell us that the report was proper that was tabled the other day. We cannot any more depend upon the reliability of that office in view of the fact that it has deceived, and has helped the Government to attempt to deceive, the members on this side of the House as well as the people at large. I regret to have to speak in this strain but I actually feel that way inclined.

Yesterday I drew the attention of the House to the fact that the railway had squandered $50,000. They threw it away so to speak to Besco. I proved my point. To-day in speaking of the contract with Besco, which the Government took the credit for when this contract was tabled the other day, we discovered that this contract was merely renewed, that the present Government had no more to do with keeping the Bell Island Mines open this year than I had. As a matter of fact there was a market for six thousand tons of ore in Germany and the mines would have opened even if the Monroe Government never existed. And I want to draw the attention of this House to the fact that this company is attempting, and has succeeded so far, a combination in the coal business of this country, and the Government have not carried out their duty and made them do the right thing according to this contract.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to give the Government some suggestions regarding the coastal service and the railway service, which I know they won't take, but at the same time

a stray word here or there may be remembered by some of the individual members later on. I want to say to them to-day that the coastal service is in a demoralised condition. Last year it showed a profit according to the figures tabled in this House of $20,000, after receiving a subsidy of $50,000 from the Postal Department. I want to say here now that people in the Government have availed of their position to place their friends in positions on these boats. I want to say right here now that the boat operating around Labrador is nothing more or less than a trading boat. People go up there, policemen, magistrates and everything—men selling goods or for certain merchants in the city, and the Government pay their salaries as well. Butterine included. Sold by policemen. And I understand also, and I would like the Government to think the matter over, that even a policeman who was sent down there with a rifle sold the rifle.

Whilst speaking of policemen, I understand that the present Inspector General of Police, who received a raise last year of four hundred dollars, employed some of the policemen cultivating his land, and after cultivating some vegetables he sent them to sell in the Newfoundland Hotel. Probably the Inspector General of Police is going to be sometime Minister of Agriculture and Mines, but I hope he will have more success in the farming industry than he had in the mining industry. But speaking of the coastal boats again. As they are at present operated they cannot pay. Why? Any member or gentleman who is prominently identified with politics to-day might want a boat to call at a certain place. The first thing naturally for him to do is to get in touch with the railway management and use his influence to get a steamer to call at a place out of her regular run where she may be detained for a couple of days. We all know what the result and the loss is. I know that the "Prospero" and the "Portia", plying on the North and the South Coasts, respectively, do not keep up to the schedule they used to when operated by a private concern in the city, and I feel that the trade have not been receiving that consideration from the Railway Commission, because these boats, especially the western boats, sail from here often and never handled the freight that should be handled. Rather have the Government and the Railway Commission encouraged outside concerns to come in and cater to the trade of the West Coast. The consequence is that to-day we are losing the trade of the West Coast which is going to Halifax. The same applies to Corner Brook, as the Clarke Steamship Company have evidently cornered all the freight traffic practically of that centre. The result is that the railway does not get the freight from Port aux Basques that they should get and I have not seen any effort made by any one to attempt to get back that which we have lost. As a matter of fact the Government and the members thereof do not appear to care where the country is drifting. Last year in reply to various questions put by the Opposition it was learned that the railway was operating between nine hundred and a thousand miles of road and employing about two thousand two hundred men. No doubt a great number of these were engaged at the Dry Dock. Now I feel, especially in view of the figures tabled here showing a net loss of about four hundred thousand dollars up to the end of February last, that with proper, economical, business-like handling the railway can be operated at a loss at not more than a quarter of a million dollars per year. To begin with if the Monroe administration, when they started out squandering money, had re-railed the railway which they are doing to-day and had spent some of

the money which they spent in other directions on the railway and have it re-railed with seventy pound steel from here to Port aux Basques, it would be very much easier to handle freight trains and passenger traffic than it is to-day, and the chances are that the public would avail of the travelling facilities more so than they do at the present time. As one of those who happened to travel across this country considerably, I almost dred when we arrive at Clarenville, and I think the public are educated to be in the same position and consequently they try to get to their respective destinations by any other means than the railway. I feel to-day that considerable axe cutting could be used in connection with the railway, provided you have the proper people to do it. But I regret to say we have not got that type of people running the railway to-day who knows how to say "yes" or "no." These are probably the only two words in the English language that they do not want to understand. But some one will have to do something in the way of axe using in the not distant future. I would like to again ask the Prime Minister if he meant what he said regarding the intention of members of this side of the House obstructing legislation? I would also like to ask him, after I sit down, to tell the House and the country the intention and the programme of the Government for the future? I would like for him to be frank and honest and if he wishes let us forget past differences and try and do something to bring about a different and more wholesome state of affairs in this country. I want to be fair and I ask the Prime Minister if he does not consider that the people of this Colony demand a show down and want to put in power a Government which the Government press were placed to designate in the recent bye-election in St. John's East, a stable Government? I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister's only answer is that to have and hear the voice of the people under present financial circumstances is absolutely necessary. When it is considered that this Government finds itself six and a half million dollars in debt, then the adjective stable would be far from suitable or grave enough to define what we actually require, but I say that the country right now needs a sound, solid and stable Government which she has not got and which every Minister of the Crown within hearing of my voice knows she has not got. I feel and I know that within the ranks of the Government to-day there are gentlemen who want a stable Government and who desire that the people be given the first opportunity to elect a stable Government, and these same gentlemen are to-day sitting in the Prime Minister's Cabinet. It is unnecessary for me to mention names because to quote the words of the senior member for Hr. Main "they know the cap fits them"; but why does not the Prime Minister get up at the adjournment of the House this evening and give a clean, clear cut statement as to what the intention of the Government is? I do not intend to dictate to him what he should do or say. The Government finds itself in the position that they are unable to bring in the drastic legislation promised by the Prime Minister. Now the natural construction some people put on that statement at first blush is that the Opposition would be opposed to drastic legislation, but on going into the matter more closely the only conclusion one could come to is that the Prime Minister cannot bring in drastic legislation on account of objection within his own ranks, because no member on this side have attempted to do anything that would suggest to the Prime Minister that we were opposed to any such drastic legislation. Consequently, the proof is absolute that,

since he made the statement that he did on opening day, he knew evidently from party meetings that his own Government and party followers that they were not in favor of drastic legislation. I say, Sir, it is the duty of the Prime Minister, a duty that he owes to this House and to the country at large, that if drastic legislation, as he has stated, is necessary it should be introduced and a Government sufficiently strong should be in power to introduce it.

I may utter these statements because they are the Prime Minister's own words spoken here in the House and the Opposition sitting in this House have made no statement whatever; no member who has spoken has; that they would be opposed to drastic legislation, and I agree that drastic legislation has to be introduced and has to be carried out and why? Our national debt will be approximately 80 millions at the end of the fiscal year that terminates in a couple of months. Interest of approximately 4 millions has to be paid on this, and the finding of this will take some better and more capable gentlemen to occupy the position as cashier of this country in my opinion, and I feel that that can only be arrived at by the people of this country whose business it is after all to see that its affairs are carried out as they desire by the people selecting men of their choice to carry on their affairs. We are to-day merely representatives of the people who told us to do certain things which I may add the Monroe administration have not done. This is what one would call a shareholders' meeting—a general shareholders' meeting, and we have the proxy, so to speak of the people of this country. We know that at various large corporation meetings where it is discovered that the executive of that corporation are not carrying out their duties properly, new directors and presidents and vice-presidents are elected; and a general meeting of shareholders is necessary now for we find that we are in the financial position that we can't pay bills without borrowing money; and we have to call upon the shareholders to endorse our note so to speak. If shareholders say that the Government that they have representing them have failed and that you can't carry on they will elect new directors and new presidents and vice-presidents. I say that it is your duty to ask for a general shareholders' meeting in the shape of a general election in Newfoundland in the Autumn and then let them speak and say whom they wish to carry on their affairs, because after all they are the people whom we are serving and who own this country. If the people of the country want this country to go insolvent let them say so, but if the people don't want the country to go insolvent they must devise other ways and other means to recoup their finances and pay the bills. How that is to be done is a problem for future Governments that will take the gravest consideration and gravest thought. I would not off hand outline a policy for the present administration to carry out because every suggstion from this side of the House has been absolutely ignored and it would only be wasting my breath and wasting my time to offer a suggestion regarding the future welfare of this country, to be left in the hands of the present administration to carry out, and if I made a suggestion I would like to feel that it might be carried out, and that this Government are capable which I personally do not think it is. In the event then of this general election, it is up to the people to return men to power, and then if I should happen to occupy a seat on any side of the House it is my duty to attempt to help that Government elected by the people to carry out their interests.

I would make this suggestion to you; a suggestion whereby taxation

could be reduced 15 p.c. even with the deficit; although I know the suggestion is falling on deaf ears, and I feel you are incompetent to carry it out. You are attempting to-day, I understand, to induce the American Government to repeal the Fordney Tariff. I tell the Monroe Administration now that that can be done in 24 hours, and if they are unable to do it there are people in this country who can do it. If they have tried during the past six or twelve months and have failed then they do not know their business. I have correspondence in my possession to-day assuring me that under certain circumstances Newfoundland fish would be allowed into the country practically free of duty; I doubt if the Monroe Administration has even arrived at that stage. What would it mean if our fish were allowed in free or even at 25c. per quintal. It would mean the future of this country. America consumes millions of fish annually. They have practically four fishing ports in America; two or three on the Atlantic; to-day American vessels cannot get bait or supplies here or employ men to fish round our shores, because in 1925 Sir Robert Bond's Administration repealed or brought in a bill in this country, which forbade foreign vessels from taking bait or supplies from this country and from fishing round our shores or employing our men to fish in our waters.

I have every reason to believe that if these restrictions were removed by a bill to be brought in by the present Government the American Government would consider taking off the duty off our fish. If you have offered them that and you haven't succeeded it is a proof that you are incompetent. I have correspondence from Gloucester.

HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER—The United States Government is not at Gloucester.

MR. CASHIN—No, but representivs of Gloucester representing the fishermen go to Congress and they work for their fishermen which this Administration hasn't done for our fishermen, and so do the representatives of the Canadian fishermen. The Canadian Government have given the fishermen every advantage on the Grand Banks. They have even helped our fishermen. Mr. Lake told the House the other day that the hospital ship on the Grand Banks for the Canadians has often cared for our sick people. This Government never thinks of them. All this Government has done is to attempt to enslave the fishermen. This country under the present Administration is some fisherman's paradise. I say it is an industrialist's paradise, a country where people can invest capital, huge amounts of money, and then be recompsensed through the avenues of the Customs of this country, and I say now that this country is an industrialist's paradise far from being a fishermen's paradise. It is interesting to see how some individuals represent the common people of this country and there is no more sincerity in it than in a flip of my finger. It is the Prime Minister's duty to-day to say that in view of the present position of the Government that a general election must be held in the fall.

During my four years in this House, I have attempted to carry out my duties in a proper and official manner, and during that four years I have had the privilege of crossing swords in debate with the Prime Minister. I have had the privilege of meeting him in open debate where the people of the country were the judges, and one could say what one pleased, and I feel that the Prime Minister to-day realizes that although I may only be insignificant in his eye, that I was particularly responsible for putting one all over him. It is unnecessary for me to mention these various occasions for we might stray too far from the

argument on the Speech from the Throne. I am glad that I have drawn a little fire from the Prime Minister, but I feel as I said before regarding the fishery of this country, that he should be able to arrange with the United States Government to have $1.40 taken off our fish, or even fifty cents, and if he can't do that he should get out. If that were done, we would have a market for half a million quintals of salt bulk fish, and that would mean there would be only another half million left to go to the Mediterranean. It would mean a better price for that fish, and it would mean a better price in the Mediterranean.

There is not one law on our Statute Book to-day with regard to the fisheries of the country. The laws to-day for the Fishery are made by those interested in the purchase and sale of fish to the foreign market, and they are commercially insane, because each one attempts to beat the other instead of co-operating for the good of all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have proved to the Prime Minister and his administration that the duty he owes to this country is to bring up the Legislation that he accused us the other day of obstructing and lay it on the table of the House, to bring up this drastic legislation that he says his own party will not let him put through, and we will help him to do it. If he has drastic legislation and his own party won't put it through, bring in your Estimates reducing expenditure, and we will help put them through. But you won't do that. I say that Estimates will be brought in a quarter of a million in advance of the one last year. I could almost mention now the various amounts extra to various departments. There was only one department last year that any way economized and that was the Postal Telegraphs. The Marine and Fisheries Department was side swiped on every side; telephones in practically every house at public expense; money spent that was not voted, and we don't hear any comments from the Government side of the House as regards that.

But if one member of the Opposition attempts to speak he is doing so for his own personal advantage or perhaps, as the Honourable Member for Harbour Main pointed out, in order to get square with some one.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it must appear evident to the gentlemen and ladies who visit these Chambers that the members of the Government display very little interest in any proceedings. Important Ministers of the Crown do not sit here.

In speaking of the fisheries, and to return again to my experience of the election campaign in St. John's East, I visited a place called Flatrock. The people there have been promised by every government since Responsible Government, I think, that a breakwater would be built if the government was elected to office. The Government candidate told them that a breakwater would be built, and I told them that when I returned to the House I would bring the matter up.

HONOURABLE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The present representative is here.

MR. CASHIN—Yes, but I told them that I would bring this matter before the House.

MR. BROWNE—You told them a lot of good things, I think.

MR. CASHIN—You told them a good many things too. What I said outside I am not afraid to say inside too. Mr. Speaker, I don't think the Honourable members reception at Flatrock was any too good. It is good for us to have a little joke now and then, it bucks us up.

A few years ago something like $10,500 was allowed for the purpose of building that breakwater at Flatrock; they built a bridge and spent some

money to dredge it out. The men there think that a breakwater should be built across the north entrance of the Gut at Flatrock, as a protection against the north-east and south-east winds for the fishermen who bring their boats in through the gap. In Flatrock this is necessary, and if the $10,500 had been properly used it would have been there.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As a matter of fact, for the past four years, plans have been in the Government Engineer's Office. It was thought best to excavate inside first.

MR. CASHIN—If the breakwater had been put there it would have been some use to them, and that would be doing something in the interests of the fishermen, but for the $10,500 they only got a bridge.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We spent $5,000 to $10,000 in excavating, and spent the rest on the bridge.

MR. CASHIN—There is a lot of sand there.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They are a sandy crowd. Don't believe everything they tell you at Flatrock.

MR. CASHIN — Indeed I do not. Coming back to the fisheries. I ask the Government now, and I'll put a question on the Order Paper to-morrow, if I am here, regarding anything that took place between our Government and that of the United States with regard to the removal of the duty on our fish going into the United States, and in that way do some good for the fishermen of the country.

At the present time, a company, the Hudson's Bay Company, prepare fresh frozen salmon, take it across to England, and make good money. If some scheme could be brought in whereby we would be able to take fresh frozen cod off our shores, we should be able to sell it in England as well as the Hudson's Bay Company. It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, in view of the present financial condition of this country, to do something. In 1924 the Prime Minister said the present condition of the finances is very bad. If it was bad in 1924, how is it now? Better or worse? In 1924 when the Prime Minister and his party came into power the deficit was one and one-half million dollars—to-day it is six and one-half. The Budget was cooked last year. Now we find there is a deficit of six and one half million. How are you going to meet it? Are you going to bring in a loan? Certainly. Are you going to raise it outside the country, or are you going to let the people of this country have a chance to invest their money, or are we to be told that it is a difficult matter to raise a loan here. It is not a difficult matter. As a matter of fact there was no difficulty in 1918 or 1919 when the Coalition Government raised a loan on the local market. After you bring in a loan of six and one-half millions where are you going to be? Are you going to be in a better position? First, the Directors of the Company, the Company of Newfoundland, Incorporated, will have to call a meeting and see how we are getting on. You will have to pay interest of $325,000 a year, more money added to the public expenses of this country. Where will you get the revenue? Certainly, somewhere. Now what is our ability of paying the hundred million dollars national debt? Can we do it? I say, no. At the present time our national debt is eighty millions. At this rate of going in another four years we will be at breaking point. A receiver is called in, just the same as a company 'going up the spout.' He collars everything in the country. A man's house is not safe. There is a mortgage on this country for one hundred million dollars and our creditors can come and sell it. I am not well up in the law business but I think that is the position. Now then, what are we going to do to try and stop it.

As regards selling the Labrador to Canada, someone may say "hold off and you will get a better price, but two can play that game. Canada can play that game. They might also say: "Let us hold off until Newfoundland goes insolvent and then we will get it when it is put up to the hammer." But if we could make a deal with them to take over Newfoundland's shares we would relieve the tax-payers to the tune of $4,000,000, and reduce public expenditure to by that amount. What would not that mean to the colony and the people of this country to-day. In the case of flour, pork or beef it would not matter one iota, but in a country where large duties are charged at the present time on clothes, boots, shoes and articles of wear. If you reduced taxation on these articles, which you cannot to-day I agree, then I say that this country would be a financial paradise. But even you, Sir, as Prime Minister of Newfoundland, even when you found the financial conditions of the country very bad, it was your duty and the duty of your administration, not when they went into power the first year, that the first item was to borrow 6½ millions. You attempted to borrow ten millions. You should have merely borrowed enough to pay the deficit of 1½ millions. Where would you be now? You could have got along very well. And it would not be necessary to-day to bring in another loan bill. You would not have the deficit which you have at the present time, provided that you got down to business. But instead you indulged in wild cat schemes.

I must say now that I was associated with one wild cat scheme, and I am not trying to take the responsibility off my shoulders. When the contract for the dock was made, the contract was for $1,086,000, it cost 2½ millions. I was clear of the Government after it cost that. Consequently no onus could be placed on me for the additional cost. I also say that we would have been better off if we had not expended that $1,086,000, although I was an advocate of the dock at that time. You would have saved 2¼ millions if you had got down to doing things as they should have been done. Consequently we would have been relieved of the interest in that direction alone of about $125,000 a year. I say that you can put a 16,000 ton ship on that, and let her pay off all the men on the dock and incur no further expenditure, and the interest on what the dock cost would not be paid by the revenue received from the docking of a 16,000 ton ship for a year.

Mr. Speaker, returning to the dock question, I think I made the remark before regarding that dock, regarding the shed there, they may look very nice, but I think that the remark was made last year by the Leader of the Opposition, that we might all like gold watches but we have not all got the money to purchase them. Sir, 2½ millions would have been sufficient to borrow when you came into power if you had meant what you said, when you came into office in 1924. So your indebtedness would be anywhere in the vicinity of $70,000. You would have saved the interest of a half million on the other ten thousand which you will have to borrow. Naturally your expenditure would be down, and taxation would be reduced accordingly because under the trying conditions of the present time it is not necessary to put aside a new surplus. I must apologise to the Hon. Member for even attempting to intimate to the present Minister of Finance that he ever thought of a surplus. Because he does not understand that. Deficit is all that he understands. Then the Minister of Finance gets up here and tells me that my statement is incorrect. For the life of me why does he table incorrect information in this House. I am not so well acquainted

with the procedure of this House as to know what to do when incorrect information is tabled in this House, but I do know this that if incorrect information is tabled in this House, you have not heard the last of it. And I say here now that before this House closes, I intend to use the proper methods to introduce the Auditor General to this House of Assembly.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am about to close my remarks, but before doing so I would make the suggestion to the Minister of Finance, that in future when he comes into this Legislature, or the Government comes into this Legislature, that it is his duty to tell the truth regarding the finances of this country and not attempt to deceive the public as to the actual state of affairs in Newfoundland. Though their idea may be good in one way, namely that they did not want to let the financial world know the actual state of affairs existing in the country at the present time, as they may want to raise another loan. But do they remember that by doing so, and raising money in that way, they are raising money under false pretences. I say that a Government that does that just as with an ordinary business man, should be impeached and driven from office, because the truth, Mr. Speaker, lives, but falsehood cannot live. It dies eventually. It would have been alright for the Government in their first year in office to take $200,000 from the accounts of the following year, in the hope of getting a higher revenue the next year, to make it up. But as a matter of fact you got less. So you find yourselves 6½ millions in the hole to-day. And I say here now, Mr. Speaker, without fear of contradiction that the loan raised last year by the present Government was raised under false pretences.

I trust that the people who bought the loan knew the true state of how we stand, and I feel that they do because the people that bought that loan can tell us more about the affairs of this country than we can ourselves, so it is probably a good sign to see the bank buy the loan. It is questionable if the Bank of Montreal gave an absolutely correct statement regarding the affairs of this country when it sold the loan to underwriters in London. I want to state now that the Government knowing that budget last year was cooked and the Bank of Montreal, if they knew it were procuring money under false pretenses.

Now, Sir, I have one last word to say to the Prime Minister in the way of a slight lecture, I say again, as I have said before that a vote of want of confidence is unnecessary for the present Administration to have to retire. That was moved in St. John's East and passed some two or three months ago. It was moved by the Government and seconded by the members of the Opposition and carried by the electors of St. John's East, and consequently the Government to-day find themselves in the position that a vote of want of confidence has not only been passed by the people of the country who three or four years ago pledged themselves to stand by them provided they carried out the promises contained in the Prime Minister's manifesto which they failed to do, and I say now that it is the Prime Minister's duty this evening, or any other evening to admit his failure, and in order to help matters in this House to give to the members on this side an absolutely correct statement of our financial position.

It is the Prime Minister's duty today to say that in view of the present position of the country and of the present position of the Government that a general election must be held in the fall to see if the country still wishes his party to remain in power or for someone else to take charge. He should do that and give the oppor-

tunity for something to be done for the good of the common people.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the few words I have to say will be somewhat brief. I just want to make a few comments on what is known as the Speech from the Throne; but before doing that I would, as is customary, offer my congratulations to the Honorable mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. I also extend congratulations to the Honorable gentlemen who have been elected to this House since last the assembly was in session. It is quite in order for me to do that, but I am not inclined to think occasionally that it is a matter for congratulation. I have often felt that it is questionable whether or not it is. Anyway since it is customary I, along with the other gentlemen who have spoken already tender my congratulations to those gentlemen who have been elected.

In commenting on the Speech I will just mention a few of the paragraphs. It is a document that comes along annually, and it is supposed to be a resume of the year past and more or less a forecast of the coming year. It sometimes fills the bill in that respect and sometimes it doesn't. With regard to the opening paragraph that deals with the settlement of the dispute of the Labrador Boundary, I would like to make a few remarks. It is a matter for congratulation I suppose to this country that we have that dispute aparently settled. I say apparently because in my opinion that boundary line is not yet settled. This Labrador Boundary question has in the past been a means whereby lawyers and others in this country and other countries have obtained very fat fees for their services in connection therewith, and in my opinion somebody has got to get some fat fees yet. As far as the Boundary is concerned we know approximately what it is, but until that is defined and properly surveyed we don't know where we are with regard to the boundary, and I claim that there must be a lot of money spent on that boundary yet before it is finally defined. There must be a proper survey. It is amazing what we don't know about Labrador. Look at the coast line—that isn't surveyed as far as I know. It is surveyed as far as Hamilton Inlet and north of that there is no survey so far as I know.

There is no geological and no marine survey. We know very little about it. I have heard it said that we should get surveyors to come here and have them survey that boundary and find out where our limits are. I don't think we need go outside the country to get surveyors to define those limits. If we can't do a thing like that ourselves we are not fit to have the award given us. Why should we go outside the country to get men to do anything for us? We have men in the country who could have built the dock just as well and probably cheaper than the people who did build it. We have men in connection with the High Roads Commission who know as much about concrete ,if we can judge by the work done as the W. I. Bishop Company. We should not go outside the country to get surveyors to define these limits. If we get a fair amount for that land I say that we should sell it. Personally I am of the opinion that it is not going to do this country very much good. Timber will be got there and grants will be taken out for certain holdings, and what we will get out of it is perhaps a little labour. Outsiders come in and get the best of things is what has happened in this country while our men get perhaps $2.50 per day. As to that it has been stated by some of the outsiders that come in here that we have not men sufficient enough to take hold of the jobs that bring down a decent salary. I will now show where we have got efficient men and they didn't get the jobs. There are

two ships ,the "Corner Brook," and the "Humber Arm" on the West Coast. Now everybody will agree that we have men in this country above all things else who can man a ship from the captain down to the mess boy. In these two ships there never have been more than two Newfoundlanders, and the personnel comprises 80 odd men. That is typical of what is done in this country. Our people get the slack end of it. So I say if we got the chance to sell that territory over which the dispute has just been settled I say that we should sell it and wipe out our national debt if we can, and wipe it out with this proviso that we never borrow another cent. Let us reserve our rights for the fishermen so far as the fishermen are concerned on the Coast and hand the rest of it over to Canada as long as we can get rid of this incubus that is hanging round our necks. I just have a word to say about the codfishery. I am sorry the time draws near for closure as I would like to speak on one or two points that haven't been commented on, but the most I can say has been commented on before, and I don't suppose I can raise many new points.

With regard to the cod fishery it has been stated in this House, more especially by members of the Government who stand up and greet the Government of the day and talk of the lack of interest taken in the cod fishery, but they never put forward any propositions that might be put through to better the existing conditions. What we need in this country, and need soon ,is regulations with regard to the shipment of cod fish. Regular shipments should be made, as was stated by one of my Honourable friends. When you flood the market down goes the price. That is quite natural, it is the natural course of events. When you send large argoes that is the result. Cargoes of forty, fifty and sixty thousand quintals of fish have been known to have left these shores inside of five days. At another time one hundred and twenty thousand quintals of fish were shipped within three weeks. Now that is a state of affairs that should not exist. The Government should see to it that legislation is brought into this House to insure regulations of shipment. As regards the price, I don't think we would regulate that, but we can have standardization of cull, other than we have at present. I have heard a lot of talk, and one writer stated that Great Britain could get a lot of our fish. Great Britain is one of our competitors in most of our markets. More fish crossed from Aberdeen to Rio last year than we have shipped during the last five years. I want to suggest that we standardize our cull according to size, so as to contain twenty, fifty or a hundred as the case may be. Then you could have the fish analyzed with regard to its salinity, whether there is sufficient salt in it or not. Then the fish could be analyzed as regards its moisture. If the Government would take steps to have these things done.

HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER — Would you analyze every fish?

MR. RANDELL—Not every fish, a certain number out of every shipment should be analyzed. Now in the inspection of lobsters, one or two are taken out of each case, and in the case of herring the top one or two layers are examined, still we have inspection and I don't know but that it is alright and we could do the same with the cod fish. Water Street may not agree to it, but the merchants will have to conform to the law ,and when a thing is good for the country generally I don't see why anybody should object to it.

The sealfishery also is referred to in the Speech from the Throne. The sealfishery has been below the aver-

age and that is a thing to be deplored. In my opinion the herd is becoming depleted. That is the opinion of a great many people. No matter what class of animal you attack, even if it is the mosquito, if they are killed at the rate of five hundred thousand a year for forty or fifty years, that animal will in time become obliterated.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—That would be a national blessing in the case of the mosquito.

MR. RANDELL—If you get after any animal for a hundred years then you will find that the animal will become extinct in time.

Before taking my seat, Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse what has already been mentioned by several members. I refer to the references made to members of this House by one of the daily papers. About two years ago I made a statement that the climate of this country is not one that would attract tourists to come here, and I still hold that view. Some honourable gentleman of the Government side of the House took occasion to disagree with me and an editorial appeared in one of the daily papers, headed "Boost your country." Though no names were mentioned it was evident that it referred to what I had said and you might know that that paper received Government patronage. What struck me was the heading "Boost you country." In 1923 when that paper was given no protection by the Squires Government, in commenting on the fisheries it went on to tell how many fishermen were leaving our shores and going to some other country and said, amongst other things that there were 50 p.c. less fishing on our shores and 100 p.c. less on the Labrador. Of course, that might have been an error. It rated our tax at £7 10 per head for year. That might have been copied from some foreign periodical, but there was nothing to show that it was copied. Again last year an article appeared in this paper showing that three hundred and fifty thousand people in this country were criminals by profession. That is what I call boosting the country. If that paper calls that boosting the country I would much rather have what I said published. Fancy a foreigner reading that three hundred and fifty thousand people are criminals by profession in Newfoundland. That paper is the "Evening Telegram."

MR. PUDDESTER — Thought he was going to say the "Daily News," didn't you?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Wouldn't have been surprised.

MR. RANDELL—I haven't much use for that kind of journalism, even though it may be alright to look after the affairs of the government.

Before I sit down,—I shall not delay the House much longer,—I would just like to make a few remarks with regard to the report of the Liquor Control. I am sorry that I was not in this House when that Act was brought into the House. I would have added my objections to having any such Bill brought in. I do not approve of it. This bottle a day business in my opinion should be stopped. Where a man would take a drink in years under the old system now buys a bottle, and if he likes it he drinks it all and gets drunk. Few people have had as much trouble through booze as I have. I have seen men go to their death through it and I want to express my views here. I do not agree with making $850,000 of revenue which was produced through the sale of liquor during the past year. Who was it that paid this amount? If it was coming from outside it wouldn't be so bad, but it is paid by the taxpayer of this country. It is a crime against the homes and children of this country to have a liquor bill like that.

Just one word more, I have heard a lot about the financial condition of the country. Some people advocate a

Royal Commission. Of course as some people mean when they talk of a Royal Commission it is unthinkable, but I will appoint a Royal Commission now if you will allow me. A little while ago I had the privilege of reading a charter party made out between the British Government and the owners of a ship in 1881. The ship was supposed to carry troops and convicts from England to Australia. In that charter party there was a clause that no Member of Parliament should be in any way a party to benefit by anything contained in it; no Member of Parliament would benefit directly or indirectly; no Member of Parliament would have any influence or anything whatever to do with it. Now then I will appoint a Royal Commission. Let the people of this country elect Members of this House of Assembly without any remuneration at all if you like, but principally let them come here and make the laws and rules for the country and let them have no voice in any contract in connection with government and have no say and no benefit in any possible way in connection with any contract or have any influence in making contracts. Let them come here and do the business of the country. Give them proper remuneration if you like, but I say now let them have no voice in making and no benefit from contracts, and we will have clean government and will very likely be able to get this country out of the hole; otherwise I see very little hope.

On motion the debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

Mr. Russell gave notice of question.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn, I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the statement made here this afternoon by the member for Ferryland in his address; he made the statement that for the year 1926-1927 there will be a deficit of $2,225,297, and this information was derived from the information furnished to this House by the Minister of Finance and Customs. We have before us the Budget Speech and we do know now what that contained in reference to the year 1925-26. But Mr. Cashin also made the statement that that budget was also padded, and instead of having a surplus that year we had a deficit. Now last year when this House was in session, the Minister of Finance brought a budget in here, and told us that we had a surplus for 1925-26, and he estimated a surplus of $300,000 for 1925-26. After the budget speech was read, in this House, then a loan bill was brought in here for the raising of $5,000,000. Anyhow the correspondence which I have before me furnished by the Minister of Finance and Customs, in it I notice that the information he gave to the underwriters of bonds are as follows:

(Reads)

Presumably this is the information on which the loan was raised. Now one of the statements are incorrect. It would be impossible for the Minister of Finance to come in here and estimate a surplus of $300,000 and then to have a deficit of $2,025,297. Either the other statement is untrue or this statement issued by the Auditor General under his name, is absolutely false.

I am bringing this matter before the Prime Minister, because both statements have been made, and it is due to this House and the people to know which of these statements is correct. And I think that before we consider any more legislation in this House, that this thing should be cleared up. The authenticity of the Auditor General's statement has been questioned. It has been stated here that to make accounts appear better he has charged up one month's expenditure to a previous year. I do

not make any charge against the Auditor General, but I only say that if that statement is correct made by the Member for Ferryland, then we can no longer place any faith in the figures tabled here by the man who does such a thing.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I don't understand whether the Leader of the Opposition says that he does not take the Auditor General's statements, because the Auditor General, in this country, is supposed to be immune from any bribery or any suggestion of wrong doing. But if he makes statements that are incorrect and has not got the confidence of the House of Assembly, then he ought not to hold office. If members of the Opposition have clearly determined that the Auditor General has not got the confidence of both sides of this House, then I would like to know it. and if his statement of the affairs of this country is not to be received as being correct then he certainly ought no longer to hold office.

The Leader of the Opposition has asked me to furnish him with a statement showing whether the statement made by a certain member in this House is correct, or whether the statement made by the Finance Minister is correct, and I propose to bring down the statement from the Auditor General as the only authority I know by which to correct any statement made in this House regarding finance. I ask him whether that will be acceptable to him.

MR. CASHIN — Mr. Speaker ,in speaking to the motion to adjourn, as I was responsible for bringing about this state of affairs. I made this statement to-day and yesterday distinctly sir that if correct information had been tabled in this House by the Minister of Finance and Customs, in answer to a question asked by me, then sir, that deficit of two million and odd dollars did exist, and that budget speech is wrong as I still contend it is. If the Finance Minister has been given incorrect information that is not my fault. But I asked for a monthly statement of revenue and expenditure from all sources exclusive of the railway operation, and each month I get the amount of expenditure and revenue and add them up. And if for the twelve months and the revenue exceeds expenditure then we have a surplus, but if it is the other way around then we have a deficit, and any schoolboy can understand that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, it is rather amusing to hear some of the statements that are made in this House. They are so amusing sometimes that I don't pay any attention to them. I am Minister of Finance, and the Auditor General is absolutely in charge. Any figures that are asked from me, I ask Mr. Keating and he sends them to me. Whether they are correct or not I don't go to check them. And I want to tell the Leader of the Opposition now, and I want him to bear it in mind, that I fear no investigation in that Department as Finance Minister. And I say that a deficit of $6,500,000 is absolutely ridiculous, just as ridiculous as to tell this House that we have borrowed $18,000,000 since we have been in charge. The Hon. Member for Ferryland made the statement that the dock cost 2½ million dollars. If anyone gave him those figures, they are absolutely wrong. The cost including the wharves and the whole outfit was $1,988,000. That is what it cost. Of course I don't check up those figures. it is not my job. But I court that enquiry to see whether the figures I brought in here are correct or not. And if I were a couple of hundred thousand dollars out in my estimates last year, I want to say that it would be a very clever man that could make an estimate within $200,000 of that amount. And I have not met him yet. What the deficit will be this year I

will let you know shortly, but there will be no surplus. But when people talk about borrowing six and a half million dollars to pay the deficit it is like child's play.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, May 30th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourend accordingly.

MONDAY, May 30th, 1927.

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

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE tabled the following:

Fire Loss Returns for St. John's, for year ending December 31st, 1926.

Fire Loss Returns for Outports, for year ending December 31st, 1926.

Constabulary Returns for the year ending December 31st, 1926.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS tabled:

Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act for the period ending 31st March, 1927.

Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General on the Accounts of the St. John's Municipal Council for the year ending December 31st, 1926.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Russell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Before going into the Orders of the Day, I crave the privilege of the House in connection with the discussion that took place in this House just before adjournment on Friday in connection with our financial affairs, when a statement was made by the Leader of the Opposition, in which he insinuated that from the figures quoted by Mr. Cashin that it looked to him that the Budget for 1925-26 had been padded. I want now to say, as I said on Friday, that the financial statement laid before this House by me was the correct and true financial statement of the country. In his remarks the Honorable Leader of the Opposition insinuated that I had deceived the public in my statement in getting a loan. That insinuation is absolutely untrue and for the information of the House, and without attempting to go very far into the matter of the financial affairs of the Colony, I intend to make a few simple remarks and let the matter stand, as I hope in the near future to be in this House when it goes into Supply, and I shall then be able to deal with the matter much better than at the present moment. It is true that as the Member for Ferryland said the figures he had would show a deficit of about two million and they were tabled in this House. In honesty and fairness to the Auditor General I may say that these figures were not given to me by him, but by Mr. John Keating, my Deputy Minister, in whom I have implicit confidence. I have great pleasure in having a man such as Mr. Keating as Deputy Minister, and I am quite convinced that Mr. Keating would not even to please me pad a Budget, and what figures he gives me he gives believing them in all sincerity to be correct, and I know the figures were correct. In the figures tabled for June the expenditure was quoted to be $3,994,258.01. As I have said in this House if I were to check every question asked in the Finance Department and go through them all I would be a very busy man. When I ask my deputies or the Auditor General for statements in answer to questions I take it as a matter of fact that they are correct, and as a matter of fact this answer of Mr. Keating was correct except that a typographical error was

made and instead of the expenditure being $3,994,258.01 as was in that statement it should be $2,418,511.63, and that makes all the difference. It is possible even for the most brilliant men to make mistakes. It is possible even for the Leader of the Opposition, who I believe understands finance very well, to have his typewriters make a mistake. That is the explanation of that.

Further, we find this position: that Mr. Keating in giving the expenditure for the year included amounts which had been charged to Exchequer Account and which belonged to Loan Accounts as the Loan had not been raised at the time. This means that we had to borrow from Exchequer Account temporarily month by month on Loan Account, thus abnormally swelling this account until the loan was raised and a cheque to cover the expenditure was available. This was done during the year 1925-26 and has been done for purposes of book-keeping long before Mr. Hickman and I were in this House. I may say that neither I nor my officials have any object in deceiving the House what avail is it to us to do so?

Now what was the position for the year 1924-25? Do you mean to infer that the Auditor General would be part and parcel in assisting a Finance Minister to pad accounts? That is a very serious charge; it is an unfair charge and there is one way always to clear it up, and that is by going down and examining the Bank of Montreal's accounts, which should compare with those of the Auditor General. If they do they must be correct, and there is no doubt about it they are correct, as both accounts tally. Take the report of the Auditor General for 1924-25. He says the expenditure on current account was $9,436,185.23. The revenue on current account was $9,783,188.46, leaving a surplus of $347,003.23 in favour of the Colony. That is in his report for 1925. Do you mean to tell me that the Auditor General is foolish enough to write his report to suit the Finance Minister or the Government? I do not think so; I know him long enough to be certain that you cannot influence him in that fashion. Some men question the Audit system, but let me tell them that it takes a mighty clever man to catch a rogue. The Auditor can be fooled and the rogue often goes free for a long while before he is caught. We mercantile men know that; we have been often fooled ourselves even with audits for a long while before the rogues were caught.

That statement for 1924-25 can be verified by the Bank of Montreal, and surely honourable members of this House, even the Honourable Leader of the Opposition will not for one moment question that statement.

Coming along to the year 1925-26. The total revenue for that year was $9,752,551.28 and the total expenditure for that year, including Loan Account expenditure, which Mr. Keating shows in his monthly totals, was $10,285,225.78. Before the Loan of 1926 was raised, as already stated to the House, the amount transferred to Loan Acount was $420,058.44. Deducting this amount from the gross expenditure of $10,285,225.78 leaves an expenditure of $9,865,167.34. Take the revenue of $9,752,551.28 from this expenditure and you have a deficit for the Colony for the year 1925-26, which can be verified at the Bank of Montreal, of $112,616.06, which includes $30,719.65 being amount carried over by the Customs Department to 1926-27 by Order-in-Council, as it was found to be outstanding after accounts were closed. By adding the $81,000.00 shown to this $30,719.65, a simple bit of addition, you arrive at the actual deficit for 1925-26.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the charge made was a very serious one, but I am sure that there is no longer any doubt in anyone's mind in this House

that figures were juggled with. In any cause I am not worried over any investigation that may be held on the financial affairs of the country since I have had control of the Department of Finance and Customs. I court the fullest enquiry. In fact I want it, because I have no fear as to what the result will be. I do not think, Mr. Speaker ,that there is any occasion for me to proceed any further with this statement. I am satisfied that the people of Newfoundland who know me will accept my statement, but as a matter of fact they do not have to acept my statement alone because the Auditor General is behind it, and the Bank of Montreal has the proof, and the best answer I can give to this House and to the country at large is that these balances stand and are to be seen to-day in the accounts at the Bank.

But, Mr. Speaker, statements such as these to which I have referred are injurious to Newfoundland; that the man who makes them and broadcasts them to this and other countries and claims he is a Newfoundlander, has lost the respect for the country in which he lives. I leave this matter now, Mr. Speaker, and hope to have an opportunity of going into it more fully in the very near future.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister this afternoon made a statement which goes to prove there was plenty of room for my stating on Friday last that there was a difference between the figures given the House by him and these figures supplied the member for Ferryland, and the Minister has corroborated what I said by telling us now that a typographical error occurred in making up the statement. The Minister says that some one made a charge. I do not know whether he refers to myself or Major Cashin or somebody else on this side of the House. Personally I made no charge against anyone. As I sat here and listened to the member for Ferryland on Friday last and heard that the figures he had received from the Finance Minister were vastly different to the figures given out to the House and through a letter in the press by the Minister, and showing a marked difference in the actual postiion of the finances of the country, I thought it my duty as Leader of the Oposition—it would be my duty no matter what position I held in this House—to ask for an explanation because an explanation is due to this House and to this country. The Finance Minister with considerable bluff and bluster made remarks this afternoon which I consider were not necessary. All we want is a statement of facts and when we have that we are satisfied. I have made no charge or made no insinuation against anybody. I simply said that if the figures furnished Major Cashin were correct, then the figures supplied by the Finance Minister in his Budget and also in a letter to the press must be incorrect. The figures which he had given shows a difference of one million dollars in the statement of his Deputy Minister. Therefore, no blame can be laid to the member for Ferryland for the statement he made because he had facts to corroborate his statement. I just want to put myself on record this afternoon as not having made any charge against anyone by asking for what this House should have and that is a statement of facts so that the entire matter can be cleared up.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, as it was your humble servant who brought about this discussion and after listening to the Finance Minister this afternoon, I feel that I should make a few remarks in return. The Finance Minister stated that a typographical error was made in the figures by his Deputy, Mr. Keating. Looking at the figures, it appears to me that it was something different to a typographical error. I can understand a 3 being made for a

2 or vice versa and I can understand how a mistake of 1 or 2 millions could be made, but the Finance Minister stated that there was a mistake of $2,418,511.63 By deducting that amount from $3,994,228.01 you get a difference of $1,575,716.38.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—You will find it comes nearer two millions when you add to it $420,000.00, which Mr. Keating shows is his monthly expenditure for a year. This $420,000.00 is money borrowed from Exchequer Account to be transferred back to Loan Account.

MR. CASHIN—If that $420,000.00 represents the monthly expenditure for twelve months on Loan Account, I take it that the Minister cannot tell the actual expenditure correctly of his department each month. Last year I asked for the revenue for the current year 1924-25 and I had to wait and get it from the Budget. Now I take the Auditor General's report in this way. We were told recently in the press by the Finance Minister that the deficit on current account would be eighty one thousand and odd dollars. To-day the Minister tells us that the deficit is $112,000.00. Why was not the thirty thousand and odd added on to the $81,000 before. In my opinion the Auditor General should have added that on before. So that now the actual deficit is $112,-000.00 instead of two millions, although two millions were the figures tabled in this House in answer to my question a few days ago. The Minister of Finance is the gentleman in charge of the Department of Finance and Customs and as such he is responsible for financial statements to this House whether they are correct or incorrect. Now I think this is a serious matter, a matter that your own figures showed that you were $2,025,000.00 short, and when I made the statement here the other day the Finance Minister had right to be here and correct me and told me that there had been a mistake made. The fact is that the Finance Minister is the reponsible party and he cannot throw the blame over on Mr. Keating or the Auditor General or anyone else, although he tried to shift the blame this evening. It is only a matter of adding up ten lines of figures and I am sure the Finance Minister is able to do that. But the Finance Minister has not explained the deficit up to April 30th. The statement he gave does not satisfy me at all. The system of having four hundred thousand dollars distributed over various months is not right, and I want a further investigation of the affairs of that Department. Deficits have occurred and were paid out of Loans. I have put a question on the Order Paper asking for details as to how the various loans were spent and when I get a reply we will be able to discuss the matter further. The great trouble is that we cannot depend upon any information we get from that department because the Minister in charge does not take the responsibility upon himself that he should. I don't think that I can be blamed for what has happened, as there is no one who wants to see a surplus better than your humble servant.

HON. FINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, just a few words in response to the honourable member for Ferryland who in the course of his remarks said that I have not explained the deficit up to the 30th of April. I do not intend to. When the Budget is brought down in this House he will know the deficit or surplus, whatever it may be, up to the 30th of June. I would also like to state for the information of the same member that I have a hazy recollection that moneys were taken from loans to pay deficits in the past.

MR. CASHIN—I grant you.

HON. MINIISITER OF FINANCE—I do not intend to discuss this matter further this afternoon, as I shall have

an opportunity of dealing with it fully when the Estimates come before the House.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say in connection with the Speech from the Throne, which I take it indicates the policy of the Government and indicates also the legislation that the Government proposes to introduce during the present session of the House. I want anything that I may say to be taken in a broad general way. Now, I consider that the country, its people and its interests are far more important and of greater consequence than any political party or government or any individual member of this House. The country and its interests should be our first and foremost consideration. Unfortunately, in this country Party and its interests and the interests of individual members of that Party receive first consideration very often to the detriment of the country. During the course of my remarks if I have to refer to any individual member of the Government it will be in his official capacity, as it is not my intention to be personal.

The most important items in the Speech from the Throne that I can notice are the Labrador Boundary Question, the deficit in the revenue, and the paragraph which deals with future industrial development. I am disappointed that nothing is said in the Speech from the Throne about the fisheries of the country, which have been so often referred to as the mainstay of the Colony, the staple industry, the industry upon which every other industry practically depends. I regret that no future policy regarding the fisheries is outlined in the Speech. I regret, also, like other speakers who have preceded me, that the Government saw fit to postpone the opening of the House until the 11th day of May, when members of the Government as well as members of the Opposition should be attending to other business. Time was when members of this House, particularly the Prime Minister, seriously deplored the late opening of the Legislature. Preceding governments were criticized and almost damned because it was contended that the legislatue should open earlier in the season so that the public business of the country could be transacted. We are now in the latter part of May and the business of the House is scarcely started.

I want to congratulate Mr. Chambers on his election in Burgeo and LaPoile, although for one reason I am not doing it with very good grace. Mr. Chambers happened to take the position I formerly held. I was told to get out bag and baggage, without a hearing, and Mr. Chambers after a few weeks saw fit to take that position. But I want to tell the Prime Minister and this House that Mr. Chambers at one time was just as dissatisfied and disgrauntled over the way the Government was acting as any of the five men that left the Government ranks. I hope I am not giving away any secrets on Mr. Chambers when I say that. However, Mr. Chambers is in charge of the Department of Public Works now and I hope he will find conditions there more congenial than I found them. Personally, I do not think he will find them very congenial unless he makes up his mind to become a "figure head" or a "rubber stamp." I remember in 1923 Sir John Bennett in his Manifesto deplored the fact that there were members in the Squires Government who were in charge of departments and who were not taking that share of responsibility which the importance of the office warranted. Well, I may say that when I was in charge of the Department of

Public Works I tried to do my job well, and to do my very best to practice economy and retrenchment. I was talking my share of responsibility. With what result? Dr. Mosdell is not in his seat this afternoon, but I would also like to congratulate him on his victory in Fortune Bay against exceedingly great odds. It was an indication, to my mind, of the unpopularity of the Government, and vindicated the views which myself and others expressed from time to time. Particularly do I want to congratulate Mr. Brophy on his election in St. John's East. I was a member of the Government for two years, and I want to say that any time the matter of opening the district for a bye-election was discussed with me I took the stand that the spirit of that section of the Election Act, which states that when a vacancy occurs in any district, an election shall be held within six months, should be carried out. As the Old Country sets the pace for Canada and the other Dominions, I thought that Newfoundland should be just as good, and not do what previous governments had done. When I became a member of the Monroe Government, I understood the actions of past governments were not going to influence us. We were not going to follow in the footsteps of any party, or in the footsteps of past governments.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, the absence of my old friend, Mr. Mott, the Clerk of the House, but I am happy to know that he is quickly recovering from his recent operation. Mr. Mott, though not a native, has lived here many years, and is a man of sterling worth and character, and has served his adopted country in a very capable manner. I hope his recovery will be complete.

The Prime Minister, on opening day, made reference to the deaths of Sir Robert Bond and Sir Michael Cashin. I wish to concur in the expressions of sympathy. I did not do so at the time. I feel it my duty to my constituency to endorse the letters of condolence to the relatives of these two deceased gentlemen. I need not say anything to impress or emphasize the public worth of these two gentlemen. Sir Robert Bond was a leader in the political life of this country for years. He was well-known, not only in Newfoundland, but throughout the world, as a man of sterling character. I remember well the political demonstrations that were held in his honour at St. John's over thirty years ago. Sir Michael Cashin was also well-known in Newfoundland, as well as other countries. Sir John Bennett in his Manifesto of 1923, said that Sir Michael Cashin was the most successful Finance Minister this country ever had.

Then we have had during the past year, in connection with the Government of this country, four Deputy Ministers pass from this world to the other. I refer to Mr. Turner, Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines; Mr. Summers and Mr. McGrath, Deputy Ministers of Justice, and Mr. Alan Goodridge, who recently passed away. I think I should say a word about Mr. Goodridge, for I knew him best, and very often discussed fishery matters with him. He was very much interested in the success of the fisheries of this country, but particularly in the matter of oils. If Mr. Goodridge had been given a freer hand and had been permitted to carry out his plans, the fishery, and particularly the oil industry, would have reached an even more advanced position in the markets to-day. Great credit is due to Mr. Goodridge, for it is owing to his efforts that our oil, especially refined cod liver oil, holds such a high position in the markets of the world to-day.

Now I want to congratulate Messrs. Cahill and Power, who moved and seconded a motion that a committee

be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I must congratulate these two gentlemen on their efforts. You never know what's in a man until you put him to the test. The two junior members of the Monroe party acquitted themselves very well, indeed. Mr. Cahill, in reference to the deficit, used these words: "It is pointd out in the Speech that it is not considered necessary to adopt any drastic remedial measures, showing, happily, that the Government believes that the unfortunate conditions which have brought about this result are only transitory and are bound to improve." Now, when the Prime Minister spoke on opening day, he made reference to the fact that certain members of his party had crossed the floors of the House, and that, as a result, he could not bring in the "drastic remedial legislation" which he thought necessary. This is what he said: "We acknowledge that we are not as powerful to do things that we think ought to be done as we were before we lost some members to the other side. If we had those members we would be able to introduce drastic measures that we don't feel powerful to do at the present time. I don't believe those necessary but drastic measures will ever be carried out by Responsible Government in this country."

Mr. Cahill's remarks, Mr. Speaker, and the Prime Minister's do not seem to agree. Mr. Cahill said that the Government did not consider it necessary to adopt immediate drastic measures, and the Prime Minister says it is necessary, but cannot be done by reason of the weakness of the Government in regard to numbers.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I do not wish to interrupt the speaker, but the point I want to make is that the Hon. Member is misquoting. The Prime Minister was referring to drastic measures in connection with the tariff.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Speaker, I submit that the Prime Minister may have had drastic remedial measures in mind with regard to other matters as well as the tariff. The Prime Minister said he do not think those drastic measures will ever be carried out by Responsible Givernment in this country. Then if they cannot be carried out by Responsible Government in this country, who is going to carry them out? The Prime Minister, referring to the doing of the Imperial Conference, said that we have a certain independent status not previously enjoyed by us, and if we applied to the Imperial Government for a Commission they would say to us, "Physician, heal thyself."

In my opinion, it is only a miracle that will save this country from insolvency, and if the Labrador Boundary Question had not been settled in our favour God knows where we would be and how we would be feeling to-day. The decision, however, has been given and awarded in our favour, and a considerable asset has been added to the assets we already have. I trust the Government will not, on the strength of our assets, raise more money to be spent on questionable ventures, and add more burdens to the already overburdened taxpayers.

Now, with reference to the latter part of Mr. Cahill's speech. I cannot agree with Mr. Cahill in his references to the defections from the Monroe Party. I happen to be one of the "malcontents" that he referred to. If he means by "malcontents" men who represent the people, and are determined to voice their opinions as members of a government, then I am willing to be dubbed a 'malcontent," but not otherwise. Independence of members is talked of from time to time. The F. P. U. members, a few years ago, were accused of not being independent enough, but of being mouth-pieces of Mr. Coaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you are with a Government and shows

a little sign of independence, you are no longer wanted, and you are told you do not know what you are talking about, and if you don't like it you can get out. The very idea of Responsible Government to my mind, is that the humblest member of the Government as the choice of the people, has just as much right to speak his mind and express his opinion as the biggest man there. Mr. Cahill's insinuations were cast on the members who happened to be once in the Monroe Party, but are now seated on this side of the House. For myself I had no choice. Five of us held a meeting to discuss public matters and certain grievances, rumours were spread, and as a consequence two of us were dismissed. We did not have a chance to come to the House and cross the floors. Mr. Duff had that chance, but did not avail himself of the opportunity. It is reported, I don't know whether it is true or not, that the Prime Minister has stated that the men who left his Party were the most Honest and sane-minded he had in his party. I do not know if the Prime Minister said that or not, but I hope it is true.

Referring again to the deficit. I not only as a member of this House, but as a citizen of this country, with all that I own in the country, regret to hear that there is a deficit of two and one-half million dollars (including the railway deficit). Now, what is the cause of it? First, the low-earning power of the people. Hundreds of men in the outports are very glad if they can earn $150 in twelve months, and, but for the fact that they own their own homes and a certain amount of land from which they can raise vegetables and keep sheep, a cow or other live-stock, a large number of the people in the outports would perish. Secondly, the comparatively small number of people engaged at really productive work, and the large number living off the producers. And thirdly, the heavy interest charges on the public debt and unnecessary and unprofitable expenditures. The position we find ourselves in to-day is that we have to borrow money partly to pay the interest on the debt we already owe. Any man in business will tell you that when a business gets to the point where you have to borrow to pay the interest on money already borrowed, that business is not very sound and not very promising.

Now with reference to the Labrador Boundary Settlement. I want to congratulate those concerned, including the Minister of Justice, who took part in the negotiations which ended in our favour. I congratulate those who took part in the negotiations in the past. This matter has been going on for a long time. I was not very old when the Labrador Boundary Question was started. It must have cost this country an immense amount of money, and I would like to know, and I think the country would like to know, the total cost of the Labrador Boundary Question to date. If it can be obtained I shall ask a question at a future time. We have gained 110,000 square miles, rich in water powers, timbers and minerals. But now that we have it what are we going to do with it? Some people consider the wining of the Labrador a curse rather than a blessing. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that will not prove to be true. The danger is that, because of the additional asset, we may be tempted to borrow more money on the strength of it. I think that if we could get enough for it to pay our national debt, that it would probably be best to sell it, or Newfoundland is going to get the worst end of the thing. Retain the coastline for our fishermen, that must not be disposed of.

Very little is said about the codfishery in the Speech from the Throne. There is no future fishery policy outlined. As a matter of fact, in the House and out of it, any reference made in connection with the fishery of

the country is considered a joke, because we have talked about the fishery so long and done so little. Certain fishermen of the District which I represent told me recently that the next time a candidate came to them soliciting votes and says anything regarding the fishery, they will tell him to get out quick, and I don't blame them. There is no subject that is so much discussed in this country as the fisheries, and yet there is very little done to foster and encourage it. It is probable that nothing can be done. It is probable, I say, that nothing can be done. Mr. Speaker, if that is so, it is time that the people and the fishermen of the country were told that nothing can be done. It is not fair to the fisherman to string him along from year to year. There are hundreds to-day looking for supplies, anxious to go to the fishery, but cannot succeed in securing supplies. I have heard that a number of fishermen intend to visit St. John's and interview the Government to see what can be done in this respect. The leaders of all political parties in their manifestoes usually refer especially to the fisheries. Mr. Bennett, in his manifesto in 1923, rerered to a bonus, I'll read it for you:—

"But while ready to support this Humber industry I and my Party are not unmindful that the fisheries are the mainstay of the Island and its people, and that it will need more than a paper making enerprise on which at most only 2000 or 1500 people can obtain employment to make up for the loss which any decline in our fishery will involve for the fifty or sixty thousand people shown by the last census to depend for their support on the pursuit practiced by their forebears for generations. During late years, though the mills at Grand Falls and the mines at Bell Island have helped somewhat to solve our industrial problem, they have been at best only auxiliaries to the fishery. Greater catches of fish were made, and higher prices realized, during the war years than ever before, and a return to those conditions as far as that can be brought about, is what the country needs most to-day.

We propose, therfore, to give those directly engaged in the fishing industry—not to exceed one dollar a quintal—under conditions to be worked out as soon as possible after taking office, if we are elected; and to which the widest publicity will be given so as to be available in connection with this season's catch. Other countries have found it feasible to grant bounties or bounses to their fishermen and I am satisfied that Newfoundland can do the same. I recognize that it will be contended by those against us that this is an impossible plan, but surely it would be better to spend public money in this way then to waste it on the Badger-Halls Bay road, or the Deer Lake-Bonne Bay road, as two years ago, or on any of the other 'wildcat" schemes on which this Government has wasted the substance of the taxpayers the past two or three years."

Now, in speaking of the result of such a bonus, he says this:—

"The result of such a bonus, judiciously and properly applied should be to stimulate the production of a better quality of fish, which in turn should mean increased prices of our product in the foreign markets, and this, again, should mean a larger return to the revenue through the purchase made by the fishermen; and as the status of the industry improved and prices advanced the bonus could be gradually reduced and in time withdrawn altogether."

That was Mr. Bennett's idea at that time.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—And they did not believe it.

MR. RUSSELL—At least they did not accept it. Finally, Mr. Bennett said:—

"Finally, we propose to summon a Convention of Merchants, Planters and Fishermen to meet in St. John's next

autumn to discuss all fishery matters and to concert measures whereby the experience of practical men of all these classes can be utilized in working out a fishery policy that will prove of general advantage."

If that had been done since, as Mr. Bennett suggested it would have been a great benefit to the fishermen. There has been plenty of time to do it since. That was in 1923. It is now 1927. Sir Richard Squires ,in 1923, used these words:—

(Reads)

I will not say this both for Mr. Bennett and Sir Richard Squires, that Mr. Bennett was not endorsed by the electors and therefore did not have a chance to put his policy into operation, and Sir Richard Squires whatever his intentions were, did not have the time after the election of 1923 to carry them out with reference to the encouragement of the fisheries or the payment of a bonus.

And now we come to the 1924 Manifesto of Mr. Monroe. This is the Manifesto that I am particularly interested in because I was with that party, and I went to the country with Mr. Monroe on that policy. We told the people that if they gave us the necessary votes so that we could be elected and become the Government that we would do thus and thus. Here is the agreement or the contract with which we went to the people and asked them to endorse, and I for one and other members of that party at the time took it for granted that something would be done.

(Reads)

I think it was Mr. Halfyard who remarked the other day that this country instead of being a "fishermen's paradise" was a "fishermen's purgatory"

(Reads)

These are nice sentiments. Possibly every one of the gentlemen who wrote these words meant what they said at that time. But none of them have been carried out. As I said before, probably nothing can be done. Then if so it is time, in my opinion, to take the mask off and tell the people and the fishermen to go about their own business and solve their own problems. Tell them that the Government can't do anything, and don't intend to do anything, and tell them practically to paddle their own canoes. I remember Mr. Higgins speaking in the Star Hall in April, 1923. Mr. Higgins was referring not to merchants but to politicians. These are his words:—

(Reads)

I don't want to refer to the membership of the Bennett party at that time, but the ranks of the Monroe party consists of men just as capable as the men who filled the ranks of the Bennett party. It is reasonable to suppose that if there were men in the ranks of the Bennett party who could carry out their projects, because they were successful men, surely there are men in the ranks of the Monroe party who could do the same thing to-day. I was remarkably struck by a statement made by the American Trade Commissioner, Mr. Meek.ns, in Bulletin Number 40. This is the report of an outsider. He was sent to Newfoundland by the American Government as a special Trade Commissioner, to report on the trade possibilities of this country. His report, sir, is this:

(Reads)

We hear a lot about intensive farming nowadays. But we do not hear very much about the intensive cultivation of the fisheries. He offers this as the explanation:

(Reads)

I say that any single industry which employs from forty to fifty thousand men, women and children, as does the fisheries of this country, and from which such a large number of other people, directly or indirectly, derive their living, ought to receive the first consideration, and we should not, as the representatives of the people,

throw away the substance for the shadow. It is a fact that the fishing Industry is the basic industry of this country. We may have paper mills which employ a few thousand people who are settled in towns like Grand Falls or Corner Brook, but let the fishing industry once be given up and you will find practically the whole country deserted. Because the people have nothing to live out of but the fisheries.

The trouble is that we have been chasing rainbows. We have been dropping the substance like the dog when he looked down into the water with a bone in his mouth. He saw the shadow of the bone.

MR. BROWNE—The reflection.

MR. RUSSELL—The reflection. I thank you, Mr. Browne. When he saw the reflection he dropped the bone and lost both the reflection and the bone. It is just like a man with a good business giving an ear to somebody who comes along with another proposition. He goes into something that he knows nothing about. His own business, well-established and paying, is neglected and goes down, and the new business fails. He eventually loses both.

Hundreds of men in this country and in Conception Bay to-day cannot get employment or supplies for the fisheries. Job Brothers served notice on men in my own district that if they wanted supplies they had to pay cash. And if they took the supplies and paid the cash even then Job Brothers could not guarantee to take the fish when it was caught. But they also stipulated that if they bought the supplies and caught the fish they would have to get the first chance of purchasing it. But I understand that the supplying merchants on Water Street are not very anxious to supply this year, and therefore hundreds of men who are anxious to go to the fisheries and can do nothing else will be unable to obtain supplies. There are hundreds of men who, even if they wanted to go to Boston, New York, Philadelphia or elsewhere, could not go there. There are some who can, but most men must prosecute the fisheries or starve. There is not enough employment on public works to go around. You are pretty well through with the highroads, I suppose. These highroads are all right if we could afford it; a tourist traffic is a nice thing to contemplate, but a lot of these things are visionary. There is no guarantee that you are going to develop it or profit by it. You take a big chance. If this country could afford to take a chance speculation would be all very well, but this country cannot afford to speculate. That is the position which Newfoundland is in to-day. We cannot afford to speculate and should not.

There is one firm that I wish to refer to, and that is the Hudson's Bay Company. A ray of hope seems to be there. It is good to see a company like that with resources developing the fresh frozen and the smoked fish business. What I have got to suggest in connection with the fisheries is this: Adopt a practical and definite policy of developing the fisheries, find new markets, regulate shipments and run the affairs of the country half decently, and we can all live like princes provided too much damage has not already been done. I notice in the Meekin report reference to codoil, and I think that I will read the section here.

(Reads)

It is not all sunshine as we know for the men prosecuting the fisheries. Outside of the chances that they take, in not being able to get the fish, there is also th eelement of danger, of loss of life and hardship. And then when he comes to sell his fish the low price that he gets is often very discouraging, so that the men in the outports and throughout the country are finding it more profitable and more congenial to get out to other countries when they cannot find employment in

their own country. I am not an authority on fish matters no more than is Mr. Bradley, but living in the outports as I do you get some general knowledge of the difficulties and problems which the fishermen have got to contend with. I have thought it possible that we are marking too many rules and regulations in connection with the codfishery, and even in connection with the seal fishery. My idea is that in general we should allow the fishermen to catch fish when and how they can.

Reference has been made to the paper industry. I am glad to see such a large production taking place in that industry. Between Grand Falls and Corner Brook they produce 700 tons daily at a value of over $50,000. I want to say to the Prime Minister and the Government that I stand ready to give my support to the Gander project provided that every consideration is given to the interests of the country and the people. I am opposed, like the Prime Minister himself, to the exportation of pulpwood. I do not think that one foot of wood should be exported from this country in an unmanufactured state. We are consuming and using in this country already too many articles manufactured in other countries and by other workmen, to the detriment of our own people from year to year. The Gander project is about all the paper mills Newfoundland can support.

Referring to the other bills in connection with industrial development, I want to say to the Government that I will give these my hearty support, provided they do not contain unreasonable concessions and are not detrimental to the taxpayers of this country.

Our people want labour. Not only in the city, where there are hundreds of men out of employment, but in the outports as well. Some labour must be provided if the fisheries cannot take them all. Then you should welcome anybody with an industrial proposition. In connection with the Gander measure which was passed by the Government in 1924. There was the condition that the Gander people had to begin the actual construction work within three years from August 16, 1924, and that the sum of five million dollars were to be spent in Newfoundland within six years. And now I understand the Gander people are asking the Government to extend the time. Is that correct?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think that I told the House that the Government had no proposition from the Gander people.

MR. RUSSELL—Now coming back to the Manifesto of the Prime Minister of 1924. I said early in my remarks sir, that I was one of the members who composed your party and went to the country with a policy not only in connection with the fisheries, but also a policy of economy and retrenchment. I took it very seriously myself. And while I was head of the Department of Public Works, I did everything possible to assist the Prime Minister and the Government in carrying out that policy of economy and retrenchment. Mr. Morine, who is a member of the Executive Government at the present time, in delivering two addresses in this city sometime previous to 1924 claimed that if he were in charge of the affairs of this country he could reduce taxation by $2,000,000? Mr. Morine has been a very prominent member of the Executive Government in this country. I don't know to what extent he has tried to bring about a reduction in taxation. Anyway I don't think that we have had a reduction yet. In reference to economy and retrenchment the leader of the party said:

(Reads)

As I said before I was in charge of one department and I practised retrenchment and economy even to my own political detriment, because I was

trying to carry out the policy of the Prime Minister by buying goods as cheap as I possibly could. When demands were made upon me which I thought were wrong I refused to grant them. In connection with the buying of butter. I was trying to practise economy, and the truth about that butter business is simply this: That in the fall of 1925 I decided to call for tenders for provisions and groceries. Various tenders came in for provisions generally but only one for butter. Sir John Crosbie was the butterine man who sent in his tender for the supplying of butter to the various institutions. The Board did not accept any tender either for provisions or groceries. But after that happened Sir John Crosbie came to me and made me an offer. Previous to this I had been buying the butter in a retail way. But he made an offer, and I think that it is only fair to him for me to say that his offer seemed so good that I did not hesitate to accept it. He agreed to sell us the butter at the regular factory price, and in addition to give the Department a ten and a two per cent. discount. My reward was dismissal for doing these things. The Prime Minister saw fit because I attended a meeting with four other members of his party to dismiss me.

I think the Prime Minister has been sorry since for doing it. I think if the Prime Minister had his time over again he would not be hasty, because it has brought a lot of political trouble on his own head, and the end is not yet. Because I will say this, and I don't care who hears me say is, that when Mr. Monroe was elected he had as fine and loyal a crowd of men around him as any political leader could reasonably expect to have in this country, and I believe that every man in that party was imbued with the same sense of duty and obligation to the people of this country. I believe that every man in that party was willing to co-operate and do his best, if treated right and given a show and given a chance. Some members of the party have said to me since we moved out, "Now that you fellows are gone I suppose we will get better treatment." Quite a number have made that remark. It appears that they too realized that it was not much use in the rank and file expecting much, and that they thought it might be better with the majority reduced.

In that policy, I submit, which Mr. Monroe submitted to the people of this country there was no mention made of the things that a vast amount of money has been spent on. There was no mention of Highroads which have cost over two million dollars, and no mention made of the Dock that cost nearly two million; no mention of re-railing the Railway, or of a new steamer on the Port aux Basques-Sydney route. There was certainly a definite policy in connection with the fisheries, but as far as those other things were concerned, which meant a large expenditure of money and consequently increased taxation, and also meant the deficit which we have to-day, these things and these expenditures were afterthoughts. The Government decided on the road and other policies after the election, and I believe that if the country had been asked to endorse such a policy as the Government has carried out since they would not have been prepared to do it, because if you remember the tendency then was, because of expenditures previous to that, very strongly against large expenditures that would mean increased burdens and increased taxation, and the people were in no mood to endorse such a policy because of previous raising of loans and those previous expenditures. As a matter of fact on our election campaign we condemned the Squires Government for raising eighteen million in loans, and gave the people to understand that we didn't

intend to raise any more loans. It was not mentioned in the manifesto, I will admit, but that was what we were given to understand that the party stood for, the raising of no more loans, and no more large expenditures of money. Do you ask me if I favour good roads? Certainly I favour good roads, in the same way as I favour a mansion to a cottage, and would rather live in a mansion than in a hovel; but I have got to live in the hovel if I can't afford a mansion; in the same way as I would rather drive in a limousine than a Ford, but must choose the Ford if I can't afford the other. That is just about the position of this country to-day. We are driving in a Rolls Royce to-day, and we can only afford to be driving in a Ford.

Another thing I condemn in the present administration is the appointment of commissions and boards comprised of private individuals drawing big salaries. The commissions and Boards are nothing but minature departments adding to the expense of Government, and we are on a policy of retrenchment. My honourable friend, Mr. Duff, when he was on this side of the House, was never done talking about the appointment of the Highroads Commission, and he used to make me feel very nice sometimes when I was sitting in the Government ranks in Mr. Chambers' position, and he used to say that the Highroads Commission should be put under the Public Works Department. And he was right, absolutely right, and thousands of dollars could be saved if that department was made a sub-department of the Department of Public Works. Mr. Duff said a whole lot of things about highroads and expenditure on the highroads, and condemned the Monroe Government for the waste of money. I wish I had my Hansard here to read some of the things he did say. Another thing the Prime Minister stated is this, that if he can't succeed in saving the country nobody else can. That is a big statement to make. How does Mr. Monroe know that nobody else can It is not sufficient for any man to have good intentions. One writer has said that "the road to hell is paved with good intentions," and another has said that it is "paved with sanctimonious pretensions." Honesty of purpose and honesty of self is not good enough. Sound judgment, born of experience, is the essential thing in managing the affairs of a country. Men are not judged by what they say but by what they do. I am going to refer to the speech the Colonial Secretary made during the bye-election campaign. I think it was delivered in the Gaiety Hall, in which, referring to some men who left the Monroe Party, he called them "apprentices." In other words, the men who went out were inexperienced men, had swelled heads, and should have been seen and not heard.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I didn't say that.

MR. RUSSELL—The inference was that because certain men had entered politics for the first time they were apprentices and should have been seen and not heard. I dissent from that view, because when I was elected for a district and the electors of that district expected that the Government should not only see me but hear me, and that I should have a voice in the government as well as others. If the Colonial Secretary speaks of us as apprentices he would have to include the Prime Minister. He is just as much an apprentice, perhaps more so, because in his position of Prime Minister he has greater responsibilities. We are the representatives of the people and we are here to manage their affairs and to work in their interests. Are we doing it? We make all kinds of statements during election campaigns, and make all kinds of promises and we

come back and forget practically all that we promised and all that we said. We are up against a very serious proposition. I realize that this is no time for playing politics. I have enough interest in this country, because everything I own is here, to put the country first and the interests of the country first. I am not a know-all. I am not a grab-all, and I am not a superman. I have not got the ability that some men have, but at least I have some experience and I have an opinion, and anything that I can do to forward the interests of this country through the Government of this country I am prepared to do it; but I would ask the Prime Minister to quit playing ducks and drakes with the country. I would like to see the Prime Minister get in a repentant mood for anything that has been done that may be considered wrong, whether it was intentional or not. We have all made mistakes; I have made mistakes and every one of us has. Business men make mistakes. They decide on certain courses that look feasible and rational at the time but they turn out to be wrong. If the Prime Minister thinks that certain things the Government have done in the past were wrong and have not been for the benefit of the country and have made it harder for the people and increased taxation, why not admit it? As a result of the bye-election in St. John's East it has been contended that the country has no longer any confidence in the Government. I think the election proves that contention to be correct, and but for the one or two majority which the Government has to-day they could not carry on, and as the Prime Minister stated, no drastic or remedial legislation can be put through. The financial and commercial position of the country to-day I fear is at the breaking point. I don't believe that we know to-day just how bad we are. Every man we meet is talking about the future in the darkest kind of a way. I am no pessimist. I don't want to be suggesting anything that will bring about a condition of things that will mean red flags flying, but I do say that it is necessary at this particular time for the Government to get down to serious business. When conditions in a country are bad there are some people who need not take it seriously. They have got their money made and they are secure, no matter how things go, with their investments or with their business or with their money.

The Prime Minister on opening day in this House was inclined to blame the people for existing conditions. Now I do not absolve the people altogether, but when men are in charge of the affairs of a country they are in a position to know the true position, and if I may use the illustration they should act toward the people of Newfoundland as a parent acts toward his child. That would be adopting a drastic attitude, and that is what the country needs to-day if she is going to be saved. It is not the fault of the people that large expenditures have been made. That is the Government's own policy which was not endorsed by the people. The general feeling and accepted as a fact is that when the country has dropped from the heights of prosperity to the depths of adversity the fault lies with the Government, and I would ask the Prime Minister what he is going to do about it? If the legislation which the Government proposes to introduce this session does not turn out to be any more successful than the legislation introduced at previous sessions then I fear for the future. I would suggest to the Prime Minister to take this House into his confidence and state definitely what our true position is and what he proposes to do and I for one will give my support to any measure that I consider to be in the best interests of the country and the

people no matter how drastic it is.

In conclusion I would suggest to the Government to bring in a Bill regulating the exportation of fish; encourage and support any Newfoundlander with a practical and reasonable proposition in connection with industrial development; enforce the Crown Lands Act, whereby enough employment could be had for all, and reserve all timber limits for the people of the country and not give them to any private speculators and do something that will help the fishermen and the fisheries.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, since this debate started I have listened to the speeches of the different members with considerable interest. The subject has been so thoroughly discussed that there is very little left for one to talk about. I suppose we all have our own individual ideas as to just what legislation should or should not be passed at this session. But I do believe that every member of the House is agreed on one point, and that is that the Government of the day has not a sufficient majority whereby essential legislation is possible. Anyone reading the Speech from the Throne must become at once aware of the pessimistic atmosphere pervading it, and just why that should be so I am at a loss to understand. I am not pessimistic because I believe that never before in the history of Newfoundland were we in a better position than we are now to achieve success and prosperity—success for the people and prosperity for the country. One might ask what is there to give us an optimistic outlook for the future. Well, there are various things. The first thing is our mineral wealth which for a number of years past has been discussed so much and talked about perhaps too lightly. Various important industrial concerns are interested in our mining possibilities and the activities which we see to-day at Buchan's mine is a concrete example of what we can expect in the way of development from now on regarding our mineral resources. Then there is the paper industry which year by year is increasing in importance in Newfoundland and the eyes of capitalists on both sides of the Atlantic are centred on our paper-making possibilities by reason of our plenteous water powers and vast timber limits, which have been considerably added to since the settlement of the Labrador Boundary dispute. Then again there are the fisheries. I believe that a "come back" will be staged in connection with our fisheries even though serious losses were met with the past couple of years by the fishermen as well as by the exporters. Times have changed and as the times change we must change with the times. If the markets of the world require fish cured or packed in a different manner to the way it has been done in the past we must be up-to-date and find uot the best method of meeting the requirements of our customers. The Hudson Bay Company are at present engaged in doing something in that direction and I believe that what they are doing is the thin end of the wedge as to what we can expect in the way of development for fresh frozen fish. We have the fish in our waters and all that is needed is development to the best possible extent by devising the best means of minimizing the cost of catching it for the fishermen and to understand the different kinds of fish that are to-day required by the various markets abroad. But whatever happens the fisheries should be encouraged. Then we have Agriculture. The other day while discussing the bequest of the late Sir Robert Bond of revered memory one or two members dealt with the agricultural outlook for the country and from what I could gather they were favorably inclined to the idea that agriculture could be developed satisfactorily in this country. I know there are a great many farm products that cannot be

grown here successfully and we have to import them for consumption, but there are many things that can be grown here and to our distinct advantage. Take potatoes, for instance, a chief product of our local farms. The Prime Minister stated here a few days ago that local farmers find it difficult to sell potatoes after producing them. There is a reason for that and we should first find out the reason and then provide the remedy. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, we can do that. Nearly every year in the early Fall our local farmers are up against keen competition from Canada, particularly from the Maritime Provinces. These outsiders send down their potatoes into this market and dump thousands of barrels here and at prices that are lower than our local farmers can hope to sell for, and the worst feature of it is that a large proportion of the consumers prefer to buy the imported article apart from the low price. Now there must be a reason for that. I am given to understand that the Canadian potatoes have better keeping qualities than ours but I believe that Mr. Bayly of the Agricultural Department in this city can give the necessary information whereby the local potatoes can have better keeping qualities, as good as the imported, so that it is now up to the Government to provide the remedy. About two years ago I suggested that a protective tariff should be put into effect on certain products of farm and dairy and that suggestion was carried out, to some extent. I think the duty was increased on cabbage at a certain time of the year; and I say now that at certain times of the year, say from the early Fall until the early Spring, a certain protective tariff should be put on imported potatoes.

It will be thought by some members that if you do that the local farmers are going to take advantage of it and charge more than they would otherwise have done, but if you let it be known that the protection is on the understanding that the local prices are to compare with the C.I.F. value of the imported article and if the prices are more than that the protection will be withdrawn. I feel confident that the farmers of this country, who are in most cases just as intelligent as we are, will look out for their future interests, and do the right thing as regards prices.

What applies to potatoes is true of other things that can be produced in large quantities in this country. Eggs are imported in large shipments from Canada, America and even from faraway China into Newfoundland. I know that we can get all the eggs we want in our own country and I would suggest that the same protective tariff be put on eggs. If we adopt a wise protective policy we will find more action amongst the local agriculturists.

So then we have the mines, paper industry, fishery, agriculture and other industries that have been hinted at, and with these in view I am optimistic and think and speak optimistically for the future. We can, and if we pull together, we will bring success and these things can be brought about. Only some of us will have to put our country first and ourselves in the background for a little while.

The Speech from the Throne has been greatly criticised. A lot of what has been said cannot be too forcibly expressed. Criticism is necessary but it should be of a constructive nature.

The first paragraph in the Speech from the Throne refers to the Privy Council award and when reading it we see that Newfoundland now has the right to legislate for an additional one hundred and ten thousand square miles, and suggests we can now proceed with the unrestricted development of the Labrador assets, this of course call for considerable financial outlay. I wonder if this sentiment is echoed by the Minister of Finance.

In any case the question of the Labrador Boundary is going to be a very important one in the near future and it will be up to this Government or some other government to discover just how they are going to dispose of it. Some of the previous speakers have expressed their view or at any rate conveyed the impression that they thought the best thing to do was to sell it for the best sum that could be obtained. We must keep in view the fact that once you sell it for a lump sum it is out of hands for all time and before doing so it is wise to look at another side. I think that the most of the Honourable Members know the story of the 'prodigal son' and it has occurred to me that perhaps the moral of that parable might be aplpicable to the Labrador. If we sell it for a lump sum of money, that will be spent within a very short time, we shall have spent everything and have nothing left of our heritage. Perhaps we can develop the Labrador assets ourselves, and gain a yearly revenue for all time by reason of the labour used which will make the revenues.

At any rate it is a very important question and should be looked at from every angle when the time comes.

The reference to the cod fishing industry is disposed of in three and a half lines and reference is also made to the seal fishery. I have often thought that those who prosecute the seal fishery, that is the common sealers, always did get very little returns for the hardships which they undergo. These sealers who go out to the ice in the spring of the year for three weeks or two months, come in and are very lucky if they receive thirty to seventy dollars for all the hardships which they have undergone. I think that this is one case where a minimum wage bill could be very well applied.

The previous speakers have omitted to say anything about the Imperial Conference or its importance. They have congratulated several members of this House, on their success in the by-elections or with reference to the Address in Reply. I would also like to congratulate these gentlemen, but I am also going to congratulate another member. It may seem strange coming from the Opposition side of the House but I think the Prime Minister deserves to be congratulated upon the way in which he performed his duties as representative of Newfoundland at the Imperial Conference. From official reports and from private letters which I have received, it is evident that he held his own against representatives of larger and more powerful countries and brought credit not only to himself but to Newfoundland through the happy eloquence and general bearing.

Now we come to that part of the Speech from the Throne in connection with the deficit. A deficit whether large or small is something to feel down in the mouth about. Various suggestions have been made as to why we have this deficit, but it is significant that at the present time that about one-third the value of our imports is on the free list and it will require a great deal of courage for any politician to atempt to remedy that, but supposing that we struck out the free list altogether and reduced the amount of duty upon the other two-thirds. Level up the whole. I don't know if this sugestion is worth anything or not but I think it could be considered a little more fully when going into the tariff question.

It is mentioned here that the deficit on the railway will be considerably less this year than it was last year. It is quite probable that it will be so, and it is great to know it. In connection with this the railway, freight department is showing a good deal of commendable active and further receipts can be expected due chiefly to the fact that a new freight tariff has been compiled by Mr. Rolls, who deserves

to be congratulated. It will induce the importers to route more shipments over the railway than they have been sending during past years and the result will be an increased revenue due to the new tariff.

I am sorry to see mentioned in the speech from the Throne that the Government intends to re-impose the Income Tax. I am in favour of this tax, if it can be applied fairly. We all know what happened when it was applied before. Just a few of us paid it. When I was giving in my returns there were men within a stone's throw of me who hadn't even been asked to give in their returns. Unless the new bill convinces me that a better method is suggested of collecting and compelling men to give an account of their incomes than before, I shall have to vote against it. I am only one, it is true, but there may be others who have the same views. The assessor before could go to the mercantile firms and ask for a list of the employees' salaries and Mr. Employee would have to pay the assessed amount whether he had any intention of paying it or not. There are many business men who will not tell you how much they are making and though you examine their books it is difficult to tell. There are many other business men in this country who make big incomes and who do not keep any books, at all.

I contend there are a thousand more people well able to afford to pay income tax. Many are not even asked to give returns and even if they are asked to give them they would purposely make a very small showing. I hope that when the new bill comes in it will have a new method of collection, and of obtaining information.

I don't know how much it cost to collect the income tax and the business profits tax when they were in force. The chances are that the returns that were gotten in did not warrant the expenditure.

A Bill will be brought in here in connection with Buchan's Mine and I notice that we shall be asked to admit into this country free of duty certain articles in connection with this mine for a period of 20 years. This is not the time to discuss that now, but I venture to say that we should not consider giving free entry for such a long period to articles coming into this country. There will also be a Bill in connection with the Gander. That is something that we cannot criticise unless we see the bill. That territory is very valuable to those interested in the pulp and paper manufacture and the legislation that I would like to see in this House in connection with the Gander area would call for the erection of paper mills in the Gander area. If one listens to rumour, I understand that owners of paper mills in other countries are contemplating the purchase of the Humber industry, and also the timber area on the Gander, and that they propose the erection of two more machines at Corner Brook which will be fed by timber and brought in from the Gander. If we can get that we are adding another source of labor which we very much want, but we must not cater to the wishes of the buyers too much. We must consider whether the companies that wish to purchase are desirable from every point of view.

Before taking my seat I shall just refer to the present unpopularity of the present Governent. The reason that the Government is so unpopular to-day, is because, their promises have not been fulfilled. I do not say that any blame can be attached to any individual. That is one of the reasons why the Government to-day is unpopular, and as evidence of their unpopularity we have the example of five or six gentlemen leaving their ranks, and who came to this side of the House last year, and the result of the recent by-elections have shown public sentiment in that respect, and

in view of this condition I think that it is due to the people of this country and not particularly to the Opposition, the Opposition cannot be expected to be considered, but it is only fair to the people that they should be given a chance to say what Government they wish to have after this Session. The elections should not be deferred, in my opinion, until next year. I am not one who desires to be in the ranks of the Government. Those who are cracking their necks to gain a position in the Government and a seat in the place of power do not realize perhaps the responsibility of Government, but I do think this, that the country should have a General Election this fall.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, when the House opened resolutions of condolence were passed to be sent to the relatives of the late Sir Michael Cashin and Sir Robert Bond. There were members of this House who spoke on these resolutions, and what they had to say I entirely endorse. Both these men played a very conspicuous part in the public life of this country. They have left their names indelibly written on the pages of the history of Newfoundland, and anyone who has followed their careers can see for themselves that the examples that they had set during their public career, all of us could well strive to emulate. I shall speak of Sir Michael Cashin first. He was a man who came from the bottom of the ladder to the top. From the fishing boat to the Premiership of Newfoundland. Anyone who has made a record like that must have had ability, and his career is well worth studying. Not only that sir, but during his public career he had done things which were useful for the country. He was sometime Minister of Finance, and during that period while he filled that position he did actually accumulate a little nest-egg which should be an example for all Finance Ministers to follow, and leave us in a better position than we are to-day, and when we are up against the stress of circumstances we would have something to fall back upon.

Speaking of Sir Robert, I think that every man in this House will agree with me that he was, without doubt, the greatest statesman that Newfoundland has produced. He was a man who had strong convictions, and he never hesitated to express them, and if he could not carry these convictions out he would sacrifice his position and everything else rather than compromise with anything that was wrong. He was in a very independent position on account of the large estate that was left to him, a fortune which enabled him to devote all his life to the interests of this country. He would not naturally be subject to the same temptations as a man who had to struggle hard for a living and would under certain conditions be ready to compromise here and there in order to be able to progress in his path through life. But there are men with means, and perhaps with larger means than he had who would compromise with anything that came along in order to increase their income, or further their advancement by their position or in some other way. We don't have to go outside Newfoundland to find examples of these, and so naturally we honour any man who will stand up, and will bravely carry out anything that he believes to be beneficial to his country, and will not stop at anything that would have for its object the advancement of his country. Sir Robert Bond was a great patriot. When I speak of patriotism I speak of patriotism in its truest phase, the man who is willing to sacrifice his own private fortune ir order to save the country from disaster. Such a man I say is the truest patriot that could be found. When we think of a man of that description we certainly

have cause to feel proud that Newfoundland produced that type of public man. We have seen it in his bequest that he made to the people of Newfoundland and I hope that the country and the Government, and particularly the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in whom I have faith enough to believe that he is interested in the development of the agricultural resources of this country, I hope that he will do his utmost to assist that industry, even if it does mean that he will have to establish that model farm. I don't see why it should be any additional expenditure to the colony. Perhaps an amount of money voted for the agricultural grant may be allocated to that purpose.

My congratulations must also be given to the member for Burgeo and LaPoile. He no doubt was elected on his own popularity, and no doubt also because he had a nice comfortable fund behind him. It is only natural to expect that when you have twenty or thirty thousand dollars at your disposal from the different departments of the Government, and those are distributed through that district that they are going to have some weight in electing you in that district. And if the fight is closely contested it is going to swing it from one side to the other. He was in the happy position of being Minister of Public Works and was able to have that amount at his disposal in order to help him to win that district.

Doctor Mosdell was sent up to Fortune and was elected as a member of the Opposition and no doubt if he takes part in the debates of this House he can bring a lot of information that will be valuable to this House. He has the knack of being able to assemble a lot of facts. The part that he played in the Upper House was ample proof of his ability as a speaker.

In referring to the Speech from the Throne, it is remarkable as somtone has said for what it does not contain. I say that it was the most vacuous document that was ever read in this House of Assembly. You can say that on looking into the document. You cannot say that it would buoy up the hopes of the people of Newfoundland. Y ou cannot say that it would give encouragement to the producers of this country to go ahead and work harder than ever to help bring about a better condition of things in this country. I say now, Mr. Speaker, that this country is up against a very hard proposition. The failure of the fisheries of last year means a deficit in the earning power of the fishermen. The result has been a decline in the trade that has been done in this country this fall and it was felt hardest this spring. And we cannot put out of sight the fact that conditions are hard at the present time. But all the same we were up against just as hard conditions in Newfoundland before, and if anyone peruses the history of Newfoundland from the earliest times down to the present he cannot help but see there that Newfoundland has passed through very hard times, harder than they are to-day perhaps, and got over them. And if our forefathers had the courage and will and the determination to carry it through then surely we as their sons have the same will and the same determination to do the same.

Well sir, these are the conditions that we are facing in Newfoundland to-day. When I read the Speech from the Throne, I almost began to think that the leader of the government had lost faith in this country, because if he had not, or if he had some programme, he would have said that the conditions were hard alright. He would have said that the revenue was declining, that there was a large deficit. But Newfoundland has gone through that before and is going to

get through it this time. He would have mapped out a programme, whereby this country would see itself fetting over these difficulties in a year or two. Take the fisheries for example. There is no mention in the Speech from the Throne as to what is going to be done for the restoration of the confidence in the fisheries. If there had been some statement like that in the Speech from the Throne it is not likely that we would have so many men leaving the fisheries and going away to Canada and the United States to-day. Every steamer that has left this country since the month of March is loaded with fishermen, chiefly, who are going to Canada and the States because there was no hope given out that would induce them to stay in their own country, and stay at the fisheries for another year.

According to those people who are connected with the supplying merchants, there is very little hope of seeing anything better done at the fishery this year than was done last year. In consequence, a large number of men are so discouraged that they are not troubling about going to the fishery this season. It was pointed out by the Prime Minister in his Manifesto in 1924 and supported by every member on the Government side that the codfishery was the mainstay of the country. Well I cannot understand how a man or men prominently identified with the fishery have not got the Government to make some pronouncement as to what they promise to do to carry out their promise of 1924. After being three years in office the Government have not yet made a move to formulate some fishery policy. Even the Colonial Secertary in 1923 said in his Manifesto that he was going to have a convention of the merchants of St John's and the outports and representative fishermen to discuss ways and means to try and improve fishing conditions, but still the convention was never called and nothing has been done since. Surely, sir, under conditions of that kind and with promises made galore, you cannot expect the fishermen of the country to retain their confidence in the fishery? If no interest is manifested by those who have large investments in the fishery, how can you expect the ordinary fishermen, who only operate for about six months out of the year and do not get sufficient out of it to support their families, to take an interest in it? Now the question of the cull of fish has been alluded to here already by previous speakers. Last year the cull was the most discouraging feature of the fishery. I know a man who sold his cargo of fish to a merchant and was congratulated upon the splendid quality of the article. A day or two afterwards another man came along with a cargo of fish of inferior quality and sold it to the same merchant.

The man with the inferior article was paid the same price as the man who had produced a better cured article. The result is that the man who took care with his fish has given up the fishery entirely, as he said if he had been given only twenty cents more per quintal for the superior article it would have encouraged him to continue fishing, and he also said that he knew scores of other men who were treated similarly to him and who had decided to abandon the industry altogether. Now what has the Government done or what are they going to do in the matter? It is not only to-day they were made aware of that condition of things. That was known to the Prime Minister and his colleagues last Fall when so much dissatisfaction prevailed. Yet no attempt has been made up to the present to remedy that condition. For a long while the Board of Trade has been endeavouring to get a number of fish merchants to meet them at their rooms to discuss the situation and they had the greatest difficulty to get any one

supplying merchant to become a member of their Council until the Prime Minister's son came along and became a member of it, so that we have one member of the supplying merchants on the Council of the Board of Trade to-day, but up to now there has been nothing done to restore the confidence of the fishermen of the country and no effort has been made to improve the conditions which are confronting the fishing industry of the country to-day.

On motion the debate was adjourned to to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, May 31st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 31st, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Brown, from Botwood, re construction of a road.

Mr. Brown, from Bishop's Falls, re roads.

Mr. Ashbourne, from Birchy Bay, re roads.

Mr. Scammell, from Pacquet and Woodstock, re telephone communication.

Dr. Mosdell, from St. Jacques, Belleoram, Pool's Cove, Bay du Nord and Rencontre East, re herring fishery.

Mr. Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of Question.

Mr. Winsor gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of Question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of Question.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of Question.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a statement made in the Daily News this morning before we go on to the Address in Reply, and also to add a few remarks to the question of financial difficulties that has arisen during the past few days. In giving a synopsis of the Minister of Finance's speech this morning the Daily News says: "In the course of his remarks Mr. Cashin had said that from figures supplied him by the Auditor General the deficit for the year 1925-26 was really two million dollars." That statement is incorrect. I never made any such statement. I said that from figures tabled by the Minister of Finance and Customs that that deficit was there. I never attributed it to the Auditor General that he tabled figures in this House because he can't. This misrepresents what I said, and I don't think the Minister of Finance made that statement that he is quoted for either, because he couldn't. I want to draw attention to that error for the Auditor General would think I was after his scalp in connection with that affair from the News this morning. Furthermore, I would like to draw the Finance Minister's attention to the figures he quoted in connection with that deficit. The Finance Minister states, "If you take June month, the expenditure is quoted at $3,994,258.01. This amount should have read $2,418,511.63, which makes all the difference." By correcting that error we lessen the deficit $1,575,746.38; that is the deficit which I had figured on from figures tabled in this House by the Minister of Finance would become $449,502.07. Further on, the Finance Minister mentions the amount of $420,058.44, which must be deducted from the total expenditure. By subtracting this amount from the deficit which I had figured on, we find the deficit only twenty-nine thousand instead of one hundred and twelve

thousand. I would like to hear the Minister of Finance explain that.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

MR. GRIMES—The reply of the Colonial Secretary this afternoon in relation to the conversation that has taken place on the matter of getting a reduction on the duty or removal of the duy on our fish going to the United States was very interesting, and it is good to see that some step has been taken to try and get that tariff removed and help the fisheries of this country, but it is going to take some time before that is arranged, if it is done, to the satisfaction of either Newfoundland or Canada. For, I presume, that the Canadian Government will take good care to look out for the interests of the Nova Scotia fishermen, and before any satisfactory decision is made in Newfoundland, the United States Government will have to deal with that country as well. In the meantime, we have to deal with the situation that exists in our own country. I stated yesterday that large numbers of fishermen were leaving the country and had left the country already in their thousands, and that those who were left behind, or a large number of those left behind had given up the fishery and were seeking other avenues of employment. It is appalling to think that this industry which we all regard in this House as the most important industry in the country is so little attended to by the Government, at least so little effort is being made in order to help to improve the conditions with which that industry is faced. I learned from a man, who is well versed with the North, that there are sixty schooners now lying up, or they are not at least following the fishery the same as last year, some probably going in fo rcoasting, while others are lying up. Along with that are the large numbers of men who went in to Corner Brook, Millertown, Grand Falls and Buchan's Mine to look for employment. There are, I understand, now about 700 working at Buchan's Mine and Millertown. Some of these are fishermen and some belong to the West Coast; some are labourers, but a large number of men had to turn back again and these men have come to St. John's hoping that they will be able to get somebody to go security for them in order to get supplies to prosecute the fishery, and the answer to all of them is: "Well! We don't know where we are going to get off in connection with the fishery this year." A great many have no intention whatever of following the fishery. If they can get employment elsewhere they will do it, and if they can't, they will say: Well! The Government has got to get work for us. Well! That is a very sorry position to be in to-day, and quite a large number of men round the coast of this Island who are taking this attitude, and if we ask them why, they will say they have been discouraged by the small price last year and the fact that even if they had a catch they were able to square accounts, and if not, they were in debt to the merchant or the supplier, and here we have to-day all these men looking for employment and not finding any, with wives and children depending upon them, and a great many of them now looking to the Relieving Officer to see what he can do in order to provide for their families. A great many of these men have been going on the Labrador, and some of the men who have supplied them have joined with them in saying that there is no possibility whatever of making the Labrador fishery a success with the price of Labrador fish at $4.00. They give you an array of figures showing the cost of outfitting for the Labrador and they place it side by side with what a full catch or the fill of a schooner will bring to go to cover the cost; or they will show you the value of each return which will not cover the cost of the fishing outfit. When they bring that before us,

Mr. Speaker, we cannot hep but be convinced that they have a case, and that it is up to the Government of this country to find some way of dealing with a situation of that kind. I have said that no, or very little attempt, has been made by the Government to do anything to help out the situation. They have not done anything in the way of opening up employment, presumably because they cannot get money to do it. All the moneys raised for the purpose of building Highroads have been expended and there is no hope of getting employment in that direction this year. At any rate, if the statement of Prime Minister is to be taken that work on the High Roads has been stopped for the year. Well, what are we going to do? Aren't you going to do something? What will renew hope and restore confidence in this country which is fast waning away. Take the condition of some of the people who are living in the outports to-day. They have gone back there, as I say, from Buchan's Mine and other places seeking supplies, and they hope to get them from the small merchant of the place to which they belong, some little help in the way of supplies to go to the shore fishery, but these men say that they can't do it, that there is nothing to justify them in advancing any supplies no matter how small for the fishery when they see no hope held out that it is going to be a profitable venture this year. The question may be asked why should the Government interfere in the management of the fishing industry. Well, my reply would be that it is a national industry, and when private enterprise fails to carry on that industry profitably for the people, then it is time that the Government should step in to help out in a solution of the problems. We have precedent for that in other countries. We can take Italy at the present time and compare its condition with what it was several years ago. Italy was practically on the verge of bankruptcy, but the Government of that country decided or a later government called the Fascisti Government decided that it would discourage in every way possible the importation into the country of any goods that were manufactured in the country and the result has been that the exports and imports about balance and that the heavy deficits with which the Italian Government was faced a few years ago have been practically wiped out, and the value of the lira has gone from 150 in the pound to 90 to-day, because the Government interfered in connection with the business of the country. It took hold of certain industries and said that it was going to give assistance in connection with manufacturing industries in Italy. We intend to impose certain taxes on imports and we expect you to employ a greater number of men because of the increased trade that will come to you.

Now, as I said before, Italy has taken the same position in connection with the Government of that country. They are helping out industry, they are not leaving it to private enterprise alone to look after the welfare of the people when they have failed to do it ,but said that we are ready to assist you in every way possible in order that these industries may be made useful to the people of the country; and here we are after all the experience we have, after the last three years doing nothing to help the important industry of this country. Suggestions have been made to the Government time and again to do something with regard to the regulation of shipments. Every mercantile man concerned with the fisheries of this country that I have had conversation with has agreed that that is one of the means in which we could help out the fishing industry of the country. Still the Government has

made no attempt whatever to try and bring in regulations of shipments of fish and again no attempt has been made with regard to standardisation although we find that every other fish-producing country has done something in order that they may popularize the sale of fish and increase it. In the Evening Telegram a few weeks ago practically a whole page was devoted to rules and regulations concerning the fishery which are carried out by the Norwegian Government. They have been fostering in every way possible the fishing industries of that country and only recently I find that the Canadian Government have also taken steps in a similar way. Recently I said the Canadian Government have taken steps in a similar way as was evidenced by the publication of a communication sent out by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to various fishing ports in Nova Scotia and others of the provinces of Canada that export fish to various countries, and in that communication were laid down certain rules and regulations governing the cure of fish. What has the Fisheries Department of this country done in order to get the co-operation of the trade and get from them suggestions as to what will be beneficial in order to improve the quality, and once having improved it see that rules are carried out to keep it so. They have suggested this according to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada for the purpose of having an inspection of all fish exported from Canada where any fisherman desires to see that he has got the proper cull placed on his fish. For instance, if a contract is entered into by a fisherman for the supply of a certain quality and if he feels that contract is not being carried out he is privileged according to Canadian Law to call in an inspector of fish to say whether there is an appeal and state the position with regard to it. We had nothing like that last year in connection with the cull of fish in this country. Dissatisfaction was great. Hundreds of fishermen were discontented with the cull and there was no appeal from the culler of the merchant.

Let us go a little further into the matter, Mr. Speaker, and see if anything has been done to encourage the sale of fish in our country.

A good many people smile at the suggestion that you ask a fish eating people to eat more fish. I consider that there could be fifty or sixty thousand more quintals of fish consumed here between the months of November and June than there are at present, if we go the right way about it. I am just as confident that it can be done as I am of standing here this afternoon. I think it is admitted by all present that outside of Fridays very little fish is used in this country. At the present time and during the summer when the fish are in season it is more often found on the tables in every home, but after the fall season begins we very seldom see fish on the table other than on Fridays. We have in this country—(reads a list of families)—altogether about twelve thouand families.

Now I think everyone here will agree when I say that when you go into any settlement—and I have been in them all and have taken part in the work and spent three and four days at a time in the homes of the fishermen and never seen fish on the table at any time—that very little fish is consumed by the outport people. They have any amount of foreign foods such as tinned meat, but the one product on which the livelihood of thousands in this country depends, receives only a secondary consideration. What is the cause of this? It is because the people are not alive to the needs of our most important industry and the Government should take the lead in the matter. The Gov-

ernment should call a meeting and with the co-operation of the exporting merchants arrange to do something in the way of a system of propaganda in order to get the people to eat more fish. The question will undoubtedly be raised as to where we are going to get the money. If we follow the example set by Canada and, I think, last year by the United States Government, I feel sure that we would be able to find a few thousand dollars to spend in order to induce the people to eat more fish, than they do at the present time. The desired result was brought about in Quebec, New York, Boston, Philadelphia and a great many of the seaport towns of the States. I remember reading an article in one of the New York fish magazines of the work of a Mrs. McPherson who had visited several cities and an enquiry was made as to the result, and the report showed that all the fish dealers without exception reported that the sales of fish had increased. If they could do that in the United States and in the province of Quebec, I don't see why it couldn't be done in Newfoundland. There is very little doubt whatever that if the Government called on representatives of exporting merchants and representative men from the fishermen they would find these men, if they got together at a round table and talked over the matter, willing and ready to do what they could to boost the sale of fish in this country.

I visited the logging camps in 1923 all up and down the Exploits River and I never saw fish on the table more than once a week, and that was on Friday, and I asked the camp steward why there was not more fish consumed and he told me that the men preferred fresh meat, pork and beef, and when it came to fish some of them wanted the Labrador and some didn't and he really didn't know what they wanted. So they only got a small quantity of fish for the logging camps. I am convinced that if you could get thees men in the logging camps at a round table conference and point out to them how much the people of the outports are depending on the amount of fish consumed, this produce of our own country, they would say send it along and we will do our share.

The trouble to-day is to get the fish cooked in a way that will make it appetizing. There are many people who declare that they do not eat fish because they cannot get it cooked in a way that will appeal to their taste. I think I am safe in saying that there are only six or seven different ways of cooking fish in Newfoundland. If you will take up the recipe book of the Gorton Pew Company you will find that there are at least a hundred different ways of cooking the fish in order to appeal to the different tastes of the people of the United States.

If the merchants and the fishermen got together and got some women and men, for there are a good many men who are good cooks, and obtain from them some recipes of different ways in which the fish could be cooked there would be sufficient to satisfy all tastes.

I was speaking to a gentleman who returned from Norway a few weeks ago and he told me that in every restaurant and at every hotel you found that fish was always on the menu. In fact at many places fish formed the whole of the menu—that is different kinds of fish. They are always boosting their fish and keep it ever before the people of Norway, with the result that you find it on every menu and used extensively throughout the whole country.

If we do not boost our fish we cannot expect other people to boost it for us. Every time we bring a friend to our homes or to a hotel we have a chance to do a great deal of good for the country or a good deal of harm. If everybody would only be a booster of the country it would be of

great benefit to the fishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the Government intends to do anything in connection with the fishery this year. I feel that they can do something along the lines I have already suggested. The first thing to do will be to call a meeting of the merchants and other people and make arrangements to do something to boost the fishery of this country.

If we could have one hundred thousand quintals consumed in the city this year it would be a great thing for the fishery. Now the Government has great opportunities and if it does not do something then we will know that it is the most incapable, incompetent and in efficient Government that has ever held the reins of office, considering all the opportunities it has. So much for the fisheries.

With regard to the high roads policy of the Government. I agree, to some extent with Captain Randell, that the climate of this country is not inviting to tourists. Some summers the weather is splendid, while other summers the climate is bad. But there is one part of the Island where the climate is fine every year and that is the section known as the "Fog Free Zone." From Hall's Bay to Badger and to Rushy Pond, there you would have a strip of road about one hundred miles long running through the most beautiful part of the country. There is a good deal of road already there—there is a road from Hall's Bay to Badger and part of the way from Grand Falls to Rushy Pond. If the Government would erect a road from Rushy Pond to Badger there would be a road of a hundred miles running from Hall's Bay to Rushy Pond. This is the prettiest section of Newfoundland, where lakes abound and where there are innumerable fish to be caught. It is a paradise for tourists. One or two of them were down to Hall's Bay last year and though they admired the scenery very much they complained of the condition of the road. It will be worse this year unless the Government intends to make any improvement.

If the Government could make a road through that section that I have just mentioned it will be another boost to the coutnry because, as I have said before, the country up there is delightful and the scenery all that could be desired. Instead of that all the money has been spent on the Avalon Peninsula, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government has any money to use on the roads this year that they take that part of the country into consideration.

There is one other matter that was referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the matter of retrenchment.

That was promised in the manifesto of the present administration three years ago, and three years have gone by and the expense of carrying on the Government to-day is greater than ever before. The policy of retrenchment has not been carried out. If it had the expenses would have been less than we find them to-day. The Government has seen fit to carry on in the same old way, to run the departments in the same way as of old. During its term of office several vacancies have occurred in the public departments which could have been left alone, but they were filled and the revenue suffered to that extent. At the present time the accounts show that the revenue has suffered a loss of about two million dollars. Knowing all this there can be no other way to save the country from destruction than to adopt some form of retrenchment. A good many petitions have been presented to this House with regard to roads and bridges and other public matters. Where is the money coming from? Are we still going to continue more borrowing? Are you going to raise the necessary funds by

increased taxation? Or have you got some industrial policy before you that will increase importation and increase the revenue. Unless that is done, Mr. Speaker, I contend that we are headed for destruction.

There is one other matter that I would like to refer to and that is the report of the Board of Liquor Control. The report shows that there have been one hundred and seventy more convictions for breaches of the liquor law than the previous year. When reference was made to this some years ago when the present liquor act was introduced to bring the law into existence, it was stated that if we brought in this law we would have no further moon-shining and illicit sales of liquor. Still we have in the liquor report the number of convictions during the past year for boot-legging and a large number for illicit sales of liquor. Apparently the law has made no improvement in that direction. My information, and I have it from a particularly good source, tells me that there is more liquor consumed in the outports to-day under the present liquor law than ever before. I submit that to have one and a half million dollars spent on liquor is a very poor way of encouraging the people to be thrifty and care for their families. We ought to think here of the women and children whose lives have been ruined by the large distributions of liquor that are going on.

I understand that in Norway a few years ago the Government gave a bonus to every clerk showing an increase in the sale of beer and wines in preference to strong drink, and a still larger bonus if he could show an increase in the sale of temperance drinks. The Premier should call his party together and arrange to make a better law and one more in keeping with the wishes of the people. I would say that a large number of the people in this country are dissatisfied with the present law and some means should be found to better the existing conditions. Call a meeting of representative people to-gether and go into the whole question and devise a better law that we have at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the matter of having a general election this fall. I think it ought to be clearly understood by the Government that they no longer retain the confidence of the people. At any rate recent by-elections have shown that their candidates have been defeated by a large majority of the people, though they hold a majority in the House.

I remember reading a statement made by the Minister of Justice of Canada referring to the same question, when he said that the supremacy of the people is greater than the supremacy of the party, and he felt that a general election should take place, and it did.

It is well known throughout the country and well known in this House that the Government do not hold the confidence of the people to-day as they did in 1924. That feeling has been shown by the two recent by-elections. It is now the duty of the Government to go to the country and stand by their old policy or draw up a new one and take a mandate from the people. I think that is the way for the Government to act in connection with the questions which have been brought before this House.

In connection with the deficit that has taken place the Speech from the Throne says:

(Reads)

I looked up the Customs records for 1925 and 1926 to see how much the reduction on cotton goods affected the revenue. These are the figures:

(Reads)

The total duty collected on cotton has not been more than twenty per cent. It is $514,583.75. In fact it is safe to say that the reduction of

cotton goods does not average more than 15 per cent. But we will give the Government the benefit of the doubt. If there was a twenty per cent. decline in the city on all cotton goods imported into this country, the duty would be about $96,739. So that low price of goods imported into this country has little to do with the decline in the revenue of this country.

(Reads)

I think that the Government are acting very wisely in reimposing that income tax, but as Major Cashin said in this House a few days ago, I don't think that it should apply to people in this country whose incomes are around $1500 or $2,000. It should be mainly for persons getting $3,000 or over.

Reference has been made in the Speech from the Throne to the Labrador boundary dispute. A great many people have been concerned with the Labrador Boundary question for a great many years passed. Those gentlemen who have been associated with the settlement of that boundary dispute from Martin Furlong down to the present Minister of Justice deserve to be complimented. I hope Mr. Speaker, that the Government will in a few days do something in the way of a fishery policy. It is quite evident to every member in this House that until we restore a better condition of things in connection with the fisheries that we are going to be up against pretty hard times. So I think that the Government should make some pronouncement or another to help that out.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks in connection with the subject that has occupied the attention of the House for the last two weeks, I want to say at the outset that I have no desire whatever to delay the business of this House or to be classed as an obstructionist. I am quite prepared now to help the Government put through any legislation that they will bring to this House, but at the present time we have no legislation, concerning which to ask for our assistance. There is one bill I know on the Order Paper, then why not go ahead with it. I don't want to be in this House longer than is necessary to pass legislation, anymore than any member here. It is not because I crossed over to this side of the House that I have got to oppose any legislation that is brought in here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those who have spoken before me have offered their congratulations to those members who have come in here since last this House was prorogued. I first must offer my congratulations to the mover and the seconder for a committee to be formed to draft a reply to the Speech from the Throne. To the seconder I offer my hearty congratulations, but to the mover I only go half way, because he could have well left the latter part of his speech unsaid. There were certain things in his remarks that I as one of the people who helped Mr. Brophy in St. John's East take exception to. I also offer my congratulations to the Hon. Member for Burgeo and La Poile, and I welcome him back here. He is a friend of mine and sat next to me on that side of the House and I may say that I made it possible for you to become Minister of Public Works. If I had not moved over here you would still be bringing water to the elephants like I was when I was on that side of the House. He went to the district as I thought with his bare knuckles, but low and behold when the public accounts were tabled we found that it cost twenty thousand dollars to elect Mr. Chambers for the District of Burgeo and La Poile. However I have no fault to find with him, and I hope that he will enjoy his seat there whether long or short. Since the last session of this House a gentleman who sat on this side has got

away somehow or other. On that day we closed 17 to 17. But Mr. Duff saw fit to go to the other side of the House.

There was another gentleman who sat here and now is gone. I do not know what caused him to get out so quick, but some say that he struck a job.

I will pass on and come now to my friend, Doctor Mosdell, who went to the district of Fortune, never saw the district before, and came back victorious. I congratulate him, and I welcome him to our gang. He is going to be a great acquisition to us. I did not have the pleasure of helping in the fight in Fortune Bay to win that seat for Doctor Mosdell, but I did have the extreme pleasure of participating in the campaign in St. John's East, that gave Mr. Brophy the biggest victory, bar none, that has ever been recorded in Newfoundland. And when the history of that campaign is written, Mr. Speaker, it will be told there, how, there never was and never will be again a member with the backing of the Executive Government, every departmental head and every piece of artillery brought into the fray, so ridiculed by the votes of the common people, men and women alike.

When the Government were forced to open St. John's East by some members of their party they were on the horns of a dilemma. The next day a gentleman who edits a paper in this city thought fit to make the statement that the only two gentlemen that wanted the district opened were myself and Major Cashin. Now neither Major Cashin or myself had anything to do with the opening of the district. As far as I am concerned I would have been satisfied to see the district closed. But this gentleman who receives a salary in the upper House thought fit to insult the representatives of the people who occupy seats in this Chamber. And as far as his influence is concerned it is practialcly nil. In fact he lost the fight for you in the East End, and also the other paper that supports you. We had a little paper, a rag they termed it, edited by my friend Mr. Grimes, who put it all over the big dailies and won out in the battle in St. John's East. Now I took a prominent part in that fight in St. John's East. When the campaign was opened and the Prime Minister made a speech in the Gaiety Hall, it was reported to me afterwards that he made the statement that nobody wanted that district opend but Phil Moore. He discovered that there were five thousand others in the district against him and his Government. The fight went on and we got our committee working. Every thing went along fine until two days befort polling day. Major Cashin was on Bell Island and he sent me a long distance phone message to say that Mr. Monroe had hired the hall over on the Island and that he was coming over. "What will I do," he asked. And I sent back the reply "Hold the fort and we got them licked," and there are men in this Chamber this day who know what happened on Bell Island. Now I am going to give you a little of the history of what happened in town. They asked me about down the shore, and I said leave that to me. Next day an S.O.S. call was sent from the Prime Minister, and every member of the Executive answered the call, except Mr. Woodford, who refused to go. So I left here at 2 o'clock and went down the shore to lay my plans for the evening performance. Certain men who came down from the city will never forget it as long as there is breath in their bodies.

However we were up early on polling day and first we went to the booth rooms. At one place there was a gentleman who went down from the city to spread reports. He went into one House and said that there would be no supplies this year if they didn't

vote for Monroe. I had a great deal to do to counteract that. After 8 o'clock that night I was never so tired in all my life. But I felt that we had done a great work. Then when the first count came out it was 100 to 61 in favor of Brophy. The second day the supporters of the Government were looking for two votes, the silent vote and the intelligent vote. They never got them. And that is the history of the fight, and I am glad that I was in the fight and I am glad of the part I took in that fight.

And now I will pass on to take up the Speech from the Throne. This epistle that has been handed to His Excellency to read to this House who ever is responsible for it is the most laughable thing that has ever been brought into this House, since the days of Responsible Government. The Finance Minister cannot balance his budget owing to the falling off of the imports of cotton. But a few nights before the Minister of Finance had a dream and it would have been a good thing if he had to rush down to the bank on Monday morning and deposit that surplus.

Now I would like to refer to the labour question as I see it to-day in this city. I understand that there is going to be a meeting to-night called by men out of employment, I understand 700 or 800 of them. I know most of these men. I have known them all my life-time. I don't see the Ramsay MacDonald in his seat now. The labour candidate who promised to look after them. They gave him their votes and put them where he is to-day, and now he has turned his back on them. All he need do to-day is to stand up there in his seat and demand a certain amount of money to be expended in connection with these men who are out of employment, and he has got to get it, or else leave the party.

I am sorry to say that I represent an outport constituency and I brought them in here. When the Dry Dock was getting built they came to St. John's. Some of them lived in boats while here and some of them lived under the houses of certain members of this House. They have never gone back to their homes, and if the Government would make an allocation this evening to allow those men who are hungry to earn a few dollars, they would be only distributing the money amongst the outports of this country, because every outport in Newfoundland almost is represented among the unemployed of St. John's East and West, I will give it my unqualified support. Mr. Speaker, the Monroe Government went to the country with a fishery policy, and my colleague and myself were elected by the people of the district of Ferryland on that policy. But I am sorry to say that at the first party meeting I need not tell you what happened, Mr. Speaker. I asked for one millllion dollars to be devoted towards roads and the encouragement of the fishery and I was sneered at by the Leader of the Government. The only member of the Monroe party who supported my proposition was my colleague, Major Cashin. The Monroe Government went to the country and shouted from the hill tops that they were going to make this country a fisherman's paradise; but they came back and they made it a lawyer's paradise. I represent a district that has sixty miles of a coastline and almost every man in that district depends entirely on the fishery for a living. Now I do not profess to know anything about fish, but what I wonder at is that every year between three and four hundred men cross the Gulf and go to Lunenburg and there man Lunenburg banking vessels, which come to our very doors and take the fish and bring it back to Lunenburg, cure it and market it at remunerative prices; whilst there are Newfoundland fishermen to-night who cannot support

their families. I cannot understand why there were ninety sail of vessels left Lunenburg last year, as against that there is a marked falling off in our banking fleet. I do not know the reason, although there may be some explanation to it; but surely if the Lunenburg people are able to make the bank fishery pay by operating at our doors, we ought to be able to do something. However, it is not much use for me to be stressing the point because the present Government is not interested in the fishery or the fishermen. Therefore, we shall have to wait until the new Government comes in power—and thank God it is not far off—and then I hope that the district that gave me its confidence for nearly twenty years will come into its own. The member for Harbour Main referred to the "blatant demagogue" that existed in St. John's East. For over thirty years my late lamented colleague, Sir Michael Cashin, represented the district of Ferryland in this House of Assembly. He was refused the honour of being elected for the district which was recently won by my friend Mr. Brophy. Was it a "blatant demagogue" that crushed the heart out of that gentleman? The Daily News said that across the forehead of that man his political sins were written. Let me tell them that across the forehead of the "blatant demagogue" that crushed the heart out of that deceased gentleman ingratitude is written in letters of fire. I shared the honour of representing the district of Ferryland with Sir Michael Cashin for nearly twenty years. To-day I share a similar honour with his talented son. He is dead and is sleeping in lonely Belvidere this evening and might I be permitted to say in a room where he pleaded the people's cause for thirty years "May the Lord have mercy on his soul and may perpetual light shine upon him."

In conclusion I want to ask the Prime Minister if he will get up and tell the House whether or not it is the intention of the Government to hold a general election the coming fall. If you are going to grant an election you will have no further difficulty in putting all your business through in ten days. As far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to help you out day and night until you finish up, because, after all, the people throughout the country want, and are clamouring for, an election next fall. I was speaking to a business man to-day in the Board of Trade rooms and he said, "Why are you delaying the business of the House?" I replied that we were not delaying any business because the Government had no business ready yet to delay, and that the trouble is that the Prime Minister does not seem inclined to the idea of having an election this fall. "Well," he said, "it is your place to keep the House open until he submits to the wishes of the people." "We will play the game with the Prime Minister when he plays it with us," I added. However, I believe that when the business of the House gets working properly and when he gets in a good mood he will agree to a general election this year, but then we will have to get a guarantee to that effect.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I may say I have been handed a few lines from a friend of the Prime Minister and a friend who worked and voted for the Prime Minister in the past. Here are the words:

"The old ship Terra Nova is drifting
to her doom,
You have rifled her and scuttled her
and brought her near to ruin;
The people shout you must get out,
we will trust you not again,
So pack your grip and leave the ship
and give place to better men."

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I rise to avail of the opportunity of saying a few words to the motion which is now before the chair and which is, as I understand it, a motion to the

effect that this House will thank His Excellency the Administrator for the Speech with which he opened the proceedings of this Legislature on the eleventh day of this month. I feel that it is the duty of every member of this House who were elected to this House by the voice of the people, and representing free and independent people, to stand up here and give an expression of opinion as to whether or not we, as the representatives of the people, can find it possible or compatible with all that is just and right and proper to thank the Government for that Speech, which was put into the hands of His Excellency on opening day. I say, sir, that we should give an expression of opinion and an expression of opinion not as obstructionists but as the free and outspoken representatives of the people of this country. It is our duty as representatives of constituencies in this House to speak, to discover if there was any cause for thankfulness on our part for the policy or for the record of the Government, as presumed to be outlined to us in the Speech to which I am referring. That is the position I take this afternoon in standing up here and speaking to the motion before the chair. I feel it my duty as the representative of one of the most important constituencies in the country, a constituency that has honoured me with its confidence in three general elections and a constituency which I have had the honour to represent for eight years, to give an expression of opinion, not only to what I may consider to be my individual opinion on the policy and record of the Government, but to what I consider to be the thoughts and feelings of the people that I represent in this House. It is in that spirit that I address the chair this evening and not at all in the spirit of attempting to obstruct or delay the proceedings. I am merely fulfilling, in other words, that manifest duty that I owe to my constituents. A man who comes into Parliament, I care not with what political party he may be associated, and does not recognise at the time that there is a duty devolving upon him to give a free and untrammelled expression of opinion on public matters and who has failed to measure up to that duty, is, in my opinion, in no sense fit to be trusted or to be honoured with a seat in this House, no matter what section of the country he may represent. I am under the impression, of course, that our attitude from this side of the House since the day when we first came, man after man making speeches, may in some quarters of the Government side be regarded as tactics of obstruction. For my own point of view I have been actuated and prompted solely by motives of sincerity and I have no intention for a moment to obstruct. I have only one idea in the back of my mind and that is the one to which I have given expression. But I do feel that there is a condition of things obtaining in this country to-day which dictates to members of the Opposition that they should remain in this House as long as their health and numerical strength permits them, and until such time as the Prime Minister makes some definite pronouncement regarding a general election.

I do feel that a situation has developed in this country and that there is a trend of feeling in this country to-day which dictates to the Opposition in this House that they shall remain here as long as health and circumstances permit them until the Executive Government makes some pronouncement in this Chamber as to what intention they have with regard to an election in the coming fall. We feel that we are doing our duty in sitting here discussing your proposals and your record in tearing piecemeal if necessary everything you lay before us until such time as you give us that pronouncement. Throughout

the length and breadth of the country the people are expecting a general election and they are expecting us that if we can't get a pronouncement with regard to it from you in a fair way they expect this Opposition to remain firm until other ways and means are brought to get that pronouncement from you. Before proceeding further with the discussion of the situation of the Government and the Government's record and the Speech from the Throne I will go back to some of the proceedings on opening day. I think that in justice to the Leader of the Opposition that when the House opened here he made his position and the position of this Opposition absolutely clear. I think he threw across to the Prime Minister a plain and deliberate invitation to give us some kind of a pronouncement as to whether or not his Government proposed to have a dissolution at the end of this session and that the business of this Legislature would be forthwith facilitated. So far I regret to find that neither the Prime Minister nor any one speaking for him has seen fit to make any pronouncement, so I presume we are to understand that no decision has been arrived at. I say that the country today is expecting that pronouncement on the question of a general election, and I stand firm in my position that I feel it my duty to stay in this House as long as health and circumstances permit me to stay and to try and bring the Government round to it that they will make that pronouncement that the country is expecting. You, honorable members, on your side of the House, although you may be firmly entrenched, to some extent, in office and although you count with a good deal of certitude to holding on by constitutional means perhaps for another eighteen months, I feel sure that there must be in your ranks, in the ranks of the Government, some who feel that they are only prolonging the day of reckoning and flying in the face of public opinion by remaining in office a day longer than the day we complete proceedings here this session, I therefore would appeal to honorable members in the rank and file of the party if you in your very hearts feel that at least a part of what I am saying in this connection is correct, you ought to give the matter serious thought and try tto bring pressure to bear on the Government also to get a decision as early as possible on this all important subject.

I went back and began with the proceedings on opening day, and first of all it is my duty in a sense I suppose to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply on that day, Mr. Cahill and Mr. Power. Personally I offer them my congratulations, but from the standpoint of the job they had to perform I can offer them no congratulations. They were in the position of having to get up on opening day and bolster up the position and outlook of a Government that if not entirely defunct was morally so. I congratulate them on getting out of a difficult position and handling a very delicate situation in the best way they could. On opening day on coming into this House resolutions of condolence were passed with regard to the passing of two statesmen who have passed away since last we met here as a Legislature. I refer to the demise of Sir Robert Bond and that of Sir Michael Cashin. I feel that I would like to give some expression of opinion to add to those given in praise of these two departed statesmen on opening day. I did not feel then that it was my place to do so but I feel now that I should and that this is a proper opportunity. I never had the pleasure of meeting Sir Robert Bond personally. My entry into political life came long after he had passed out of politics, but from the day I was old enough to take an interest in political affairs of this

country I have been an admirer of Sir Robert Bond and all those associated with me were supporters of his. I sat in the galleries of this House as a schoolboy and watched many a battle across the floors of the House between Sir Robert Bond and Lord Morris, and all those who had the pleasure of listening to him will agree that it was an education to come here and listen to the learned dissertations which Sir Robert Bond delivered in the debates on various matters touching the welfare of the country. I think that we have probably lost our greatest statesman but he has left a record of integrity in public life behind him for those of us who remain to emulate as best we can. I feel that if the men to whom the destinies of Newfoundland are to be entrusted in coming years will model their lives on his record and his ideals the country will have nothing to fear from those in whose hands it has left the working out of its destinies. With regard to Sir Michael Cashin, I knew him very well. I came into this House when he came in here as Leader of the Opposition and I admired him then as a fighter. Then in later days I had the pleasure of knowing him still more intimately. I feel that in him this coutnry has lost a splendid type of man, a man who by sheer perseverance and dint of hard work rose to the topmost rung of the ladder, and I join in the expression of sympathy given out here on opening day because of his death.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that since we came into this House that the Government has made some additions to the Upper House, and if I am not out of order I would like to take occasion to refer to these appointments. I wish particularly this afternoon through the reporter's box to congratulate one gentleman who has been appointed to that House; I refer to Captain Kean. I cannot say that Captain Kean and I have been personal friends; I certainly can say we have not been personal enemies. We had been political opponents in a hard fought contest in 1919 and I then found Captain Kean a clean and honorable opponent. Politically, perhaps, we have not been in the same boat, but I have always had for him a great deal of admiration. Like Sir Michael Cashin, he was a man who sprang from the lowest rung of the ladder and in my opinion he well deserves the honor conferred on him by the country in his appointment to the Upper House. I feel sure that with his mature years and broad experience, particularly in connection with the fisheries of this country and marine matters as well, that he will bring to the debates in the other Chamber information and advice that cannot fail to be of lasting good and cannot fail to have a good effect on such legislation as will from time to time go before that Chamber. I trust that Captain Kean will be spared many years to enjoy this honor and will always give to matters coming before the Upper House a full consideration in a spirit of fairness and without any bias or prejudice whatsoever. I feel it a pleasure this afternoon to congratulate one who has been a political opponent but whom I have always respected and had a good deal of admiration for. I have mentioned here before that, as regards the Upper House, I hold some strong opinions on it, and I say now that I think it would be a good step to have it abolished. I fail to see its necessity in our legislative make-up. I do not see why that institution remains, and I feel that if we tried,as time goes on, to get more progressive statesmen appointed in that Chamber and to occupy seats on the floors of this Assembly, may we soon be saying goodbye to the Upper House. It is part of the machinery of legislation now, and we have to make the best of it, and by putting practical men in the

Upper House is the only way to make it an efficient instrument.

Since we last came to this House I notice there has been a decided change in the complexion of affairs; in fact I feel safe in saying that every year since the Monroe party came into power we have noticed some change in the complexion of things. In 1924 you came in with a Government composed of 25 members. You had on this side of the House ten, and you had one gentleman as an independent. In the session of 1926 you wound up with 18, and something like 17, including independents, on the Opposition side of the House. We now see 19 in the Government and 17 sitting here as a united Opposition. These figures, of course, in themselves are trifling, but when viewed from the standpoint of what they convey, they are not at all to be regarded as trivial. The lesson I learn from these figures and the lesson that the country intends the Government to learn is that to-day confidence has been shaken in the Monroe administration. Members of that administration who came with it in 1924 lost confidence in it, and I take it it cannot be said to-day that you represent the feelings or wishes or the will of the majority of the people in this country. Among other changes that I notice here is that a gentleman who, during the last session, sat on my right now occupies the seat immediately facing me. I refer to the member for Carbonear. I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to be personal with the honourable member. I can ascribe to the honourable member various reasons for the step which he took when he decided to sever his connection with one party after the House was closed and go over to his erstwhile political opponents. I see in his position to-day something more than the mere fact of his sitting where he is. I see in it something that I have considered it to be of a menace to the interests and the welfare of the people of this country. I see in it a representation of what the Monroe administration has been from the day it came into power. In effect I see in it a movement to stand by to substantiate or uphold big interests in this country. I am not going to be uncharitable enough to say that Mr. Duff left the ranks of the Opposition because of personal benefit to be derived. It is said that the public accounts might show something different, but I don't intend to ascribe that to him for the step that he has taken.

The true position of the matter, when looked at in the true light, was that he went over to substantiate the Government, to help along the big interests that were to be served and could not be served by a tottering and shaking Government. And that is where I see a menace to the public life of this country. When a member is elected to this House it is his duty to look after the affairs of the district that has placed him there, but instead of that we find some men who become the tools of big interests, which from the first the Monroe administration has stood for and as a result of which they are no longer trusted by a majority of the people of this country. Possibly Mr. Duff only went over to the other side of the House to carry out and strengthen that policy.

What is the use of going to the country for a general election, to be appealing to the electorate, to be going up and down the country and along the shores asking the people to send you to the Legislature to look after their interests and see that they are protected, when the men whom they elect later cross over and become the willing tools in the hands of the opposing party. That is one of the things that is responsible for so much trouble, politically, at the present time in this country, and for the dissatisfied state of the people's minds. The men elected to Parlia-

ment seem to lose sight of the interests of the people and become the agents of big interests, interests of the wealthy, of the rich business man, and not the interests of the common people of this country. The Government has aimed exclusively at bringing about such interests which benefit the classes and not the masses in this country.

Mr. Duff has crossed over to that party, has become a part and parcel of the Monroe Government to strengthen and assist them to produce big interests to satisfy the merchants of this country. I was amused last year when some defectors from the Government ranks crossed over to this side of the House, to read in one of the local papers that Mr. Monroe was the sort of man who would have neither truck nor truce with traitors. I would be only too happy to think of Mr. Monroe as such a man, but in view of the position of Mr. Duff I feel that the attribute can no longer be applied to Mr. Monroe—that he has neither truck nor truce with traitors.

Passing on we come to a subject which during the last few days, has been more commented upon and talked of than any other subject—I refer to the by-election in St. John's East. Just as Mr. Duff crossed to the other side of the House to help the Government to prosecute its policy for the classes against the masses, so the result of this election shows the feeling of the masses towards the present administration.

For two years the Government stood out against the opening of the East End and took the stand that the district was well represented as there were already two city representatives and it was not necessary on that account, nor was there any need to put the country to the considerable expense that a by-election in the East End of the City would involve.

We on this side of the House insisted that, constitutionally, under the Election Law, there should be a by-election in the East End. We wanted to see the law carried out, we wanted to see the contest on foot. In my opinion, if the Government had held the by-election when the vacancy first occurred, there might have been three representatives of that district on the Government side of the House to-day. But they set their faces and refused to open the East End for the election, and as a consequence the prestige of the Government began to fail and the whole country was as anxious to have the by-election as the people of the district concerned. So much so, that when the district of St. John's East was opened, thousands and tens of thousands of people all over the Island, went down on their knees and prayed to God Almighty, that the Government would be defeated in the election.

Mr. Brophy has not only got to thank the five thousand people who voted for him, but, and I say it in all seriousness, he has also got to thank the prayers that went up from thousands and tens of thousands of hearts all over Newfoundland for his success in the recent by-election. It was a contest in which the people of Newfoundland entered as if they had come in their thousands into the city and taken part personally on election day, because the people expected and thought that with the defeat of the Monroe candidate in St. John's East that the downfall of the Government was certain. That was what the people wanted. And still the Monroe party sits tight and robs the people of what they want. The whole country prayed for the result as it was, and want to see the utter rout and defeat of the Government from the floors of this assembly. When news of Mr. Brophy's election was published it was received throughout the length and breadth of the country with acclamation of delight, and even

some of the Government supporters were thankful for the result.

I understand that we have in Newfoundland a gentleman who acts as a special correspondent of the "Times" incidentally is a great friend of the present Government. After the result of the by-election in the East End was announced this gentleman cabled to the newspaper that the Government had received a severe blow as a result of the election, and in the publication of the London "Times" for April 28th we find the following:

(Reads)

So says one of the men who is supposed to be a guide, philosopher and friend of the Government. I wonder if all the Government supporters have been as uncharitable as that particular gentleman has been.

I have heard it said that Mr. Monroe is a man of some courage, I have heard him referred to as a man who does not balk at meeting a difficult situation. I say now, Mr. Speaker, that the decent thing and the courageous thing for the administration to have done was to have had a general election or to have gone and immediately placed their resignation in the hands of His Excellency the Governor. You cannot hope to deceive public opinion, and it is certainly no use going on because you no longer hold the confidence of the majority of the people of this country.

I congratulate Mr. Brophy personally. It was a splendid victory that he won, and the moral effect of that victory is going to amount to this: that as far as the honourable member is concerned if he goes back to that district as opposed to the Monroe Government, he need have no further worry about finding a seat on the floors of this House. I congratulate Mr. Brophy, and I trust that he will long be spared to sit in this Assembly, and I trust that he will long be honoured with the confidence of the people of St. John's East, and I trust that during the time that he sits in this Legislature either on the Government side or on the Opposition that he will seek at all times to advance the interests of the people, and stand up for those principles which the electorate had in mind when they placed him in the position that he occupies to-day. Those principles are well defined. During that contest the Government papers would have us believe that no real issue was at stake, but I submit, Sir, that issues were at stake and worthy ones. One of the greatest issues at stake was this, that the interests of any one class in this country should not be exclusively catered to to the detriment of the welfare of the toilers of the Colony.

To go further back I take occasion also to congratulate the Hon. Dr. Mosdell, member for Fortune Bay, who went up there practically as a stranger and won in that district a splendid victory. Mr. Cashin, speaking here to the address in reply stated the other day that it was unnecessary to have to move in this House a vote of confidence against the Government; that Fortune Bay and St. John's East had registered a vote of want of confidence in this Government by electing two men to this side of the House. I congratulate Dr. Mosdell. He represents a very important district, perhaps the most important district in the country from the standpoint of the fisheries. I trust that he will long be honored with a seat in this Legislature and that he will do his utmost at all times to advance the interests of the fishery, especially in that District. St. John's East and Fortune Bay have spoken. If you were given a choice to open two districts in the country in order to find out the opinion of the whole you could not have had a better opportunity, for view it from whatever way you like in these two districts you have the laboring man and the fishermen in one campaign, and you have

got an expression of opinion from both sides of the slate.

Now, Sir, I come to another subject which I wish to make some reference to. I don't care whether the precedent has been created by a government with which I was associated with in politics or not. I want to say that I utterly disagree with this present practice of delaying the session so late in the year. I don't consider that such a course of conduct is fair to the man who represents the outport constituents in this House. It is not fair to call outport business men into this House at this late time of the year and expect them to be able to sit in their places here to-day and expect them to give the best attention to the study of the various matters that have to come up before this House. I want to protest against the conduct of the Government in delaying the session so late. The Prime Minister had to make some kind of show on opening day, and so he stated here that the delay was largely due to the fact that the Government was awaiting the proposed Gander legislation. We opened on May 11th, and yesterday the Prime Minister informed the House that even then the proposed Gander legislation had not come to the purview of the Government. Now, sir, nobody is going to force it down my throat or down the throats of the people in the outports that that was the reason for the delay. No sir, the fact is that this House was delayed in opening in order to permit the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to go to the ice as the captain of one of the steamers, and make a few thousand dollars and then come in here and make another thousand. And the business of this country has got to be delayed for that. This legislature has got to be delayed, and the outport men have got to be called in here when their proper place is in the outports, in order that Captain Winsor is permitted to go to the icefields and make $2,000. There is not much necessity for me to say much else on this subject, but I cannot help subscribing to the opinion expressed by my hon. friend, Mr. Halfyard, who said that if there never was a Captain Winsor, the steamer would probably have gone to the icefields and brought in a load of seals just as well. Captain Winsor is not indispensible to the seal fishery and I don't presume that he is indispensible to the firm that employs him. Besides the first duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries he owes to this country and not to the firm that employs him, and sends him to the icefields. Again I want to say that I am strongly opposed to the idea of having the session of the legislature so late in the year. And in fact I would like to see a law placed on the Statute Book setting forth a day for the opening of this Legislature and a day from which there could be no ecape. No Government would then be able to come into this House after delaying the session for purposes of political expediency. And then in the dying hours of the session we found some important legislation brought down on the table of this House, and hurriedly put through. The next day we hear it criticised on the street. We are asked what we know about it and we have to say in justice to ourselves we are no wiser than if we never had seen it at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am coming down to the document itself, the Speech from the Throne. That document, which as everybody knows now, is placed in the hands of His Excellency the Governor on opening day. Not only this legislature but the people of this country as a whole look to this document for some outline as to what the achievement of the Government has been or what their proposed policy is going to be. I think, Sir, that never in the history of Newfoundland since we have had respon-

sible Government, and since it has been the practice for the Speech from the Throne to be read to the members of this Assembly as the country looked forward to the Speech from the Throne with as much interest as it looked forward to the Speech from the Throne with which the Government opened this session. This country looked forward to that Speech from the Throne as the one with which the Government would open the present session, and hoped that it would contain something of good promise. All over Newfoundland to-day there is a feeling of depression; the lives, the body and soul, the heart seems to be gone out of the people. Days are dark and dreary. Turmoil is in evidence; and the people looked to the Government in this Speech from the Throne to throw out some ray of hope that if not in the immediate present at least in the near future something would be done to materially brighten the aspect. Mr. Hickman, the Leader of the Opposition, on opening day talking of this Speech from the Throne said that all that was needed to make it the Govenment's obituary notice was a black border. If any man entered the Legislative Council on the day the Speech was read and had gone there with the idea of getting some hope of better things, he would have come away and told his friends to abandon all hope. Never I say did the people look so confidently or anxiously toward a Speech as towards this. They expect the Government to show them a ray of hope. After all that was not unreasonable, for the Government was pledged to make conditions better; it was pledged to reform things and it was pledged to hand out a helping hand to the people and to make Newfoundland a paradise politically. This Government then having pledged themselves to do all those things were expected at a time when hope had almost died in the people to have ome hope for them, some encouragement and some slight assurance at least that it would be able to make things better and brighter throughout the country in the near future. When that Speech from the Throne was read and published then I say the people of the country received an absolute shock because there was nothing in the way of hope of paving the way to better times in the immediate present. It doesn't even tell us anything that the Government has done or has been trying to do in order to make conditions better or brighter. The one subject which the people and in particular the fishermen were I think expecting to find some reference to in the Speech from the Throne was the subject of the fisheries. If there is one subject in Newfoundland today more talked of than another; one subject to which the common people to-day are giving more attention than another; one subject generally considered of the utmost importance to the whole country; that subject is the fisheries. Still to-day we find a Government in power over three years and pledged to make this a fisherman's paradise, has not considered the subject of this trade or industry, even in view of the condition of things obtaining in the country, of sufficient importance or of sufficient relevancy to the matter in hand, to make even a mere passing reference to it in the Speech from the Throne outside of the fact that it states that the fishery was not so productive last year as the price was low.

(Reads from Speech from Throne)

The Prime Minister whether deliberately or not on opening day avoided any reference to the subject in the course of his remarks. I am going to say now that the Prime Minister is not going to make any reference to the fisheries if he can possibly avoid it. Things needed to help the fisheries and regulate matters connected with them whereby to benefit

them will never be done in my opinion while this Legislature holds the complexion that it now does. I was astounded when I think it was a year ago the Honorable Member for Port de Grave presented from his seat on the other side of the House a petition signed by the fishermen of Conception Bay in large numbers. I think all the fishermen of Port de Grave and many fishermen from other districts concerned with the Labrador fishery. This petition asked that some regulations be enforced with regard to the sailing of vessels with codfish from the Labrador. Here was a petition presented by the fishermen themselves. These fishermen found themselves in a position that they saw evils that should be remedied in the exporting of their fish. They felt that the time had come to take cognisance of it themselves, that it could no longer be left to the merchants to deal with or those in politics. So they drafted a petition themselves and got it well signed and sent it here to this legislature praying that this House or this Government would take steps to prevent the export of codfish from the Labrador by steamer. I have never yet been able to discover, and I don't think Mr. Bradley who presented it has either, what happened that petition. In my opinion that was one of the most important petitions that ever came to this legislature. The reason I mention it now is to illustrate my point that I don't believe that there is going to be anything done in matters of that kind by a Government directed by men too closely connected with the exportation of our fish. Were we ever able to find out exactly what did happen that petition I believe it would make very interesting reading, if a report contained an account of what consideration it received and its fate. I will go so far as to say, though I speak subject to correction, and will withdraw if I am wong, that that petition found its way down on Water Street and those men who had to do with the shipping of fish by steamer from the Labrador advised the Prime Minister or the Government not to have anything to do with it and so the petition that the fishermen of Conception Bay conceived to be of the utmost importance to them and their livelihood found its way at last to some pigeon hole because the plutocrats of Water Street thought that by giving effect to the petition their own business would be hurt in some way or other. On the subject of the merits or demerits of that petition I am not concerned at the present time. I only mention it to show that when anything in the way of legislation conflicts with the interests of the plutocrats of Water Street we are up against a stone wall. When I say that nothing will be done for the fisheries while this Chamber has its present complexion I mean that no legislation passing this Chamber, until the fishermen get as representatives here fishermen having experience and education, if possible, and place them here on the floors of the House in a controlling body, will be the legislation that the fishermen need. Not till then can the fishermen hope to have anything done for them in a practical and efficient way. We are not going to have things done for the fishermen and labourers as long as the classes that give the men to fill the seats in this House are the mercantile and legal and those other than these I mentioned. I am not opposed to mercantile or legal men sitting here. It is the proper place for some of them but I do say that until the main body comes from ranks of common people and not till then can the common people hope to see practical effect given to their wishes, and I think the same principal that prevented the Prime Minister from making any pronouncement as regards the fisheries or the outlook for them, was the principal

that caused the mysterious disappearance of that petition. One reason the Prime Minister was boosting the country was because he was a large business man and had large experience in connection with the main industry of the country. But I have sat here for three sessions on this side of the House and I have yet to hear any pronouncement such as would result from his vast experiences as a business man, and I very much doubt if the Prime Minister has brought his experience and knowledge to bear on fishing problems with his party in such a way that we can hope for helpful legislation from him. The fishermen of this country to-day are in a very bad position. They have lost hope, some of them, and are disheartened, and the sad thing about it is this, that we are losing from the country the young men. We are losing the men who to-morrow ought to be the men interesting themselves in procuring motor boats and cod traps and becoming masters of schooners and things of that kind. I was brought up as a boy in a large fishing outport, and in my day it was the boys' ambition to be able to serve as second hand, and if some young man got control of a schooner as master at eighteen years imbue them with ambition to-day to become masters of schooners and owners of property or other things of that sort.

On motion the Debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I move that this House at its rising do adjourn until to-morrow at three o'clock.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the figures given by the Minister of Finance show a discrepancy and are not satisfactory to the Opposition members of this House.

He stated yesterday that the deficit was $112,000, making the difference by adding $30,000 which should have been added nine months ago, but really appears only in the past two or three months.

We must have a correct statement of the finance of the country, and it is the duty of the Minister of Finance to see that the figures which he gives us are correct. At the present time there is good cause for an investigation.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I would say that I undertook yesterday to furnish this House with a written statement from the Auditor General. Some of the members of this House have made certain statements and used rather strong wards against the Auditor General ,intimating that he should be turned out of his office. The Leader of the Opposition himself made rather a nasty insinuation, — which he withdrew afterwards, I think—still it was a serious charge, and I am not quite clear as to whether, in answer to this question, he will accept a statement from the Auditor General or not. If that is required I will have one prepared and bring it into the House tomorrow showing the exact deficit.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I regret this whole affair. I was responsible for bringing about this controversy, and my contention in connection with the whole affairs is that you cannot look to the heads of the different departments for correct information. I made certain statements a few days ago on the assumption that the Minister of Finance's figures were correct, and nothing mentioned by the Finance Minister serves to change my mind regarding the deficit. I repeat, and this is the last time that I will say it in this House, that I would not take stock from any civil servant

in regard to the deficit or anything else. I want ,in order to satisfy me, a proper investigation into all the affairs of the Customs and the other departments from June 1924 to date. Nothing else will satisfy me and I tell the public generally and I tell this House that this is the last time that I am going to say it.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, it appears that from certain information tabled here by the Minister of Finance and Customs in reply to a question asked by the junior member for Ferryland, and statements made by the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs, that the junior member for Ferryland made certain calculations. I took occasion, Mr. Speaker, to check up his calculations myself and I find that his figuring is correct. When the matter was brought into question by the member for Ferryland, the Minister of Finance—who I notice persistently absents himself fom this House—was asked for an explanation, and came in here yesterday afternoon, and, in rather a flippant manner, offered what he claims to be an explanation of the discrepancy. Again, Mr. Speaker, I checked up the figures that were given us yesterday afternoon and the calculation shows that they do not agree with the Finance Minister's statement. The deficit that he makes out is not the same as that given the House. I am responsible, as a member of this country for the expenditure of money collected through the revenue. This matter has got to be sifted and I, personally, am prepared to stand on the floor of this House until I get an explanation. It is not a matter for the Auditor General. He is only a checker of the accounts. It is the duty of the Minister of Finance to provide correct statements, and that has not been done. It is an insult to this House and an outrage to the people to sit here and not offer an explanation.

MR. BROWNE — It was explained yesterday.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, I say there was no explanation given, and I repeat for the benefit of the Honourable member, that there was no explanation because that which was offered was not correct and an explanation that is not correct is not an explanation.

I do not want to delay the House on this matter except to say that the matter has got to be sifted and there is only one way to get it. It is the duty of the Finance Minister to come in here and give an explanation not to put the blame on the shoulders of his subordinate in office. We do not know any subordinate. We don't' care whether there is a sub-ordinate. He is responsible to this House for the finances of this country.

I have to say this in his absence because, as I have said, he is not here to hear me. It ill becomes a Finance Minister to shift the blame unto the shoulders of a man who is not here to defend himself. It is time this kind of thing stopped. Much has gone on during the past three years which is unsatisfactory to the people of this country, unsatisfactory to many members of this House, and if their true opinions were given, unsatisfactoy to the majority of this House. There is something like a deficit of two million dollars this year. The discrepancy must be explained and it is the duty of the Finance Minister to come in here and place the correct statements before this House, and if he is incapable of doing that let him admit that he is incapable and resign.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Speaker, I feel that I cannot allow this opportunity to pass without making a few remarks in reply to the statements made by my Honourable and learned friend. He made a statement that he will have to give an explanation of, that the figures given by the Minister of Fi-

nance did not agree. With what did they not agree?

MR. BRADLEY—Did not agree with the Deficit.

MR. BROWNE—That was explained yesterday.

MR. BRADLEY—Would you like me to explain the situation. Well, the deficit which the Minister of Finance & Customs told the House yesterday for the year ending 1926 was about one hundred and twelve thousand dollars and on which he calculated that there were various duties which would make a difference of twenty thousand dollars.

MR. BROWNE — I for one do not quite see what the Honourable Member expects or is objecting to. If I remember rightly the Honourable Member for Port de Grave was not here the other day when this matter was being discussed. I do not think it necessary to act as apologist for my honouable friend the Minister of Finance and Customs, but I might say in reference to the Hon. Member's remarks on his absence that I have a recollection that the honourable member himself was not always perfect in attendance here, and even while he was a Minister of the Crown was generally conspicuous by his absence.

Surely if there is one official whose word we must take with regard to the financial affairs of this country it is that of the Auditor General, and I have been greatly surprised by the statements made with regard to this matter by the hon. members on the other side. It is hard to see what they desire or what will satisfy them, it is hard for the Government to see what to get to corroborate it. As I see it the figures, as tabled by the Finance Minister and the figures of the Auditor General are in accord.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following communication from His Excellency the Administrator of the Government, which he then read:

The Administrator of the Government has the pleasure 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, as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of a Minute of the Honourable Executive Council approved on the 30th of May.

(Sgd.) W. H. HORWOOD,

Administrator.

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.,
31st May, 1927.

Certified Copy of Minutes of the Honourable Executive Council Approved By His Excellency the Administrator on the 30th May, 1927.

May 28th, 1927.

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

The President, Legislative Council.
Hon. A. B. Morine, K.C.
Hon. S. Milley,
The Speaker, House of Assembly,
The Prime Minister,
The Colonial Secretary,
The Attorney General.

Certified true copy.

(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS,

Deputy Colonial Secretary.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.
Mr. Godden gave notice of question.
Dr. Mosdell gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn tomorrow, Wednesday, June 1st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 1st, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Grimes, from Summerford, re a public wharf.

The Minister of Marine & Fisheries tabled the Report of the Department of Marine & Fisheries for the year 1926.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of the debate on this matter yesterday I was making some reference to the tragic turn of events in this country as presented to us in the spectacle of the decline of the codfishery, and I was pointing out that despite the fact that this subject more than any other at this present time is the one which is most animating the minds of the general public of the country, the Government scarcely saw fit to make reference to it in the document placed in His Excellency's hands on the day of the opening of this Legislature and which he then read, and that the Prime Minister didn't see fit to refer to this subject in his own remarks on opening day.

I was trying to point out furthermore that so far as the Speech from the Throne is concerned, and in so far as the Prime Minister in his personal remarks on opening day avoided any specific or general reference to the subject of the codfish industry, that document could only be regarded as hopeless; and that as far as the people of the country were concerned, it was practically useless for them to expect anything from the Government in the way of legislation that would be of assistance to them and that would tend to improve conditions in this country respecting the codfishing industry. To get down to brass tacks, I had thought that the Speech from the Throne at least would have contained some reference to the fact that last year in this Legislature the Prime Minister moved for the appointment of a Fisheries Commission, and that subsequently that Fisheries Commission was appointed. I had expected to hear something as to the work of that Commission. I had also expected to hear in the Speech from the Throne, and the country had expected to hear that that Fisheries Commission had been meeting, and that it had been on the job and had completed its labors and found itself in the position to have made some recommendations to the Government as to the proper steps to be taken and the proper course to pursue to obviate the decline of the fishing industry. I am not oblivious to the fact that in approaching the subject of this Fisheries Commission, I lay myself open to a certain amount of criticism from the Government side. The Prime Minister and his Government did myself and the Leader of the Opposition the courtesy of an invitation to act upon that commission. I declined to act. But I did not decline to do so without first giving the matter very serious thought and very serious consideration. I took the position for declining to act upon that Commission, that in 1924 the Government themselves came into power and charged with a responsibility of doing something for the fishermen and the fishing industry in this country; in fact I go further and say that the Government had from the fishermen and electors of this country a mandate to do something in a practical way for that industry. In other words they had a mandate to carry out a policy which would mean the payment of a bonus on every quintal of fish caught in this country. I took the position that for three years the Government had been in office, and for three

years they had declined to give any attention whatever to the pledges they had made to the electorate regarding the fishing industry. It looked very much to me—and I do not want to be over uncharitable—that the move of the Prime Minister last year in this House to have a Fisheries Commission was something in the nature of what I might call political kite-flying. In any case my point of view in the main was this, that the responsibility for any fishery policy that was necessary or that might have developed to enhance and to help forward the fishing industry primarily rested upon the shoulders of the Administration in power. It could be scarcely thought reasonable—and I do not think the majority of the people of the country would have it so—that the Prime Minister had to come in this House and ask the Members of the Opposition to share with him or his Government the responsibility for any fishery policy that would result as the workings of such a commission. The responsibility was the Government's because three years ago the Government made it clear to the fishermen and to the majority of the people of Newfoundland that they were prepared to come into this House and assume such a responsibility. They felt themselves able and capable of coming in and doing something for the fishermen. Consequently, the position I take is this, that if the Government after three years in office feels that they are not in a position or are not strong enough or able enough to tackle that proposition, then it is their duty to give place to men who have sufficient confidence in themselves and who are able and capable to tackle propositions which the pressing need of the hour dictates. I fear no criticism or no attack for declining to act on that Commission. There was no other course consistently up to me than the course I took, and without labouring the question further I will reiterate the position I took at that time, namely, that the responsibility for a fishery policy devolved in the main on the Government because the Government had a mandate from the people to evolve such a policy as would meet the pressing needs of the fishermen throughout the country. But the fact that myself and the Leader of the Opposition were invited to serve and work upon that Commission and that we declined that invitation is in my opinion no justification whatsoever as to why the Commission ought not have pursued its labors in the interests of the fishermen throughout the length and breadth of this country, as there are members on both sides of the House who confidently expected that when the Speech from the Throne was brought in some reference would be made in it to the labors of that Commission, and that as a result of such labors some definite step would be taken at this session of the legislature towards bringing into being something in the nature of a fishery policy. I very much doubt, as I stated here yesterday, as to whether the present Government is, in the first place willing and in the second place ,able to evolve any such policy such as the state of the fishing industry at present would seem to necessitate. Honorable Members, I am sure, will believe me when I say that I stand here to-day in a rather fair position to judge and to give an expression of opinion as to what the majority of the fishermen in the North are thinking along these lines. Since last session of the House I travelled the northern section of this country from Bonne Bay to Bonavista, and during my tour I addressed public meetings and dealt principally with this same subject. I gave an expression of the views and opinions of my own, but opinions which I gathered from the ideas which I formulated as a result of coming in contact with

those who are well able to size up the whole situation. One thing that struck me forcibly when I was fortunately addressing those public meetings was the unanimous acceptance of the views I set forth, not alone from our own supporters but from supporters of the Prime Minister and his colleagues as well. And I have every reason to believe that thousands of people in other sections of the country see eye to eye to-day with the views entertained by the people of the North. Politically the Government may be inclined to lead us to believe that they are dead to all sense of public feeling as regards the position they occupy in this country to-day, but I do not for one moment believe that any member on the Government side of the House, at least, no honourable member who represents a fishing constituency, but who knows that there is among the fishermen a tremendous feeling of depression, of agitation, of dissatisfaction and of discontent. And why is this so? Because last year saw the culmination of a series of events which practically drove fifty per cent. of the fishermen to absolute ruin. Now when you come down to actual facts and figures and you take into consideration that during the past two years the earning power of the fishermen decreased, as exemplified from the returns which showed that the catch decreased to the extent of four million dollars, you can very well understand that there is reason for thought in the position I take that the fishermen are discontented and that there is depression and general mistrust abroad. To revert to the year of 1923. A general election was fought in this country and a party was led by Sir John Bennett and with which party the present Prime Minister was identified. In that election the subject of a bonus on fish was made a live issue. Now I am not ashamed nor afraid to say that in 1923 I was opposed to the idea of a bounty on codfish because the party with which I was associated did not think it an economically sound proposition. In 1924 I was in the same position, but I was certainly greatly interested with the experiment that was about to be performed when the present Government took office in that connection. If the Prime Minister wishes he could square one on me this afternoon by saying that he only made the promise in 1924 contingent upon two circumstances, one of which was that the fishery needed it, and secondly that the condition of public finances was such as to warrant it? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and I am going to take his memory back to a conversation I had with him in late October last just previous to the time when he started out on that famous trip to Bonavista Bay and when he went down and satisfied the crowd who were thinking about coming to St. John's and starting an agitation last Fall about the price of fish—discussed with me the question of a bonus on fish. He will also remember that I pointed out to him that, after giving the Government an allowance for everything they had done in the way of expenditure of public moneys, and that for the things they had undertaken to do had been efficiently and economically performed, there would still remain over a sufficient margin to pay a bonus of one dollar a quintal on one million quintals of fish within the past two years. I go further and say that I believe that at the time he was somewhat impressed by the position I set up. To substantiate that position take the matter of the Dry Dock which the Government said would cost one million dollars. You asked for legislation in that connection and we voted the money. To-day, according to the Finance Minister and Auditor General, the dock cost two millions. Even that was a monstrous proposition to come in here and ask for a million

dollars, although we told you that the dock could not be built for a million, but, even at that, had you kept within your own estimate in that undertaking you would have saved one million dollars and with which amount you would have been enabled to pay a bonus on fish. I contend that there is no weight in the argument that the condition of public finances during the past few years has not warranted the payment of a bonus on fish and I doubt whether any gentleman on the other side would dare have the hardihood here or elsewhere to stand up and refute my assertion. It may have been that no pressing necessity arose for you to give serious consideration to this important matter before last autumn; but I submit that if ever there was a time when you as a Government, pledged to have given some consideration to the needs of the fishermen and their affairs it was last Autumn. Some activity on the part of the Government last year might have brought about a condition of affairs in this country that would have saved $1,500,000.00 Yet you are down here to-day bemoaning your fate as regards deficits and you are trying to tell the people of the country that one of the reasons that caused the enormous deficit in your financial affairs is that the cost of goods in which cotton is entered as a large constituent has considerably declined in price. No such nonsense. If I had occasion to I could stand here and tell a very interesting story about what happened to the cotton industry abroad and of how a Government tries to prevent it from going to the wall when it sees an industry of that kind tottering. If you have read the foreign papers, you will have observed what the American Government did to revive and resuscitate the cotton trade in that country, and in that you got an object lession as to what the Monroe Government should do to save the fisheries. You were short in your revenue and you are facing an enormous defiicit because the earnings of the fishermen have been less by four millions of dollars during the past two years and of which sum $1,500,000.00 could have been saved for the fishermen of this country. The Prime Minister does not want me to tell him they cannot exist on $4.50 per quintal for Labrador fish. They cannot make two ends meet; whilst the owners of small schooners cannot bring home enough fish to square accounts on the basis of $4.50 a quintal. Before I came here this afternoon I talked with a man, Captain Roberts, one of the biggest fish-killers in the district of Bonavista. He told me that he considered that, under present conditions, any less than $5.00 a quintal would not pay, although I do not agree with him. Last year if there had been shown some legislation or some activity, as between the Government on the one hand and the exporters on the other, there would have been brought about a condition of affairs, which, to some extent, would have prevented the demoralization that existed in our foreign markets after exporting. I gave some consideration to this subject last year, and Sir John Bennett, who was Acting Prime Minister at the time will recall that he received a letter from myself and currently another one from Sir William Coaker on the subject, and I am going to tell the story this evening of that correspondence because it will again serve to show what consideration can be expected at the hands of an administration such as we have at the present time in power. Sir John Bennett, a man for whom I have the utmost respect and veneration, and I think every one else has, was Acting Prime Minister in October last when I considered it of sufficient importance to bring to his notice a trend of affairs in connection with the exportation of codfish. Sir William Coaker, directing a large exporting concern, also con-

sidered the matter of sufficient importance as well to bring it to the notice of Sir John. We both pointed out in our letters that if things went on as they were going the tendency would be that the price of fish would have to decline rather than enhance, and that as a result of the voyage fifty per cent. of the fishermen would not be able to square accounts and that the following Spring would likely witness a big influx of the best fishing families in the country going out. We pointed out the issue in the main to Mr. Bennett and asked him if he would use his good graces and try and get the exporters to co-operate in order to bring about certain regulations and certain agreements that we felt would remedy conditions as regards exporting fish, particularly with respect to sailings to foreign markets. Sir William Coaker left his business at Port Union and came and personally interested himself in the matter. Sir John Bennett, seeing some justice in the representations that were made to him, did try to get the exporters together to consider the situation. The only criticism I have to urge now against Sir John is that in my opinion he was not firm enough in the stand he took, because he was on the spot and knew the circumstances of the case. However, after a week of a series of deliberations and correspondence being exchanged, the sum total of the answer of the Acting Prime Minister was that the exporters felt that it was the duty of the Board of Trade to convene a meeting to deal with the matter of regulating the exportation of codfish. And there the matter rested. Contingent with that suggestion that Sir John Bennett should get the exporters to co-operate we suggested that the matter was of such pressing importance that if the exporters would not co-operate that the Legislature might be convened to deal with the situation, and the response we got was that the idea could not be entertained. But, if a crowd of capitalists came here from the United States, Canada or England and they had a proposition of pressing importance to be legislated upon, they would bring pressure to bear upon the Government and it would not be long before the Government would call the Legislature to meet to deal with the matter, but when it came to dealing with something affecting the vital welfare of the fishermen of this country, the opening of the Legislature would not be contemplated by the Government. I admit, Sir John Bennett, was in a rather awkward position, as the Prime Minister and Minister of Justice were out of the country, although we, on behalf of the Opposition, gave an assurance that no attempt would be made to take advantage or to deliberate on political matters. The Legislature was not convened, and again our request did not meet with the approval of Sir John Bennett and the matter dropped. I sincerely regret, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Mr. Long is not in his seat this afternoon because I had some very pertinent remarks to address to him, as he was President of the Board of Trade at the time I refer to.

These fishermen met and they telegraphed the following message to Hon. J. J. Long, President of the Board of Trade:

And still, Sir, I am pleased to say that ,in my opinion, despite that message, there was no feeling in St. John's last autumn that the fishermen were dissatisfied with prices.

(Reads)

It is signed by supporters of members of this House, some sit on this side and some on the other side of the House, a very representative gathering. This message was merely addressed to the President of the Board of Trade, simply and straightly to ask him, in effect, the price of fish; if it was going up or down. After all, even if Mr.

Long had not been President of the Board of Trade, he might have been a very fit and proper person for the gathering to telegraph to, because he is a prominent member of the Executive Government, who is pledged to assist the people of this country. Let us see how Mr. Long deals with this matter. He says:

(Reads)

Is it any wonder that the gathering of fishermen telegraphed back to Mr. Long and told him that they were disgusted with the answer. Had the fishermen even telegraphed to the meanest commercial agent on Water Street, all he would have had to do was to go down the street, ask the prices of fish and telegraph to these men. Instead of that, the President of the Board of Trade and forsooth member of the Legislature took no notice, but sent back an answer dealing with the composition, make up and duties of that august body known as the Board of Trade.

On the one hand the Colonial Secretary, then acting Prime Minister tells them that it is not the duty of the exporters but the duty of the Board of Trade and on the other hand there is a message from the President of the Board of Trade in which he states that it is not the duty of the Board of Trade but of the exporters. I am not good at comparisons, but would like to be able to put that situation in very choice language. I would say this that the outcome of the situation last autumn amounted to this. The fishermen were left, between the nether millstones, as it were, of selfish exporters on the one hand and a supine Government on the other hand. The Government was too supine and the exporters too selfish to co-operate, and the result was that the prices went down, and though in some cases when a man got here early he got a good price for his fish, still the prices did not rally and were never really sufficient to pay the men for their produce.

Mr. Speaker, it is a condition of affairs such as that that has driven hope out of the hearts of the fishermen ,it is a condition of affairs such as that that forces them to despair and they are at their wits end to know just what they ought to do. It forces them to do what they least want to do, to abandon the calling with which they are accustomed and which they love, and go and seek a living in a foreign land. I asked the Colonial Secretary the question as to how many Newfoundlanders of the male sex had left Newfoundland since March last. It was stated by some gentleman that we were having a nice time of it in Newfoundland, and all the people were living under comfortable and in many cases luxurious circumstances, that is the common people of this country. These figures speak for themselves and tell their own story. From the figures given to me by the Colonial Secretary we find that nine thousand three hundred and fifty Newfoundlanders, of the male sex, left this country since March 31st last. And the exodus continues.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Read the other figures. Tell how many came back.

MR. SCAMMELL — The Colonial Secretary has added that some five thousand of these have returned. I send back a reply that to balance that probably more have left the country during the past spring. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not been content to confine my remarks merely to a criticism of the Government and the existing state of affairs, but I have been seeking to discover if there are any facts that the Government may take cognizance of.

I may say again that I was disappointed to find that the commission appointed at the suggestion of the Prime Minister last year did not function and we got no report from it.

We are all at our wits end to know what to do in connection with the fisheries, but certainly goodness if we were to look in one direction more than another for enlightenment we would look to that body, that august body, the Board of Trade. I read with some interest the report of that body given through the columns of the "Trade Review." I read it looking for light and looking for information because I felt that such a body could not meet without giving some official recognition to the conditions that existed. It is illuminating comments that you would expect from men supposed to stand top-notch when it comes to dealing with matters of this sort. The report states

(Reads)

Mr. Long is speaking

(Reads)

He outlines some of the things by which we are handicapped; exchange conditions, Fordney tariff, bounty on the fish of our French competitors. "These matters are beyond our control," but it is very interesting to note that the reduction of taxation was within their control—the reduction of taxation was within the control of that body and the President of the Board of Trade who is also a member of the Government, pledged to serve the people. He says in the Board of Trade that one of the reasons for the present state of conditions is because of the high taxation, and that that matter is within their control. It is within his control. If he was sincere and want to give practical effect to his speech he could have done a good deal towards the reduction of taxation.

"The matter of taxation," the Board of Trade report says, "weighs heavily upon the fishermen of this country." Of course it does. And the Government by its policy has made it still heavier. By imposing large taxes of 15 p.c. on various articles, as has been so ably expressed by Major Cashin, to benefit such concerns as the Ropewalk, Butterine Factory, Tobacco Factory and goodness knows what else. And the report goes on

(Reads)

Mr. Speaker, the fishermen do not want the Board of Trade or Mr. Long to get up and speak such trash—to tell them that they are going to suffer from the taxes. They know it all too well. But what they do expect is that those gentlemen will tell them that they are immediately going to get to work and reduce the taxes and try to lighten their burdens in that respect. Here is another comment on the situation—"The Government are lamenting the fact that there is going to be a very immodest—not modest deficit as Mr. Cahill suggests—but an immodest deficit this year. How could it be otherwise.

The Finance Minister in his Budget Speech last year anticipated a revenue of about ten million dollars and bases his expenditure upon a calculation that the revenue will be such an amount. I put down the total catch of the shore fishery at a million quintals, commanding a price of $6.00 per quintal. The Board of Trade puts the price down at $5.50 per quintal and you take into account the way the fish was culled ,etc., it is hardly likely that you would get much more than $5.50, but we will give it the benefit of the doubt and say $6.00. That means that the shore fishery brought in a revenue of six million dollars and allowing for a catch of two hundred and fifty thousand quintals on the Labrador, at $4.50 a quintal, the value would be one million one hundred and twenty five thousand dollars. Thus making a grand total of $7,125,000. And the Finance Minister anticipated in the Budget Speech in this House that there would be a revenue of $10,500,000. The position is the same as if the fishermen took every quintal of fish and dumped it down at the doors of the Customs House and

said "Here, Sir John, take the fish and make what revenue you can." He would answer "Thank you, gentlemen, but I want three million dollars more." It is certainly a dangerous state of affairs when the total catch is not sufficient to meet the estimated revenue by three million dollars.

If we are not tottering to a fall or going headlong to destruction then I would like to know what we are doing. And here, Mr. Speaker, arises what I have been inclined to regard as a matter that warrants some serious thought. I was under the impression, and I was wrong, that when the Humber deal and the Gander deal got under way that we would have a cure for all our ills. It appears that this is meant to be a fishing country. And if we wish to remain a country ,then everything possible must be done to improve, encourage, and mage a success of the fisheries of this country.

Hundreds of men are employed at the Humber and at Grand Falls, but outside of their wages they are bringing nothing worth while into the revenue of this country, nothing like the proportion as could be obtained from the fisheries. You can go to work in Grand Falls and make paper worth seventy to seventy-five dollars a ton. Does any man mean to argue that we get say $56.00 of that $75 that the ton of paper is worth. No. But for every quintal of fish that is exported there comes back at least seven eights of the value of every quintal sent out. So there is nothing that we can get such returns from or that will be more beneficial to the country than the fishery—no other production of any kind whatever can produce such returns.

Now, what are some of the things that could be done to encourage the fishing industry.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, now, seeing that the thing has gone as far as it has that last year the Government should have taken steps to put a bounty on fish. Of course, we expected a bounty to be paid when the present Government was returned in 1924, but if there was one time more than another during the years that have gone by since the Government took office, last year was that time. A difference of even fifty cents a quintal on codfish put out as a bounty would have had a good effect all round. Last year, again, there was no end of trouble and grumbling in connection with the cull of fish. Sometime in August, we were informed through the "Postal Telegraphs" in the outports that several fish firms in St. John's had decided to agree together and institute a cull on fish. At that time it was thought a good idea, but each firm set its own standard and the result was that there were as many culls as there were merchants. There was no such a thing as a standard cull all round. It was stricter in St. John's in the main than in the outports but there was general dissatisfaction that was caused by there being no standard cull.

To standardize the cull of fish is a somewhat difficult thing for any Government to institute but, to my mind, it is one thing that has got to come in this country very soon. There are many fishermen who to-day are anxious to have standardized cull who will talk differently when it is put into effect. It is a difficult thing to institute and even the gentlemen of the Board of Trade seem to have no definite idea. One of them suggests, Mr. Job, that one way would be to have wax models of the fish made and in that way the cull could be put into operation. I suppose that if the culler was not sure what kind of a fish he was handling he would run to the show case and look at the wax model and so be able to determine.

If that is as far as we are towards a standard cull of fish, having wax models of the fish made ,then I am afraid it will be a long time before we have standardized cull of fish. I

do not mention, this instance in the way of criticism but merely to show that even the biggest men don't seem to be able to discover the best way to get to work to better the present conditions.

There seems to be a growing feeling, Mr. Prime Minister,—I am addressing you, Sir, through the Speaker,—amongst the fishermen in favour of standardization and if you were to go and come into contact with the fishermen you would find that there seems to be a feeling that standardization ought to be brought into effect. It has been tried by other Governments but they could not come to any decision as to the best way to regulate the matter. But standardization is something that will have to come and the Government should consider the thing and acquire some laws of standardization. As a matter of fact there is no need for you to worry about drawing up an Act, for there is already an Act on the Statute Book, the Standardization Act of 1921, which has never been repealed. All that you would have to do would be to make any changes that would be necessary to suit present conditions, and amend the Act accordingly.

Give standardization a fair trial and I think great good will result in export of codfish.

I firmly believe in it myself and would advocate that the Government give the matter their immediate attention, and consideration ,and serious consideration at that.

I have heard a lot, Mr. Speaker, about a gentleman named Professor Sleggs who went down to Trinity Bay in August and spent all his time throwing bottles overboard in order to find out the temperature of the water.

I notice to-day in the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries that the Minister or at least his deputy made some reference to Professor Sleggs. He says here talking about some of the things that he has done.

(Reads)

Did he go down to Bonavista and talk to 500 fishermen there about the cause and the prevention of bad fish. Did he go down to Fogo or any other places and do the same. No, but I presume from what I gather that he delivered a lecture to some school boys up in the Memorial College But if you are a reasonable and fair-minded man you will admit that while scientific research may be alright, if we wanted to increase the catch of codfish, and if there was any doubt in our minds that the codfishery was being depleted. This very man was sent up to Halifax by the Government, and I propose to find out what his expenses were. He was sent up there to attend a fishing Commission there. This august assembly which was under the auspices of the fishery board at Washington, had a meeting up there to have a chat about things connected with the fisheries, and one learned gentleman, whose words I read in the Halifax Chronicle a couple of days ago, said that there was no need to worry about the codfishery being depleted. There were millions left yet he said. Well, if that is the case and we need not worry about a surplus of codfish, why cannot we get our heads together and see if we cannot bring about a better condition of affairs in connection with the curing of codfish. No, sir, the slogan "catch more fish" is not going to solve our troubles. In fact in my opinion the statistics of the codfishery in recent years if anything show that we are catching too much fish. It would be better, perhaps, if we caught one quarter of a million or 500,000 less fish than we have been catching.

Now, sir, I am associated with an organization known as the ishermen's Protective Union, and an organization which seriously concerns itself

with measures pertaining to the fishermen's interests, and at our convention in Port Union last year we went thoroughly into every aspect of the subject from the fisherman's standpoint to-day. It was decided that we would have to take some practical steps to see whether we could not have a change of conditions. We drafted a petition at that convention and we circulated it throughout the North. I am pleased to say that the petition was well received. It was signed not only by men in the north who are adherents of the Union but also by men outside of Port Union. Next week when we get down to business I am going to ask from the Prime Minister and the Government for their serious consideration for the subject matter to which these petitions refer. I hold in my hand a draft copy of the petition to which I am referring, and from it I will now read whatever may be relevant to the subject matter before the chair.

(Reads)

Let me state again, sir, that this petition is largely signed by thousands of fishermen, and when it comes up before this House I ask that it receive the serious consideration of the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. Brown, the other day made strong reference to the conditions of things in the logging industry. I do not propose to delay this House by going very deeply into this matter. Suffice it to say that I consider that the present logging act must be amended. We have got to-day in the lumber woods a condition of things, the coming of the sub-contractor, and he in turn taking the control out of the hands of the company more or less. That has created a condition of things in the logging industry at the present time that the logging act is not competent to deal with. The conditions are nothing short of outrageous. I had considerable correspondence with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines on the subject as he knows. Every time I got a prompt reply and I believe that the Minister has done all in his power to make the inspectors do their duty in seeing the enforcement of the logging act. That act was placed on the Statute Book only after a hard fight. And it is our duty to see that it is carried out. That the men are treated as human beings in the lumber woods. And I say that if you dispense with the inspectors and appoint a number of able-bodied men to do the work you will have better returns and there will be more satisfaction to the men. But certainly sooner or later that act got to be amended.

I was also sorry to learn of the conditions of the food supply at the sealfishery. That is another act that we will have to overhaul and put some teeth into and make it more perfect than it is at the present time. The sub-contractors in the lumber woods have got to go. Even if we find among the men themselves a number that still want to hold on to the sub-contractors. The people have got to be protected against themselves.

Now I propose to say a few words about taxation and expenditure, and revenue. And, Mr. Speaker, the figures are certainly interesting. I have tried to overhaul these public accounts and the various statements placed at the disposal of the members since this Legislature opened, and they show how the idol is shattered and fallen. My mind goes back to the days of 1924 when we were told of the terrible squandermania of the Squires Government. We were told of the terrible deeds that were done overnight by what is called Minute of Council Government. All these things were going to be done away with. Expenditure, said the Prime Minister, or the Finance Minister, for him must be kept within

the limits of the estimates. There is going to be no Minute of Council Government. We are going to come into this Legislature and put our cards on the table and when the House of Assembly closes the story will be told. We have been here now since the 11th of May and we have not yet got from the Government of this Colony a correct statement of the true financial position.

We have in this country as regards the financial position of this Colony a kind of jig saw puzzle, with three points to it. We have been told in the Auditor General's statement that the deficit was only $81,000. We have been told by the Finance Minister in answer to a question tabled in this House that the deficit was $2,000,000, and then again we have been told by the Finance Minister in explanation that the deficit was only $112,000. But I want the members of the Government to understand that the people of this country are taking the situation that has arisen over these figures very seriously, and they mean to get from this Government a proper statement wherever it comes from of the correct financial condition of the country to-day. And this Opposition feels itself in duty bound to see that that financial statement is forthcoming before voting on a dollar of supplies.

Now what is the Government's record. The Government was going to balance the expenditure with the estimates. Let us see. The total expenditure of the Government for 1924-1925 was $10,522,000. The revenue for the same year was only $9,783,188.46. On in that year you spent $739,000 more than the revenue. For 1925-1926 the expenditure was $11,960,000 and for the same year the revenue was $9,834,000. Therefore last year on that account you spent $2,125,000 more than the revenue, yet you were going to keep the expenditure below the revenue. You have spent during the three years, $41,000,000. That is you came into power in effect for the record of the Government that was going to reduce expenditure and keep within the estimates. No doubt that when these figures go to the country that it will be astounded. That organisation talked about the expenditure of the Squires Government and yet on looking into the figures you can find that the expenditure of the present Government was $41,000 more than the last year of the Squires Administration.

You are not in the position to come in and tell us that you can't do any better. You have got to undo the things that you have already done. The income tax that you removed from the shoulders of the rich, you are compelled to put back now. But I venture to say that you are not going to put back the $500,000 income tax. And you are not going to bring in a law as strong as the one that you repealed from the Statute Book when you came into power. And the country has to be taxed to make up for your blunders.

Bad as the Squires administration was it would have been better if it had gone on in power. To-day from Cape Bauld to Cape Race, every section of the country feels that they have been hopelessly betrayed. And, sir, and I am going to talk to the Prime Minister through the Speaker, you cannot any more ask approval for your conduct for the way in which you handled the affairs of this country. The idea of the Government making a contract to build the dock for one million and then to find that it cost two millions.

Two and a quarter million dollars spent on Highroads. This will cost you an annual interest of a hundred thousand, and I venture to say an annual charge of two hundred and fifty thousand for maintenance. What have we got down in the District of St. Barbe? Before I left town last year

I went to the Prime Minister's office. I told the Prime Minister what I wanted of him. I told him that there were certain moneys in the Public Works Department to the credit of the District of St. Barbe, and I said that I wanted to be recognized in connection with the distribution of this money. I got a tentative answer from the Prime Minister and went off. Then I communicated with the Public Works Department by telegraph and, before I was through, spent dollars in getting my rights and recognition as the representative of St. Barbe District in saying how some of this money should be distributed. I had found that my opponent had as much to say as I about it and a good mess he made of it.

I read the other day that the Relieving Officer at Harbour Grace was giving out some five hundred passes to men who were going to White Bay. A few days ago I had occasion to ask for a pass for a man to go to the French Shore. A letter was given the man from the Colonial Secretary's Department to the Commissioner of Public Charities. The Commissioner of Public Charities, I was told by the man, tore up the letter and stamped it under his foot. I got Mr. Brownrigg's explanation and I got a letter from the Colonial Secretary's Department that they considered Mr. Brownrigg's explanation was all right. It is all very well for the Deputy Colonial Secretary to say the explanation is all right. He can go down and get $280 for extra services as he did last year. Though civil servants who treated that man in that way are being supported by the taxpayers of the country.

We have in our country to-day a Publicity Bureau that I suppose is going to make Newfoundland a veritable paradise for tourists. I notice that a man named Meehan is Chairman, and every time he took occasion to ask for a thousand dollars he got it. He got some seven or eight thousand. A young lawyer in Boston got away with another seventy-five hundred out of the million dollars we voted under protest last year. St. Barbe got a paltry twenty-five hundred dollars—thanks to the man who interferred in my work and in my district, but Mr. Meehan gets thousands to spend on publicity and Mr. Tait gets seventy-five hundred more. Again if a district is within a hundred miles of St. John's they can get what they like. We did not get anything out of the Highroads. That is the way the people of the outports are being fooled to-day. St. Barbe is one of the most important fishing districts in the country, not only from the standpoint of the fish caught, but from the fish brought out of it. Fishermen come from Bonavista Bay and bring tens of thousands of quintals of fish out of it.

I have got a message here now I received from a prominent citizen at Flower's Cove (reads) . . . and they are absolutely right. But I wonder are they going to get it! I propose to bring this matter before the Government in another form and see what answer I will get. I am going to try and get out of the Government what I consider as a fair share of that million dollar loan.

A word or two more and I am finished. I want to say a few words on the subject of the Imperial Conference and the Labrador Boundary question. I was amazed to hear the Prime Minister stand up here the other day and say in connection with the decision of the Imperial Conference in granting equality of status to the various dominions within the Empire that as far as he was concerned he did not see what good it was to us. The thing that seemed to impress him most was that if ever we wanted to go back to be a Crown Colony, the British Government might not take part in that desire. His opinion seemed to be that as far as we were concerned that it was a matter of small importance. I want

to tell the Prime Minister that it was a matter of the utmost importance, and if he came away with that impression, he came away with an impression different from many others who have expressed their views on this, such as different representatives and prominent newspaper men. I suppose there is no more eminent journalist on the continent of Europe to-day than ————————, the Editor of the Review of Reviews. Writing on the decisions of the Imperial Conference he says: (Reads) . . . The decision of the Imperial Conference was a most momentous decision for Newfoundland, coming as it did, practically synchronizing with the decision of the Privy Council which confirmed beyond the shadow of a doubt Newfoundland's right to Labrador. If I understand those two decisions correctly Newfoundland is fully entitled to the disposal of Labrador in whatever way she chooses. In fact, I will go so far as to say that the way I read that decision, and I would only allow myself to be corrected by legal men, is that we can, if we choose, sell that territory to the United States without any interference from the Home Government. In view of that, I cannot see why the Prime Minister could say that that decision was not of much importance to Newfoundland.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Not much benefit I said.

MR. SCAMMELL—Of course, if the Prime Minister used that word his remarks are open to a different construction. With regard to the settlement of the dispute and the acquisition of the territory on the Labrador, it was painful to learn the other day that the lawyers are not finished with the Labrador yet. We have got to have what the Prime Minister designated as a legal survey. I can fancy the countenance of our legal friends in the Government lightening up when that announcement was made. I wonder how much of the Labrador is going to be left when the lawyers are finished with it. It was interesting to notice in the Royal Gazette just after the decision was announced to see the effect of certain parties immediately becoming interested. In every issue you would see applications for some thousands of square miles of timber land. I understand that a considerable number of square miles are held already. The Government are bringing in a Bill with regard to grants on the Labrador, and they have put a paragraph in it to make sure that those who have land there can by no means lose it. I am going to oppose the second section of that Bill, and try to work up opinions to oppose it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is not the purpose of the section at all.

MR. SCAMMELL—You know that the Canadians are feeling badly over this thing, but I have no doubt that they want the Labrador and what is on it. Then again the United States are interested in other matters besides the fishing industry. To-day we cannot get the American Government to alter the Fordney tariff, so why not get in touch with those people whereby you could play off one proposition against the other; or get the Canadians interested and get them to pay the price for the Labrador. We have no means of developing the Labrador because we have no money to do it with. Therefore, negotiate and sell the the Labrador and get the best price possible for it. No doubt the price you would get for it would pay off the national debt of Newfoundland. As far as the water power down there is concerned, its potential value is not possible at present to estimate, as I suppose it is only a matter of a short time when electricity through the air will be an accomplished fact and then the value of the Labrador will be increased a hundred fold.

In conclusion I would remind the Government again that their bounden

duty, in view of the conditions that ol ta n in the country at the present juncture, is to give consideration to the grantnig of a general election the coming Fall. I reiterate that you have lost the confidence of the people of this country. You lost it in the Bye-elections of Fortune Bay and St. John's East. You have betrayed the people. You have been weighed in the balance and found want ng. You have cast their money and their interests to the four winds of Heaven and you have to get out or give the people a chance to put you out in the early Autumn.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that on my first occasion of addressing this House I must strike a note of condolence and make more than passing reference to the remarks already made regarding the passing of the late Sir Robert Bond and Sir Michael Cashin. There are a variety of reasons why I should do this. I come from a settlement and from a family that for a long period boasted of their connections with the Liberal Party. With them the names of Whiteway, Bond and other old chieftains of the Liberal Party were household forms. It meant something good to them in principle and in practical politics, so that when I speak of the late Sir Robert Bond and of his loss to th s country I speak of the loss of a man with whom my family, my settlement and myself personally were closely connected with both as followers of that Party in an election and as supporters of that Party in general. There is something about the name of Bond that possesses a great deal of magic for the people of this country, and a magic about the name that calls for explanation—a kind of a magic of that name that suggests the greatness of a character of a late Liberal Leader, the recognition of a signal service that had been rendered by him to this country in his many years of office and the value of a shining example that he set during his lifetime and what it meant to the men who were his followers. There is something of a contrast, perhaps, as between the times of Sir Robert Bond and our own times, with the policy he considered and the policy we are pursuing to-day and it is because of that the people of this country hold such veneration, affection and respect for the late Sir Robert Bond to-day. I feet that it is a tribute from the common people, a tribute from the intelligence of the common people and a tribute to a man who set country above self and who set service to country above self-interest and self-recognition; and it is because of that that the people of this country are anxious above all things, particularly in times such as these, to think so highly of Sir Robert Bond and to revere his name. It was only the other day I was reading a book containing a biography of Sir Robert Bond and in his biography was a foreward written by himself, and the point made by Sir Robert in that foreward that struck me most forcibly and that appealed to me most deeply was his statement that the true estimate of the greatness or the value of a man depended upon the extent to which that man had done yeoman and beneficial service for his fellows, and taking Sir Robert Bond's own estimate of the value of a man and applying it to himself we feel that he realised his ideal in his own life and service to the very highest degree, because, after all as far as Sir Robert Bond is concerned, there was really nothing very brilliant about his personality, there was nothing so very brilliant about his undertakings, but the outstanding phase of his career was the value and the quality of service that he did for his country and for the people of the country's interest. It was only the other day I was speaking to a former Minister of Sir Robert Bond's Cabinet and he said to me that during the election of 1908 a member of his Party asked to have a public expenditure

made of $25 or $30 with which to establish a Post Office in a small extern settlement and that if the request was acceded to it would mean the winning of the whole district. It had been urged upon Sir Robert Bond that it ought to be done; but Sir Robert took the position that the Post Office was unnecessary and that the expenditure should not be made no matter what votes were lost. Compare that position and that attitude with the position and the attitude of to-day when tens of thousands of dollars are flung away, with waste and extravagance prevailing in so many of our public departments, purely for political purposes and for political advantages. No wonder that people are anxious to return to the times of Sir Robert Bond so that when men are trusted with the responsibility of protecting the finances of the people that they are to safeguard them as jealously as if they are their own private or commercial businesses. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that there is a universal feeling of regret throughout the country and a general feeling of sorrow over the passing of Sir Robert Bond in respect to the man, in respect to his personality, in respect to his honesty, in respect to his example and in respect to a regime that the people wish to see continue to their own benefit and to the benefit of the country.

The other gentleman whose passing I wish to refer to is Sir Michael Cashin. I have not had the same intimate connection with him that I had with Sir Robert Bond and his Party, although when I became a supporter of Sir Robert Bond Sir Michael Cashin was associated with him. More recently when I was a candidate of Sir Robert Bond, Sir Michael was not an associate of his. For a number of years I was an opponent of Sir Michael Cashin, but, although an opponent, I learned to admire and respect him. He was a hard hitter, handed out his weapons, flung them out unmercifully and dealt many severe blows politically. That is why I had admiration and respect for him. He believed in playing the game and he believed in playing the game for those on his side and for his Party. Later I got to know something of his bigness, his tolerance, his greatness of heart and of his generosity. A year or two before he died I learned more fully of his bigness. I grew to like him, I grew to esteem him and I grew to form an opinion of his able and admirable qualities. Here are the two contrasts. The one, Sir Robert Bond, who sprung from a highly educated family. The other, Sir Michael Cashin, the product of a son of the soil, a son of a fisherman, a self-made man and one who grew up with the most difficult circumstances to overcome;a man who refused to allow difficulties to stand in the way of his progress and a man who won that degree of success that would do credit to any citizens of Newfoundland or to any citizens of any country. One thing about Sir Michael Cashin that appealed to me was the splendid adaptedness displayed by the man himself in the circumstances he was placed from time to time. We hear a great deal said about the ordinary Newfoundlanders in other lands, how they are able to adapt themselves to any position of usefulness and of their earning ability. Well, to my mind, Sir Michael Cashin was a particular exemplification of that type of man. He came from a fishing settlement, sprung from a fishing family and won his way to become a Knight of the realm. He was placed in charge of the most important department in the public service of Newfoundland and fitted in there in the manner born. While administrating the finances of the Colony he made a name and a record for himself and he left that department with the highest and best records of any other statesman of Newfoundland since we have had self-Government; and I firmly believe that Sir Michael

Cashin in any other department of the Government of the Crown would have done as much credit to himself, to his country and to his fellow-countrymen as he did in the Custom House. These two gentlemen referred to have now "Passed to that bourne from whence no traveller returns" and we can only speak with deepest regret of the loss of men of that type, and pass on our message of condolence to their families and trust that in our present and future hours of need that Newfoundland will always, in her times of trials or troubles, have men who had achieved such greatness as Sir Robert Bond and Sir Michael Cashin.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen who have preceded me on this side of the House were very profuse in their congratulations to certain members of the House who won success in the recent two Bye-Elections. I want to follow suit, with the exception, of course, that I do not want to congratulate myself. But I do want to extend heartiest congratulations to Mr. Brophy and to those who were associated with him in the recent Bye-Election.

During that campaign I was acting the roll of a sort of political prophet and that is something that I happened to be somewhat associated with and something that I could always eschew, because I know enough about politics to have a fair idea of what is going to happen, but I would not know with certainty until the ballots were counted. Well I put the situation this way that, if the same feeling against the Government was in evidence in St. John's East as was in evidence in the Fortune Bay election, there was no question about it that our friend Mr. Brophy was going to be elected.

Public feeling took the form of decided hostility of the people against the Government of the day. And that feeling developed into what was really class feeling from an industrial standpoint. The ordinary working men made up their minds that their interests were not at one with the interests of the Monroe Government and for that reason, and not because of any special ability of mine, they voted against the Government in Fortune Bay and in St. John's East the same thing happened. I would congratulate Mr. Brophy on being elected with a large majority of something like five hundred votes on the other side of the chart and upon being given a mandate by the electorate of the district to now sit in this august assembly.

I would like also to congratulate the Minister of Public Works. I know something of the personal popularity of that gentleman in the district of Burgeo and LaPoile. I know that he worked hard for the district and during the election even the gentlemen who went up there as his opponents helped towards his election; they each thought that the other should not be elected while they both thought that Mr. Chambers should be elected and the people elected Mr. Chambers as a member of this House and Minister of Public Works. I am glad to see Mr. Chambers here and am very anixous to do bsuiness with him in connection with the district of Fortune Bay. I believe that Mr. Chambers is going to discover the half million dollars in connection with the Board of Works because there are several things needed in that matter. Mr. Chambers is the sort of happy Minister of the Crown who doesn't know how to say no ,and I am quite sure that he is going to prove just the sort that we require.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, that I would congratulate those who have preceded me in speaking on this side of the House. They deserve the congratulations of the House, but I am afraid to say too much about the brilliancy of their speches because there

will be such an outburst of applause from the Government side of the house that the Honourable Speaker will have to call the House to order. But speaking seriously, during the last three weeks I have sat here and listened to man after man speaking from this side of the House, discussing many different subjects, much general and outstanding ability has been displayed. And I think it is a pity that the newspapers have not seen fit to publish these speeches which are examples of such ability and are evidence of thorough understanding of certain subjects and the amount of research that must have been made into the public accounts and public matters generally. And the thing looked at from that standpoint must be a matter for congratulation because all these men are men of this country, born and bred here and conduct their business here.

The newspapers would be doing a good stroke of business for themselves if they published these speeches, because the people are interested in the accounts of the proceedings here. They like to know more about such matters and it is only fair that they should get a full and not prejudiced account.

The Government does not dream how much it can accomplish when it has such an opposition composed of such an aggregation of men. For a Government is as good as the strength of its Opposition, and the Prime Minister must look across at the Opposition and thank Providence for having such a number of gentlemen ready and willing to assist him by offering helpful suggestions as to how to legislate for this Colony, and more than that, the gentlemen on this side of the House are ready to relieve him of that great burden and take up and manage the affairs and legislation of this country so much better than the Government of to-day.

Now in reply to the congratulations extended to myself I must express my extreme pleasure at the tenor of these congratulations. Not that I think it was anything very much to do with my personal efforts but it was just as in the District of St. John's East, the majority of the people took occasion and the opportunity to express their hostility to the Government by voting against the Govern candidate , so in Fortune Bay the same feeling prevailed. I happened to be the lucky member representing the Opposition and there was nothing else for them to do but vote for me, because they were voting against the Governmnet.

I would like to say that the Government could not have sent a more gentlemanly candidate to represent them, one who worked hard for his cause, leaving no stone unturned, nor one who fought more squarely than did that gentleman in question.

Now something has been said in respect of the matter of that fight in the district of Fortune Bay. Well, I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, that the fight in that district was purely and simply on the issue of the day. I went there and found the fishermen of the district dissatisfied with conditions, feeling that things were some how or other all wrong, that the fishing industry was not being treated properly, that locally, they had not got a square show of improvement necessary to carry on the fishery, felt they were overburdened with taxes, could not condust the fishery so as to make it pay, felt that they had been discriminated against in favour of other districts and that waste and extravagance too were predominant; and on the strength of these feelings was the district won for the Liberal Party.

Now in being done the honour being made the elected member for that district I only hope that I shall

be able to live up to the standard established by the former representatives of the district.

If I can gain for myself for services within the district the same sort of admiration and respect that was accorded my predecessor I will be immediately satisfied with my record in that respect, and, Mr. Speaker, if I can gain for myself within this House of Assembly the sort of reputation, both as capable with regard to the rules, regulations and proceedings and take as creditable a part in the debates and help as much in public affairs, as he did then I will be satisfied on that score.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is just one point that I want to emphasise, and that is this, that throughout the whole country there is a feeling against the Government and that feeling of hostility is particularly noticeable in fishing places such as Fortune is.

I have often noticed when sitting in that place the sounds of discussion coming through the walls very often, and they were disturbing to the peace and quietitude of that other place. Still I am glad to be over here and glad to take part in the proceedings of that chamber which gives to the country it's practical legislation. I am glad to be able to get away from the formality of the dotting of I's and the crossing of T's, and I am glad to have an opportunity to play some small part in helping along the enactment of legislation beneficial to the country.

Now s.r, the topic of topics is the Speech from the Throne. It has been discussed by gentlemen from this side of the House, in practically all moods and tenses. I have yet to hear anybody from these benches say anything complimentary about it. The nearest approach to a compliment in respect to the Speech from the Throne was that it was empty. I may say that the gentlemen on this side of the House have done a great deal to fill up that void, but really as far as I am concerned personally my intention is to address myself solely and simply to the topics that are cognate to the Speech from the Throne, and to endeavor to advance some criticism constructive I hope in respect to this document. Of course, I may say there was a great deal of justification for the extent to wh ch the Opposition members have delivered themselves in respect to that Speech. It was so absolutely disappointing, so absolutely not what this side of the House expected, so absolutely not what was expected by the country generally that there was no need for surprize at the expression of general disappointment and disapproval.

Now it has been said from the other side of the House that the gentlemen over here have engaged in tactics of obstruction or what appeared to the other side as tactics of obstruction. As far as that is concerned, I know of no arrangement or no such understanding. The general idea was that as long as the Government seemed unprepared with legislation, as long as the Government brought in here nothing of outstanding importance that there was no reason why the Opposition should not take the Speech from the Throne as their text and supplying the omissions in it in order to complete that text should discuss the record of the Government and the affairs of the country at the greatest possible length hoping to show the Government that they were derelict in their duty, next that they have lost the confidence of the people, and next the desire of the people that the whole matter be referred to the voters at the earliest possible time, which should be this Fall.

Now I was surprised at the gentleman, the mover of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, who took a different view, an entirely different view from that which has been entertained by the gentlemen

on this side of the House, and so expresed by them in their various speches to the House during the last three weeks. The gentleman who moved that Address in Reply had a great deal to say about the Labrador Question and the Gander, and he also said something about the fisheries. There is one particular expresion used by that gentleman in connection with that Speech that I want to refer to particularly and that is the discussion of government scandals. Of course, the gentleman was referring to the alleged scandals in connection with the procedure of the present Government, and he was trying to make the House believe that by comparison the present Government had a very clean record in office, and proposed to continue according to him along the straight and narrow **path.**

Now it is my personal opinion that during the last few years a great deal has been said in this country, in this House and in the public press regarding scandals real or imaginary. And only a very few months past I have heard about defalcation, alleged wrongdoing, this, that and the other thing ,condemning the righteousness of the present Government. And where has it got us.

Where has all this washing of dirty linen got us, to-day. What good has it done us. What benefit has accrued to us. Is it not a fact that as far as we are concerned, that we simply blinked our eyes, and set ourselves up as a spectacle for outsiders to laugh at and contemn. Members of our Legislature, members of the journalistic profession of Newfoundland, went out of their way, laboured assiduously hard and continuously, to endeavour to strip from Newfoundland, and the Government every semblance of decency. What good has it done us. And I say that when honourable gentlemen on that side of the House or on this, go out of their way to make childish insinuations of that kind they are not only doing themselves no good, but they are continuing to do the country an injury. There is no point in such references. Nothing but harm will come from such references. And I take it that every gentleman in this House agrees with me when I say this. I don't care how honest; I don't care how good the intentions of the Leader of the Government may be, I don't care how close a supervision he may keep over public affairs, that come under his purview, wrong doing is almost certain to occur, in spite of his supervision. Things are bound to happen without his cognizance. Things are bound to take place that he does not condone, and does not agree with, but of which he is ignorant. But it ill becomes the people of Newfoundland and the public journals of Newfoundland, and above all this legislature of Newfoundland, to endeavour to besmirch this country generally and the public men particularly because some irregularity of that sort has taken place in respect to one or two parties. The idea that must be abroad with regard to Newfoundland politics when brought up for discussion is that this Newfoundland of ours is simply a sink of corruption. That politicians and the public are anything but dependable, and that if you scraped Newfoundland with a fine toothcomb you might find a few honest men. And if you put an honest man in power he was liable to be corrupted by his dishonest associates. And who is responsible but ourselves. We went out of our way in times past to give that idea to the outside world, and the men carrying on the administration of the affairs of the Colony to-day are suffering from this. So I say let us forget it. What has happened is bound to happen and will continue to happen, until we eliminate the dishonest man in public life, the irregularities in the Gov-

ernment, men exploiting their place in the public life to the detriment of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. Of course if we can get the balance on the side of decency and good government, so much the better for us, but at least I think that we can pride ourselves on being in that position of ordinary decency to-day.

That gentleman who moved the address in reply also made some reference to the spirit of the Government. Now I want to say this about the member for Harbour Main that he put up such a magnificent case for the Government, in the position in which they are at present, he made such a splendid show with such a hard subject to handle that I am wondering just how well would have been his pronouncement, if he had something worth while extolling. Because the address of the Hon. Member for Harbour Main was one of the finest presentations that I have ever heard ,and certainly does credit to him and the constituency that sent him here, even if some of his remarks and some of his conclusions were not in accord with the facts. Now the Hon. Member for Harbour Main in speaking about the spirit of the Government, talked along lines rather different from that of the Hon. the Prime Minister. The gentleman who moved that address in reply, stated that the intention of the Government was to batter its way through in spite of obstructions ,in spite of the difficulties that the opposition might put in its way; in spite of the fact that the Government majority was so near the vanishing point, they intended to carry on, and complete its programme. The Government was not in a position to carry out such a legislative programme as the season of the year and the condition of the country demand to-day. Now let me speak of that spirit of the Government for a few months? The Prime Minister was elected as Leader of a Government with a direct and a definite mandate from the people of Newfoundland in 1924. He went to the country giving certain specific undertakings to the electors. He received the support of these electors because they believed that under his Premiership these undertakings would be carried out. Now I think it has been made fairly plain by the members on this side of the House who have preceded me that the record of the Government has been anything but consonant with the undertakings that were given by the Leader of the Government in 1924. As a matter of fact, in very striking contrast are the record of the Government in office with the undertakings of the Government previous to its accession to office. Already the electors of certain districts of the country have refused to endorse the record of the Government and they have refused to continue their support of the representatives of that Government and the outstanding instance occurred very recently in the by-election in St. John's East. The same thing, of course, had previously occurred in the district of Fortune Bay. I take it then that, if the Prime Minister, as a business man, arranges a contract with some other man in respect to his business or any portion of his undertakings and that man fails to keep the terms of that contract that the Prime Minister on his part is not bound to keep his side of the contract. Similarly, therefore, the people of this country feel that the Prime Minister has not kept his side of the agreement with them. They are absolved from loyalty to him and he should return to them the mandate they gave him and which mandate he failed to carry out during the last three years in office. Frequent changes of Government none of us are anxious to see because it does no good; on the contrary it does considerable harm both at home and abroad. It is essential,

however, to get down to a stable Government and I think we should achieve it as quickly as possible, but under present conditions you cannot have stability of Government within this country because you have restlessness, restiveness and unsettlement obtaining throughout the country. The whole matter of policy should be referred to the country whereby the people could give a mandate to some other leader to endeavour to carry on and reduce expenditure and taxation and to make it easier for the people to live in the country. The people want to get away from the condition of things existing in the country to-day ,as is evident from the expressions of regret paid to the memory of the late Sir Robert Bond. They want to get away from that waste and extravagance that prevails in our public affairs at the present time. They gave the present Prime Minister a mandate to abolish that sort of thing and that mandate has not been carried out. The people are prepared and are anxious to pass on that mandate to some other leader, hoping against hope, perhaps, to get faith in a Government and which the Government of to-day do not enjoy. One of the curses of this country was achieved in a most outstanding manner by Sir Edward Morris. When Sir Edward Morris came into the field with a Party, the result of his advent was a breaking down of Party lines within this country. Men no longer owed themselves to any Party, Liberal or Conservative, and men were prepared to disassociate themselves from one Party and another because the Party line was wiped out. There was very little difference between the Party principles ,and unless you get a return to the Party line and get people to belong to a Party and stick to a Party because of the political faith that is in them there can be no hope for stability of Government and just so long will you have a state of unrest in this country. The Prime Minister may think that by holding on to office and showing his loyalty to his associates that he is playing a game that he is doing something to restore political stability to this country; but greater than his obligation to his Party associates, greater than his desire to a restoration of stable Government and greater than he or I can conjure up is his obligation to the people of this country to keep faith with them and to perform the mandate given to him by the people of this country. I could sympathize with the Prime Minister in his display of anxiety to remain where he is and play the game by his Party associates. I sympathize with him in trying to prevent political confusion before the ordinary time for a general election; but I cannot sympathize with him because of his stubbornness as against the will and desire of the people of the country, as expressed in the by-elections which we have had recently. The Prime Minister came into power on a wave of popularity, a wave of popular support based upon his personal reputation, faith in his integrity, his courage and his determination. The country does not hold the Prime Minister as a man in that same same spirit to-day. I would like to see the Prime Minister face the issue courageously, fairly and squarely; I would like to see him reject all advice to the contrary, and he would be a bigger man and a more influential man than he is by kicking against the pricks and ignoring the expressed anxiety of the people of Newfoundland which the districts of Fortune Bay and St. John's East showed they wished to have recently. In 1924 there is no man who had as much faith in the Prime Minister as I did myself. That was a bold, big broad policy as set out in that Manifesto of 1924 and if it had been put in force there was some hope for New-

foundland. There was a chance of getting away from the irregularities and from the waste and extravgance of past administrations, and getting down to an expenditure that we could afford and having public affairs generally put in such a position that whoever succeeded the Monroe Party would have an easy time of it. As a Newfoundlander, nobody is more disappointed than myself and nobody more sorry than I am because of the present Prime Minister's failure to adhere to that policy because the Government came into office when such reforms were necessary in the public expenditure and reforms were necessary in every department of the Government. The need for such reforms is even greater to-day, the people are anxious to have them, and the time is opportune to have them put into force. But the question is are you going to get the people as eager, as anxious and as ready to accept the word of a leader that will do the right thing, because to-day there is a feeling of synicism and scepticism among the people owing to the failure of the present Leader of the Government to do the right thing. But despite the moral feelings of the people of the country, has the attitude and his Government given a set back to the reforms that were then necessary for an improvement in the conduct of our public affairs. As the hour for closing is reached, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House a detailed statement of the Surplus for the year 1924-25; also a statement of the loan account and current account for the year 1925-26; also a statement of the revenue and expenditure for the fiscal year up to April 30th, 1927. These statements are all signed by the Auditor General and certified by the Bank of Montreal.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Thursday, June 2nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, June 2nd, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Ashbourne, from Virgin Arm, re Roads.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Answer to question No. 242 was tabled.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I wish to call attention to some questions placed on to-day's Order Paper by the Honourable Member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin. These questions cover a period of over eighteen years and on that ground are in my opinion unreasonable. Some limit in point of time should be set which should not be exceeded in asking questions. If no such restrictions were imposed a most undesirable, if not impossible, state of affairs would be created: questions might be asked involving the search of disused and ancient records, thereby not alone unduly imposing upon the officials of the departments concerned but preventing them from giving proper attention to the ordinary duties of their office, quite possibly to the serious prejudice of public business. The administrative services of the Colony have to be carried on; but it is patent that these would be gravely interfered with and impeded if the departmental staffs had to devote their time to the compiling of information extending over lengthy periods in reply to questions in the House. The

inherent right of Members of the Assembly to obtain information on matters of public concern must be confined within reasonable limits; and this is particularly so in reference to the period covered by the questions. Modern Parliamentary usage is very much averse to this type of question which should really be the subject of private research. Last year I made a ruling in reference to questions generally to which I would redirect the attention of the House. In passing I would like to say that it is a salient principle that information which can be obtained from ordinarily available sources should not be made the subject of questions. It very often happens that after the Public Accounts have been tabled questions are directed to Ministers concerning items of expenditure under their departments; and it is supposed that they must recompile data already set out in these official records and which is readily obtainable by the Members asking the questions if they but referred to the Accounts placed at their disposal in the House. This is not so; such questions are unnecessary and should not be asked. I feel sure the Honorable Member for Ferryland will appreciate the position and realise the desirability in the public interests of avoiding this type of queston. Under the circumstances I must refrain from calling the questions referred to.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, taking up the actual first paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, I want, in common with all other Newfoundlanders without exception, to congratulate this Legislature and Government and all concerned on the splendid result achieved in connection with our case in respect of the Labrador Boundary and the territory on the Labrador. It is a good many years ago, I think twenty years, since Quebec first disputed our claim to own the territory beyond the coast line. Since that time a good many Newfoundlanders have been connected nected with the fighting of the case on behalf of Newfoundland Sir Robert Bond set a great deal of store by fighting and proving the claim of Newfoundland to the ownerhips of that territory. Another prominent man then Sir Edward now Lord Morris was also of that mind and greatly instrumental in the preparation of the case. The late Martin Furlong, one of the cleverest and most outstanding of our lawyers, also did noble service in connection with the case and planned the outline of the course the case should take. Coming down to present days I am also glad to see the present Minister of Justice a Newfoundlander born and bred identified with the last stages and the final success of that case before my Lords of the Privy Council. It is a source of extreme gratification to me and I think also to every Member of this Legislature and the country generally that the outstanding men connected with our victory in respect of the Labrador have been almost exclusively Newfoundlanders, and that in spite of the fact that our great legal representative thought very little of our chances of success in that case that the matter provided by the gentlemen I have mentioned was so handled by the gentlemen in charge of the later stages of the case that Newfoundland won a great and complete victory in this case; and no matter who won that case the size and extent of the victory ensuring our undisputed possession of an area practically three times the size of our own island is something for us all to be proud of and to be extremely grateful for. But, now, Mr. Speaker, that we have undisputed possession of this territory and the undisputed right to the disposal of it, what are we going to do in connection with that property? The Speech from the Throne refers

to the result of the appeal to the Privy Council and says that the country can now enter upon the unrestricted development of these areas. Here we have been assured of our undisputed right to the possession of an area of 110,000 square miles; half of that reported to be wooded and 30,000 undisputed to be well wooded and capable of profitable exploitation and development. The area is so large; the size so great that it almost staggers one's imagination to get a complete grasp of it. The mere matter of surveying these resources, of getting a complete stock taking made of these resources is one to stagger the financial resources of this country. A good deal of it can only properly be surveyed by aeroplane and then to have a proper cruise made and to send specialists over that area would involve an outlay of money of an amount which under the best of circumstances we could scarcely afor and certainly cannot in the state of our finances to-day. Of course I feel this about the case, at this juncture in respect of the Labrador, that the circumstances under which the case was staged because of the hundreds of references and the amount of discussion that has been carried on in papers of the Old Country, in Canada and in the United States, have won for this area and Newfoundland a tremendous amount of free publicity of an incalculable value and benefit to the present owners of the Labrador. I remember it was only the other day or a very few weeks ago that the "Literary Digest" came out with a full page of reference to this case shortly after we won it. I understand that the amount that the "Literary Digest" would charge for publicity purposes or for advertising is $10,000 or $15,000 a page. We can multiply that a good many times over for similar references and discussion in other publications, and then will realise how much Newfoundland has obtained in the way of free publicity in respect of this area. The area then is well known ,throughout the civilised world, and a great deal of attention has been attracted to that area by those interested in that sort of timberland. Supposing we had an inquiry on the basis of a complete sale what could we say? What information could we give? We would not be in a position to entertain a strict business proposition for the sale of the timber lands area as a whole. As a matter of fact when it comes to a disposal of them in that way I think it is absolutely hopeless for us to be buoying ourselves up with the idea that at any time within the near future there is a practical possibility of anybody making us an offer for Labrador. We have heard a great deal on selling the Labrador for amounts ranging as high as 150 million. I take it that any investors or capitalists who are going to invest to that extent would have to have the most complete knowledge of the property in question and a most definite idea of what they were getting for such a huge sum of money. The great extent and the difficulty of development of the area; the fact that the area will be resorted to for the most part when other supplies are exhausted; these do away with the idea that anybody now or in the near future will make any bid for an area of such an extent. But there is this fact to be borne in mind in respect of that Labrador territory, that while the area is so large and so much of it is somewhat far removed there are small areas within the same territory that are more accessible than the bulk of it that can be disposed of profitably and to the practical advantage of the Colony. Reading over some of the exceptionally interesting dissertations of the President of the other House in this connection, I notice that he claims that certain territory is easily accessible from the

coast for the purpose of surveying and easily accessible for those who might want to exploit that area.

(Reads)

It might therefore be suggested that if the Government saw fit it could concentrate on the surveying of an area such as that; concentrate on giving the greatest possible publicity to an area such as that and on getting the utmost in returns therefrom. Then it may be that while some of our hopes with regard to large realisations from the Labrador today may be disappointed we may as year succeeds year be able to secure from the sale of nearer lands sufficient money to meet our expenses of the surveying of larger portions of the territory so that while those of us of the present decade or of the present generation may not be likely to see the realisation of our hopes of great financial returns from the Labrador those of the succeeding one will and the country will therefore be so much the better off in years to come. It looks however very much as if the Government has made up its mind not to do anything drastic with regard to the exploitation of that area because I notice that while the most assuring sort of references regarding the disposal of the territory are made in the Speech from the Throne the undertakings the Government proposes to enter into don't bear out these assurances. We have in years past in Newfoundland disposed of timberlands of a maximum of benefit to the speculator and a minimum to the country or in other words we have given out licenses under our old Crown Lands Act at $2 per square mile. I was hoping personally that when the Government brought in its Bill regulating licenses on the Labrador that it would in respect to that territory at any rate depart from the regulations of the old Crown Lands Act because if any one thing was emphasised following our victory it was that it seemed that the neighbouring provinces of the Dominion of Canada are obtaining returns from their timber lands far in excess of anything we have been getting from similar resources in Newfoundland. Such an authority as the President of the Legislative Council has supplied us with regard to what Quebec for instance gets from timber lands and water powers.

I notice in the series of lectures that that gentleman delivered in respect of the Labrador and what it means to us that he stated that where we get that $2 bonus per square mile for timber lands with some little additional for royalty Quebec obtains for timber lands $2.75 for stumpage per square mile and $3.35 for square mile as tax. In addition to that $2.75 and $3.35 a royalty is paid that varies. The difference is a remarkable one. I don't claim necessarily that we could do the same in the way of rates charged. There may not perhaps be the same demand, but with an area so near as Quebec paying that much we should certainly approximate those figures so that where they get $150,000 for a similar area I think we should at least get $100,000 or $475,000 instead of $60,000 as under our present rates of timber charge. That is $60,000 for 30,000 square miles. Again, we come to the question of water powers. These water powers are going to become valuable as they are developed in connection with industries established on the Labrador. These can only be established as the land is surveyed and the resources made accessible to capitalists. It is interesting to remark the series of figures given by Sir Patrick McGrath in connection with water powers in this colony and in the Province of Quebec. Take the water power on the Exploits River in connection with Grand Falls. Then there is horse power. Under our rates of charging we only get $10,000 per year. He

takes in Quebes, a river in that province and points out that in leasing that river Quebec first set the amount of rental at a price of $6,000 per year for all developed but makes a graduated charge as royalty, for the first ten years 50c. per horse power and $1.50 for the next ten and perhaps $2.50 for the third ten. Newfoundland would earn a quarter of a million in a quarter century while Quebec would get for the lease almost 1½ million. Again, I am not saying that the example of Quebec is one that we can or should follow, but it shows that we have been setting too low an estimate on the value of such natural resources as we possess and have been disposing of from time to time, and the point I want to make is this that in disposing of these Labrador areas we should not adhere so rigidly to the rates and terms set down in the old Crown Lands Act. We have acquired a territory geographically separated from us, of the utmost potential value and in disposing of it there is no reason why we should not make special rules and regulations and enact them. As a matter of fact I hope that the new bill will be amended to provide that we get something more commensurate with the immense value of the territory in question and in keeping with what is got in other countries. Another question that in common with other Newfoundlanders I would like to see cleared up is that of the ultimate disposal of licenses that have been already granted in past years on the Labrador but of which the rentals are very much in arrears. I understand that arrears on some run up to $300,000. A lot of people wonder if those who got those licenses for speculation may be allowed to plead that they allowed the rentals to lapse because a dispute arose a certain number of years ago, and that the dispute being now settled they should now be allowed to pay up the arrears. I think the position every man of ordinary intelligence takes is that persons who took licenses on the Labrador took them on and paid for them and paid rentals for a certain number of years, came there simply as a speculation. With them it was a gamble. There are a whole lot of people who gambled in that way. I don't see why if these people have failed to keep up their leases now that Newfoundland has brought the case to a successful conclusion that these people should be allowed to have the major portion of the benefits from that territory belonging to the people as a whole. In dealing with that area everything that savours of speculation should be cut out, and again we should try and get a good deal more per square mile for rental than we have been getting. I can quite see, Mr. Speaker, that while there is no possibility of immediate returns in actual terms of dollars and cents on this Labrador territory, where it still may be utilised to our own embarrassment because it undoubtedly has increased to an enormous extent the assets of the colony and to that same extent has enhanced the financial prestige and credit of Newfoundland as I think the Speech from the Throne remarks. Here then without actual possibility of being able to realise on that territory in terms of dollars and cents through its sale, we are up against the possibility of the value of the territory being used for the raising of further loans on the credit of the colony. I say that, I don't care what Government is in power ,at a juncture like this, with an asset of that value to pledge, and with the financial position of the country as it is to-day, with so many demands on the public finances and expenditure, it is bound to be a sore temptation to take the easiest way out and raise money by using the Labrador as a pledge for the raising of money. I argue that such is the case, Mr.

Speaker, and I desire to pass over a warning to the Government in that repect, that the country having reached a pass to-day with regard to borrowed money, being now in debt practically to the extent of 70 millions or so, we have to go very slow before going into the money markets and raising further loans. Let me go over the position in that respect without intending to weary the House. Some 14 years ago this country was being financed on a total expenditure on current account of something like $3,900,000 and we are now to-day spending almost that amount in interest year by year on our public debt. We have got round to a position where we are spending over a third, making over a third of our annual expenditure in connection with interest on public debt for loans raised on the credit of the colony. Obviously then we are in the position that we have one third of our expenditure absolutely irreducible, unless we are going to default on our interest. There is an amount of taxation without any hope of reducing it for the tax-payer and it is unthinkable that the proportion of expenditure on interest on loans to total expenditure should be increased any greater. All of that gets us down to the consideration of the present position of the country financially; and that position with regard to the manifesto of the Prime Minister for the election of 1924 in terms something like this: that the conditions of the public finances at that writing were very bad, and public expenditure must be drastically reduced; that everything must be done with a view especially to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries; that the cost of public service must be reduced; that the cost of government was too high and there were too many unearned salaries. Today in opposition to this is the Speech from the Throne which says when we are facing a position with taxation much higher than ever previously that we have to cope with a deficit of 1½ millions in respect of revenue, and further to meet a condition in which the railway is placed of having a deficit of $750,000 or about 2¼ millions to be raised in addition to ordinary revenue. Surely then the pronouncement of the Prime Minister in respect of the public finances as made in 1924 is even more applicable to the conditions as they obtain to-day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the last session of this Legislature there was appointed a Commission to go into the public finances of the country with a view to considering every reasonable ways and means whereby expenditure and taxation might be reduced.

Obviously that Commission has resulted in nothing particular being done because the Speech from the Throne has referred to the deficit in the following manner:

(Reads)

The statements appear to me, Mr. Speaker, as being very peculiar, in view of the present circumstances; here you have conditions in this country ,where you have fishermen doing nothing, an army of unemployed throughout the whole country; here you have conditions under which scores of men are telegraphing to the Members in St. John's, appealing for relief, appealing for work, for some opportunity of finding employment, for some means of earning a living. Still the Government says that no immediate action seems to be called for.

The Statement that the Government purposes to use the movement of trade does not appeal to the ordinary man because at the present time trade in this country is stagnate, is practically paralyzed and cannot function to the same extent of action.

No immediate action is to be taken when the public moneys are being spent to the extent and in the manner revealed by the public accounts tabled

in this House. No immediate action is to be taken when such waste and squander in the public departments as has already been referred to, is taking place.

I took occasion to go carefully into the public accounts with a view to finding where the trouble was, with an idea of getting together some information as to money collected and to get some idea as to where money goes and giving due attention to what will be the possibility of reducing expenses and so lower the taxes in this country. I came across some figures, which I copied from the public accounts, and to which I would now call the attention of the House. I am not trying to anticipate anything that might come up in respect of the amounts which I mention. There are many payments of money scattered all through the public accounts and there seems to be no attempt to give a systematic account of expenditure, and I feel that the Prime Minister does not dream of some of the amounts that are expended in certain connections. I am sure that the leader of the Government would not stand for certain expenditure that appears in the public accounts if he was aware to the extent that some of the expenditure is being made. Now, not because it was a matter that concerns me personally but because it was pointed out to me, I would first of all call the attention of the House to the amount expended for medical attention on certain paupers and the amount is no less than $80,000 for last year.

Now when you come to consider our healthy climate and the hardihood of the people ,and take into consideration the expense is only for part time services for a handful of doctors, then I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, when I say that if that expenditure had been properly regulated and the conditions had been properly considered, the amount expended need not be more than $25,000 to $30,000 a year. Now I don't want to be misunderstood, I do not begrudge any person who is sick and needs relief from the Government, but I do claim that this country cannot spend one cent more than is absolutely neecssary on paupers or anyone else because we cannot afford it. But here you have $1,634.00 for one doctor, for another $2,300.00 for another doctor $2,400.00, another $3,000.00 and for another doctor $2,304.00. And the greatest amounts are charged up for services in the most populated centres where the people are fairly well-to-do and not secluded sections of the country where the doctors would have to drive a long distance and pile up expenses in connection with travelling. The sum total of all this sort of expense is over $70,000. I have not gone into the accounts very carefully and there are probably many others which I have overlooked and would bring the total up to about $80,000 a year in respect of medical services paid to a few doctors.

And that led me on to see where we get off in respect of medical services for the people at the expense of the Government, and that means the hospitals, the Sanitarium, Sudbury, Poor Asylum, Lunatic Asylum and so on must be considered, and I discovered that in these various connections something like $812,000 was expended last year. In addition to the $80,000 paid to the doctors I mentioned there is another $80,000 paid to the hospitals just for people who come to the hospital at St. John's and are not able to pay for themselves. We are paying about $800,000 a year to look after helpless paupers. I say that I regard that expense as out of all proportion and quite unnecessary, and I do not want to be misunderstood—I do not begrudge medical service free to those who really need it and cannot afford to pay for a doctor, but I am claiming that the present

expense in this connection is far too great and under the circumstances is altogether unjustifiable. Why even the Auditor General in his report makes reference to the Financial Commission and in speaking of the Public Charities says that some investigation should be conducted into the department.

(Reads)

People from all over the Island are coming here to stay at the Hospital and I am of the opinion that the doctors should do something to stop this. The number is increasing and will increase every year and something should be done to stop it in view of the conditions of the finances of the country to-day. We are spending what we cannot afford and not only that, but we are spending it unnecessarily in connection with some of the several larger institutions, and as the Auditor General has said, we must do something to cut down the expenditure.

The ordinary man who goes down town and sees something selling at an attractive price in a store buys it, not because he needs it but because he hasn't to pay much for it, because it is easy to get. If the people are given the idea that it is easy to get into the Hospital if they want to they will ask for it—so and so got so and so there and they ask their member for it and too often get it. The difficulty of the matter is that at present it is so easy to get into the hospital and as a result the people take advantage of it. Now I know that the Government, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Government and each member must be well tired of hearing that "something must be done." You hear a lot of criticism, destructive criticism, from this side of the House and little in the way of constructive criticism. Well let me make a few comments and offer a few suggestions to the Government in this connection. I am not going to point out shortcomings without being prepared to offer some suggestions.

Take the General Hospital. That institution costs the country about $180,000 a year to maintain and what is being done to reduce the cost there? Let us suppose that every patient there deserved to be taken in, needs to be taken in. There are lot of people who are brought to the Hospital who would be better at home but are taken unnecessarily at Government expense and have a holiday at Government expense. This sort of thing should be stopped. It would be some satisfaction if we could discover something going on in that direction —there should be a regulation of admission. Why, last year, here you had $83,000 charged up to the Department of Public Charities to pay for people who couldn't afford to pay for themselves. I feel that that amount should be less than $20,000. Are the people pauperised to that extent? It is an insult to the country to make any such claim. Two thirds of the people have to be absolutely dependent on charity ,if such was the case.

My claim is that if we make it more difficult for people to get into the Hospital the expenditure, that is unnecessary expenditure, will be considerably reduced. Confine it to cases of absolute need of immediate relief, real hospital cases, and concentrate on collection of fees and the result will be an increase of the revenue of the Hospital and even if you do not reduce the expenditure one cent the country is going to profit.

You have in the road ,the Lunatic Asylum, which costs the country about $150,000 a year. There is no place in there where a person can put a member of his family who is mentally deranged, for private treatment. Is not a cent of fees collected in connection with this institution? Here we have an industrial department which might be made to provide a quarter of the cost of maintenance

of that institution; instead of that you only get $10,000 a year from the department. The industrial training forms part of the treatment in practically every such Asylum outside of this country, for in many cases the patients are cured by doing some work whereby their minds are taken off their troubles. I remember some years ago when in Canada spending several weeks at an Asylum just outside Toronto studying some cases, and one day when walking around the grounds with the doctor he explained to us the success which had been achieved through their industrial department and how very many of the patients became cured because by means of their work their minds were taken off their troubles. There was one patient, he explained, at one time who gave the staff a lot of trouble. For weeks they were puzzled to know what to get him to do. He didn't seem to take any interest in anything, but one day when he was walking through the grounds with the doctor he bumped his head off a low branch of one of the trees, he stopped and looked at the tree in a puzzled way, and the doctor had an idea and set him to work pruning the tree and in three weeks he was home on probation, and he was apparently cured, for they never heard of him after.

We can do the same thing in this country, for they have the opportunity here to introduce a proper system whereby the men can follow their trades and will be able to earn something and thereby reduce the expenditure in connection with the maintenance of the institution.

You have a $150,000 institution in there with absolutely no operative treatment and the inmates instead of paying nominal amounts of money are living at the expense of the Government and the country. If you could get them to raise $10 to $40 each a year it would be something towards paying for their maintenance.

You have at Sudbury, a place which costs $17,000 to $18,000 a year to run, a splendid X-ray outfit. The sort of thing that a man has to pay the highest prices to avail of in Canada and the States. In my opinion if Sudbury was run properly by a proper management it could be made self-supporting.

The Sanitarium costs another $92,000. Here again there is no industrial institution which could easily be established as an occupation for the patients. The same thing applies to this institution as in the case of the Lunatic Asylum. If one of you gentlemen takes occasion to go into the Sanatarium Dr. Rendell will probably take pride in showing you a magnificent motor boat which was made by some men who were staying at the Sanatarium. I think that there should be some industrial system in this instittution in order that there may be something for the patients to work at, such light work as making baskets, etc., and in this way the revenue of the institution could be increased and continue to run the institution at the least cost.

How are you going to do it? The only way, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I offer it to the Government as a suggestion ,is to make the services and management of the institutions much better than at present.

Take the General Hospital, what have you got down there? I will admit that you have in charge one of the finest doctors on this side of the Atlantic, but you haven't got a business head there. Every Tom, Dick and Harry who wants to sell some supplies can do so, and so on. There is no proper business management.

You have in that institution down there an operating room that cost the country $20,000 or $30,000 to instal. It is a beauty. It is one of the best that I have ever seen and I have seen some pretty good operating rooms. It is used day after day for operations

which cost from $20 up to $150 and the hospital doesn't get a cent of it. We put it up to the Executive Government when I was a member of the Board of Governors, but they took no notice, then the Board of Governors decided to collect the sum of $5.00 or $10.00 for each operation—but the hospital never got it. The patient paid their fees to the doctors, but there were no returns made to the hospital in respect of the use of the operating room, by the doctors.

You have down there at the General Hospital an institution that has cost this country a huge sum of money to build and equip and staff, and do you know that it is run on such a loose system that it is not able to qualify for the minimum grade of efficiency set for the hospitals of Canada and the United States. A hospital that is not well up in the standard of efficiency in these countries is not recognized, and ours does not reach the lowest grade. The same remarks apply to other things. The asylum is a place of detention only. If a man is strong enough to overcome his mental disability he will get out of it, if not he stays there. It is a case of "Hope abandon ye who enter here." I know of institutions of that kind where such a simple thing as extraction of teeth has taken a patient from a lunatic asylum, and has made him a strong and sane man, and enabled him to go back to his ordinary occupation.

(Reads)

So that the Superintendent at the Lunatic Asylum pulls down $8,000 from the Government, not reckoning his profitable practice outside the asylum. The Auditor General suggests in his report, that the Superintendent is sadly overburdened, and should get some assistance. If Mr. Speaker, you have officials connected with these institutions, by all means pay them well, but insist that they attend strictly to the business of the public service, and get better satisfaction from them. You have got health institution after health institution but each run on its own. Duplication of equipment, and duplication of expenditure. You are expending hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, for the lack of scientific organisation of that service. What have we got. A Board of Health charged with the superintending of all the health problems of this city. This is the only body in connection with health that has a medical man on it. He is kept as busy as he possibly can, with bacteriological cases from the hospitals. We have a Board of Lunacy commissioners with no power whatever to interfere in the management of the Lunatic Asylum. We have got all these bodies and yet no controlling general body, to look after the maintenance and management of these institutions, and yet we are surprised that we don't get the value for the expenditure in connection with these services. Now if the Prime Minister wants to tackle these problems in a way that will prevent the exploiting of the funds by the medical doctors he will have a chance to do something if he falls in with the suggestion that was made at the Doctors' Convention last year. It is this, that there is no way to get economic management of the public medical health institutions except by having some responsible official to look after these institutions. That does not involve a political appointment, it does not mean an elected member of this House if you do not want it. But it certainly demands such a man at the head of these institutions. The burden is not only great but is on the increase. You will say to me, sir, that I am asking for another salary to be created. But that is not the point. You have not anybody responsible for these expenditures now. A man responsible for these expenditures can save his salary, no matter what it is. Even if it

is $10,000, he can save his salary ten times over.

And that brings me along to the consideration of another department of the Government. I refer to the railroad. An institution that is costing this country from a quarter of a million to one and a half millions to run annually. Last year you had a capital expenditure of one and a half millions. Who is responsible for that? You have not got a practical business man in charge of that railroad. You have got a gentleman in charge of that railroad who is a first class man from the standpoint of general business needs. But he is not a practical railroad man. There is no co-relation between the outside and the inside affairs. There is no effort made to create an intimate touch as between headquarters and the man on the move. You have got to the position where the man on the outside finds that it is no use for him to take any interest in the affairs of the railroad because when promotion comes it is going to come to the gentleman in St. John's who moves up a step according as the man above him or is promoted or gets out. To maintain discipline and efficiency and loyalty in a department of that size you must have a practical man at the head of that Department and answerable to the House. Another new salary you will say. Granted. But if the $4,000 salary is going to save you ten times the amount or more in efficiency and reduction, why not go to it. The outcry that will be made against you will be only temporary. Because after a short while you will be in a position to show the advantages from the undertaking. What is said to-day is forgotten to-morrow, but what you do to-day will continue through a great many to-morrows. And you will have your severest criticis rise up before long to call you blessed for the benefits that you have bestowed on them.

While we are on this subject I want to consider a little more about the department of Public Charities. And you know that that Department spends 11 p.c. of the total expenditure of the colony, as against eight p.c. for education. Now let us consider this department not this time to find fault with the indiscriminate giving out of charity, but to discover for ourselves what showing is being made with the money which we are voting year by year to be spent on that department. You have in this country ninety relieving officers. These officers have charge of the expenditure both in permanent and casual matters of $217,000. Now here is why I object to the system by which this relief is being granted. In the first place it cannot be such that the relief that is granted is always going to the deserving cases for the reason that firstly the appointment of your relieving officers is political and naturally they are going to do all they can to please the people who put them in their positions. In the second place they are local men, men who are not anxious to be at outs with their neighbours. They are prepared very often to O.K. demands for relief so that they may keep in good friends with their associates.

The Auditor General makes the complaint in his report this year that the expenditure of public money for purposes of charity through the department of public charities have become so outrageous that he considers that there should be a departure from this system, and that instead of the present system there should be inspectors appointed; men who can be called in to investigate and consider the cases of application for relief, and men who are calculated to get down and consider these applications on their own merits and on that basis alone. You have enough already voted in respect to the salaries for these relieving officers to pay two or three efficient inspectors. Competent

men who should be placed outside the realm of politics, men of ability and independence.

Now take the case of another institution that could be made more selfsupporting, than it is at the present time. The penitentiary. There is an institution that is costing over thirty thousand dollars a year to maintain; an institution in respect to the revenue producing possibilities of which the Auditor has some remarks to make. He refers to the broom department of that institution:

(Reads)

That is taken from the Auditor General's report. I think as a general principle where a public institution or a group of such institutions by co-operative management and arrangement can be made self-supporting they should be made so. I don't say that the products of these institutions should be put in the open market in competition with legitimate trade. But where you can produce an article in one institution that can be used in another institution, and thereby you are enabled to reduce expenditure on this department, it should be done. The other system of supplying public institutions is clearly the wrong sort of thing that should obtain in a country that is as little blessed with finance as we are to-day. You have the Board of Works down there presiding over the granting of supplies in respect to certain institutions, and three men down there last year voted themselves, or got their associates to vote themselves or their firms $80,000. A small bunch of druggists got another $28,000 out of the Government institutions. I am of the opinion that the contract system should be used wherever possible in the matter of purchasing supplies, and monthly price lists should be furnished to the heads of all the departments. This is what the Auditor General says:

(Reads)

I take it that his remarks lend point to what I have said in reference to the expenditure or otherwise of public institutions in this city. And before I pass on from that so that they may not feel that I have been neglecting them, let me congratulate the firms of lawyers in this city that last year shared $12,000 between them. I was afraid that they might feel they were neglected after what the Medical Profession got out of it.

Now Mr. Speaker, when I got on my feet I did not think that I would be anything like this length of time discussing the various items in the Speech from the Throne. But I feel that because of the fact that I come from a fishing district that I cannot close without some more or less extended reference to the fisheries, around which the whole interest of Fortune Bay centres, and which is also the staple industry of this country, that possibly something maye be done of a remedial nature in connection therewith. Do you know, Sir, that it appears to me, Newfoundlanders generally are losing sight, to a great extent, of the dignity and stability of our fishing industry? A great many people seem to have got the impression that it is anything but dignified to do anything that belongs to the fishing classes. Our children are being educated to-day under a false system that leaves them to get away from the fishing boats and they look for those soft jobs, particularly jobs in the Government. I think there is something wrong about all that. You had a similar movement in Canada and the United States during the last few years in respect to agricultural pursuits. Young men and young women deserted the farms and went to the cities looking for easy jobs, and the position became so intolerable within those cities with respect to the surplus of labor that educationalists of Canada and the States introduced a system by turning the young people into food producers. The movement

was successful and it had the effect of driving the young people from the cities back to the farms. You want to do something of that sort for the people of this country. Here you have an educational system under which all reference to fisheries is avoided and where you seek to turn the children from the occupation to which they are adapted to give service, and very necessary service, to other occupations which do not require much energy. I am firmly convinced that, if your Department of Education instructed the children within the schools respecting the dignity of manual labor, whether it be fishing, pick and shovel or anything else, to get away from this false shame that prevails throughout the country, it must do a tremendous amount of benefit. After all, what is the position to-day with respect to the fisheries generally? The whole world is turning to-day to the fisheries in order to obtain foodstuffs for its ever-increasing population. You have to-day in all countries something like one billion dollars worth of food fishes produced and you have in England, Japan, United States and Canada an annual production of one hundred million dollars worth of fish foods produced. You have in our own country a condition under which the products of fish foods constitute seven-eighths of the value of your exports. You have an industry here giving employment to about twenty thousand workers and a living to the bulk of your population. Surely then an industry of such relative importance deserves the utmost consideration of the Government, and surely an industry upon which this country depends to a very large extent and an industry from which people get their means of livelihood and which have been and should be to-day above all others in every way possible. Yet you have a position to-day in which your fishermen are deserting the fisheries by thousands. We had an answer from the Colonial Secretary to a question asked for by Mr. Scammel tabled the other day to the effect that within a year you had nine thousand people gone out of the country. It is true that some of them came back again. But is it not the case that thousands of Newfoundlanders have gone abroad to reside permanently to get their living abroad, and is it not true that thousands are leaving the fisheries, their ordinary avocations, every year and going to Canada and the States and who come home during the Christmas season to spend a holiday and who go back again to earn their living abroad? There is the unfortunate position and where is your Government. You have men who could produce things economically and to the utmost value to Newfoundland, but because of no encouragement given to them in their native land they are mere transient residents here and they are of more value to Canada and the United States and Newfoundland is the loser. I know that the Prime Minister is as interested in this subject as anybody can possibly be; for it is a fact that, while the common men engaged in the fisheries have failed to make a living here and were forced by thousands to seek a livelihood elsewhere, the Prime Minister and numerous other members of fish exporting firms, have had losses to meet in respect to the exportation of fish. I was very much interested the other day in reading a list of the number of fish exporting firms that had gone out of business, firms that had been destroyed by outfitting for the fishery during the past thirty or forty years. There were some fifty or sixty in the list and those were men who had a common cause in the fisheries with the fishermen of the country, and men who had taken a losing gamble on the fisheries and eventually were driven out of business. Well what is the trouble with the fisheries then? Why

is it that our own fishermen fail to get a living from the fisheries and why is it that our business men fail to get the ordinary profits out of the fisheries sufficient to keep their businesses running? The people to whom the fish is consigned to in the markets do not have that experience. The buyers of our fish abroad have made large fortunes out of our Newfoundland fish. Outsiders have profited from our business and are still piling up great fortunes therefrom, while our fishermen and our business people are impoverished. What is wrong with the situation? Why is it that our people, the producers of that commodity, get nothing but the skimmed milk out of the profits of that business and the outsiders get all the cream? In the first place the fisheries have not been given that due consideration, that assistance and that encouragement that were particularly promised them by the Prime Minister in his Manifesto of 1924; and in which Manifesto the Prime Minister also referred to making Newfoundland fisheries a "Paradise"—it is Paradise lost today. If the Prime Minister thought conditions under which the fisheries were carried on were so bad, as presented by him then, they are infinitely worse to-day, because the cost of Government has increased, because taxation has increased to a large extent and because the extra burdens imposed upon the people have become so great. You have had inaugurated since this Government came into power three or four undertakings that mean increased taxation to the amount of about $400,000.00 and two of them you must put in the problematical class as far as general benefits from them are concerned. You have the Highroads Commission which spent two and a quarter million dollars on tourist roads and you have the Dry Dock on which you spent in the neighbourhood of two million dollars. You have also spent and are going on spending on Capital Account on your railroad and every dollar you spent on these things increases the public debt and inevitably increases taxation on the ordinary men in the country of whom the fishermen are in the majority. I really cannot understand, except on one basis of explanation, how the Government ever could or ever can justify that Highroads expenditure. It has been said that the expenditure on the railroad ,the expenditure on the Highroads and the undertakings in connection with the new hotel were all designed towards one end and that was the development of the tourist traffic. Take the position that has actually developed through the expenditure of all that money. You spent two and a quarter million dollars on Highroads, mostly on this side of the Island. You have placed on the Cabot Straits a new steamer, the "Caribou," a ship that cost a half million dollars and a ship that was especially designed for the tourist traffic and with accommodation for carrying motor cars to that section of the country where you have no motor roads. Your system, in other words, does not feed your tourist traffic. Then you have a big hotel that cost a million dollars. It is true you got the hotel going in the eastern part of St. John's, but beyond that there is absolutely no accommodation for the sort of tourist that you want to arrive in this country and remain here to spend his money. There is no system about the thing. There has been a steady expenditure of money. If you had a headquarters hotel here such as proposed under the original scheme and subsidiary hotels at the various fishing places and suitable tourist resorts you could have constructed your highroads leading to them. Now we have nothing of the kind. We have nothing beyond the accommodation at the hotel to suit tourists, to suit sportsmen and

those who come here for rest and diversion away from a city. With these expenditures and with increased taxation you have had additional burdens imposed upon the fishermen and they are disheartened and the fisheries are languishing. I am not a bit surprised that in view of this radical departure of the Prime Minister from the program as outlined in his manifesto in respect of the fisheries I am not a little bit surprised that some of his party found it necessary to sever their connections with him. I know that representing a fishing district myself with such a change of face on the part of a leader I would feel that there would be nothing left for me but to keep faith with my constituents by putting up a protest of that kind. Other men connected with the Government also felt it incumbent upon them to protest against the dock, highroads and other expenditures and they were invited to go out. I don't see what else they could have done. I don't see what the representatives of any outport district could do representing fishing interests, but put up a protest of that nature. So, we are in a position that the fishermen are languishing and suffering because of taxes and increased burdens imposed upon them, and because so many industries in the country can be described as industries that are parasites on the fisheries of the country. Where we take part in the establishment of large industries and where we look forward to the development of the Gander industry and that of the mining industry around Buchan's Mine, and we think of the other industries that may be opening up, isn't it a fact that we have got to face the position that capitalists can only be induced to come here and make expenditures here at the ultimate expense of the fisheries of the country. We have got to give free concessions of one sort and another, duty concessions, and guarantees, and ultimately I say it imposes a further intolerable burden on the fishermen of the country. Well then, why instead of concentrating on those things, why not concentrate somewhat on the fisheries of the country. In reference to your high roads policy I say that there may be one explanation of your expenditure on the dock and on high roads that would fit the case, and that is, the idea that it was necessary to look after employment to some extent and that these things were undertaken really and truly to relieve; they were glorified by the names of high-roads and tourist and dock facilities policies and in truth beneath it was the necessity of relieving so that the Government had to embark on it, and instead of facing facts they simply camouflaged their actions in that way. If that is so it is alright. If it is so admit it. If the Government would admit it a great deal said of an unkind nature would have not been said. You have not admitted it but at any rate it may be offered to you as an easy way out of an awkward position.

What are you going to do to revive the fisheries of this country? One thing that might be done is make some effort to regain the hold we have lost on some of our old markets. We have in Brazil a market that took 400,000 quintals of fish annually and in 1925 took 135,000 and in 1926 212,000. We have been frozen out there by competition. We have had the same sort of experience in markets like Italy; competitors putting up fish either different or imitation article that appeals more to the people there than our own article and unless we find the demands of those people and meet them and unless some other effort is made to regain our old hold and lost position that market is going to slip away from us like other markets.

It has been said that there is not much use in looking for new markets in respect of dry salt cod fish. Perhaps that is right. I read a statement

of a Canadian fish expert Mr.———— ————that as far as the worlds markets are concerned all the salt dry cod fish that can possibly be disposed of was being done so on the markets that were open. He made a statement that even in the West Indies where the colored population has become possessed of more cash than it used to be possessed of, that they are turning away from the salt codfish and are using the fresh article in frozen form or canned form instead. He advised the export of that form of fish frozen or flaked ,and he said that it was necessary to produce and provide for the consumer the best possible article that could be given him. If the consumer were satisfied at the markets the necessary steps would have been taken to hold the markets and avail themselves of any increase that might offer. It has been stated that in respect to S. Africa there is a feeling that Newfoundland might export there and exploit that market now only being availed of by the Norwegians and Scotch; the Argentine Republic. But there is this much about new markets as well as old markets that unless our people and business men are prepared to adjust themselves and adopt the methods to prepare the particular kind of fish needed by these people we cannot hope to make any progress in business in the way of increasing the markets for our fish.

I may make reference to Mr. Davies going to Wembley. He submitted a report with regard to his experiences at Wembley and he said in reference to inquiries regarding our fishing industries that he could discover no interest in regard to the ordinary salt fish but that the fish products that people were interested in were fish put up in cartons, flaked fish and boneless fish; that people from South Africa were interested in these products; that people from Africa had called attention to the fact that there was quite a colored population likely to be interested in a large supply of dry salt cod fish; one of the countries Nigeria has a population of eight or ten million and Norway was already sending large shipments of dry salt cod there. Surely these are opportunities that Newfoundland might avail of.

The question as to whether or not we improve the position of our fisheries is going to depend also on whether we improve the quality of fish we offer to our customers. All exporters and those who consume the fish seem always to say that Newfoundland has the best quality of fish but very few are prepared to say that Newfoundland makes the utmost use of the outstanding natural qualities of the fish or that Newfoundland cures it and makes it most attractive to the people consuming the fish in different countries. A good many objections have been made to a general movement towards outstanding improvements of our codfish. I think we can be assured by reference to what has happened in countries that have adopted standardization in the cure of codfish. One instance that appears to my mind is Iceland. Ten years ago they had a catch of 250,00 quintals and about that time they adopted a system of standardization of cure of fish. They introduced a fish inspection allowing no fish to be exported that did not come up to standard and they sent inspectors to the markets to discover just what these markets wanted; how to prepare it and to put it up. Since then, Iceland has been going ahead by leaps and bounds and they are now our chief competitor in these old markets. Even Canada has been considering methods to hold their previous position and enhance the value of their fisheries productions. I saw the other day a statement of standards submitted to the various provinces and it contained a much more elaborate list of standards than we ever consider here.

This points cut that Canada has been struck by the necessity for the improvement of the standard of the cure of salt cod. We seem, however, to be doing practically nothing because it appears to be impossible to get those interested in trade those people concerned to agree on the questions. It doesn't seem to be possible to establish a common point of operations as between the various firms which handle the exporting of our codfish to the markets. We talk about our competition in the foreign markets; what we have to be up against through foreign competition is as nothing to local competition as between the various fish exporters who instead of working together are working in their own interests.

If you want proof of the value of standardization consider what has happened in the case of the local cod liver oil There is an official inspection of every gallon that you have brought here and to-day our cod liver oil is worth more than any other in the world. Then again you will find that the local fish cannot command the same price as the Norweigan can.

If we could produce such results in the markets for cod liver oil why not try it on fish? It might not be easy but still where the fish is shipped in such bulk there should be some ways and means of devising and employing some inspection of fish, to the advantage of fishermen and exporter alike.

I have been speaking entirely on the fisheries in respect of our staple industry and product but there is another aspect of the fisheries that should receive the earnest and immediate consideration of the Government of today or any Government that may be in power.

In the export of fish we are on the verge of a possible industry. At the present time we are preparing our fish for the poorer classes of Europe and South America at the lowest possible prices. This fresh fish trade may prove more important to the country than the salt fish has ever been. That was the experience of Canada. Thirty or forty years ago the main produce was cod fish now the production of fresh fish, salmon, smelts, and even caplin, far and away exceeds the production of salt cod fish.

Last year there was tabled in this House a report from a gentleman, Mr. Chambers, who came down here from British Columbia for the purpose of ascertaining whether we would be able to carry on a salmon exporting industry. He was explicit in stating that we had the right kind of salmon and the quantity of salmon to justify production of salmon. He states that from a river like the Salmonier River we could produce forty thousand cases annually. In the district of Mr. Power the salmon industry might be made of the utmost importance to the country. Here could be produced every year something like twenty to thirty thousand tons of salmon which could be exported. This matter is worthy of the careful consideration of this House, because as we have seen Canada made such a success of it financially and in every other way, so we might be able to do the same and it would be something worth while on behalf of the fisheries and would help along the salt fish industry as well. It would increase the advantages of the fishery and improve the value of the fishery generally for the people of this country.

There are other aspects of the subject of the fisheries that might be gone into, such as general management and certain fishery conditions, but I feel that I have kept the House already overlong and thank the members for their kind attention.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, although this subject of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne has been well handled by my colleagues there are a few particulars which I wish to make

that I could not speak about on opening day.

I want to speak first on the fisheries as that should be the main topic of this House of Assembly at every session of the Legislature.

We are all at the present time dependant more or less on the fisheries. We have other avenues of employment but the main industry and our main revenue comes from the fishery and that should be the most important topic for discussion on the floors of this Legislature at every session.

The fishery question has been handled very well by some of the members of this side of the House, particularly by Mr. Scammell, the member for St. Barbe and by Dr. Mosdell, member for Fortune Bay.

Now, I want to give a little explanation. During the last session of the House we urged upon the Government the necessity of giving more attention to the fisheries and if necessary introduce a fish cull, and in the dying hours of the session it was proposed that a commission be formed to go into the fishery matters.

The commission was appointed of which I was one and so was Mr. Scammell, the member for St. Barbe. I was prepared to do anything I possibly could to give any assistance that I could command to assist the fisheries but to my surprise after the House closed I found upon looking through the "Newfoundland Gazette" that I had been classed as a Commissioner of the Government and not wishing at that time to hold any Government position I declined to take any part on the Commission and resigned. I offer that as an explanation as the Prime Minister may have something to say in connection with this matter.

Although Dr. Mosdell is not a fish exporter or a fisherman he has handled the subject very well indeed and often an outsider can see the mistakes of the game better than the person who is in the game. He has made reference to the fresh fish industry. The Prime Minister has often stated in this house and so have other members that we have never offered anything practical and I would suggest now to the Prime Minister, that in view of the present situation, his Government encourage a fresh fish industry and if necessary pay a bonus on fresh fish that is exported, particularly fish that are of very little commercial value such as smelts, soles and other fish, and even herring.

Now the fishery report which I received yesterday tells us that the export of salt herring in barrels was ten thousand barrels less in 1926 than in 1925—a falling off of ten thousand barrels. It must be evident to everyone that the herring industry is a dying one and certainly must be from the report which shows such a great falling off, in a comparatively small output of ten thousand barrels and this matter should be brought to the attention of the Prime Minister and he should investigate and see what the trouble is. Since the Government came into power the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has introduced some fishery rules which have greatly affected the herring industry. They are probably justifiable from his standpoint but they are bad for the herring industry. I claim and I said so at first, that the inspection is altogether too rigid. Most of the sale of herring in this country is caught in the spring of the year when the herring are spawning and are in very poor condition and are put up particularly for West Indian markets. There is very little difference in the herring and in the northern part of the Island, particularly in Green Bay, the fishermen during the winter months make herring barrels and in the spring of the year when the herring strike the coast they put out their nets and catch the herring and put them into barrels. There is only little cost which is for salt and that is not very much,

They produce a commodity that has been a source of revenue to the people of Green Bay especially during the Spring. A law was introduced that every fisherman who wanted to put up herrings had to obtain a license from the Government and had to have a branding iron. When it is considered that these people live around the bays of Newfoundland, and the people of one section scarcely come into contact with anyone except those in the immediate vicinity, the fact of caling upon those peope to get a license is going to have the effect of frightening them away from the industry altogether. Then again the fishermen used to utilise their hard-wood beef and pork barrels to pack their herring in. Now the Government has one law, sir, which says that these herrings should not be exported in hardwood barrels such as are used for beef and pork. To the man who can gather up his herring in those barrels it means perhaps an increase in his income of $20 or $30. These things have been introduced by the Government and it has a much greater effect on the herring industry than can be imagined. My opinion is that a great deal of the reasons for the falling off to the extent of 10,000 barrels of split herring in this country for export is on account of that. Some of the reasons for the falling off I must admit is on account of the duty placed on herring coming into the United States on account of the tariff. It is also due to the preferential tariff enjoyed by Canada with the West Indies, which we Newfoundlanders do not enjoy. Now the Prime Minister told us a few days ago that he and those in his Government had made some effort to get the tariff in the United States taken off in reference to Newfoundland or at least to get it reduced. But I gather from his remarks that apparently he has given up the case as hopeless.

Now I think that the Prime Minister should still keep on trying to get some returns from the United States, and get something working that will be effective in getting the United States to reduce the tariff on herring and codfish going into that country. There are many things that we could reciprocate. Many years ago there were large shipments of fresh and split herring from Newfoundland, particularly from Fortune Bay. The schooners came down there in the fall of the year, large numbers of them. They brought down American gold and paid it out for the herring. It was really a warfare for the purchase of herring around Bay St. George and Fortune Bay years ago. This has somehow fallen off, and we can also offer to the United States fishermen coming into this country better harbor and port regulations, that would induce them to come here. Then there is a large quantity of imports and food stuffs which we receive annually from the United States, and I am sure that if we persisted, eventually, they would come to some understanding whereby Newfoundland would reap the benefit. We are also at a loss and up against a strong wall by the preferential tariff that Canada has with the West Indies, under the Canada-West Indies agreement. I have now before me a bill that was brought into the House of Assembly at Jamaica, and no doubt it makes Mr. Puddester feel good to see how large that Bill is. In this bill enacted by the legislature of Jamaica, the duties on fish are given and they are as follows.

(Reads)

This is a great drawback to the fishermen of Newfoundland in respect to the shipments of fish from this country. Now this Canada agreement was put into force two years ago, but under certain conditions, that certain shipping connections had to be furnished by Canada to the West Indies. But up to the present I don't think that the steam service is in operation.

Still Canada enjoys the preferential tariff. It should be one of the foremost things of the Government, even the Prime Minister himself or some one in his Government to see if they cannot make some kind of arrangement with the West Indies. If necessary spend some money by sending some capable man to the West Indies and the United States to see if something cannot be done because it would mean so very much to us at the present time, when we are going through a period of declining fisheries and declining country. Newfoundland was never in such a condition financially as she is at the present time. I am not now referring to the revenue and the finance department. I am referring to the general conditions in Newfoundland, in every department to-day. The fishermen have not been able to catch sufficient codfish to live. They have been unable to pay their accounts and therefore the merchants in the outports have had to suffer. The merchants themselves during the past two years have taken fish from their dealers which they have had to sell at a price less than they paid for it, and used up their surplus. The condition of Newfoundland to-day is a great deal worse than a great many people think. The question is what can be done to improve it. Is there anything that can be done. The Government must foster the fisheries in some way. Every country fosters the industry that looks to be a dying industry. Anything that cannot support itself the Government takes hold of it and helps it out. Take the fisheries of France for example. These fisheries of France have been fostered by the French Government for years. They pay a bounty sufficient to keep the fishermen at the industry. This year ninety craft left St. Malo to fish on the Grand Banks, and in other waters around Newfoundland. The Government of this country got to make it their business just as the Government of France is looking after the codfish. The fisheries of Newfoundland means more than any industry that I know of to the future of this country. The population is so small and so scattered that we must of necessity look after the fishing industry. If we encourage the development it is going to take some time before the development is going to take place. What we must do now is to look after the fishing industry no matter what it costs. It would have been far better if the Government had spent that two million and a half dollars that they spent on the high roads, in fostering the fisheries of Newfoundland.

Now some time ago in this House a discussion took place in reference to the estate of the late Sir Robert Bond which was willed to Newfoundland, and the Prime Minister brought the matter before this House with the intion of getting its opinion as to whether it should make an outlay of a certain amount of money in order to lay out that estate as a model farm or let it go to the trustees to be sold. My opinion was expressed at that time that we should utilize that farm and if necessary make it a school of instruction for agriculture. It is all very well to say that model farms have been started in this country and they have been a failure. Perhaps this one will not be a failure, and if the expense of that is small, then I say we ought to have schools of agriculture and also of fisheries. I have come round now to a school of fisheries. In Norway they have schools of fisheries and of seamanship; in Holland they have some; and in Halifax, Nova Scotia, our next door neighbours, they have a school in which there were 52 pupils attending a few months ago. During the winter months they were there, learning everything in connection with fisheries. They are taught not just

how to split a fish and a few main principles, but numerous things in connection with the fisheries. They a e taught such matters as are connected with refrigerating and canning and things like that as well. The people who attended that school were not all young men either. They were men ranging in age from eighteen to fifty, who go there to learn and get instructions in reference to the fisheries in a school of fisheries under Mr. ————. I say if we can start something, a school for agriculture or fisheries we should do that. Young men are leaving the country because they don't want to prosecute the fisheries. The reason is they don't want to take schooners down on the Labrador like their fathers did and come back and not be able to make the two ends meet. We should try to have these men stay home and be instructed in preparing fresh fish. That is the coming industry in Newfoundland as well as elsewhere, and the Government should immediately take some steps to encourage the packing and export of fresh fish. In the Speech from the Throne delivered by His Excellency on opening day, there was nothing whatever said about the hardship of taxation. Now, we all know, the people sitting in this House as well as those outside, that at this moment this country is bleeding in every limb from the burdens imposed upon it by the p esent Government by taxation. If the present load upon the people of this country who prosecute the fisheries is increased, matters will get worse. Expenditure at the present time is staggering, and taxes have risen to so extravagant a figure that the resources of the country cannot stand it. Something has to be done, and there is only one thing, and this is to foster the fisheries and cut down expenditure. There must be a merciless cutting of expenditure in this country if we are going to make a success of things. At the present time the country is existing by death and disease absolutely. It would not get along at all if the people did not die. Last year we got $150,000 out of death duties and got $350,000 out of rum, and over $400,000 out of duty that was paid to the Government by the Liquor Department. That is over $900,000, one-tenth of our revenue that is received at the present time, from death and disease. Where would we be only for these two incomes. The country, financially, is as bad as it can possibly be, and I am very sorry to have to make that statement upon the floors of the House of Assembly. Now, as I said before, we have to foster the fisheries, and if necessary to have to pay a bonus on fresh fish, if we want to keep the industry alive. Last year the total exports of the Colony was $27,563,213, out of which the fisheries produced $14,000,000; so that is another reason why we should use every possible effort to encourage the fisheries. You are expending money which the country can ill afford. The Government, I see, propose to re-rail another part of the railway at a cost of $1,000,000 to this country, and where is that money coming from unless we borrow it. It is all very well to have the railway fixed and to have new rails laid down from here to Port aux Basques, but we must cut our garment according to our cloth and expenditures of that kind must not go on. If the Prime Minister, when he came in to power in this country had taken the same attitude as the Mayor of St. John's when he was elected five or six years ago and said we would spend our income and that is all, Newfoundland would be in a much better position to-day than it is, and instead of going out and borrowing eleven and a half millions and spending it and squandering a lot of it and wasting a lot of it and taxing the people from

$350,000 to $600,000 annually in interest, had said we would live within our income, then the Prime Minister would have been Prime Minister of this country for the rest of his life. The railway system has to be changed, and while we need have it, perhaps, re-railed, we cannot afford going in to any such expenditures because it is all, after all, at the expense of the fisheries. One of the things that affects the value of our fishery at the present time is that the counries or the foreign markets where the fish is sold, that we have as customers for our fish, are mostly bankrupt countries, and that is another reason why the fishery should be fostered on this end.

On motion the debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion the remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, June 6th, 1927, at 3 o'clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 6th, 1927.

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

Mr. Cashin gave notice of quesion.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. HICKMAN — At the adjournment of the Debate I was talking on the fisheries and showing the importance of fostering the fisheries on this end on account of the countries with which we trade being more or less in financial troubles or with exchange so low that they are unable to purchase this and other commodities at a reasonable price. To prove what I am saying I will give the rates of currency of the different countries prior to the Great War and at the present time. In Italy before the War the working gold basis was 25 lire to the £ sterling now it takes 90 lire: Our salt fish is sold on the other side in sterling and half the difference in exchange makes it three times as much so that the customer has to find three and a half times as much of the currency to buy a quintal of fish than when the war started. If a quintal during the War cost $8.00 it would now be worth in the vicinity of $30.00. The Bank rate in Italy at the present time is about 7%. In Greece pre War working gold basis was twenty-five drachmas to the £ and now 396. to the £ and the bank rate in Greece is 11%. In Italy the currency is increasing in value because of the present administration or the present Prime Minister at Italy having started out with an effort to make Italy a self supporting country. So there is no advantage from the increasing rate of exchange in that country. In Spain the rate of exchange was 24 escyedis to the pound now it is twenty-seven and a half. And the Bank rate is 5%. Spain was not effected very much by the War. In Portugal pre war working gold basis was five shillings five pence halfpenny to the escuedo which is worth two pence halfpenny. In our country where it was worth $1.35 it is now only worth five cents. That shows the great difference in the cost of goods imported into these countries whether fish or any other goods and for that reason it is almost impossible for exchange to improve in these.

In reference to the new customers for salt fish. Take for instance the cargo of fish that was taken by the "Escasoni" a few years ago and sold to the Roumanian Government. According to reports that came back that

fish was destroyed on account of those people not knowing how to cook it. Mr. Hepburn went over at that time from here and from the way he saw the fish being cooked the people were not accustomed to salt fish. In one particular case he saw people trying to fry it in a pan. The result was that the fish was unpalatable and was not consumed.

I referred on Thursday last to the West India agreement and the Fordney Tariff and showed how necessary it was for the Government to take greater interest in those agreements. In Canada the West India agreement was talked about for a long time, and when the Prime Minister and other delegates were in Canada a few years ago in connection with the Labrador Boundary he took the matter up, so he reported on his return here, but I would be interested to know if he followed that up because the West India Agreement did not come into effect until May 1st, this year, and there was ample time for an effort to be made to try and get Newfoundland included in that agreement of Canada. This Treaty is now open to effect Bermuda, Jamaica, Trinidad, Tobago and several other West India places and all the other West Indies will be included in the near future. I read for the information of the House a copy of a Bill that was introduced in the Jamaica Legislature putting Canada under the preferential tariff, which was fifty per cent of the ordinary tariff other countries had to pay. Canada for a long time has been engaged fostering her trade with the West Indies. As far back as 1903 Hon. W. S. Fielding made a Treaty with the West Indies pointing out the importance of an outlet for fish and other products of Canada. In 1900 the trade between Canada and the West Indies amounted to two and a half millions of dollars. In 1925 the trade between these countries had increased to thirty-seven millions of dollars. A Treaty introduced by Hon. W. S. Fielding, Minister of Finance, placed a duty upon German sugar of 33⅓ per cent. Canada at that time used to receive a large quantity of raw sugar from Germany. The result of putting on that 33⅓ per cent. diverted the purchasers of Canada to the West Indies and that helped to increase the trade between Canada and the West Indies from two and a half millions of dollars to thirty-seven millions. Canada also had a duty upon bananas coming into that country through the United States. There are four and a half million dollars worth of bananas consumed in Canada each year and most of that amount had been coming from the United States, but Canada has now taken off the duty for direct importation, and, perhaps, that might have been more or less influential in putting on the Fordney Tariff and including Newfoundland as well as Canada. While we are an independent colony, at the same time a great many people in the United States yet look upon Canada as a part of Newfoundland, and linked up with Newfoundland. Even that opinion is held in the Senate. I remember last year in Detroit I was sitting at a table with some twelve or fifteen people and not one of them would believe that Newfoundland was not a part of Canada until I explained to them our position. Canada in this West India Agreement has ceded to the West Indies preferential duties on most of their commodities, such as sugar, cocoa, coffee, bananas, ginger, spices, rum, $2.00 per gallon, Angoslor $5.00 per gallon, bitters and other articles. I pointed out here last year that it would be no hardship on Nfld. to give preference to rum, particularly on rum coming from Jamaica, if we are to get any benefits by having a preferential tariff on our fish going in those markets. It would be no hardship whatever to Newfoundland to place rum on the free list or give them the same as Canada, namely, two dollars per gallon preference.

After all a great deal of the rum that comes here is watered, the water is cheap and the profits would be made out of the sale instead of through the Customs. If we can gain anything by that, I think the matter would be well worth taking up. Then again, take the matter of fresh fruits that are coming from the West Indies into this country. These are important articles of diet, and we would be doing well here if we put certain kinds of fresh fruits on the free list the same as we did with Spain a few years ago and in which we were included. The West Indies ceded to Canada preferential tariff on flour, cordage, lumber, confectionery, butter, cheese etc. Nearly every one of these commodities could be had in Newfoundland as they are manufactured here. There is no reason in the world why we could not get some of them if we started out. We produce now some of those commodities and they could be sold to the West Indies if we had a preferential tariff. I am giving these points to show the great necessity there is for fostering the fisheries in this country. Something has to be done on this, and because we cannot expect anything from the other end in the way of improvement in the very near future.

In reference to Agriculture, a great deal of discussion took place here, on the farm that the late Sir Robert Bond bequeathed to the Newfoundland Government, although nothing has come out of that discussion thus far. At that time I was in favor of taking over the farm, but to-day I am stronger than ever of taking it over to run, as I belive much good will come out of it, particularly if it is linked up with a Memorial College or something of that sort, and provided it gets proper oversight. The products of this country, principally turnips and potatoes, are to be had in large quantities, but it is no use producing them unless the demand is good for them; and it is no use for a man in Trinity Bay, for instance, to produce a large quantity of potatoes, selling fifty barrels say, and have to put the remainder in his cellar in the Fall of the year and find them all decayed in the Spring. There has to be some encouragement given for farmers just as there has for the fishery. We should have in St. John's warehouses with a right temperature to keep vegetables, and such warehouses could be built out of the money that is wasted on snow-shovelling and stone-breaking.

Every year I think that the Government should take the matter of building about a half dozen warehouses into their serious consideration for a variety of reasons. People who are out of work could get employment and besides the Government would have something to show for the money expended. Besides vegetables, eggs, poultry and everything of that kind could be raised in this country in large quantities and kept in warehouses all the year round. A great quantity of these foodstuffs are imported into this country and there is no necessity for it because I believe all our requirements can be obtained in the country Now this country is particularly adaptable to hog raising. A hog is an animal that lives on fodder, clover, barley, oats and things like that, so that hog raising could be carried on extensively in this country. The statistics of Quebec show that a 200-pound hog costs $8.50, and at the present time there are one million pigs in Quebec. Sheep raising could also be done along this coast the same as in other countries where the climate is even a great deal colder than our own. Sheep raising is done on a large scale in the Falkland Islands, and in Batavia and other foreign countries. The late Mr. H. Smith, one time manager of the Knitting Mills here, stated that Newfoundland was a typical sheep raising country and it could be made a profitable industry here. Now the

Government could arrange the tariffs to give further protection for our vegetables and the other products of our own country. The Prime Minister stated that the members of this side of the House criticised everything and offered no suggestions. Well I would now suggest to the Government to build a centrally located cold storage for vegetables out of the next money that is handed out for relief work. Put the Long Bride to the west of the Railway Station and dredge the harbour to where the present cold storage plant is and then have your farm products as well as you fish products in cold storage. In Canada they have certain methods for chicken raising as they grow up, and outside of Montreal they have the raising of poultry down to a science. Ducks are killed when they are ten weeks old because they find that is the age when it is most profitable to kill a duck. After that age it is found not so profitable. The same applies to chicken. I heard that when the Prime Minister was in England attending the Imperial Conference he offered a blank cheque for Newfoundland. I presume that is why England wanted us. But I do not think that everybody in this country would be satisfied to give England or any other country a blank cheque, and no doubt they would all like to see the cheque and see what Government apparently have been running their business their own way without consulting the Executive Government or the Prime Minister. The Auditor General in his report, tabled a few days ago, referring to the Marine and Fisheries Department, states: "As far as the Marine and Fisheries Department is concerned the rule is honoured in the breach more than in observance." That is a wide statement for the Auditor General to make for the record of the House and for the Government. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has held the office up for a number of weeks by going to the sealfishery and going with the consent of the Prime Minister who considered it was more in the interests of the country to have him go to the sealfishery than it was to have outport members, who are also connected with fisheries, sit here in the summer time when the codfishery is going on and neglecting their own business. I think that, in view of the statement of the Prime Minister in the past, the House should have been opened at the proper time and have the business put through instead of holding up the House for the convenience of his own party. A few days ago accounting were asked by an Opposition member for material given out on the Labrador a year ago to people who had lost property. We find that the accounts are not in any of the Government offices, and, as far as we know the Purser of the Labrador steamer is the only person who knows anything about the disposition of the material which the Government of this colony paid for. Now we were very much surprised also to hear that the members of the Highroads Commission received last year one thousand dollars each for their services last year. I am not saying that the members of that Commission or of any other Commission should not be remunerated for their work, but the Prime Minister eulogized at one time in this House and also at a luncheon of the Highroads Commission by saying that he had discovered three Rotarians who would gladly give their services for nothing and he led the country to believe that these gentlemen were doing the work for nothing, and now we find that they were each paid one thousand dollars for last year's work. If they were to be paid, why not have arranged for their remuneration, instead of announcing to the House and to the country generally that these men were working for nothing. The

same applies to the new hotel. The Prime Minister told us in the House two years ago that his Government would not guarantee interest on bonds for the construction of the hotel and a few months afterwards he comes in and advocates a guaranteed interest of six per cent. on the bonds. Why were we not told by the Prime Minister in the first instance that it was the intention of the Government to guarantee the interest on the bonds. I think this side of the House would have sanctioned it, because the hotel in St. John's, is, no doubt, an acquisition to the town. But what we object to is the inconsistency of telling us one thing and doing something different. Arguments took place in this House a few days ago in reference to the deficit of the Colony for 1925-26 and to the deficit for 1926-27, arguments that were probably warranted. Now it is not our intention to make any noise about anything that is not necessary, but the figures placed upon the table of the House three different times did not compare and so it makes us think that everything is not alright and that we cannot depend upon the information we receive, particularly upon information coming from the Finance Department. We are not yet satisfied and I think it is the duty of the Prime Minister to satisfy the House with a statement as to what the real financial position of the country is, and I think also that we should have a special audit of the accounts made by some person who could tell us exactly what the correct position is. We do not want to make the position any worse than what it is, but it only is right we should know. Nobody on this side of the House has accused the Auditor General of intentionally giving a wrong statement to the House; but the ability of the Auditor General and his department to give us a proper statement is what concerns us, and, we doubt whether the department of the Auditor General at the present time is able to give a proper statement of the country's finances or in fact of any department of the Government. What we should have now is the information concerning the disposition of all loans, balances if any, the amount of temporary loans in the Bank of Montreal and a statement showing all outstanding amounts owed by the Colony. I think the member for Ferryland was right in questioning the figures brought down, and we are still without the information we sought and it is necessary that we should have that information. In short the Estimates will be tabled and before we vote on the Estimates it will be necessary for us to have the Budget brought down so that both can be dealt with at the same time, so that we can see where the money we vote is coming from. I tell the Prime Minister now that we want the Budget after it is delivered, tabled with the Estimates so that we can know where we stand exactly. We want to know the position of the Colony in relation to borrowing, as you have always had to borrow ever since you have been in office. Some of the members from this side of the House speaking on the Address in Reply asked the Prime Minister, and I ask him now, if it is the intention of the Government to hold a General Election the coming autumn, or is it the intention of the Government to hold on to office. Holding the Government with finances as they are to-day, and with a great number out of employment is not an enviable position, but with the small majority they have they are not able to put through any legislation that will be of any benefit to the country, unless they get the support of the Opposition—that is they are placed in a position where they cannot properly administer the affairs of the country; they have not got the support or sympathy of a

majority in the House of Assembly, or of the country. Now it would be statesmanship for the Prime Minister to go to the country and give it a chance to elect the party it wants. A few years ago the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Bruce, whom the Prime Minister met at the Imperial Conference, had the Government with a good working majority, but on the labor question alone he went to the country—he resigned from his position and let the people say who they wanted, and the result was that he came back with a substantial majority. Mr. Baldwin, on the defeat of the Ramsay MacDonald Party could have carried on the Government for a couple of years, and no doubt finished his term without going to the country, but he preferred to let the people decide whom they wanted to control the affairs of the State. McKenzie King, although in a different position from the other two, still went to the country and came back victorious, and let the Prime Minister allow the people to decide whom they want, this fall, as their representatives in the House of Assembly. I am told that Sir Robert Bond in his day lost an election in Port de Grave on account of refusing to give a $30.00 grant, whereas the present administration spent from twenty to forty thousand during a bye-election. It was found on enquiry that during the bye-election in Bonavista Bay they spent that amount, with no other object, it seems, than that of getting political support. Twenty thousand was spent in Burgeo and LaPoile, and so much more in St. John's East. It shows the difference in the calibre of this administration from that of Sir Robert Bond — he wouldn't squander from twenty to forty thousand dollars to have a candidate elected. The proper thing for a man in the position of the Prime Minister to do is to put country first and self afterwards. Newfoundland at the present time—and I regret to have to say it—is in a position where something has to be done, and unless it is done, we shall find ourselves on the rocks.

Now, I think it was during the first session of the Legislature that the Prime Minister told us that all timber areas (and I presume these would include Labrador) were to be reserved for the Government and sold on account of the Government. I think that last year two licenses were given, and if that is so it does not appear to have been in the interests of the country. I have the particulars somewhere and will give them later.

Referring to the Railway—I am not a railroad man, nor do I pretend to say what should be done, but I do say that something should be done, because the railway costs a great deal more each year than it should. The facilities for carrying freight and passengers, particularly on the Carbonear Branch, and on the Bay de Verde, Placentia and Southern Shore Branches, are altogether wrong. The people today are not travelling by the Railway between here and Conception Bay points. If they can get there by the "Pawnee" they go by hundreds; every chance they get to travel by motor car they take, and pay the same fares as on the train, do it in quicker time and get better accommodation — if the Railway wants to compete they have to wake up. Someone has to be put in charge—I am not saying that the present Manager is no good, but after all he is only a servant for this Government, but there must be a man to arrange cheaper transportation. I was compelled to make a trip to Harbour Grace before the roads were open, and there were some important passengers, such as the Chief Justice aboard, and the time taken in shunting about and changing trains was, to say the least, monotonous. Anyone travelling that way would come immediately to the conclusion that they would do it

because they couldn't help it. It would be a good thing for the Prime Minister and the Executive to make a trip to Carbonear on some nice warm day and see how they like it. The Railway has to devise some cheaper means of taking people over its lines, and giving better accommodation; they should travel more quickly, and have trains leave St. John's, in the evening, so that people could get their work done and go out. I am fully convinced that we must get someone in charge who will get cheaper means of travelling. It is not necessary to have huge engines and long freight trains and their tenders and shunting, and things of that sort, while passengers are waiting; you have to get means such as cheaply operated gasolene engines to hold on to the traffic and get more revenue. And the same thing applies to the freight traffic all over the coast —.f we don't compete with Farquhar and the other boats trading on the coast we will suffer. If the Government were to go into the thing, and cut rates or do whatever they can to meet such competition, they would be wise. I presume that the Railway Commission, like every other Commission in the Government ,is not capable of handling this. I do not doubt the individual ability of the members, if they had nothing else to do but they are like a man who attends a directors meeting for one hour a week—he can't know much of how affairs are going on. I suggest that the Government take some immediate steps, for from $750,000 to $1,000,000 is too much to lose annually—our resources can't stand it, with all the expenses of official and maintaining the Departments, with the interest on our enormous debt.

In the Speech from the Throne we have a forecast of some legislation, and I understand that legislation regarding the Gander, and Buchan's Mine will be introduced. We have been waiting a long time for some legislation of this sort, because it can be very better for the Government to make it public, and in a few days it will have been finished. But if they let it run on it will increase as it goes around the street.

Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne there was no mention of a reduction in taxation, and no doubt the Government will ask how they can reduce when they have such an awful amount to find for different things. Well, if taxation can't be reduced for the fishermen the industry cannot be carried on, and there must be some way of getting over this. Now some years ago when the motor car industries were declining one of the big motor car manufacturers increased the pay of all his employees from four to six dollars per day and dropped the price of the cars and the result was that the great output got by reducing prices paid the increase, and the industry became very profitable indeed. Perhaps the Government by reducing taxes can help the fishermen and laborers in the same way.

Now Mr. Speaker, I am going to propose an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, which I shall read. (Reads). The Articles I have mentioned are all essentials for the fishery. While tobacco is not an article of food the fishermen consume it to a large extent and can't do without it. Dry cell batteries they use in motor engines, and butterine is an essential. The profits of some of these industries have been enormous, and taxes ought to be placed on them. It is very well and proper to protect labor-giving industries so as to allow for a dividend of 10 per cent.. but not to an extent where they pay 15, 20 and 30 per cent. and still put by big reserves in government bonds. When we come to tariff affairs, I think we should enquire into the affairs of every manfacturing concern in the country, and if a labor-giving industry has to work short-time they should be

protected, and the tariff put up to give them further employment, but it should also be provided that exorbitant profits should not be made at the expense of the country. These reductions must be made before the fishery can be successfully operated. I therefore beg to propose the amendment.

MR. BROPHY—Mr. Speaker, little did I think when I assumed the responsibility of contesting the bye-election in St. John's East that I should have to go through the ordeal of standing on the floors of the House of Assembly to make a speech. I trust however that you will accept my apolog.es, if I do not measure up to the mark required of members of this House.

My first duty is to extend my thanks to all those who gave me such a hearty welcome here. I assure each and every one that as far as I am concerned I intend to play the game as fairly as it is possible toward any legislation brought into these Chambers ,if beneficial to the District which I have the honor to represent or to the country at large, it will have my hearty support. I should also like to join with those who have preceded me in offering my congratulations to Mr. Chambers, the genial Minister of Public Works, who has been elected for Burgeo and LaPoile, and to my fr.end Dr. Mosdell, elected in Fortune. Anyone who knows Mr. Chambers knows that he possesses the popularity that goes with the crowd, and with the amount of money spent ni the District it was natural that the District would not do any other than elect him. I trust that before long he will see the error of his ways, and join the ranks of those who without doubt have the sympathy of the people. Dr. Mosdell had certainly something up against him in the form of the Government, and I am sure that Fortune in electing Dr. Mosdell will have one no doubt who will interest himself in regard to h:s District. I would also Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate the hon. member for Harbor Main, Mr. Cahill for the able way in which he handled the Address in Reply on opening day in this House. I felt that that speech was one which any lawyer or any gentleman might well be proud of. His masterful way of handling the various subjects of the Speech from the Throne was excellent. But the ending of the Speech I do not think was worthy of the rest of the speech. I am of the opinion that in writing that part of the speech he was under the influence of somebody else, whether a member of this House or not does not matter, and that is why he referred to the recent bye-election in St. John's East. I may tell Mr. Cahill that as far as I am concerned and those connected with me in regard to that recent bye-election, that if I may be permitted to use that word, never in the history of the political life of this country, has a general election or a bye-election been fought with cleanliness so free from personalities as was that recent bye-election in St. John's East. Surely to goodness that gentleman should have known otherwise than to refer to the reception that he got and the hon. the Colonial Secretary got on that historical night in loyal old Torbay. It ought to be sufficient for him to know that it was unnecessary for us to do or say anything, only to play the game as far as possible. If the hon. member was not satisfied with the reception that he got at Torbay surely to goodness he could have consulted the Hon. Minister of F.nance and Customs and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and they could have told him of the reception that they got at Portugal Cove. And if he was not satisfied with the opinion of those gentlemen he could have consulted those who visited Bell Island, they would have in-

formed him of the conditions over on the Island.

It is unnecessary for me to delay further on that Mr. Speaker. I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to tender my congratulations to my friend the Hon. member for Bay St. George. I quite understand his position in regard to the remarks that he passed about himself in reference to his being the silent knight. A lot of us would like to be the silent knight, at certain times. I feel that the ordeal that he had to go through was something beyond his expectations. One would like to be able to say a lot, but not being in the habit of making speeches of any kind, his actions generally speak louder than words. I congratulate again the hon. member for Bay St. George. He certainly must have thought that St. John's was going to elect your humble servant anyway as he was good enough not to mention anything about the bye-election in St. John's East.

Now being elected in St. John's East it is only natural that my constituents are looking to me, your humble servant and towards the Government as well. Conditions in the city to-day are deplorable. Not alone in the city but in fact all over the island. As far as the district of St. John's East is concerned never to my mind were there cases of need more pressing or more deserving than these are at the present time. Practically every day, in fact four or five times a day in my small way of business down there, I have callers asking me in the name of God to try and do something for them. No later than this morning I had an individual down there who had a wife and five children and his conditions are such that if something is not done, not alone he but in the case of many others as well, God only knows where the results will be. I think, Mr. Speaker, that something should be done to try and relieve the unemployment to-day. True it is that a few months ago $89,000 was spent in the relief of unemployment, and I think that as far as that money was concerned it was spent well. The results may not have been equal to what one expected, but in comparison with the results that were obtained before that I think that money was well spent. Somewhere in the vicinity of 15 or 17 hundred unemployed received help. I think that the average amounted to about fifty dollars a man. That is all right. I think for that $89,000 better value was given than was gotten out of the $120,000 that was distributed amongst the lawyers in this city. And something further should be done, Mr. Speaker, to try and cope with the situation in the city at the present time.

Although a lot has been said in connection with a general election in the fall, I don't think that any person can speak with more authority in regard to this bye-election, than your humble servant. I think that the main plank in that platform in the bye-election down in St. John's East, was that a vote for Mr. Barter was a vote for stable Government. I think that the people of St. John's East have thought differently. And I think that in justice to those people who have sent me here, they have sent me here to ask if you are going to grant them their request next fall. No better proof could have been given than the results of that bye-election. I hope that it will receive the consideration of the Government and will not be consigned to the waste paper basket as it were, like the petition of the six thousand voters of St. John's East, when they made the request to have the vacancy filled that was created by the appointment of Mr. Vinnicombe to the Controller's Dept. I would also like to say a few words in regard to the death of Sir Robert Bond and Sir Michael Cashin, both of whom were great losses to this country. I did not know Sir Robert Bond personally, but from what I can gather and from the information that I have received from

other sources he was one whom this country could ill afford to lose at the present time. In regard to Sir Michael the old saying, "To know him was to love him," is most applicable to him. It was mainly through the influence that he brought to bear in St. John's East that I can attribute my election. I certainly sympathise with Lady Cashin and his two sons, and I trust that both he and Sir Robert Bond are now enjoying eternal peace. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the amendment made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman, and I trust that it will be granted.

Mr. Hickman moved, and Mr. Brophy seconded, that the following paragraph be added after the word "legislature" in the Report of the Select Committee appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's Speech:—

"This House regrets that the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open this session of the Legislature contains no reference to a proposal to reduce the taxation with which certain articles essential to the fishermen of this Colony are at present burdened, and is of opinion that the cost to the fishermen of such essentials as lines and twines, oil-clothing, rubber suits, dry cell batteries, tobacco and butterine should be immediately reduced in order that a better opportunity may be afforded the fishermen to make a living out of the present unremunerative fishing industry and that a tax be imposed upon gasolene used in motor cars to help recoup the loss to the revenue occasioned thereby."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, when I was framing the Speech from the Throne, I thought that if I made it as short as possible and kept out of it as much contentious matter as I could reasonably do, I would, to some extent, curtail the debate on this particular subject so that we would be able to proceed to business earlier than we usually do, but, as one man said the other day whatever was lacking in the Speech from the Throne, the Opposition would be quite well able to make it up, and, as a result, we have had a debate lasting nearly a month. I suggested that the leaders of the various groups would speak for this particular group, and I think they have done so. We have had 16 speeches, and each speaker has represented his own particular group.

The Opposition claim to be united under their leader, Mr. Hickman, but on the other hand, we have had a pronouncement from the member for Fortune Bay that he bore no allegiance to Mr. Hickman; Mr. Lake, in his correspondence to his colleague, said that he bore no allegiance to Mr. Hickman, and we have had the statement from Mr. Bradley on the floors of this House of Assembly that he bore no allegiance to anyone. Generally speaking then, the gentlemen on the other side of the House are united in one thing only, and that is, in their opposition to the present Government.

There have been various speeches, all containing some repetition as to the results of the various bye-elections, congratulations and regrets, but there has not been a very great deal of constructive suggestions, although I think more than usual.

The honourable member for Fortune Bay, perhaps, stands out more distinctly than other members in the speech that he made, which was somewhat constructive, very well delivered to the House and which in my opinion is proof that Dr. Mosdell will contribute largely and beneficially to the debates in this House in the future. I am glad to hear the statement coming from him that he hoped that the press would cease raking up scandal and do away with personalities as far as the public men were concerned. It is certainly pleasant to hear a statement of that kind coming from

a man who at one time was responsible, or at least, the community considered him responsible for conducting a press that was not altogether immune from personal references.

There are a few comments in connection with the Speech from the Throne that have been made from the other side which I would like to refer to. Mr. Lake made one of the first constructive suggestions that I heard in the House this season, and that was that the Daisy should be taken from St. John's and kept in Port aux Basques with all steam up and the crew on board in case some of the fishermen, in prosecuting the fisheries, should get astray on the grounds. While I have a great admiration for the fishermen on the South West Coast, and I think that the Government should do all they possibly can to assist them, yet I rather think that the fishermen themselves would not be desirous of incurring such an expense as that in case of fishermen going astray. The Government would be prepared to provide a boat for that purpose, if necessary, but the fishermen all over the world have to run risks and they do run risks, and they understand they are running risks when they are prosecuting that noble pursuit.

Some reference has been made to the purchasing of goods by the Board of Works, and a great many questions have been asked as to how much so and so got, and how much somebody else got. I saw an article in the Advocate some months ago, which largely emphasized the amount of money that Mr. Brophy had received from the Public Works. Mr. Brophy was then supposed to be a supporter of the present Government and was supplying Public Institutions. Now Mr. Speaker, I think the position is this, that it does not matter a bit how much money a man gets in the shape of patronage as long as he gives value for the money. The important point is whether the goods are required and whether he has given value for the money he receives, not how much money he did receive.

My firm has always refused to take patronage from the Government. I don't take any credit for that. On the other hand, I don't see any particular harm in a man taking patronage as long as he gives value and better results than somebody else does. Mr. Brophy had to give value to the Board of Works for the patronage he received, and I claim that he did give value, if he did not, it would have been a reflection on the Board of Works for purchasing from him. And I claim that all goods from the time that I have been a member of the Board of Works and before that have been bought for best value. The member for Fortune criticised a gentleman the other day who happened to be a member of the Board of Works. That gentleman's name is Mr. Gould, and he said that he had to go and buy goods from others in order to sell them to the Government again. I make this statement to-day before this House and I can prove that I am correct, that there are no goods better bought than the goods bought from Mr. Gould. But if he sells fifty barrels of pork at a low price the amount of money should not be considered by this House. The point is what value does he give for the money. Mr. Godden it was who referred to the advisability of having protection on potatoes, eggs and various other local products. I quite agree with him. I asked the Minister of Finance some time ago if he could not consider bringing in some proposition in respect to that. But I understand that there are more vegetables produced in this country than there are markets for, not because there are no people who want them, but because there are thousands of purchasers not properly organized. The Minister of Agriculture has during the past year arrang-

ed for the transfer of large quantities of vegetables from one end of the island to the other and no doubt he can do so again. I belive it is right to have a protective tariff on these things, more particularly at certain times of the year. But in this connection I want to say that the importation of eggs is a matter that gave me great concern at the Board of Works. I found that most of the eggs were being imported and I found that it was largely because the local eggs were not satisfactory.

We were getting eggs from Conception Bay and other places and the public departments were complaining that a large number of the eggs were bad. And we came to the conclusion that it would not do to buy eggs from the collectors and the traders in Conception Bay. At the prest time we are buying eggs from Mr. Earle and we will buy them from any farm than can guarantee them, but we figured that to buy eggs from the various shopkeepers was not satisfactory and more expensive than if we imported them. I wrote to the Poultry Association and I have not got a satisfactory explanation from them yet. But if the Poultry Association is encouraging the production of eggs why is it that they cannot get them properly standardized so that the Government can buy its eggs in the country. I think that the standardization of eggs is one of the things that has to be looked into as well as the standardization of other things.

Dr. Mosdell referred to the General Hospital and to the improvement that was necessary in that institution, and at the same time he told this House that he sat on the Hospital Board for some years, and he was not able during that time to get anything effected in the way of alterations or retrenchment. We have got a scheme for the enlargement of the buildings of the sanatorium with a view to taking out the tubercular bone cases that have been lying in the General Hospital for many years and transferring them to the Sanatorium. In order to make more room in the General Hospital. I feel that $50,000 spent on that building would give returns in a very short time. That is a matter that is having the careful consideration of the Government. He also referred to the Charities Expenditure, and I want to say this that the commission that has been going into that matter, have not made any report yet, but that when they do make a report that it will be beneficial. I don't say that we can save much money in the distribution of charitable relief, or in assisting the poor, but I do say that we can have the money distributed in a much better way than at present by placing the relieving officers in various sections. And those most in need will get more and those less in need will get less.

Some references were made to the Hon. Mr. Duff. I think that Mr. Duff will speak for himself but I would like to say on his behalf that I think it was very unfair of the hon. member for Ferryland at a meeting on Bell Island where I was present, to get up and tell the people that Mr. Duff was bought body and soul by this Government. I asked the hon. member on the platform if he would explain what buying a man body and soul meant. He told me that it meant giving him a seat in the Executive Council and an influential position on the Board of Pensions Commissioners. The hon. member for Port de Grave has told us in this House that he hoped that Mr. Duff's conscience did not prick him. I don't think that the Hon. Mr. Duff's conscience is more likely to prick him than that of the hon. member for Port de Grave. Mr. Duff sat on the other side of the House and after six members crossed over, and while he was on that side of the House himself, he told these gentlemen that he thought their proper place was to stay

where they were. I could see the disgust written on his face, and it did not require any persuasion on my part, or on anyone's part to bring him to this side of the House. Some members on the other side of the House, I am sorry to say, cannot think of any way of drawing a man from one side of the House to the other except by pay or bribery. And I want those honourable gentlemen to understand that the Hon. Mr. Duff is not in my opinion on this side of the House for any money that he has got or is to get on account of his action.

Now I want to say a few words about the fisheries more particularly because Mr. Scammell the hon. member for St. Barbe and the Leader of the Opposition and I think Mr. Bradley made reference to the fact that I had made certain announcements before about the fisheries and that some explanation was necessary. I am perfectly aware that the fisheries of Newfoundland are in a distressful position to-day. But Newfoundland fisheries are not the only fisheries in a distressful position to-day. The fisheries of Norway and Iceland are suffering just as much as our fisheries and in many ways are in greater distress. The fisheries have not been remunerative and the fishermen who have to send their fish to a salt cured fish market are suffering and are bound to suffer. Things will get better I have no doubt. If I had any doubt I would not be issuing supplies to-day. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have got up here and read my pronouncement in which I said that when the fisheries prospered I prospered, and when they suffered I suffered. That is perfectly true. In the giving out of supplies now for three or four years past, one-fifth of the capital of the Monroe Export Company has disappeared.

I have no doubt that other exporters have found exactly the same thing and those that are in the fishery trade have got to suffer with the fishermen, but the time is coming when that will go the other way. Supply and demand have got to take their course in the meantime. If I did not believe that it was coming back I would not be supplying to-day like I am. I am not in business for my health and I do believe that times are coming when fish markets will prove remunerative and when a man can get returns for his outlay. There has been a great deal of talk about taxation on fishermen. I would like to remove all taxation from all the people of Newfoundland, but let me say that the fishermen are possibly less taxed directly than any other portion of the community. They get a large amount of goods duty free; and two independent fish merchants made up only last year just exactly what taxes are paid on fishery supplies. One made it ten per cent and the other eleven per cent. It is certainly not over twelve per cent. that the fishermen has to pay to the Government on his supplies. I think that the fishermen really recognise that they have got to pay something towards the revenue. Only the other day I found it very refreshing to have a man of my district in conversation with me in my office tell me: "Well, Mr. Monroe, we were figuring up that we have got a telegraph line repairer and a post office and a telegraph office and this thing and the other and when we think of all the various Government officials and various Government expenses in this particular part of the district and figure up what returns the revenue gets for them, we wonder how the Government is able to do it." It is very refreshing to find that there is somebody who feels that after all he is not contributing more than his share in that respect.

The hon. member for St. Barbe made reference and so did the Leader of the Opposition to a Commission appointed by this House to inquire

into the fishery situation. I think it was a very poor excuse from the Leader of the Opposition that because he was called a "Commissioner" he coud not sit on that Commision. I want to make it plain that there was no suggestion that these Commissioners should be paid and they were only gazetted in order to give a status in order to deal with the situation. The hon. member for St. Barbe refused to sit on the Commission too for reasons which he has given. It is not very encouraging for a Government desirous to get the best assistance it can to look into the fisheries situation, to find that members of the Opposition refuse to consider the question of sitting on a commission to see what can be done for the interest of the fisheries at a time when they haven't very much else to do. A committee in Catalina have themselves been looking into the questions too, very seriously, and they have got some system. The hon. member for St. Barbe gave me a copy of a petition which is being largely signed asking for various things to be done. I have the copy here. Mainly it asks to establish a system that would procure higher prices abroad. We would all like to be able to establish a system, and nobody more so than the export merchants. But I have been looking into systems from various points for my own benefit as well as for the benefit of the country and I can't see exactly what can be done.

With regard to a bounty on fish which you talk about us having promised before we came in power, and somebody called it a political kite and said that we didn't mean to give a bounty on fish. I really believed in it when I came in power and it was a fact that the fishermen were giving up fishing and I said naturally we had to consider the fisheries first and give a bounty where we could. The position may not be much better now, but the country is not in a financial position to give a bounty on fish. Then if we did give a bounty on fish as a member on the other side has said, it means that you give something to the man who catches a lot of fish and nothing to the man who doesn't, and you will have a large amount of poor relief in spite of the bounty on fish.

My firm has this year begun a venturn down at Badgers Quay and it has been commended by the committee with which Mr. Scammell is associated. And it is that there is to be built by our firm at Badger's Quay a drying station and when the fishermen return to Bonavista Bay with their loads they put off the fish at Badger's Quay and we buy it green so that they can return to the fishing grounds with trawls or anything else and get more fish. We cure the fish at our station. There are in my district I may say, the very best fishermen in the world; men who cannot be excelled in any portion of the world as fish catchers; who go down to Labrador and take all sorts of risks and who have got some kind of instinct for catching fish where perhaps other men would not find it, and are absolutely certain to bring home a voyage. What these men do when it comes round to October, after curing a few quintals or handing it out to somebody else to cure for them is that they come on to St. John's using a good deal of time and expense carrying it at that juncture. If he can get rid of it and go fishing without loss of time surely it is a good thing. In that way something can be done for the fishery. A suggestion has been made by the committee that a bounty might be given on merchantable fish and many a man in my party said that was a splendid idea. But as any member must ask if he stops to consider, how that can be worked out, who is to get it? Surely the fishermen that has caught it

and made it. And how are we to give it from government funds Sometimes it is sold by a storekeeper, sometimes by traders and sometimes it passes through two or three hands before it gets to St. John's, if it ever gets there, and the difficulty of sending a culler to cull it as between merchants and fishermen and fix the quality so far as they are concerned is almost impossible.

I don't see and have not been able to find any way in which such a scheme can be worked out. I do think that to a certain extent there can be a classification of fish for export, and export only, and even that is particularly difficult. I told the House last year that our firm and several others were bringing an expert here. He wasn't Aaron Shapiro as Mr. Hibbs mentioned, but I think he was just as good. He has given very practical advice as regards the standardization of various articles in various parts of the world and this gentleman made a study for two or three months at our expense, not the Government's, with a view to trying whether he could initiate any scheme that would bring about standardization that would be used here and I think he failed entirely. Mr. Grimes, I think, has suggested on many occasions that people be got together to take things up; that the merchants and fishermen be got together. The Leader of the Opposition knows how hopeless it is to get these people together to take things up and arrive at any conclusions. I feel, for instance, that the Leader of the Opposition and my friend the Minister of Finance would not be on a board that would be at all likely to come to conclusions beneficial to themselves and the fisheries, and I have found out through my connection with the fish exporting business that the general tendency at all these meetings is to arrive at nothing.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Why do you make that statement?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Because I generally found that you were on opposite sides of the argument on all occasions when meetings were held to discuss these matters. The suggestion has been made that it is ridiculous to talk about a plaster model as Mr. Job suggested. As a matter of fact if we had standards that would probably be the proper mode of showing what the standard of fish would be; to show it in plaster so that it could be referred to. It would not be necessary for one to be in every fishing port, but there might be one on every mercantile premises. So that suggestion of Mr. Job's is not in my opinion so ridiculous. The honourable member for St. Barbe referred to the fact that we had got a commission together in connection with the fisheries, and called it political kite flying. I think the fact that those gentlemen refused to sit on that commission, and talk about what the Government ought to do is more an indication of kite flying politics than the appointment of the Commission. I want to say that the commission didn't effect very much. They did succeed in getting to the Board of Trade and in getting several exporters to agree to the culling of fish over the board and making three qualities of it, but there were not many firms that practiced that very long and I am still unable to find a means of government compulsion of what the merchants themselves are unwilling to have.

Mr. Bradley referred to the petition which he had presented from his district to prevent steamers carrying fish from the Labrador and I notice that the petition which Mr. Scammell tells us will be most largely signed is also calling for the same thing. I think the Leader of the Opposition would agree with me to-day that it would not be good legislation to prevent

steamers from loading on the Labrador coast. Sailing vessels are fast becoming a thing of the past and if we passed an act to prevent the use of steamers we might possibly find ourselves in the position that we were without conveyances to take the fish away after it was caught.

Reference has been made by the member for St. Barbe to the fact that last Fall when I was away Sir William Coaker and himself represented to the Government that something must be done in connection with the price of fish and in connection with the marketing of fish in the interest of the fishermen b;ut he did not explain what the main proposition was that Sir William Coaker put before the Government and which he asked that the House of Assembly be called together to consider. The proposition was that the Government should buy two hundred thousand quintals of fish which had been caught in excess of the quantities which markets for salt codfish could consume. I want to say, sir, right now that if there were two hundred thousand quintals of fish produced more than was wanted, why in the name of fortune is all this talk about giving a bounty to catch more fish. But the fact is that there were not two hundred thousand quintals of fish caught more than was wanted and that is clearly demonstrated by the statement which I now make that there are less stocks of salt codfish on hand in Newfoundland to-day than there have been for a great many years. The Government should never be called upon to buy any stocks of fish. How could it benefit the outside situation to have the Government holding two hundred thousand quintals of fish instead of having the merchants holding it? Are not the buyers of fish in the foreign markets made aware and is it not their business to know what stocks there are in Newfoundland? And if there are stocks here, does it benefit the situation any to have stocks held by the Government instead of by the merchants? Any school boy knows that it makes no difference whatever unless the Government was buying that fish for the purpose of destroying it and so reduce the quant.ty on hand. That is the only way in which any benefit could be derived had we bought two hundred thousand quintals of fish at the time we were told that there were two hundred thousand quintals of fish in the country more than was wanted, and if we had bought it, it would be a serious thing for this country to-day.

Reference has been made to the Highroads Commission and to the unemployed. Mr. Brophy, the new member for St. John's East, in addressing a meeting of the unemployed the other day said that he and the Municipal Council were of the opinion that it was the business of the Government to build a Highroad through the city of St. John's, and the way the highroad, according to the Municipal Council, was to be built was through Duckworth St. in the middle of the town. In other words, the Council wanted the country to pave Duckworth Street instead of the city do:ng it themselves. Now, sir, I do not think that the new member for St. John's East would go to Torbay or Bell Island and tell the people at these places that he thought that the moneys of the taxpayers generally should be used to pave Duckworth Street from one end to the other in order to make a highroad; and I am perfectly satisfied that the members for Ferryland, if they expressed their real opinions; or any member on the other side of the House representing outport constituencies, would not think that it was their duty to spend tthe public moneys in paving Duckworth Street from one end to the other and putting down new sidewalks. Surely to goodness it is the duty of the Munic pal Council to undertake such city work and Mr. Brophy well knows, as a member of this

House and he knows as a member of the Municipal Council, that it is unfair for him to take an attitude of that kind. I would recommend to Mr. Brophy that he be fair and manly in his opinion, that the St. John's Municipal Council has got to look after the affairs of St. John's and that the taxpayers of St. John's city have got to take care of the paving of Duckworth Street.

I believe that the Highroads Commission was probably very largely responsible for the fact that we lost St. John's East in the recent bye-election, because we had men who were employed by the Highroads Commission in many sections of the district on roads and the greater majority of them were entirely opposed to us politically. If we had played the political game and employed men who were our followers and adherents we probably would have very different results; but we appointed an independent Highroads Commission, we did not interfere with them and they employed men, who, in many cases, are not now and were not our supporters at the last General Election. The other day I heard that two men who worked on the Pouch Cove Road belong to Fogo District. I do not know whether this is true or not but the fact is that we might have benefitted ourselves immensely, if the men to build these roads had been engaged by the Government rather than by the Highroads Commission. However, I take the position all the same, whether it was politically disastrous for us or not, we would not have the roads around the country that we have to-day at the expense we had gone to or anything like it, if we did not have an independent Highroads Commission, which I think has justified its existence.

In that respect I would like to make an observation on the new hotel, which has been referred to by members on the other side of the House and on which we are often told that a big expenditure and a big liability has been incurred by the Government. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that we stated we would not give bonds and then that we would give bonds. The member for St. Barbe told us last year in this House that when he fought another election he was going to tour the country from end to end and condemn us for the policy of building that hotel. Shortly after the House closed I found a Minute-of-Council of a former government, which Mr. Scammell was a supporter of, in which was a proposition, put forward by Mr. B. B. Stafford for the building of a hotel in St. John's. At a Council meeting a letter was read from Sir William Coaker and the letter was considered of such importance that it was embodied in the Minute-of-Council. The letter distinctly said that Sir William Coaker was preparing to back a hotel to the extent of one million dollars for a bond issue. I merely mention this incident to show that before the member for St. Barbe goes touring the country from end to end condemning the policy of building a hotel, he ought to make sure that he gets his chief to assure him first that he has changed his mind. The hotel bonds have not been guaranteed so far by anybody. We said that bonds would be issued when the Government Engineer, through his chief of works, vised that a certain amount of work was done with no prior lien on the building. Before any application was made to the Government a prior lien was put on the building. The Royal Bank of Canada advanced the money and these are the only people who have any need to worry; they have to pay off the lien and discharge the liabilities before the Government has anything to do with the issue of the Bonds. Even then the Government will be only guarantee-

ing $450,000.00 in bonds, and, according to the excellent paying business done at the hotel all last winter, the dullest time of the year, you may rest assured that the Government will not have much to guarantee by the time the Company is arranged.

In most of the speeches delivered from the Opposition side the one outstanding desire on the part of the speakers was that I would give up and announce that a general election would be held next Fall. That was the one thing more than anything else troubling their minds. An election is their burning desire. They told us we were a dying administration. One gentleman told us that he could hear the death rattle in our throats and in most cold-blooded terms told us to publish our own obituary notice. I think that I have already explained to the House that as long as we are a Government it is our duty to carry on as a Government, and we would not be a Government if we were to accept the dictation of the Oppospition. If we are to be a Government it is for us to say whether or not a general election this year would be in the interests of the people. That is my position as regards a general election. I might say that I am not desirous of remaining here any longer than is necessary in the interests of the country. And neither the members of my Executive nor of my party are seking the fruits of office but, as they have shipped under me to try and fulfil their duty to their country, as a Government and a party are prepared to carry on. So I say it is for us to decide if a general election is to be held and for us to advise His Excellency the Governor to that effect on his return to Newfoundland. An election is not what Newfoundland needs.

But there are matters concerning me to-day more important than the date of an election. Only last week I got a notification from Mr. Smith, General Manager of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company at Corner Brook telling me that on the 15th of July next we have to provide $267,000.-00 to pay six months interest on the N. P. and P. Co's Bonds. The N. P. and P. Company informed the Government that they are unable to meet the July interest and we have got to do it. Now it is for this Government to immediately ascertain what the position of the N. P. and P. Company is. Our liability is there and if the Paper Company do not meet it, we have got to meet it, or the credit of the country suffers, so we have got to be prepared with the money to meet the interest. As a financial proposition, it was suggested to have the International Paper Company, whose representatives are here, make a deal with the Government, but the proposition, as outlined by Mr. Smith, seemed so preposterous that I immediately sent a message to the Secretary of State for the Colonies asking why we should be called upon so suddenly and without warning to pay this interest and be kept in the dark up to this time, and I pointed out that some means had to be provided for the Company to pay that interest until such time as we were able. Our representative of the Board has been attending meetings, but the N.P. and P. Company has refused to give information to the Board. Mr. Reid, the Vice-President of the Company, who it is claimed is largely interested in the Gander proposition states he has not been able to get a statement for the Board. There are also other reasons which we are not aware of at present, at any rate we have not got the information we require and we protested against the position that was put up to us. I do not want to say anything more about this thing this evening as the Government are having a meeting with the various parties interested to-night. All the correspondence will be tabled here and nothing will be hidden in the transaction that takes place. The

Gander property, it seems to appear, will have to be inked up with the Corner Brook proposition now, but whatever it may be, the full statement of affairs will be placed before this House at the earliest posible moment. I mention this to show that a General Election is not one of the points that is concerning the Government at the present time—there are lots of things that are giving us graver concern, and I assure this House that if I could get rid of this responsibility, and give it to the gentlemen on the other side, knowing that they could do better than we, I would do it tomorrow. We are not going to stop in office one moment longer than we feel it is for the country's good.

MR. HICKMAN—Might I ask the Prime Minister if he did not make a mistake last year in giving away our security?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We made no mistake—all that will be threshed out later. The Leader of the Opposition has brought forward an amendment which seems intended only to embarass us—it is not reasonable to suppose that we could consider any amendment of that kind. Any alterations in the tariff will be considered when the tariff is before us for consideration. The fisheries have been stressed, and I am in compelte sympathy with them—my interests are all wrapped up in the fishery, but the fishermen are not suffering more than the mechanics in St. John's, and I cannot support any such proposition as the amendment.

HON. MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make on the matter in hand. I should first like to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the Address in Reply. We knew Mr. Cahill and expected something from him and we received a fine address; the seconder, Mr. Power, was unknown as a speaker, but we found that he possessed fine qualities. The Opposition can see that if it ever befalls us to get in Opposition we too will be able to make speeches. I also congratulate the new members on the other side of the House; I didn't know that I played such a part in the return of Mr. Brophy as has been claimed here this afternoon—however I give him my blessing and hope he will be an acquisition to the House and to the country. I was a member of the Opposition for a long time and enjoyed sitting on that side and criticising the Government, and could still do it, I think. After all is said and done, I don't know of any Government that is perfect—some members now in Opposition have been in Governments before and they can ask themselves what did they do for the country—when they ask that they might come to the conclusion that we can't do much better than we are doing at the present time. The members of the Opposition have not agreed on the propositions brought before the House. For instance some wanted the Herring Inspectors done away with, while others were in favor of them. And the Opposition must remember the large amount of unemployment, and that 1500 men were employed by the Government—that is a fairly sufficient reason for such work.

The Opposition is still asking for impossible things, and wondering why they are not given. A member the other day asked for a breakwater for Flat Rock—there are a hundred Flat Rocks looking for such things, and when they come before the House one wonders how ridiculous they are. I was pleased to see the members of the Opposition asking so many questions, and noticed one especially on the content of ash and carbon in coal. It reminds me of a cargo of coal sold by a gentleman now on the other side, and which was discharged at Humbermouth, which was the veriest filth and dirt, and when the wind blew it turned the whole countryside black—one man had a black and white cow, and

thought he had lost it, until a rainstorm revealed it again; if the gentleman would get an analysis of that cargo of coal it would be something worth reading.

I sat on the other side of the House and was supposed to be Liberal; now I come across to this side and find some who left it telling me I am a Tory. Not so many years ago I stood on a platform with the Leader of the Opposition and the Colonial Secretary—I don't know what we were then, but think it was something like Liberal Progressives. What I do know is that the only distinction to be drawn for the last fifteeen years is between the inns and outs—and those out are always waiting to get in. I didn't cross the floors for my own benefit—I wasn't bought. One paper said that I succumbed to the lure of an Executive seat—I didn't ask for an Executive seat, nor was I offered one. There was also some talk of letters from the Prime Minister to members of the Opposition, and a member of the Opposition is quoted as saying that Duff got caught. I don't know how they found out about any letter from the Prime Minister to me—I did get a letter, but it was about something in Carbonear. I never received a letter asking me to move across, nor did I receive any suggestions from members of this Government that I move across—as I said, I don't understand where they got anything about letters. I went to the gentlemen whom I heard were going to the Opposition side, last year and asked them to remain where they were—if they had I should be where I was when we sat here last year. One of them said he was afraid it was too late, and with another I knew it was too late—if I had seen them before, I should have still been in Opposition criticising the Government. The member for Port de Grave hoped my conscience was not pricking me. I have to deal with an effusion in the Advocate, sometime last year. I will read it.

(Reads)

That is a hard thing to say about a person without good grounds. I have not had an opportunity previous to this of refuting that charge. It is unfortunate that a paper in this country should run riot in that way. Now the gallant Major Cashin made the remark on Bell Island that I was bought body and soul. He must have known in his own mind that it was not correct. He also said that I was Chairman of the Pension's Board last year; so I was. Dr. Parsons had to go away for an operation and I was asked to take his place, but I suppose Major Cashin considered that as I represent an Outport, I had no business there. I received $440.00 for that, but I think that I gave value for it.

There has been a great deal said about the fisheries. After all we are selling our fish products in the same old way as we have been doing for hundreds of years past and we have to get new ideas. They are coming. Here we find that in one place this year one hundred and fifty or two hundred thousand dollars worth of halibut was sent out of the country, and the Hudson Bay Company are exporting salmon from this country and the fishermen are getting remunerative rates, and the same thing can be done with the other fisheries. It is only a matter of time, and we have to change with the times. There was one gentleman on the other side who gave us a very brief and optimistic address ,and that was my friend Mr. Godden, and after all is said and done some of us have no optimism, and yet that gentleman spoke so nicely in regard to the affairs of this country, it ought to put hope in us. Consider what a saving can be effected with these modern ideas applied to the fisheries, and when we consider the great possibilities there are in the future of Newfoundland in Buchan's mine for

instance we are told we have one of the greatest mines in the world, so that we have perhaps turned over the top. In conclusion I would just like to say that I came over to the Government with a clear conscience. I am quite satisfied in my own mind that I was not bought, and I hope that the Members of the Opposition and the Government will do what they consider the best in the interests of the country.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House at any length with regard to the amendment before the chair, but I just simply want to make a few brief remarks regarding the amendment itself and the possibilities of bringing about the state of conditions so that the various items outlined in that amendment would be carried into effect, and I notice that one of the first items refers to the duty on lines and twines, and asks that the duty be taken off those articles, and also off butter, oilclothes and rubber boots, and I feel this evening in speaking to this amendment that I am performing a certain duty that I owe to my constituents who represent a certain section of the fishermen of this country, to see that their interests are properly protected.

Mr. Speaker, the fishing conditions of this country at the present moment warrant a reduction in taxation on these various items. It will be remembered that in the Speech from the Throne this year we are told, that the income tax is to be reimposed. I feel that with the imposition of that income tax about four hundred thousnad dollars can be collected by way of revenue. An item such as lines and twines which is absolutely essential to the successful prosecution of the fisheries had to be taxed in order to make up for the amount of money that was lost when the Government took the income tax off. I have on very many occasions in this Chamber expressed my opinion in connection with that industry that manufactures lines and twines, and whilst I would be one of the first to encourage the fostering of an industry that required fostering yet at the same time I am in no way in accord with the project of protecting an industry that is making huge profits, and at the same time these articles most necessary to the fishermen of this country, are taxed. And I consider it my duty and the duty of every member in this House especially those who represent fishing districts in this country to see that those small items mentioned in this amendment should be allowed in this country duty free. During the past quarter of a century that corporation watered its stock two or three times. It is paying to-day on the original investment about forty per cent. and then why should we as a legislature vote them extra protection. I say, Sir, it is vicious legislation, it is class legislation of the first character at the expense of the people who are the producers in this country. On the other hand we are told by the Prime Minister that in July next we will be faced with another obligation of $267,000.00, interest on guaranteed bonds for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. This information is new to this House, and, no doubt, as time goes on we shall receive further information in that connection. But I feel that even if that additional expenditure will be added to us, and I question whether we are liable for it under the circumstances, the extra fifteen per cent. placed on lines and twines two years ago should be reduced. It does not matter whether any member on the Government side does not agree with our policy. It is the duty they owe to the people who put them here, if they want to foster the fisheries of the country ,to vote for the taking off of that extra fifteen per cent., because the industry which is getting

fifteen per cent. protection does not require it, and, secondly because the people, who are catching the fish which goes to pay that extra fifteen per cent. to the corporation which gets that protection, have to pay into the Treasury to-day in order to enrich plutocrats in this Newfoundland of ours. We are not here to represent any class in the community; but to represent the people as a whole, and if we do not represent the people as a whole, whether we are on the Government side or on the Opposition side, then I say it is our duty to resign our seats in this Legislature and return to private life. Comment has been made this afternoon by the Prime Minister regarding speeches that were made from this side of the House, speeches which were made in good faith and attitudes which were taken on principle. Last year I remember a similar amendment being made to the one now before the Chair and I remember it being voted for by Mr. Duff, who is now a member of the Executive Government. It will be interesting when the amendment is put how Mr. Duff will vote this time. And then we are told by that same gentleman that our consciences may or may not prick us. Now so far as I am personally concerned the remarks I made on the subject of the debate have been made with honest intentions. The Prime Minister stated that we comprise sixteen political parties and which statement is absolutely uncalled for. Well, if we comprise sixteen parties, I feel that some gentlemen on the Government side are in the same position and no doubt when this amendment is put each will be able to vote for his own party and the parties they represent are the fishermen of this country, and, as I said before, it will be interesting to see how Mr. Duff will vote and it will be equally interesting to see who have the conscience and the consistency. Now with regard to the duties on butter. In 1925 an extra duty of two cents per pound was put on that article. As there are six million pounds of butter produced in this country annually, that gives the different butterine factories operating in this city extra protection of $120,-000.00 a year. Is it not the duty of every member in this House, provided we have the interest of the country at heart, although from casual observation one is inclined to doubt it, to see to it that there is reduction in taxation on butter, because it is the common people who consume that article and it is the common people who require the necessary protection in order to make both ends meet, and if they are not able to get it through the legislature in a legitimate way how can we expect them to contribute to the upkeep of this country. It is a known fact, Sir, that butterine corporations have ben making profits of twenty five per cent. annually, and at the same time have been placing eighty thousand dollars a year to the credits of their reserves. That was prior to 1925 in which year the present Government gave two cents per pound extra to these factories and to-day we are asking for the reduction of that two cents a pound and we on this side of the House are voting on that principle. I was a member of the Government when we went to the country, and when we asked the people for their support we told them that when we came back to office taxation would be reduced, and then the first opportunity the Government had they increased taxation rather than reduced it. I say it was not necessary to increase taxation, provided that the financial condition at the time warranted it, and it did not warrant it. Now in taking off that extra taxation on butter we should be able to make it up in some other way so that the revenue need not suffer. If our financial condition according to the statement tabled

in this House was not right then I say the extra taxation was necessary because it would be necessary to borrow money to pay our deficit; but if it is correct that we had a surplus in 1924-25, it was unnecessary to put on that extra two cents per pound on butter because it meant the taking of $120,000.00 out of that surplus and putting it in the pockets of the wealthy corporations. I do not propose at this juncture to prove that it is necessary to borrow money to pay deficits, but if it is unnecessary to borrow money to pay deficits, then the extra taxation of $120,000.00 on butter can be taken off for the benefit of the common people of the country. Imagine dividends of twenty five per cent. profits each year by butterine corporations in addition to putting aside from eighty to one hundred thousand dollars in reserves and then they are given another hundred and twenty thousand here to put aside. It is absolutely preposterous, in my opinion, for any Government to continue that kind of legislation, and any Government or any members of such a Government whoever they may be doing such are finished in this country. There are various things that could be embodied in an amendment, but it seems that if it is necessary to pay $267,000.00 for interest on bonds next months, no doubt it will be hard scraping in order to pick up the moneys necessary to bring up the revenue. The Prime Minister stated here this evening that the fishermen of the country did not pay more than twelve per cent. in taxation. Surely goodness he was not serious when he made that assertion. Take any fisherman to-day and say he catches fifty quintals of fish for his hand. How much does he pay? He sells his fish to a merchant on Water Street. Then that merchant gets employees to handle that fish. Well that merchant would not engage extra employees but for that fish. I move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker, as it is now half past six.

On motion the Debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn until to-morrow, June 7th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 7th, 1927.

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

A petition was presented by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines from the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, praying for leave to introduce a bill providing for certain concessions and privileges in connection with a mining and ore treating industry near Red Indian Lake.

The petition having been read was, on motion, 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. Minister of Justice
Minister of Agriculture and Mines
Mr. Power
Mr. Halfyard
Mr. K. M. Brown.

Mr. Halfyard presented a petition from Heart's Content re Roads.

The Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting a Bill for the ratification of a contract for the St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of the debate yesterday afternoon, I was speaking on a proposed reduction of taxation for butterine. I pointed out, I think, to this House that we had, in the tariff of 1925, given extra protection to that industry of an extra $120,000 per year, and, in support of the motion now before the Chair, that a reduction in that article should be given in order that it may be made easier for the fishermen and common people of the country to earn a livelihood or to pay their bills. I think I made the point quite clear that the people who consume these various articles were the common class, and that this House and the Government, as it is constituted to-day, were placed in power to serve the interests of the whole of the people rather than a few. I also pointed out on various occasions that extra protection, since the present administration came into power, has been given to the Imperial Tobacco Company. In the tariff of 1925 we gave them practically an extra protection of five cents per lb. on tobacco. There is consumed annually in this country 800,000 lbs. of tobacco; an extra five cents is therefore a further protection of $40,000 per year on tobacco. It is common knowledge that the fishermen of this country generally use tobacco manufactured in the country. We find, from the Customs Report, that Excise Duty was paid last year on about 500,000 lbs., or that industry indirectly gained by an extra five cents the sum of $25,000 in that year. During the time that tariff was brought in the question that occupied our minds was the high cost of living. Now, we were told at that time by gentlemen now sitting opposite us that the extra taxation that was being put on would not increase prices of these various commodities, but we did not receive any guarantee from the Government for these concerns that if a lower price could be obtained in the foreign market that the people would receive the benefit. I refer to the Prime Minister's statement at that time regarding the price of lines and twines. I think he said when that was put in force that the prices would not go up, but he forgot to tell us that if that duty was not on it to-day, the fishermen would be getting the benefit of the extra 15 per cent. taken away by the Revenue Bill of 1925. I am one of the foremost advocates of giving employment to our people, but I am one of the foremost opponents of the protection of industries that have flourished and are flourishing magnificently. Tewnty-five and thirty per cent. annually is a very good investment ,and I wish I had sufficient money myself to invest at 25 per cent. or 30 per cent., which these industries are paying. In view of the fact that the Income Tax Bill is to be reintroduced in this Legislature, I would make the suggestion to the Government now, in order to collect further revenue, that profits made by various industries in Newfoundland, industries right here in the city, which profits go out of the country, and from which we get no returns whatever, should be taxed by that Income Tax. One industry to-day in Newfoundland sends $125,000 or $140,00 out of the country. All that amount of money going out of the country should be made to pay taxes which, under the Income Tax, it would not pay, but under the Business Profits Tax, it would have to pay. It is the duty of the Government to see that profits made by concerns like the Imperial Tobacco Company, that is contralled by a large Trust outside the country, should be made pay a tax on their profits that are being taken out of the country.

HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER—I

wish to draw the honourable gentleman's attention to the fact that he must keep to the matter before the Chair, the subject of the Amendment. He should refer to those other matters when they come up.

MR. CASHIN—I don't want to further detain the House, and I will leave any further remarks until later, but I would like, in closing, to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Rule 117, when the vote will be tabled on the Amendment now before the Chair.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a word or two on the Amendment now before the Chair, because, in my mind, it seems to give practical suggestion to the only way in which it is possible for this Legislature at present to bring any relief to the people of this country who are at present overburdened with taxation, and before I proceed to the discussion of the Amendment proper, I propose to ask you permission to make an explanation arising out of some remarks of the Prime Minister yesterday on the original motion then before the Chair. It will be remembered that, during the course of my remarks, here on the Address in Reply, I made some reference to some correspondence that took place last autumn between Sir John Bennett, then Acting Prime Minister, Sir William Coaker and myself on the question that something ought to have been done at that time to have warded a serious decline. The Prime Minister was not in the country at the time, and the correspondence in question took place with the Colonial Secretary, but in reference to that correspondence yesterday the Prime Minister stated that the main idea behind the proposition which Sir William Coaker was making with regard to convening the Legislature was that the Government of Newfoundland should purchase last year 200,000 quintals of codfish supposedly in excess of what it was possible to profitably market. At the time the Prime Minister made that statement the Honourable Colonial Secretary was not in the House. Had he been present at that time it was my intention to interject an interruption and ask the Colonial Secretary point blank if he was in a position to corroborate the statement of the Prime Minister in that connection. I quoted the Prime Minister's statement from memory and in substantiation of it I have before me the Daily News of this morning which editorially refers to the Prime Minister's various statements and his statements in this connection.

(Reads.)

That, of course, is the statement of the newspaper itself, but over in the reportial columns of the paper the Prime Minister is quoted presumably verbatim, and I think we are safe in taking the report as a correct report of the statement he made yesterday afternoon.

(Reads.)

In justice to Sir William Coaker, who is not in this House now to defend himself, I think it is only right that that statement should be flatly contradicted. It is absolutely false. I reiterate that had the Colonial Secretary been in the House yesterday afternoon I should have asked him point blank if he was in a position to corroborate that statement of the Prime Minister. I know that this proposition was not made by Sir William Coaker and felt fully sure that no such proposition was made by him and no such proposition contemplated by him. The Prime Minister was not in the country at the time, and I will go further and say that, judging from his remarks yesterday, he never read the correspondence between Sir William Coaker and Sir John Bennett. The whole correspondence was published and no man on the Government side of the House is in a position to-day to say that Sir William Coaker ap-

proached any member of the Government on the proposition that we should buy 200,000 quintals of codfish last autumn. This morning I received a letter from Sir William Coaker which I propose to read with your permission before proceeding to the discussion of the Amendment.

(Reads.)

The latter part of that letter, I must admit, in fairness, in view of the latitude you have allowed me, has no reference to the incident I have started to clear up, but I thought it just as well to read the letter as a whole. I was astounded yesterday afternoon when the Prime Minister made that statement, and I knew it was incorrect. He had no ground for making the statement; no member of his Cabinet or party can say that he, as an individual, or that they, as a whole, were ever approached with such a proposition and no such idea ever entered the mind of Sir William Coaker. I will go so far as to say that the reputation and the integrity of the Prime Minister will receive a severe blow unless he retracts the statement he has made and announces that it is without any foundation in fact.

To proceed to the discussion of the Amendment now before the Chair. It proposes that this House shall effect a substantial reduction in taxes on those items which are vitally essential to the prosecution of the codfishery. During the course of my remarks on the Address in Reply I pointed out that it was the duty of this House not only as an Opposition but as a Government and as a Legislature, collectively and as to its individual members to look to discover if there is any couse for thankfulness in the Address with which His Excellency opened the Legislature. We have discovered no cause for thankfulness but we submit that there would be if honourable members on both sides could see their way clear to support the Amendment now before the Chair. In effect it asks the Legislature to lighten the burden of taxation now weighing upon the shoulders of the people of the country. We have searched and we have discussed matters in the course of the debate to discover whether or not something could be done in a practical manner to assist and encourage the fisheries of the country, but no such promise of hope was given by the outline in the Speech from the Throne; and no such hope having been given or held out by the Prime Minister in his remarks made on two occasions speaking to this motion on the floors of the House, there remains for us to see whether there is not in our power some other means whereby to encourage the fishermen in the prosecution of the fisheries. There may be a different way of tackling our fishery problems which will encourage our fishermen without the necessity of reducing taxation, but if there is no hope in the immediate future at least of the problems being tackled and brought ot a successful solution, can we not look round ourselves and see whether we mightn't encourage the fishermen. The only other way is to lessen the taxation upon them. If we can't come in here and bring in a Bill to do something to stabilize prices and possibly get more for our fish, then let us see if we can't do something to lessen the cost for the fisherman of his going fishing. That is what in effect and substance the Amendment before the Chair proposes to bring about. The cost of catching fish can be lessened if prices can be brought down by making a substantial reduction in taxation, and it asks you to consider making such a reduction. The reduction of taxation was one subject which the Prime Minister laid before the people of the country in 1924 as a cause why they ought to elect his party to power. The electorate in 1924 went to the polls believing that the advent of the present Prime Minister to power was

going to see a substantial reduction in taxation. The previous administration to this one had been severely condemned and criticised by the Prime Minister in his Manifesto on the question of taxation. I find here, referring to the expenditure of the previous administration, he said:

(Reads.)

Surely if the electorate of this country be given credit for average intelligence they must read into that the implication that if the Monroe party came into power there would be a surcease from this grinding burden of taxation. Further I find a statement making a promise of reduction in taxation in full blush.

(Reads.)

In other words I think I have made it clear that the present administration stood pledged to the electorate of this country to make a reduction in taxation, and I think it is largely because of that pledge that the present administration finds itself in power today. In 1924, when your Government took office, the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech, delivered in the House, I think, on the 28th of July, or thereabouts, made some reference to the fact that the administration then gone out of office, had left a large deficit—a deficit which the Auditor General finally put down at $1,600,000. The Finance Minister was honest enough to say that the deficit was largely due to the fact that the previous administration had made substantial reductions in taxation. Yes, sir, the administration of which I was a member and partner, and which was so censured yesterday by the Prime Minister, did make a substantial reduction in taxation—we made a reduction which I estimate was of a value of from $800,000 to $1,000,000 to the fishermen per year, and why did we make it? I tell the Prime Minister now and his Government that if the Opposition worked to engineer pressure on his party as did the administration of which he is a member, there would have long ago been a substantial reduction of taxes. But we don't want to go about these things except by constitutional methods. My mind is still very clear on parades through the town and on Memorials presented to the Governor, and as I pointed out last year the result of that pressure was that we reduced taxation by as much as $800,000 per year.

In quoting from the Budget Speech of the Finance Minister as delivered on the 28th day of July, 1924, I find the following words:

(Reads.)

In other words the administration which preceded them placed on the Free List such things as flour, pork, molasses and gasoline, and further than that, there was a reduction in other things—rubber goods in particular, and our shortage was due to the fact that we made these reductions. You came in and put that taxation back, and on the flimsy pretext that we had removed these duties illegally. As I pointed out last year, the fishermen are not interested in whether taxation is removed legally or illegally—the question for them is whether it is to be reduced or not, and they do not ask for a quibble. In any case you claimed they were illegal and the duties were put back on the Statute Book. That was the first intimation that the country had that you intended to break faith with your promise to reduce taxation and to reorganize the tariff so that it would bear less hardly on the fishermen and the prosecution of the fishery. It is not, I submit, your place to stand up here and censure a Government which made such an effort to reduce taxation, in view of the fact that when you took office it was under a contract with the electorate to reform, and they expected great things from you—we shall se how you carried them into effect. You did not reduce taxation—I pro-

pose to be brief this afternoon and develop my arguments as speedily as possible—you did not reduce taxation. To begin with, your first action was under a plea of a legal quibble to place back $800,000 taxes which your predecessors removed—that is number one. Secondly, you came in this House and took a report of a Tariff Commission which you had never read or studied and put it into effect—a tariff which increased taxes generally all round to 12 or 15 per cent.—that is number two, or Exhibit B. as proof of my contention that you betrayed the electorate. And the third is that you came in here and in direct contravention to your pledge that the tariff would be arranged to encourage and aid the fisheries and fishermen, you did it in such a way that it was more difficult for them to carry on. Instead of arranging the tariff so that their burden was lighter you made it heavier and lightened those of the already well-to-do; in other words you took off the income tax, from which source the well-to-do were paying from $300,000 to half a million per year, you gave the Banks a present of $80,000.00 by reducing the Bank Tax, and to recoup yourselves from these losses you impose an all round increase on the tariff to the extent of twelve or fifteen per cent. And then to show your greater consideration for the well-to-do, you impose a tax on articles which from time immemorial had never been taxed—you placed 10 per cent. on lines and twines, and a protective tariff on tobacco, and a further tax on butterine; three taxes which were placed on for one purpose and one only—to foster industries that were well able to take care of themselves, and to make the rich and well-to-do still richer at the expense of the people who had to use lines and twines, tobacco and ordinary oleo margarine—that is how you kept faith with the people in reference to your promise to readjust the tariff. I would refer again to the conduct of your party to your predecessors and your censure of them in your Manifesto and since you took power. I am satisfied to leave it with the fishermen that as a result of your parades and memorials your predecessors reduced taxation from $800,0000 to $1,000,000, and I am also prepared to leave it to them that in contravention to your promises you have done the things I have enumerated. You have lifted the burden from the shoulders of the wealthy and the influential corporations of the country. Is it any wonder that we ask you to go to the country immediately and see what they will do when they are face to face with the ballot paper.

Let us see how the tariff operated in relation to the various items which are outlined in the Amendment before the Chair. I shall at first refer to the direct duties, for the tariff, or your juggling with the tariff, has operated in two ways—through the Custom House in direct duties, and in another along the lines of protection. In 1924-25 the duties collected on oil clothing coming through the Custom House was $21,432.00, and in 1925-26 it was a similar amount, so that there was no substantial increase in taxation there. On rubber suits in 1924-25 the duties were $2,350.00, and in 1925-26 they were $8,900.00. On dry cell batteries, which are as essential to the fisheries as gasoline, in 1924-25 $5,000.00 was collected, and in 1925-26 it reached $14,186.000. On tobacco we originally had a tariff of 40c., and you raised it to 48c. and 10 per cent.—you collected something like $100,000 in 1924-25, and in 1925-26 it was $144,476.84. On butter and butterine you collected something like $30,000.00 in 1924-25, and in 1925-26 something like $45,000.00. Gasoline was free for the greater portion of the year, for all of 1925-26 and therefore scarcely needs any reference. But just taking the items having nothing to do with local

manufactures but such as are imported, you collected according to these figures in 1924-25, $163,000, and the same returns for the fiscal year 1925-26 show an amount of $235,000, or in other words an increase of $74,-025. Now that is the result, I submit, of the increased tariff on these articles, and they are essential to the prosecution of the fishery, in the ordinary everyday living of the average man who pursues his avocation. I submit that the increase of $75,000 is as a result of the tariff on the articles which I have mentioned. Passing from that, let us consider the increased burden you have imposed by your protective tariff on the fisherman. By it on butter you have increased their burden by as much as $120,000. On tobacco you have increased it by as much as $40,000, and on lines and twines by $60,000—you have a total protection, which the consumer pays for of some $220,000, so that through these items I can easily say that the common people have had to pay through the nose to the tune of $300,-000. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the trouble to go into these figures and have given the matter consideration, and I stand open to correction only by anyone who has given it as much thought as I—in any case the Customs returns must stand. What is there in this Amendment to prevent any member on the other side from lining up with the Opposition? They are not ready to bring in any particular proposition which will lighten these burdens by as much as one ten-cent piece. You are not able to do anything, and if ever it was hopeless it was confirmed by the Prime Minister yesterday afternoon. If they can't do anything of themselves why can't they assist the fishermen through the tariff as we suggest? Support us in this proposition that a substantial reduction ought to be made in connection with the articles outlined in this Amendment. You have not decided to grant a general election in the autumn, but propose to stay in for the constitutional term, which is for 18 months more. If you were going to the country this autumn you might be excused on that score, but if you propose to remain in for another 18 months you have a responsibility to the people for that period. The Amendment points unmistakably in one direction—to make the dollar worth more, and to make the purchasing power of a quintal of fish greater, and there is no more practical way than this to do it. You may ask where you are going to get the money? I believe that if we had a lower tariff we should not to-day be complaining of a shortage in the revenue, or to come in here by and by to legislate to meet the deficit. It is my opinion, and that of thousands who have studied the question, that a moderate tariff will bring more returns than an excessive one. In placing on the excessive tariff your one idea was revenue, and in that idea you have been defeated. I reiterate that the reason you have no greater revenue is because the purchasing power of the people is lessened by as much as four millions in the last two years. On the other hand I believe that if we had a more moderate tariff the people would have expended more money, and you would have been recouped in that direction. In taxing the people of the country as excessively you are more to be blamed than pitied in the deficit you have to face.

We suggest in this Amendment that gasoline as used in motor cars ought to be taxed. I say don't be afraid to do it—you are going to offend twelve hundred people who own motor cars, but you must remember that to accommodate them you have spent something over two millions in two years and it is the only practical way you can square yourselves with the people who have to pay the taxes on the highroads. We imported in this country

last year one and a quarter millions of gas, and I should say that at least a quarter of that was used in cars—that is two hundred and fifty thousand gallons that you can tax. Why not place a tax of 10c. a gallon on that and get a revenue of $26,000 a year? It may be a drop in a bucket, but it can be handed back to the fishermen in a way that will produce practical benefit. In my conviction, Mr. Speaker, our one hope lies in making it easier for the people to live in the country, with the earning power as it is. I say now that the average people are being taxed as much as 70 per cent. Can't we make that less. Won't you consider a proposition to make it less? I look over and see the member for Burgeo & LaPoile, Mr. Chambers, who represents one of our most important fishing districts—he went up there in 1924 and talked bonus and reduction of taxation—he believed and used the Manifesto which has been read, and I feel now that Mr. Chambers is man enough to feel that he has an obligation to his district, and that the people would like to see taxation lessened and that their dollar might have greater purchasing power. If he sees that, and I believe he does, I see no reason why the honourable member cannot support the proposition which we place before the House—he must know that the big interests are being protected and that promises have been flagrantly trampled upon; he must know that the people are worn out by their burdens. If the people were being ground by taxation in 1924 I should like to ask what they are now I say that if they were ground then they are being crushed now—their life is being crushed, their initiative and energy are being crushed, and the average man is asking whether it is worth while for him to stand up and pay his bills and be a decent citizen. It is because of that that I want to cry "Halt" to this thing. We can do a great deal to lessen and eradicate this depression, and that is why I am supporting this Amendment, and because the Speech from the Throne holds out no hope of any such thing in this direction that I counselled with my colleagues and my leader to prepare an amendment to the Address in Reply so that we might not be lacking or remiss in our duties; so that the people might know that someone is giving them some consideration and support. It does not involve politics, but would come as an act of grace and relief if you could see your way clear to support the proposition.

I want to see the burden of taxation lifted from the shoulders of the laboring man and the fisherman. There is no excuse for turning this Amendment down when you are able to come in here and take the taxes off the risk to protect already prosperous industries, and I appeal now to the Members of this Legislature for the reasons that I have now outlined, to give this Amendment their heartiest support.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House yesterday when the Amendment now before the Chair was proposed by Mr. Hickman, and I have not had time to consider its merits or demerits. At the same time, from what I can gather I cannot do anything else but support it, because it happens to be an effort to impress upon the Government the necessity of doing something to protect our main industry, the fishery. It is an effort whereby the cost of producing fish may be lessened, so that the fishermen will get greater encouragement to go to the fishery, and they will be better encouraged to stay home to follow their avocation, rather than leave the country to follow other employments. Whilst I am decidedly not in favor of indiscriminately placing items on the free list, I realize we have to pocket our prejudice sometimes, and if it is necessary that lines and twines should

be put upon the free list to encourage the fisheries, and if it is necessary to lessen the duties on oil-clothes and butterine, by all means let us consider the necessity of so doing in all seriousness. The Speech from the Throne itself conspicuously avoided any reference to fishery regulation or policy at this session of the House, so that this particular Amendment proposed by the Opposition is to my mind very timely and deserving of the most careful consideration from every Member in the House, Government and Opposition, and I hope they will give it their support, being as it is an effort to assist the fishermen of this country.

MR. BROWN—I rise for the purpose of supporting the Amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. I do this in all sincerity and in the interests of the country. Because of the fact that previous to the Monroe Administration coming into power, there was no duty on lines and twines, and after coming back fresh from the poles, and after promising the fishermen that his duty and that of his party would be to give reduction in taxation, he immediately places the duty on a very necessary item, something that the fishermen have to get in order to prosecute the fishery, and to-day the Opposition are asking that members on the Government side of the House will see eye to eye with the Opposition and vote for a reduction in taxation as mentioned in this Amendment, namely, lines and twines.

(Reads)

Now I say sir without fear of successful contradiction that nothing has been done by the present Government for the fisheries. Conditions are worse to-day than ever before. From 1919 until 1924 there was a continual kick against the Squires-Coaker Government and the way they were handling things in connection with the fisheries of this country. I ask sir right here now, is the position of the fisheries any better to-day than in 1919. I say, no, I say it is nineteen times worse. When this vote is taken Mr. Speaker, every man on that side of the House is going to vote against this Amendment, but when they go back to their Districts for re-election they are going to have something else to face. Mr. Speaker, the Bank Tax has been reduced, the income tax taken off the wealthy and in order to compensate for that loss it is placed on the fishermen who are already overburdened with taxation after the Prime Minister and his party coming back from the poles pledged to the people that they would reduce taxation and give the fishermen a chance. Mr. Speaker, both the Prime Minister and his party know that they have deceived the electorate and the fishermen in every way. If the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, and this party would do what is right and what the people expect them to do they would without further delay hand in their resignations to the Administrator and give their place to other men. I don't see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his place this afternoon. When he went to his constituency seeking election in 1924 he was talking about codfish, the reduction of taxation, and a bonus on fish, but if he is here this afternoon he will rise and vote against this Amendment. Pure deceit. If I did that I would expect to be kicked out of this House, not let out. Now sir, the Opposition are trying to influence members on your side of the House to see eye to eye with the Opposition and vote for this Amendment, in order to give the fishermen a chance. Now sir, I ask the hon. members on that side of the House to look into this serious question, and I ask them in the name of the electors in the various districts to do all in their power in the interests of the fishermen and the workingmen of this country. In conclusion I want to say that I am going to vote for this Amendment, and I do

it w.th all sincerity, and I do it in the interests of the suffering fishermen of this country.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the Amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, and in giving my reasons for supporting this Amendment I certainly shall have again to refer to the financial conditions of the country. I think if there is anytime in the history of this country, when we should give serious consideration as a legislature to reduction of taxes, it is at the present time. It is not my purpose at the present time to pursue the argument on the Amendment to any great length. Enough has been said, and the argument put forth so clearly and lucidly that I don't think it is necessary for me to spend much time in bringing forth any further arguments. The object of this legislature should be to pass legislation, and to support legislation which is in the best interests of this country. We are depending largely upon the producers in this country whether fishermen, miners or laborers, and the amendment dealing with this class of people who have to acquire a living by prosecuting the codfishery, and when the conditions in that industry are such that people are disheartened and are leaving their usual avocation, the fisheries, to take up other work either in this country or abroad,; then I think we should do something to try and encourage them. There has been no hope held out in the Speech from the Throne with regard to reducing taxation, and we consider it our duty as a legislature to propose an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, asking this House to consider the wisdom or otherwise of reducing taxation on articles essential to the fishermen of the country.

(Reads)

In connection with the duty on lines and twines, it makes no difference to me that the manufacturers of lines and twines are local people. If that industry pays it's way and it's dividends I don't think that this Legislature should go out of it's way to further protect them. Therefore, from that point of view it is only reasonable that we should consider the lessening of taxation on lines and twines, because local factories can get on without that protection. Oil clothes is an article worn by the fishermen and they cannot prosecute the fishery without it. This is an article on which I think this House should reduce the taxation. They tell me that butterine factories in this City or in this country can operate with profits without any further protection, that being so I am justified in supporting the proposition that butterine could be put on the free list.

I could continue the argument in favor of this amendment, but I quite agree that enough has been said. The members of this House are fully aware of the conditions that obtain in this country and of the necessity of doing something to encourage the fishermen so that they might continue prosecuting the fishery. The slight reduction of taxation asked for may not mean much to them, but still it would show them that they were not forgotten, and it is the duty of every member of this House to vote for this amendment. It would not mean the defeat of the Government. We do not want to defeat the Government. Personally I would not have the Government, if it was offered to me to-day. I would be long sorry to have to take it, although generally speaking I am a Party man. The other part of the amendment deals with increased duty on gasolene used in motor cars to help recoup the loss of revenue. It is a reasonable tax and nobody would find fault with it, except the men who have to pay it. After all, if the Government spent over two million dollars on highroads and the wear and tear on motor cars would be greater, if these roads had

not been built and this money had not been spent. Besides the motor car owners would be only playing the game by paying this tax because it would help to lift the burden from those who catch the fish and who give the wherewithal to those who buy motor cars. With these few observations, Mr. Speaker, I give my hearty support to the amendment now before the House.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Amendment before the Chair. It is a proposal to reduce taxation upon the producers of the codfishery and it is for that reason I give it my unqualified support. We cannot expect the foreign markets to pay more for our codfish than they pay to our competitors unless we can give them a superior article of food. To-day we find that Iceland fish is being accepted in preference to our own Newfoundland-Labrador codfish. In Genoa, Italy, I am told that Newfoundland-Labrador codfish is a bad third and that Iceland fish has taken the first place. Now these are matters that the Government is aware of and they should be doing something in order to encourage our fisheries. Arguing from that premises that we cannot expect the foreign markets to pay more to us for our fish than they pay to other countries, then it is our bounden duty to see that taxation upon the fishermen is brought down to the very lowest minimum in order that the fishermen may be able to produce fish cheaply and also so that he can get a livelihood out of the fishery for himself and his family. I understand that a short time ago the stocks of Labrador fish in the foreign markets were about eight times as great as they were the year previous, and I think that, anyone conversant with the state of trade in Newfoundland to-day, particularly in St. John's, cannot help but acknowledge that things are very dead and very black looking as regards the fishery. The fisheries are practically deserted to-day and we are asking ourselves where we are going to get out skipper-men, the men who will go and captain our vessels and go to the fishery in years to come? Because of excessive taxation and low prices for fish men are leaving the fishery and I am prepared to give my support to the amendment before the Chair in order that some encouragement might be given to the fishermen by reducing taxation on the articles mentioned in this amendment. I understand that when the Tariff Commission's report was tabled and accepted by the House that it might be changed, and probably it would be changed, altered and amended from time to time when it was found out that it bore harshly upon any particular section or class, but up the present time there have been no changes to any great extent. It is not that the extra taxation on lines and twines, tobacco, butterine, etc., would effect me or any member of this House, but it is the fishermen and the man on the street, the producers, that we have to look after. I understand that the French Government pays a bonus to its fishermen on fish, and it is only to be expected therefore that the French fish can be sold more cheaply to-day than our fish. So far as our present prospects for the fishery are concerned, it looks as if the price for shore fish this year will be about $6.00 per quintal and the price for Labrador will be about $4.50. I maintain that Labrador fish cannot be sold for $4.50 per quintal at a profit for the men who catch it. Therefore, it is the duty of every member of this House to see that the articles the fishermen use are reduced so that those engaged in that industry and who are at present working for starvation wages will be able to pay their accounts. We must realise that the cost of catching fish in this country has advanced very materially the past few years and we know that our national debt has increased con-

siderably, and our interest charges are greater; therefore we have to raise more revenue in order that the Government can carry on. The fishermen on the other hand has additional expenses as well. Years ago he used to go fishing with a trap skiff and sails; to-day he has a motor boat, he has an engine and there are other expenses which have helped to bring the cost of catching fish higher than it was prev ously. Now the Labrador fishery is prosecuted to a great extent because we find that fish is more abundant on the Labrador than in other parts of the country; in fact, it is very rare that fish is not found on the Labrador. To-day we find that the fishermen are in such a state that they look upon butterine as a luxury; that they are not able to buy the butter or butterine that they need for their families. I maintain that if the fishermen of the country could earn more money so that they could feed their children better that we would not have to spend so much money on medical attendance for the poor and sick. To my mind the reason we have to do this, is to a great extent that the fishermen's families are undernourished, underfed, because the earning power of the fishermen is so low. How would honorable members in this House feel if they were told that next year they had to live on three hundred dollars for the year; yet two hundred and fifty to three hundred dollars is the average earning power of the fishermen of Newfoundland. The trouble is that the cost of carrying on Government in Newfoundland is too heavy and it reflects upon the fishermen. It is the duty of every member of this House to support any proposal which is brought in here to reduce the taxation upon the fishermen of the country and if honorable members on the opposite side of the House are not prepared to vote for it they should insist upon the Government's bringing in some reduction of the taxation upon the fishermen. A man that only earns two hundred dollars for a year cannot be expected to pay much taxes if he is going to live at all, but the man who makes a big salary is the proper man to pay more taxes and that is how the taxation in the country should be fixed so that the man who earns most should pay most and the man who earns least should pay least. To-day, at this moment, is the proper time for the Government to initiate some reduction in taxation on the fishermen because as honorable members will agree with me the condition of affairs in Newfoundland to-day are deplorable; there is absolutely very little interest being taken in the fisheries and it seems that the best of our young men are leaving the country in order to earn a livelihood elsewhere. I would suggest to the Government that it would instruct the Minister of Finance to remove these duties, with a stroke of his pen, that are mentioned in the amendment. I believe that the Government would gain prestige by doing it even at this late hour because the people of the country expected the Monroe Party when they elected them to do something in order to try and assist the fisheries as Mr. Monroe in his manifesto promised that it would be his greatest concern. As I said before with the high cost of living to-day there is not margin enough between the cost of catching fish and the value the fisherman can get for the fish, to allow that man to live in a decent way. We find to-day that flour costs over $9.00 a barrel and other commodities which the fishermen needs are enhanced in value; and at the present time it is most opportune that the Government should try to stimulate the fisheries by granting the fishermen some relief from taxation. Years ago the fishermen could prosecute the fishery and have a few dollars to boot. The reason was because taxation was low, but to-day they can't make two ends meet unless

an extraordinarily good voyage is made and there is nothing guaranteed as regards the fishery that every man is going to make a good voyage; in fact it is far from that. I don't intend to take up any further time upon the amendment except to try and impress upon the Government the necessity of doing something for the fisheries nd I trust that even at this late hour that you will take our advice and reduce taxation upon these articles mentioned in the amendment.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, in discussing the amendment before the Chair I am sorry that I was not present to hear all that has been said on the different items on which a reduction has been called for. I think the members of the House on both sides are fully aware that there is need for this reduction and if we want to give the hope to the fishermen that they are looking for to prosecute the fisheries as they have in the past that this Legislature has in its power to afford them that encouragement. I presume that now they have their minds made up and that if the salvation of the Government depended upon accepting the amendment that they will vote for the Government and against the fishery. That is about the position as it presents itself to-day. The amendment seeks to have duty reduced on certain articles.

(Reads)

All of these are used by the fisherment to-day. We have talked considerably in the House o n the fisheries since we came in but to the present time there has been no declaration from the Prime Minister or anyone on the Government side of the House that they are prepared to support legislation in this House that will enable the fishermen to get hope and encourage those who want to continue on with the fisheries. The items of lines and twines may seem a small consideration. It is however a big consideration to some 30,000 to 40,000 fishermen employed in that industry to-day. The Scotch say "that every mickle makes a muckle," and the fishermen say the same thing to-day. We have the fishermen going out this year and those that I have been in conversation with do not know what is going to be the outcome. They are going to the fishery with very little heart in them. Now what would be the effect if it was announced in the newspapers to-morrow that the Government had decided in order to help the fisheries that the duties had been removed from lines and twines and had been reduced on tobacco, oil clothing, dry cell batteries and butterine. I want to say that then the Minister of Finance might say that he had at least given a ray of hope to the fishermen of the country and that they will go and prosecute the industry this summer with a good deal more vim than at the present time; and that is what is wanted to-day to give some vim to those engaged in the fishery and give them heart so that they may prosecute it with all the energy in them, in order that they may be able to care for their families, bring wealth to the country and increase the revenue. There is no question whatever that if we had more men prosecuting the fishery this year than many of us know at the present time that it is going to have an effect on the revenue and we will have a little more prosperity than we are experiencing at the present time. Oil clothing is a small article but there are probably twenty or twenty five thousand men buying fifty thousand suits or so of oil clothing in a year and if we can save $10,000 or $15,000 to them in the way of reduction of duty then that would be very encouraging indeed. The next item is tobacco. All those accustomed to the use of tobacco will agree, that once having become accustomed to it that there are very few who can do without it, and I can fully sympathise with the fisherman going out on the water sitting in a

boat all day waiting for the fish to come along which means they wait perhaps for a fortnight or longer before they come in, if he wants something to keep his mind in some sort of a frame that he will be able to stand the strain that waiting causes. If he can take his pipe and sit down to it, there is that for consolation at any rate. There is one thing about it that it helps the mind in such a manner that there is not the same strain as if he didn't have that whiff now and then. I think so in the interests of the fishermen if the Government could reduce the duty four or five cents a pound on tobacco that a well deserved saving of money would be granted the fishermen. A fisherman uses on the average about 15 lbs. of tobacco in the course of the summer and if that was reduced 5 cents he would be saving 75 cents. That may seem a small item to the man whose means are very limited and has very often to come back from the fishery in debt to the merchant or only squaring accounts. Again a reduction of duty a few cents a pound on butterine is quite a considerable item and when we consider to-day that some of the butterine manufacturers are getting big returns from their investment and that it has been proved by investigation that they have cleared not only 10 or 12 per cent. dividends but they are able to put money in reserve as well. It is proper that the Legislature ought to protect at any rate producers to this extent, that they will get a fair share of returns out of these industries. After all the success of all our manufactures depends on the fisheries, and if the fishermen say to their representatives on the Government side "We are prepared to allow reasonable protection for industry," it is very good. They might advise their representatives in the Legislature that they are prepared to protect butter to the extent of 2c. or 3c., and it would only be fair to do so, but when they are getting retruns of 10 per cent. dividends and placing amounts in reserve, they should be willing to forego a portion and let us have something back by way of return for that protection. We would get a fair amount of revenue in that way, and I question whether we should have to make it up by a tax on gasolene. But as things stand I feel that the amendment is a good one, and that we would have to make up for the loss so sustained by a tax on gasolene. With the fishery protected to that extent, the people would be spending more money and so it would be coming back again into the revenue in addition to the increased tax on gas. So I think the proposition contained in the amendment is fair and reasonable, and it ought to appeal to every member who sits on the Government side, and they should be willing to support it. I wonder what the representatives on the other side will be able to say to their constituents if the question is put up to them "What was your attitude to the amendment in the House of Assembly. asking for reduction in taxes on articles in which the fishery is especially concerned?" What answer are you going to give—that you couldn't see your way clear to support it? You will not be able to give a satisfactory explanation, and will stand condemned as unfaithful to the trust imposed in you and to the promises made by you in 1924. It will be natural to expect that your constituents will judge you accordingly, and return the candidate of the party that is willing to support them. Mr. Speaker, I unhesitatingly support the amendment before the House.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting the amendment now before the Chair. The Prime Minister, in his remarks yesterday after the Leader of the Opposition moved this amendment said he supposed it to be only to embarass the Government. Now I should like to

make it clear before I go further I should like to make it clear that my purpose is to endorse what other speakers have said, and it is certainly not to embarrass the Government—rather on the other hand are we offering the Government the opportunity to redeem themselves in some small measure. It would have been a very good thing if the Government had taken the advice offered it by the Opposition from time to time, and on many occasions, but it has been to absolutely no avail; the Government seems to take advantage of its lease of life to absolutely defy public opinion, or the attempts of the Opposition or the public or anyone to deter them from their determination to carry on the same mad waste that has been going on for the past three years. No attempt whatever has been made to play the game or to redeem a solitary one of their promises made to the electorate three years ago.

The Prime Minister need not be surprised at this amendment, for we all know that he was of the same opinion previous to his becoming Prime Minister. He thought that taxes ought to be reduced, and said so—we have his utterances to that effect. On one occasion he went so far as to say that he believed the statement of one gentleman who said he could reduce expenditure by two millions. We are not going so far as that but we do think that this request is reasonable and should be carried out. As I said ,it would be nothing more or less than redeeming in a small measure the promises made to the electorate by this Government when they went to the polls. I agree with my friend, Mr. G. Grimes, that it would indeed be difficult for gentlemen on that side to explain their opposition to this amendment to their constitutents when they go back, if they do go back—I believe some have made up their minds not to go back, but I suppose others will. I do wonder what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is so intensely interested in the fisheries both in a public and a private way, will give as an explanation to the people of Bonavista Bay. But there is only one gentleman on the other side whom I feel will support this measure. I sincerely trust that others will consider this, and do the right thing, but one gentleman has committed himself and can take no other course than to support this amendment. This is practically the same as the one moved last year at the close of the debate on the Address in Reply, and my friend Mr. Duff, who is now sitting on the Government side was occupying a seat on this side, and I remember that he developed considerable eloquence and said that it was his duty to the people to support it, and that the tariff was discriminatory to the masses. I want to ask Mr. Duff if any change has taken place in the tariff since last year, and if the same reason does not prevail for making the taxes more equitable ,to use his own words, to the masses? I confidently look forward to Mr. Duff taking the floor when I have sat down and taking the same stand as he did last year. We will pat him on the back, and his constituents can say that he is in earnest in one thing at least. I am sure the Prime Minister and the Government are concerned as to public affairs, for what man in public life is not ,as to existing conditions. Newfoundland is becoming nothing more than a producing ground for the New England States; we raise up young men and women, and when they are old enough to start to make a living they have to go to Canada and principally to the New England States, and enrich that already very rich State. Surely we need these young people, and what is done to retain them? What is done to stem the tide of emigration going on increasingly? This year not one steamer has left

here but has carried away from twenty to a hundred young men and women. After all, they are the life blood of the country, and if we are not concerned about this we are not fit to occupy seats in this House. Now you might say that taking our suggestion wouldn't take us far, but at least it would be a step in the right direction, and it would show that we have the interests of the people at heart. No one expects you to do a great deal at the present time, but they do expect a certain amount of sincerity, but you have shown none. Everyone, no matter in what industry or avocation in this country is interested in the fishery—we talk of the fisheries ,and when the opportunity comes to do something we turn it down. The Government will probably say that this comes from the Opposition, therefore we must vote against it, but that is the wrong way of looking at things. The amendment also asks that a tax be placed on gasolene for motor cars; that brings me to another matter which is of a kindred nature, and which I shall refer to with your permission.

Now I think it is a fair and equitable suggestion that the duty should be imposed upon gasolene for motor cars, and when I am saying this I would be saying it to my own detriment if I was looking at this matter from a personal standpoint, as I happen to be one of those people who own motor cars. However, it is a necessity with me more than anything else. Now when this administration came into power, the tax on motor cars was a dollar fifty per horse power ,but under the high roads act this was reduced to one dollar per horse power. Now I don't think that I would be very far out if I said that at least $50,000 has been given by the present Government to the owners of motor cars in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate that the Government have been faithless in regard to their promises. They have promised a reduction in taxation and we are merely asking them to live up to their promises. And the Prime Minister has the opportunity if he will only avail of it this afternoon. And the other gentlemen on that side of the House if they have any regard for their constituencies, and for the people toiling for a living they can do nothing but support the amendment now before the Chair. After all the policy of the present Government must be very unsound. Only last year the Dominion of Canada reduced taxation upon certain commodities, with the result that Canada had a greater revenue than the previous year, and it was attributed to the fact that they had more dutiable goods purchased than under the old tariff. The people were better off. And very much the same thing should apply here. But the people to-day are so poor in this city especially and throughout the country that they cannot buy butter to consume. And we would be conferring a favour upon the people of this country if we placed the duty back where it formerly was. Now as regards lines and twines the Prime Minister took exception to the statement made by a member on this side of the House that the placing of a tax on lines and twines may be regarded as an attempt to foster the enterprises that the Prime Minister himself was interested in. Nobody can blame the people for saying such a thing. That is the construction that the public and the fishermen placed on his action. I would like to say again that my intention in getting on my feet this afternoon was not to hold up this House or to embarass the Government in any way, but simply to make a request to the Prime Minister that he will accept the advice of the opposition as contained in that amendment and reduce the duty upon that article or if he cannot do that, that he will do something that

will be equivalent. But at least I hope that he and his Government will give some consideration to it and not turn it down simply because it was moved by the Opposition. It is the duty of the opposition to assist the Government and make suggestions to the Government. And if the Government without taking our advice as it has done in the past then of course it is your own funeral.

I would again emphasise the fact that I think that it is a very reasonable suggestion that is made in this amendment, when you are asked to impose a tax upon gasolene for motor cars. You have to recoup the loss to the revenue occasioned by placing other articles on the free list. Because these people have been benefited in various ways, and it is not hard for anyone to realise how different is the position of a man who drives a motor car from those who go down to the sea in ships, who take their lives in their hands and find it hard to make two ends meet. It is impossible for them to run a motor car.

Why not take a chance? You will have the satisfaction of having done your duty and in some small way; having redeemed the promises made in 1924. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment before the Chair proposed by the Honorable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BRADLEY—It is not my intention to unduly delay the House this afternoon nor in any way to obstruct business although reflections of that kind have been made against me from the other side during the past week or so. In fact when I did come here it was not with the intention of speaking at all, but on second thoughts I felt that as a representative of a district largely engaged in the fisheries, that is, largely engaged in that industry which is languishing so sadly to-day, I would not have fulfilled my duty to my constituents and the people of the Colony at large were I to fail to express my views upon this most important subject. The amendment itself refers to a number of innocent looking articles and on the face of it, perhaps, one might not be inclined to attach much importance to an attempt to make a reduction upon the tariff now imposed upon these articles, but when one views the various things which are mentioned therein and observes that they include almost wholly, if not entirely, articles which are used in and are essential to the fisheries of this Colony, they assume entirely different proportions. Were conditions normal, were the fisheries of this Colony reasonably profitable to the fishermen to-day, it might perhaps be regarded by some as unreasonable in some respects that any attempt be made to deprive the Government of any revenue from tariff imposed upon these articles, but when one considers that the industry, which absolutely requires every single item mentioned in that amendment, is at present entirely unremunerative to the fishermen, the matter assumes an entirely different complexion. I say, Sir, and I say without fear of contradiction, that so far as concerns the Labrador fishery to-day, upon the whole it is entirely unremunerative to the fishermen who prosecute it, because if there should, by some strange chance, happen to be a fisherman here and there who makes a profit, that profit is more than offset by the losses of the great majority. So, Sir, I am critically correct when I say that the Labrador fishery is entirely unremunerative to the fishermen of the Colony to-day. I suppose that if that fishery and the other codfisheries of this Colony formed an infinitesmal proportion of our revenue producing industries, we might dismiss it without further comment, but when one realizes that despite what may be said to the contrary, despite the fact that the gross revenues of the paper mills of this Colony to-day

pretty nearly equal the gross receipts from the codfishery, nevertheless the producing industry, from the standpoint of the people, is the fishery, and that 75 per cent. of the wealth, which the people of the country earn each year, is acquired from the fisheries, the matter, I say, assumes an extremely grave and important aspect. This industry upon which, in the main, the Colony depends for its prosperity—perhaps I had better say has depended for its prosperity in the past because to speak of depending on it to-day under existing conditions is an absurdity—this industry, which is the one which should receive the gravest, the most careful, the most sympathetic consideration of the members of this House. I have not heard a single word of sympathy for the fishermen in their present position save and except from this side of the House. Some gentlemen look at me when I make that statement. Sir, sympathy is judged by its sincerity, and those who look at me now will be given an opportunity to show their sincerity in a few moments. What is to become of this Colony I ask this in all seriousness. What is to become of this Colony? If the fisheries cannot be extricated from the veritable slough of despond in which they now languish—if in the near future, it is not possible to render those fisheries remunerative to those engaged in them. What is going to become of this Colony? Does the Government suggest that the Labrador, recently acquired, can be sold and we can all retire from business? One hears much talk nowadays particularly from supporters of the Government that this Labrador is to be a panacea for all our ills; it is to save us. Sir, nothing can save this colony except its fisheries, is what I reply to that chatter; and if they are destroyed Newfoundland must go down to destruction also. One would imagine with these facts in view ,and I think they are wholly undeniable, that some little interest would be be shown by the Monroe Administration which claimed to have the interests of the people at heart, that some attempt would be made to ameliorate present conditions, some attempt to give some encouragement to prosecute those fisheries; but, Sir, since the 11th day of May no encouragement of any kind whatever has been shown to the people of this colony by the Prime Minister or his associates. So singular an instance of incapacity to deal with conditions has never been known in this country since we had Responsible Government. That incapacity is so plain, so clear, so blatant so aggressive, that it is almost inconceivable that reasonable men should adopt the attitude adopted by the Government during the past few years. Our fisheries are unremunerative and will continue to be unremunerative until the Government takes this matter in hand. It is useless to expect that Water Street or the merchant classes are going to do anything. The industry is dying to-day, and the country in the clutches of a rapacious Government with a discontented people and a beggared exchequer. That is the situation according to the Prime Minister's own admission. His administration for the past ten or eleven months is an insolvent concern; unable to pay expenses. Everybody knows there is justification for that statement. Everybody knows that the situation of the fishermen to-day is one that hold out no hope whatever for the future. Nearly twelve months ago two young men from my district came to my office ,and I am going to relate to this House now a story which I regret very much to have to tell. These young men, somewhere in the neighbourhood of eighteen years of age, came in with a view to getting my advice as to what they should do in connection with their own futures. They pointed out to me their

position in connection with the fisheries and the conditions under which their forefathers had lived years ago. The difference was almost criminal in its character in view of the causes for the change. They asked me what they should do. They pointed out that it was impossible to make a living at the fisheries as their fathers had done. They were fairly well educated young men and they produced figures to me showing that it was impossible to make a living by going to the fisheries and that they could not consider it. I inquired whether there was any other occupation which they knew of on which they might find employment here. They replied that they knew of nothing that they could do except to go to work on the highroads. How long will that last? I inquired. They were intelligent young men and they replied that they didn't want work on the highroads as that was Government work, and that they wanted to earn their living. I replied I have only one word of advice to offer, "Get out of this country as quickly as you can to places where there are opportunities for industry." Surely it was a hard thing to say about my own country, but it was truth and I had to advise these men in their interests when they came to me. That I fear is the situation which faces the average fisherman to-day; if he wants to earn a livelihood he has got to quit fishing. And now this amendment is introduced by the Honorable Leader of the Opposition with a view, in so far as it lies in our power, to, in some way, ameliorate present conditions and if possible render the fisheries reasonably remunerative if any efforts of ours in that behalf can make them so.

The hour is 6.30 and I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion the Debate was adjourned until to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 8th, 1927.

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

Mr. K. M. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon I was dealing for a few moments with the present situation in connection with the staple industry of this Country—the fisheries, and as far as I was able I directed the attention of the House to the conditions which exist among the fishermen to-day, and the prices they obtain for the product they catch, in comparison with the cost of producing the same. I think that all Honourable Members will admit that under existing conditions it is entirely impossible for a fisherman to continue his avocation with a reasonable hope of earning an existence thereat. I pointed out that despite the fact that the gross earnings of certain other industries compare very favourably with the fisheries, nevertheless the actual wealth brought into the Colony and available for the purposes of the people and for the revenue is produced mainly by that fishing industry, and that in view of these two facts, first, that the fishery is the main wealth-producing industry of the country and record that these fisheries are at the present time unremunerative, it is the duty of the Government and of this House to immediately take whatever steps are in their power to render it at least as remunerative as possible. Or we pro-

pose to stick more closely to the facts —to reduce the fishermen's losses in that industry. It must be clear to all that the diminuation of our people's ability to earn, reflects into the affairs of government, and renders the Government less able to pay its bills, of one of which the Prime Minister gave notice of a couple of days ago, when he informed us that a demand for $276,000 was being made for interest on the bonds in connection with the Humber industry operated by the Nfld. Power and Paper Co., who claim they are unable to meet it. The situation therefore is that while the earning power of the people is decreasing, the expenses of the Government are increasing. Is that sort of thing to be permitted to continue, and are we to make no effort to render that industry on which we depend for practically the whole of our revenue more remunerative? Then it is indeed confusion worse confounded— the industry will be destroyed, and the whole country go down in the holocaust. I say that it is vitally imperative that the Government take whatever steps are in its power to make it possible for the fisherman to get some returns from that industry, and the amendment which has been introduced is directed towards that end. I have not got a copy of it with me at the present time, but from memory I think its proposals are that the duty should be removed from lines and twines, butterine, tobacco, rubber boots ,oil suits and rubber suits, dry cell batteries, and possibly one or two other things which I can't remember at present ,and in place of these a duty should be imposed on gasolene used in motor cars. I propose to deal as shortly as possible with one or two of the things mentioned, and first of all with lines and twines. In view of the fact that there is a two million dollar shortage or thereabouts in the revenue to-day, it might be argued plausibly enough that the government is not in a position to reduce taxation of any kind whatever until the revenue at least equals the expenditure. I don't propose to deal with the problem of expenditure this afternoon—it is too large a subject ,and one with which the Government has failed to even attempt to deal in the past three years. It is not my duty to begin it at the present time or in the present connection, but I am going to deal with a reduction in the tariff on lines and twines from the standpoint of the revenue received from that commodity to-day. I say that we receive practically no revenue from it, because there is very little of it imported. If I were to say that we get $5,000.00 annually it would be the outside of our revenue from lines and twines, used by fishermen. In other words, the removal of this 15 per cent. tariff on lines and twines will cost the Colony not more than $5,000.00 per annum. To the ordinary man, and I claim to be no more than an ordinary man, this does not seem to be such an excessive loss as would warrant the Government in seriously considering refusing to grant this concession if there is a reasonable possibility that the staple industry of the country might profit thereby.

Some two weeks ago information was obtained from one of the largest producers of lines and twines in the United States which showed that the actual cost of landing foreign lines and twines in this country is just a little bit over what has to be paid to the Colonial Cordage Company to-day. It has been pointed out here and uncontradicted that the Colonial Cordage Company is a wealthy corporation whose stock has been watered two or three times and whose dividends are abnormally large ones. The question we have to decide therefore is whether we prefer to continue providing large dividends for the Colonial Cordage Company at the expense of the fisheries or not. It is not whether we

are going to lose revenue or not, because no revenue will be lost thereby. Is it the intention of this House to, in effect, say to the fishermen of this colony: "No, we will not remove this tariff, not that we will lose any revenue thereby but because the Colonial Cordage Company will lose some profit ,and that profit you must provide whether you like it or not, whether you can pay it and live, or not." It does appear to me when that question is asked ,that the Members of this House are not representatives of the Colonial Cordage Company but of the people of the Colony, and it is to the interests of the people of the colony that the Members of this House should have regard and not the interests of wealthy corporations whose only interest is to make profits at whose expense they can. So with regard to lines and twines I think it is plain that so far as the Government is concerned, as far as the Colony is concerned, no objection whatever can be raised to the removal of that tax, and it is unquestionable that the benefit to the fishermen will be considerable. The fisheries cannot be prosecuted without lines and twines, and if they can be obtained 15 per cent. less than they are to-day, then it will undoubtedly benefit our people and our country, and even the revenue of the colony, for after all the Government's ability to collect revenue depends entirely on the ability of the people to pay. Clearly then there can be no objection to the removal of this tax; no objection from the standpoint of the Government; none from the standpoint of the people; none from the standpoint of anybody except the Coolnial Cordage Company. On the other hand it would clearly be a great benefit to the people of the country and indirectly to the country itself and the Government as well.

I think it will be admitted that butterine is an essential supply for the fisheries. Of course I suppose it is true that the fishermen can exist on herring and potatoes, but after all they are human beings and they are entitled to some reasonable human food particularly when we consider the strenuous nature of their occupation. It is well known that the people of the country consume large quantities of butterine. I don't think very much butterine is imported into this country. I do think I would be correct in saying that the loss to the revenue by reducing the tax on butterine to-day would not be worth talking about. I will give the liberal allowance ,if you will, of $10,000 annually and that far exceeds what the loss can possibly be. That additional two cents per pound was put on butterine not to benefit the revenue of this Colony nor the people of this Colony, but to the advantage of other corporations who wanted large dividends; and it is a notorious fact that that increase was placed on butterine shortly after a new butterine factory was started in this town which was owned principally by a Minister of the Crown. No loss to the revenue of any moment will possibly occur by the reduction of that tax to its former dimensions, but the advantage to the fishermen will be great. It will lessen the cost of catching fish and will thereby make profits greater. From the standpoint therefore of representatives of the people and of the working classes of the colony, it is clearly beyond all doubt that this tax should be removed or at least lessened. The same argument applies to tobacco. I have yet to learn what particular advantage to the people of this colony accrued from the increase in the tax upon tobacco. The only person or corporation that I know obtained any profit from it was the Imperial Tobacco Factory, which if my information is correct is far from poverty stricken. I suppose that strictly speaking tobacco is not an essential to the fisheries. The fisher-

men could do without tobacco I will admit. We could all do without tobacco and could do without a number of other things which in fact we habitually use, but it is nevertheless the fact that the use of tobacco has become so common that it is practically an essential to-day; and it is just as essential to the fishermen as to any other classes in this country. If then we can reduce this tax upon the fishermen without loss to the Colony that in itself is reason enough to reduce it. As to the amount of revenue the Government derives from the tax on rubber suits and boots I am not prepared to speak, but I do believe that some reduction in connection with these articles is feasible and would be beneficial. The same thing applies to oil clothes. All sound arguments that can be adduced must tend to the conclusion that in view of conditions it is the bounden duty of Members of this House if they have at heart the interests of the people they represent to vote for the amendment this afternoon. The position is that purely for the benefit of wealthy corporations these taxes have been placed on an unremunerative industry. It forcibly reminds us of the words of the Scripture, "To him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken even that which he hath." We have reached a point where something must be done. If the fisheries turn out as last year then it is just as well for Newfoundland to admit that it can no longer carry on. If we can do nothing but allow the fisheries to be continued under conditions that render them wholly unremunerative, then it is useless to continue further. Members of this House have the opportunity this afternoon to show the people whether they intend to legislate for the benefit of wealthy corporations at the expense of the fishermen or not; whether they intend to continue to permit the Colonial Cordage Company and the Imperial Tobacco Company and the Butterine Companies to make large profits at the expense of unfortunate fishermen or not. That is the position and I say to them this afternoon "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." Will you serve corporations greedy for profits with no regard for anything except the accumulating of profits in their own pockets ,or will you do something in the interests of the Colony that will not detrimentally affect your revenue. I appeal to this House this afternoon on behalf of the fishermen I represent, hundreds of whom have asked me in my office to stand by them this afternoon and not the corporations which have been bleeding them the past three years. The issue is in the hands of Members this afternoon, whether they shall regard as serious their duties to those people who sent them here, whether it is their intention to honestly abide by the mandate they received from the people three years ago, or whether, on the other hand, they intend to throw these people to the wolves and support those corporations which have been partly instrumental in impoverishing them. That is the question which honourable Members on both sides of the House have to ask themselves this afternoon.

The abolition of the duty on lines and twines will not affect the revenue of the colony. Nor will the abolition of the duty on butterine affect the revenue of the colony. Nor will the removal of the duty on tobacco affect the revenue of the colony. A reduction of the taxes upon those other articles in that amendment will not seriously affect that revenue. On the other hand there is a suggestion there whereby the small loss that would be incurred can in part be made by the placing of a tax on gasolene used in motor-cars. I don't think that tax would be harsh upon anyone not well able to pay it, because after all, any man who owns a motor-car and is not prepared to pay a tax on gasolene is

in possession of a luxury which his finances do not warrant his having, and the quicker he gets rid of it the better for himself and all concerned. That tax would at least in part reimburse the Government for any small loss suffered through the reduction of the taxes on articles enumerated in that amendment. That is the situation; no loss can occur and a great advantage can be given by the reductions asked for; and how then can any Member of this Assembly honestly refuse to vote for it. Sir, it is possible that they may, then if they do they have my sympathy when they go back to the electors. No, I withdraw that statement, because under such circumstances they would be entitled to sympathy from no one, and I am quite certain they will not get it from their constituents. I am quite certain that the Members believe that these taxes should be reduced and believe that it would be beneficial to the people. They have to choose which of two masters they will serve, the wealthy corporations or the people of Newfoundland.

A couple of afternoons ago the Prime Minister took occasion to refer to me and to my conscience. Sir, I can stand here this afternoon in the presence of all men and announce that my conscience is clear so far as any action I have taken during the past three years is concerned, and I am prepared to go back to my constituents and face them with what I have done. I trust that after the vote has been taken upon this amendment that the Prime Minister's conscience will be as clear with regard to it as mine with regard to my conduct to date, and the attitude I take on this subject this afternoon.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the amendment before the chair, I do so with a great deal of pleasure, because it brings me back to the day when you and I, sir, under the Monroe manifesto went to the country with a policy of reduction in taxation. At our first party meeting Mr. Speaker, I tried to have a part of that policy carried out, and you are well aware ,sir, what happened. I was voted down. Neither my colleague nor myself went to the District of Ferryland to tell the people that we were going to put extra taxation on lines and twines, tobacco and butterine. Neither did we go into the District to tell the people there that if we were elected, that because the Prime Minister, the Leader of our Party, was interested in corporations that had to do with tobacco and lines and twines in this country, that we were to see that these corporations were to be protected more. Neither did we tell them that if we were elected that their butterine was to be dearer because the Minister of Finance intended to build a butterine factory and he had to be protected also. We went to the country, you, sir, to St. John's East, and I to Ferryland, and we promised the people a reduction in taxation, but I didn't think that from this side of the House I would be advocating that, from this side of the House, over amongst my friends here, who too, are the friends of the fishermen.

For these reasons, then, and without delaying the House any longer, I propose to vote for the amendment that has been brought forward by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to say anything at all on the question of the amendment ,but I think it might seem almost discourteous to our good friends opposite if a word or two was not said. It might be thought by some that we didn't quite appreciate their position. There is an old expression that says that "things are not always as they appear." For that reason I would like to say shortly, as one listening to the debate on the amendment, that I quite appreciate

the atti'ude honourable members opposite have taken. Commencing with the Address in Reply, that was spoken to and very fairly spoken to by members opposite. This having been spoken to in the spirit of giving a general criticism of the proceedings and policy of the Government, largely for the purpose of conveying the viewpoint of the Opposit on on all these matters, then it is the customary and usual thing for an amendment to be put to the Address in Reply. To all that of course we take no objection. No objection to that would be taken by any Member on this side of the House. The debate has been very fairly conducted; a certain amount of thought has been contributed that was worth while listening to and a good deal of matter of inconsequence has also been given voice to. We have arrived at the second act. That brings me to the point I want to make. It is thoroughly appreciated that just as in theatrical work a man has to play the roll that he is cast for. Sometimes a man is cast for comedy and sometimes for a heavier roll. I am induced to make these remarks by the attitude taken in regard to this amendment. So far as the terms of the amendment proposed by the honorable Leader of the Opposition are concerned the only objection I possibly could have would be that it doesn't go half far enough. Its contents is as follows:

(Reads)

No person can possibly take any objection to that desire. Not a man on either side of the House could. The only thing that certainly could be said is that it is hard to understand why a regret is not expressed that there will not be a reduction not only on lines and twines and tobacco, but a general reduction on everything; in fact a regret that there is no indication in the Speech from the Throne that the whole tariff should be free and that nothing whatever should have a duty imposed on it. And with all respect to the fisherman who is dragged across the floors of the House until the poor man must be worn out, what about other classes? What about a reduction on clothing for laborers? What about the mechanic and all the other laboring classes that have to pay taxes. As a matter of fact I say quite fairly and seriously as far as all that is concerned that the Opposition must not think we are going to take exception to that, but I want to say also that that is alright for them so far as "getting a thing on record" is concerned, as the Americans say. They want to go on record as taking a stand, and honorable members opposite I think will be fair enough to admit that they have repeatedly drawn attention to the fact of the view that was going to be taken by people outside, when we had voted on the question. They have almost wept and deplored the fate that was going to overtake us if we voted against the amendment. Mr. Grimes, a very serious minded man, wanted to know very earnestly how was any man going to go out and face the fishermen again if he voted against this amendment; he was really disturbed, and so because in his interest in us and in me in that way I want to say a few words just now in return. In the first place this is not at all the place where an expression of opinion profits in any way whatever. The amendment is just surplusage; it has nothing to do with the case. It has nothing to do with the Address in Reply. It is a thing thrown in as it were to make weight. In actual fact honorable members on the other side will agree that the time for the consideration seriously and properly of anything pertaining to matters of duties is when we are dealing with the triff; when the Budget is brought in. That is the time when it would be proper to submit resolutoins of this character. Submitted now, they

are merely an expression of opinion as to ideas we might have. We might all have these ideas and still find ourselves in the situation as any Member must reasonably expect, that this is not the time when we can make an announcement as to where we stand and what we hope to do with the tariff. This is no occasion, particularly in the light of events of the last few days in which overnight one might say we have had changed responsibilities, for the Government to say off hand that by the stroke of a pen it can wipe off this tax or that. This thing reads very well and sounds very well, but so far as that amendment was intended when brought down to be an actual request - a decisio nof the Legislature I am quite satisfied to state that Honourable Members know that it has no such position to-day.

Twelve months ago the following Resolutions were moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, as an amendment to the Address in Reply:

(Reads Amendment)

Now let ue before we vote, as the honourable member has just suggested, seriously consider where we are.

MR. CASHIN—Would the Minister read the names of those who voted for that Amendment?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — The Hon. Member for Ferryland is interested to know who voted for that amendment and I thank him for anticipating my intention. That was an amendment that did go further than the present one, because besides our good old friends "butterine," tobacto" and "lines and twines," we had "clothing" in the class as well. We have not been asked to reduce the ta iff on the clothing this time, because it is evidently not regarded as seriously by the Opposition as the other articles mentioned. But we are further asked this time that the Income Tax and Bank Tax be reimposed so that wealthy corporations and wealthy persons should contribute their proportionate share to the common burden. Those who voted for the amendment last year were as follows: Mr. Hickman, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Hibbs, M . Grimes, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Brown, Mr. Randell, Mr. Duff, Mr. Godden, Mr. Ashbourne, Mr. Cashin and Mr. Warren. Now that you have had your little laugh, please do not grudge us our two laughs. Those who voted against that amendment last year were: The Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Cramm, Mr. Moore, Mr. Long, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Bradley, Mr. Woodford, M. Walsh, Mr. Lake, Mr. Russell, Mr. Cahill Mr. Puddester, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Power, Mr. Browne and Mr. Linegar, and so the amendment passed in the negative. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that we on this side of the House desire to assure our good friends opposite we are deeply mindful of the spirit in which this amendment is moved and I think that, in the light of the proceedings I have referred to, I may be permitted to say that we cannot be expected to be too quickly converted to certain of the views laid down here this afternoon; but I do think that our honourable friends who have went over the disaster that is going to overcome any person who votes against this amendment to-day can blame us for saying that if we had taken a lesson by the voting of twelve months ago we should have no cause for complaint of to-day's proceedings. It gives me great consolation to note the way a certain Opposition member discussed the amendment and I take him as an example that the country generally will interpret his voting last year against the amendment. But what is the effect of the present amendment? It is not of any consequence, it is not seriously meant nor has any member of the Opposition meant any more than to wish that he would like conditions

in the country to be such that there should be a reduction in taxation. That is a thing in which every person of the community is interested in and that is a princple which does not require an elaboration; but when one is seriously asked why this should not be announced in the Speech from the Throne the reply is—and the only reply to honourable members opposite—that this is not the time nor the place to discuss the matter. It would be flippant for members to talk about local industries and the protection of members who are interested in local manufacturies, as it would be equally flippant and unfair for me to suggest that members were voting for this protection because they were handling the commodities they were voting for. I do not think that is the spirit in which we ought to view it. Personally in voting against this amendment I do it because it means nothing. it does not affect the position, nor is it intended to have more effect than to put on record for popular consumption by the electorate an expression of opinion relative to the Address in Reply, and, I am sure, it will not be accepted.

The amendment being then put, the House divided, and there appeared in favor of the amendment:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Bradley,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Cashin,
Mr. Brophy,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Scammell (12)

and against it:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. Minister of Finance,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Duff,
Minister of Agriculture and Mines,
Minister of Public Works,
Minister of Posts & Telegraphs,
Minister of Marine & Fisheries,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. W. J. Browne (17)

Whereupon, on the original motion for the adoption of the Report, the House divided, when there appeared in its favor:

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. Minister of Justice,
Hon. Colonial Secretary,
Hon. Minister of Finance,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Duff,
Minister of Agriculture and Mines,
Minister of Public Works,
Minister of Posts & Telegraphs,
Minister of Marine & Fisheries,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Cahill,
Mr. Linegar,
Mr. Sinnott,
Mr. Power,
Mr. W. J. Browne (17)

and against it:

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Halfyard,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Grimes,
Mr. Bradley,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Cashin,
Mr. Brophy,
Mr. Ashbourne,
Mr. Godden,
Mr. Brown,
Mr. Scammell (12)

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion it was ordered that the Address in Reply be presented to His Excellency the Administrator at such

time as might be convenient to His xcellency.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Bill for the ratification of a Contract for the St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Chairman, in explaining these Resolutions I may say that this is a service that has been renewed to the same Contractor and at the same price. His contract exp.red, and I made a very big effort to see if this service could not be done without or if it could not be done without, if it could be substituted by somewhat cheaper serv ce. After a great deal of enquiry, and after even going into a possibility of being able to place one of our Government steamers on the work we found that the most economical proposition, and the most necessary one was a continuation of the same boat under the management of Mr. Butler. The various clauses of the Resolut.on pretty well explain themselves, and, as they are read as we go through, if there is anything that appears questionable we shall be only too glad to answer or make explanation in connection therewith, but practically speaking the service is the same, except that this contract is for seven years instead of ten years as before. We tried to get a five years' period for the contract, but Mr. Butler said that, as his boat needed considerable repairs within the next year involving an expenditure of a large amount of money, he would not be satsfied with less than a ten year contract; we eventually got him satisfied with a seven year contract. The rates regarding freight are the same now as they were in a former Bill after amended rates were allowed by a former Government. In other respects the service is exactly the same as before. No tenders were called for the contract, as Mr. Butler had given every satisfaction before, no other people were anxious to have t.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Cair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had passed the same with amendment.

On motion this Report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be now read a first time.

Whereupon the B ll was read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Second reading of a bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of lands and rights in Labrador."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker, the bill which has been distributed some time ago, and of wh.ch all members have a copy, is a short bill, and almost self explanatory. The first clause of course simply prevents the issuing of licenses. Some members must have read wrong the second clause, as I think one member said that he was not going to vote for that particular clause. I think that it must have been misinterpreted. Because .f you read it carefully it only refers to the issuing licenses.

(Reads)

The point is of course that we cannot take away any privileges or rights that anybody had before this bill came into force, and if they had lived up to the agreement and have paid license up to date, and established a right they must be continued in that right. In sectoin 3 (a) there is a provision limiting the amount of grants for agricultural purposes to be taken out by any one person to fifty acres, and provides that it must be taken within three miles of the sea. The idea is that we don't want anybody going in, to presumably establish agri-

cultural farms, and possible interfer with water power rights for other industries in the interior.

Then again in clause 3 (b) we claim that all mineral rights shall not be included in this Bill, and so anybody can take out a license to search for minerals if he so desires.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Members speak I might anticipate some of the requests for information on this particular subject. It is rather important that the matter should be clearly understood. The object of the bill is apparent on the face of it. It is to insure that the issuing of licenses of rights on the Labrador in the sense of timber lands, water power, etc., can be done only through this legislature. But section 2 goes to the extent of providing that:

(Reads)

I would like to say in connection with that, that as a matter of fact one of the parties referred to who has paid a considerable amount in the way of rental, and whose license was cancelled for non-payment of rent has given notice of an action which he is going to take up against the Government for this cancellation, on the grounds that the Government had no authority to cancel that grant. Now it would be very improper to do more than say that he has raised possibilities that depend upon the outcome of that case. You will probably have quite a number of claims, by those whose licenses have been cancelled, or parties who believe that they have been promised concessions, take place. The position put in as plain words as one could put it, in addressing an assembly such as this, is, that the Crown is not bound to do more than give the parties the title and those who receive that title have got to accept it as it is. Accordingly a request was made some months ago by people who claimed that the reason for their non-payment of the rental was that the Government would not undertake to indemnify them in case the boundary dispute went against the country. The answer of the Government was that it was their own affair, and that we were under no obligation to make any such guarantee. They didn't pay their rentals and in fairness to the people who were doing so regularly, and after proper notice these licenses were cancelled. What I want to draw the attention of the House to is that if there are persons who have established rights, this Act cannot interfere with them. Quite a number of people are contending that they were promised concessions on the Labrador, and how far they are justified is a question of law. We are not just protecting established rights, but it clearly puts the position that no enactment of the legislature can effect valid claims that any persons may have. The result of this power of the Crown is a very intricate question of law and is going to be a matter of grave concern.

MR. MOOR—Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines whether at the time when there were any outstanding bills unpaid and two or three days after these people rushed in and paid up when they found the Labrador was going to Newfoundland?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—There has certainly been no money received and paid up since the licenses were cancelled. Any property that owed a dollar was cancelled on June 20th, 1925, consequently there were no arrears to pay up.

MR. MOORE—I think the Hon. Member for the information.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, the first paragraph of this Bill refers to the part of Labrador belonging to Newfoundland—what is the reason this Act doesn't affect the whole of Newfoundland as well? Why not have applications for any part of Newfound-

land as well as Labrador to come before this House? We were told by the Prime Minister that no licenses were to be issued to anyone—that all the timber limits on the Labrador were to be sold for the benefit of the Coliny, and we find that two licenses have been issued in Newfoundland within the past year or two.

The second paragraph is not explanatory enough for us to vote upon if a man's title is valid, it is valid, and if invalid it s nvald, and that s the end of it, and I can't see what profit there is in putting this in. If any claims or licenses are cancelled why not cancel all, and let someone bring an action and make a test case. What is the good of the Labrador to us—I have a list from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines showing over twelve thousand square miles disposed of on the Labrador, and what is there left of value to dispose of after these are all taken out? In timber licenses issued by the Government, a copy of which I have here, it distinctly states that the license is issued on express conditions.

(Reads)

If the matter of paying rentals is, as stated by the Minister of Justice, a matter for those who hold them. then also the carrying out of their agreement with the government is a matter of their own affairs, and the proper thing for the Government to do is to cancel all licenses and let somebody bring a test action to recover his limits and see what happens. If we win, then we win something worth while. If all these limits are to be disposed of, principally by speculators then we can't hope to get anything out of the Labrador. And the same thing applies to water powers. Without a better explanation of Clause 2 I propose to oppose it as hard as I can; I think it is a wrong section and is there to protect some people who have property on the Labrador, and nothing else.

MR. BRADLEY–Mr. Speaker, I have to support the principle of the Bill; as a matter of fact it is in line with the attitude which I took throughout the two years during which I was a member of the present administration. I protested strongly against the manner in which timber limits were allowed to be manipulated for the benefit of speculators, and I am glad to stand here and support a bill which has (on its face at least) for it object the prevention of that evil. I must however agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he suggests that timber limits in Newfoundland also ought to be included—assuming that there is a few left, which I very much doubt. At the same time I am not quite satisfied with certain provisions in Section 2 which are intended to save the rights of those holding vested interests on the Labador. I very much doubt if there have been 20 licenses issued to cut timber since the Crown Lands Act of 24 years ago, the conditions of which have been carried out. For that the present administration is in no way to blame—it has been caused by the failure of previous administrations to administer the law for reasons which Ido not propose to occupy the time of the House in discussing. But the fact remains that there are licenses to-day,—and some of them on the Labrador,—which have been held for years by the mere payment of the rentals, some of these payments made when far in arrears, and without any attempt to carry out the terms of the license other than by these mere payments in a desultory fashion. Mention has been made in excuse for those holding limits on the Labrador that because of the dispute they were prevented from carrying out these provisions—if they couldn't do so they had no business to take the licenses. The Colony gave no guarantee of title — theytook them knowing full well of the dispute, and if they took

a title that they knew might be unsound, they entered into a contract, and in spite of the possible unsoundness of title, they ought to carry out their oblgiations or the Government should cancel their rights. If I accept a contract with another with a knowledge that the rights he proposes to give me may be beyond his power to bestow, then I accept that contract with my eyes open—I know full well that the party on the other side may not be able to give what I want to get; I take the chance knowing that I have definitely undertaken in the agreement to perform my portion. These speculators entered into an undertaking, in the hope that it might turn out profitably to them, consequently it seems to me that from a moral standpoint they have no rights except those given them by the agreement, which they have not observed by their failure to comply with the Crown Lands Act.

Not only have they not carried out the terms as required by the Crown Lands Act in regard to the erection of mills, but in many instances they have delayed paying rents from time ot time, on the grounds that they didn't know whether their titles were good and migh lose their money, and Governments in the past have been weak enough to allow that to go on. I have to give the Monroe Administ ation credit for at least putting a stop to that, bu I want them to go further and if possible cancel all leases in connection with which the terms of the leases have not been carried out. There are a number of these leases in existence which in my opinion should not be allowed to continue provided the Government can destroy them. I agree with the Attorney General, for whose opinion I have great respect, that there is a legal point involved as to whether having accepted rents for a number of years we can now cancel these leases without giving reasonable notice. I have not heard that this notice has been given. Let this Administration do their duty by giving immediate notice to those holding grants that unless the terms of the licenses are carried out within a stated reasonable time all grants whose terms have not been complied with will be cancelled.

Under Section 2 it is provided:

(Reads)

I haven't gone into that section very carefully up to the present time, but it suggests itself to me that there may be in existence some agreement entered into by some Government of this Colony, which it had no author ity to make under the Crown Lands Act, and which therefore would not ve valid, and which might be rendered valid by this section. If that is so it is objectionable, very objectionable. I don't know whether this Government or any prior Government has given options or whether the Crown Lands Act permits it.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER — I want to draw the Honorable Member's attention to the fact that discussion must be confined to the principle of the Bill because the House will have ample opportunity if the principle is agreed to to consider the clauses in detail as the Bill goes through Committee.

MR. BRADLEY—I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, that such is properon the Second Reading, and I refer to that section merely in dealing with the general principle that the bill should p ovide not only for the prevention of the granting of any further leases to speculators on the Labrador, but that it also should provide for the prevention of any possibility of legalising agreements which may have been entered into by some persons in the Newfoundland Government and which are not in accordance with the Crown Lands Act. I take it that the principle of the Bill is to preserve to Newfoundland all rights on the Labrador to-day where rights for ac-

tual timber limits have not been granted and rights where grants have been issued and in connection with which the other party has not carried out the terms of his license, and furthermore the giving of protection to the interests of the Colony against any assumed right which may have been acquired by reason of any act of a Government which was not in accordance with the provisions of the Crown Lands Act such for instance as those I mentioned. I cannot state positively now, but I do not recollect any provision in the Crown Lands Act with regard to the giving of options. Possibly there may have been options given by some Government and from such options in a sense a right or rights have been acquired and this Bill should prevent those rights from being legalized. There may perhaps be a moral right as against the cabinet but such agreements are not in accordance with the Crown Lands Act and I know of no right that a Government has to deal w.th timber lands except under the provisions of that Act. This section may possibly make good claims at the present moment bad and I think that it should be amended when the proper time comes so as to preserve the rights of the Colony for which I am now contending.

There is another matter to be found in sub-section (a) of 3 which I don't propose to deal with now because it is a mere matter of detail, but this whole subject to my mind requires careful consideration and the Government should be prepared to accept any suggestions from this side of the House which will in any way tend to preserve our rights in connection with timber limits on the Labrador. I admit that the possibilities are that a large proportion of the most valuable timber limits are lost to the Colony. That is possible I say; nay, probable. Notice then should immediately be served on these speculators because their titles are morally unsound now, and if within the specified time the conditions of their licenses are not fulfilled, then immediately, instantly, these licenses should be cancelled. These people who have been paying rents for Crown Lands for the past ten or fifteen years have not been doing so for love of Newfoundland and you will find that in every case they will be quite as ready and willing to hold Newfoundland to the exact terms of its obligations under the licenses as I suggest Newfoundland should hold them. In speaking on this subject I have no axe to grind in connection with the Labrador. I have no money to invest or speculate with there and I am concerned only with conserving the interests of the Colony.

The principal of the Bill I heartily support.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—As fas as I know there is extant no option of any nature whatever in connection with the Labrador since this administration came into office. I do not know of any that had been in existence previously, nor do I know of any that would have any connection with section two of this Bill, as alluded to by Mr. Bradley, the member for Port de Grave.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am in accord with the principle embodied in this Bill because I think it protects the Labrador for the people, in that the people who sent their representatives to this House will have an opportunity to investigate all applications for grants or licenses for Labrador; but I am very sorry that the Prime Minister has not availed of the opportunity to give certain information as regards the cost of the Labrador Boundary to date and what it is likely to cost; and also information as regards the licenses and leases already issued in connection with that territory. I was expecting, and I do

not thing it was unreasonable to expect that the Prime Minister or at any rate the Minister of Agriculture and Mines would have made a speech of considerable length in introducing this Bill, because to my mind it is one of the principal pieces of legislation that we will be called upon to consider this season. When I heard the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon state that there has been granted leases of from eleven to twelve thousand square miles, worth approximately from five to seven millions of dollars, I think that we should go very slowly and see that the people who hold these leases and options have paid their rentals in full and also to see that we have information as to whether or not there was any obligation upon the Government to refun these rentals in case the Labrador dispute was not awarded in favor of the Government. I understand that when the Bill goes into the Committee stage any amendments will be considered.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the principle of the Bill, I suppose that nearly every member of the House will agree with it. It will be little more difficult for applicants for timber licenses now to arrange matters than it would be to arrange with ten members of the Executive Government to have their requests granted.

If this bill confined itself to terms dealing with licenses being provided by act of the legislature, there would be no matter for debate. But when we have clauses dealing with the validity or otherwise of licenses already issued, then certain things arise in the ordinary layman's mind as to whether the legal terms in this bill conform in any way with the titles already granted. We as a Government no doubt are unfortunately compelled to make concessions to those who have been successful in getting timber licenses on Labrador. However that is a legal matter upon which I am not qualified to give an opinion. But I trust that when we go into the Committee stage on this Bill that the legal men of this House and others also will interest themselves sufficiently in the matter so that we will not do anything that we may be sorry for in the future.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I have not very much to say on this bill at the present time. I agree with the principle of the bill, however, as to making it more difficult for people to get licenses for timber lands on Labrador. It is a great pity that so many have secured licenses. I would like the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to tell us offhand if he could, the number of square miles of land on Labrador that have been granted for agriculture.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—11,341 Square miles.

MR. HIBBS—That would be about 25% of timber lands. The point I want to make is this and I think it was in the mind of the Prime Minister himself and other members of this House, is that if supposing a sum could be secured for the Labrador, we ought to sell it, reserving the fishing rights of course. That is my own view of the matter. I think that if the Government could make a good bargain with Canada that the timber areas should be sold. In that event the licenses that have been given out down there would certainly embarass the Government in the sale. The argument that was given by a gentleman who is interested in timber lands was that there was no less than 25% of the lands on Labrador taken up by certain people and that that would be a very embarassing factor to the Government if they were trying to make a sale. For that reason it is refreshing to know that a bill has been brought in here to make it more difficult still for other people to get licenses on Labrador for speculative purposes.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill ing of Lands and Rights in Labrador" entitled "An Act to Govern the Grant- was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

On motion the ramaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker in moving the adjournment of this House I would like to make a little explanation in consideration of the statement that was made by the hon. member for St. Barbe at the last session of this House. I particularly desire that I should not say member of this House that was not anything in this House about any correct, and more particularly I should very much regret to say anything about anybody, outside this House that is incorrect. Having made the statement which I do not nd I can prove, that Mr. Coaker suggested that as there was two hundred thousand quintals of fish more than was wanted last year, and that it was proposed to the Government that that amount of fish should be bought by them, I wish to say if the statement was incorrect I want to withdraw it very fully and apologise. I want to explain to begin with that in making that statement I was convinced in my own mind that that statement was on record in wriing. I had not examined the letters that passed between the Acting Prime Minister and Sir Wm. Coaker when I was away in England, but I got the idea either fro ma newspaper or in some other way, at any rate the statement was conveyed to me while on the other side that it was an absolute fact that the suggestion of this 200,000 quintals of fish being bought by the Government was put before us, and I thought the Acting Prime Minister confirme dthat to me when I came back. In this conviction, I mentioned it to the House, and should not have done so otherwise. As it appears there certainly was a suggestion that the Government should buy fish. I say there was the suggestion that this House should meet for the purpose of keeping the price of fish up to 6.5 fo Shore and $5.00 for Labrador. And the statement was made by Sir William Coaker, and I think by Mr. Scammell also, that the fishermen were selling their fish at $5.50 a quintal and that the Legislature was to be called together for the purpose of putting the price up to $6.50 Shore and $5.00 Labrador. I cannot conceive in what way the price of fish could be kept up when the merchants were unwilling to buy it at a higher price, except by the Government guaranteeing the merchants the difference in price or the Government buying the fish themselves. That would be the only possible alternative. I would like to ask the members of this House to consider in their minds what would have happened if the Government had met this House, and had decided that the only means of putting the price of fish up to where Sir William Coaker thought it ought to be, was by buying in the fish, or by guaranteeing the merchants the difference in price. I claim that it would have cost the country a great deal more than just buying 200,000 quintals of fish at market rates. As a matter of fact, and I think that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will bear me out in this, I would state that when buying fish as merchants, have done this year, at reduced rates, as low as $3.50 a quintal from one end of Water Street to the other there is not a merchant who has been able to balance his accounts this year as far as fish purchasers are concerned. I only speak from the experience of my own firm. Perhaps we bought on an easier cull. Perhaps we gave much more than other people for it, but I think that we tried to buy as well as we could and we tried to get it as reasonably as we could,

and the result has been that we have lost a considerable amount of money. What would the country have lost if the Government bought the catch at six dollars. I have always claimed that the question of buying fish is not a matter for a Government at all. I do not suggest that it should ever be considered by a Government. Supply and demand must take care of it, and the Government has no business to step into the fish market.

However, that is beside the question. My reason for being on my feet is that I want, if I made any accusations that were nicorrect about Sir William Coaker or Mr. Scammell, to withdraw them thoroughly and sincerely and unreservedly. I now beg to move that this House do rise to adjourn until to-morrow at three of the clock.

Mr. Scammell—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I should like to rise to thank the Prime Minister for the retraction he has made here today, so apologetically and unequivocally. I thank him on behalf of Sir William Coaker and for myself. But as he went on to explain as to how hee came to make the charge re purchase of fish he argued along the lines that if the Legislature had been called together, only one thing could have come out of it—thebuying of fish by the Government. I want to say that there was no such idea in the back of our minds at that time. Even if the Legislature had met there was no such idea in our minds, that the Government should embark on any such a policy. Our intention was that the Legislature might be able to stimulate or sustain prices by means of regulations which, we had in mond and would have been prepared to introduce. It was by some system or regulations that we hoped to stabilize and hold up the price. Of course that was our idea of the situation. The Prime Minister may have thought that the only thing to have done was for the Government to buy, but there was no such thing in our minds. When the House goes into the Fishery Estimates I shall have something more to say on the subject.

Mr. Hickman gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave Notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Thursday, June 9th, at th ee of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, June 9th.

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

Hon. Minister of Justice presented a petition from Holyrood Pond Fisheries, Ltd., praying leave to introduce a bill providing for the grant of certain assistance in relation to the establishment of an industry at Holyrood Pond, in the District of Placentia East.

On motion this petition was received and referred to a Select Committee to enquire and report whether the Rules of the House in relation to private bills had been complied with.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Select Committee as follows: Hon. Minister of Justice, Minister of Marine & Fisheries, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Ashbourne.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines presented the Report of the Select Committee on the petition of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, as follows:

June 9th, 1927.

To the Honourable House of Assembly:

Your Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, beg to report that they have considered the petition and find that the Rules of the House relating to Private Bills have been complied

with, and recommend that leave be granted to introduce a bill in accordance with the prayer thereof.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.)

W. J. HIGGINS
THOS. J. POWER
K. M. BROWN
W. W. HALFYARD
W. J. WALSH

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that leave be granted to introduce Resolutions accordingly.

The Minister of Agriculture and M nes gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting an agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and The Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.

The Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Hon. Colonial Secretary gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for other purposes.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Brophy gave notice of question.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider matter in relation to the bequest of the late Sir Robert Bond.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman: When the Committee last met to consider the proposition now before the Chair, Honourable Members who had taken part in the debate suggested to have the Committee rise and ask leave to sit again so that myself or some other member from this side of the House would table some statistics necessary to have before the Committee on this subject. On that occasion I pointed out that there was very little that I could add to what had been already sa d, but that I was prepared to try and secure any further information so far as my department was concerned and that I would undertake to get in touch with the various sections of the country who were particularly interested in Agriculture, and, after the Committee rose that evening I undertook to try and get an expression of op.nion from as many as possible of the farmers in the different sections of the country. As is, perhaps, known already I had inserted a notice in the public press calling a meeting of the farmers of St. John's to meet in the Board of Trade Room for the consideration of the matter. On the night the meeting was held we had twenty-five or thirty of the most prominent farmers of St. John's East and West. I outlined the object of the meeting for that gathering and after considerable discussion the following Resolut.on was moved and seconded and passed:

(Reads Resolution)

That Resolution was proposed by and on being put to a vote eighty-five Mr. Cowan and seconded by Mr. Cook per cent. of those present voted in favor of the Resolution. Following that I had the Secretary of the Agriculture Board, Mr. Bayly, send the appended telegrams to various sections of the West Coast that had a particular interest in agriculture. These telegrams were sent to Robinson's, Crabbes, Stephenville, Codroy, St. George's Welfare Committee at St. George's and Mr. M. J. Gillis, President of the Highlands Co-operative Association, Highlands. Replies to all these messages were received and

I shall read them to the Committee:

(Reads Messages)

These are the replies received from the queries sent out to try and discover as to what the feelings of the people of the various farming sections of the Island were with regard to the attitude which should be taken respecting Sir Robert Bond's property as a model farm. The question arose when we were last in session as to what areas might be included in the bequest of Sir Robert Bond and I had Mr. Bayly visit Whitbourne where he met Rev. Dr. Bond, who was good enough to loan a large and complete map of the whole area, and I think it would be just as well if I tabled the map of the whole area so that honourable members can see the land included in the section of Sir Robert Bond's Will. Some of the members who have spoken on the subject matter before the Chair were expecting to have some elaborate address from me on agriculture. On various occasions in this House I have gone on record that I know but very little on the science of agriculture, so that I have very little to report, except the statistics I have compiled with regard to this important subject. For the information of the Cimmittee I would like to go back for twenty years to show as accurately as possible the expenditures that have been made for the encouragement of agriculture. In 1906-07 the legislative grant was $4,000.00; in 1907-08 the grant was $4,000.00; in 1908-09 the vote was $20,000.00; in 1909-10 the Agricultural Board was then inaugurated and in charge of Messrs. Devereaux, Downey and Seymour and the vote was $20,000.00, and the expenditure $20,822.00; in 1910-11, the year of the Agricultural Exhibition, the vote was $20,000.00 and the total expenditure was $44,596.85; in 1911-12 the Legislative vote was $40,000.00 and the expenditure was $44,146.57; in 1912-13 the vote was $40,000.00 and the expenditure $45,835.00; in 1913-14 the vote was $40,000.00 and the expenditure $45,000.00; in 1914-15 the expenditure was $20,000.00 and the amount spent was $20,000.00; 1915-16 the amount voted was $20,000.00 and the amount spent $19,000.00; in 1916-17 the amount voted was $20,000.00 and the expenditure $28,000.00; in 1917-18 the amount voted was $20,000.00 and the expenditure $31,000.00; 1918-19 the vote was $20,000.00 and the expenditure $56,000.00; 1919-20, when the Model Farm was ni operation, the vote was $55,000.00 and the expenditure $99,367.93; in 1921-22 the vote was $27,500.00, and the over expenditure was $50,000.00; in 1922-23 the vote was $40,000.00 and the expenditure was $59,575.00; in 1923-24 the vote was $20,000.00 and the expenditure $34,800.00; in 1924-25; in 1924-25 the first year I took office the vote was $5,000.00 and the amount spent was $9,000.00 and in 1925-26 the vote was $20,000.00 whilst the expenditure was $26,000.00. I might say that so far as the vote for 1925-26 was concerned the Government had undertaken to get a suitable market for eel grass which existed in various parts of the country and my department had sent across the Atlantic a large amount of this grass to try and establish a market and we put this eel grass industry in charge of Mr. Joseph Downey, who has done so much to advertise this article. I would like to point out further that during the twenty years referred to, the actual expenditure with regard to the encouragement of agriculture wis in the neighborhood of three quarters of a million dollars, and I think most of us will admit that we have not received anything like adequate returns for that large expenditure. The first time I took office it was my desire and the desire of the Government to try and bring some scientific advice into play with regard to the agricultural activities. We got into communication, on the recommendations made to us

by members of the House of Assembly, with agricultural colleges abroad, particularly in the Provinces of Nova Scotia to try if possible and secure the services of a suitable Newfoundlander qualified in agriculture. We found that after close enquiry, as the correspondence will show, we could not get the principals of those Colleges referred to, to recommend either of the men suggested to the Government who may be possible suitable men so as to advise us along agricultural lines. Then again, with regard to the small vote in former years. I found it impossible to be able to do much more than depart from the old custom of giving some assistance to various agricultural communities. It is a well known fact that a country like Newfoundland should not be sending to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and other outside places for potatoes, turnips and cabbage and other vegetables that can and should be raised in our own country. A tremendous amount of money has been spent year after year on importing these vegetables and the year 1926 was no exception; and nearly as much money went out of the country last Autumn for the purchase of potatoes, turnips and cabbage despite our attempts made for the encouragement of local products between the bottom of Placentia Bay and Cape Ray. The practise in the past has been for schooners after the bank fishery was over, to supply the South West Coast from Port aux Basques to Sound Island with potatoes brought in from outside at the expense of the people in other sections of the Coast, nay, at the expense of those people who were prevented from profitable marketing the fruits of their toil. Last year, as an experiment, I sent Mr. Bayly to the West Coast and he gave a series of lectures through the farming sections and advised the people to band themselves together and work co-operatively with a view to having their products put up in clean packages and branded as an A1 article. Mr. Bayly came back and reported to me the tdvisability of sending a commercial traveller to the South West Coast to try and see if we could not secure some of the trade that was going to Prince Edward Island and the Nova Scotian Provinces. I then got in communication with Mr. Downey, who was familiar with the West Coast and knew the personnel of the various organizations formed, and engaged him to interview the merchants and other traders of that section to try and get them to give the farmers of the West Coast an opportunity to tender for that business, with the result that we succeeded in marketing eight thousand barrels between Port aux Basques and Burin las year, as against 800 barrels sold for any one previous year, and it is now left to the growers of potatoes on the West Coast to retain that market or not. It was pointed out by Mr. Bayly and myself in correspondence and in conversation that if these people hoped to retain the market that, it could only be done by giving the people the class of article they were prepared to buy. In other words grade the potatoes and put them up in decent packages. In conversation with some of the South West Coast merchants they seemed perfectly satisfied with the result of the growth of last year's potatoes. This year I think, if farmers do their bit, there is no reason in the world why any potatoes should be imported into the section from Port aux Basques to the bottom of Placentia Bay. The farmers o nthe West Coast have taken on a new lease of life for greater production of vegetables particularly as regards potatoes, turnips, and cabbage, and, if they succeed, it will at least keep one hundred thousand dollars yearly in the country, which have been going to the farmers of Nova Scotia for the past twenty years.

With regard to the splendid offer of

the late Sir Robert Bond, I think it a fitting finish to what I consider a well spent life. This magnificent gift offered to Newfoundland is only what one would expect from the patriotic and philanthropic statesman. While not offering any practical opinion as to its value to the country, I sincerely throw out the suggestion to the Committee if it would not be worth while to look forward with any measure of hope towards making this Model Farm self-supporting. For the past twenty years the Department of Agriculture and Mines spent $750,000.00 on agriculture without any practical results and I think the House might reduce the yearly expenditure instead of increasing it if the House can with any degree of hope look forward to being able to reduce expenditure instead of increasing. In the first year I was in this Department the vote was $5,000.00 and this year we have to come in and ask for over $20,000.00. The principle reason why the votes have been increased from year to year is that it has been impossible to get anything bordering on reliable statement as to what we have been producing. The member for St. John's West, speaking the other day on the same subject referred to a statement from a foreign source which appears to be an absolute joke. There are 300 000 goats listed there and 100,000 shep and I think goats were placed at a higher value than sheep—in my opinion we haven't anything like 3000,000 goats in the country. Then it is only every ten or fifteen years that we get a census of Newfoundland and it is unsatisfactory. What usually happens is that the man taking the census goes into the leading house, maybe about dinner time, has a cup of tea, and asks who lives next door, how many men and women, goats and cows. and usually finishes up the census of the village right there in that house. We have not been getting accurate information, not only on agriculture, but also on other subjects, so much so that I decided recently, and was supported by the Government that I was goint to make a determined effort to get reliable information regarding the various live stock or produce that have been raised yearly in the various parts of the country. So I undertook last autumn, or the early part of the winter to have this done, and the system worked out would be at as small cost as possible, with the assistance of the Department of Education, but we didn't get far when I found that in any system if we wanted results we had to pay for them, and consequently that venture is going to cost practically half of my agricultural vote. I would be satisfied, and I think it would be a good business as far as the country is concerned to recomment to the Government that instead of voting $25000 or $30,000 each year for the disposal of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines or the Seretary to distribute as they think fit for the encouragement of argriculture, that if this farm can be taken over and if we have no one here who can give us sufficient advice, and I know no one locally to whom I can go for such scientific or practical advice at the present moment, that we get a reliable man of the Dr. Cummings type, who is head of the Collegt of Truro or Prof. Truman or some other reliable man to go over there and see what can be done that would be of practical value to the country that would further agriculture in Newfoundland.

I notice in some correspondence the expense of operating this Farm is estimated at $10,000. In my opinion for the farm to be of any great benefit it must be operated by the class of man I have referred to, and properly stocked. Mr. Bayly has gone into the matter, with the information at his disposal, and his experience in that line, and expresses the opinion that it will cost the Colony $15,000 to get live stock, if we are going to make a

Model Farm or an Experimental Farm, or whatever else is decided in the best interests of the Country.

There has been a lot of controversy as to the name, and as to whether it would be possible to link up some other part or department of the Government with it or to make it as far as possible self-supporting. In the opinion of farmers I have come into contact with, they seem very desirable to have a demonstration farm, somewhere to go where they can be taken over the ground by a reliable scientific man, nad that man be able to demonstrate to them such things as the kind of soil for various things, the kind of fertilizer for the kind of soil, or the kind of seed best suited for the fertilizer and so on, and with that I entirely agree. If the farm is to be a Model Farm the people from the farming sections must be able to come from time to time while the seed is becoming model or the animals can become model, but very little information can now be obtained by those desirous of getting information regarding agriculture.

In my opinion something of this sort would be better than the present system of voting $25,000 or $30,000 per year by the House of Assembly and handing it over to the Minister or Secretary to spend as they like, because at the present moment we have no agricultural policy, and if I cared to there is no reason why I couldn't allocate $10,000 to a friend of mine who is taking up agriculture in any part of the Island; there is nothing to prevent my allocating it as I like. I don't consider it fair to myself or to the Government or to the House—it is almost as well to keep it out of my department entirely, and make it a Department of Mines, or inaugurate an agricultural policy; I should like to see the votes ear-marked. There is too much room for abuse by a Minister, and I am only human as anyone else, and it is a protection to the Minister when the money is voted for a special purpose. For that reason if it can be found that this vote of twenty-five or thirty thousands can be judiciously spent, if we can establish at Whitbourne something more than rule of thumb agriculture it would be worth while—as we all know, there is very little known of scientific farming here to-day. If we could establish an institution presided over by the proper kind of man, and the vote were no more than that spent at the present time, I think the House would be very wise in considering the suggestion as to whether we should not have the advice of one or two scientific men of some standing, who have been associated with farming outside Newfoundland, before turning this down. We can't get local men for this—it would be desirable to do so, but unfortunately we can't, so we would have to go out of the country for them.

Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to worry the House further. I said in commencement that I had very little to offer to the debate, more than has already been said. I should like, however, once more to place myself on record as saying that no matter what we do towards establishing at Whitbourne an institution or not, that there can be only one opinion with regard to the sentiment that prompted Newfoundland's great Commoner in his last years, when the curtain was being drawn over the last scenes of his life. I think it will be remembered by the House and the Country that as Sir Robert Bond lived so he died, and I sincerely trust that even now some means will be found to establish at Whitbourne a monument that will show for all time, when we who are now here have passed away, and that will keep his name fresh in the memories of those who will reap the benefit of this magnificent gift.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the matter before the Chair concerning the acceptance of

the gift bestowed on the country by the late Sir Robert Bond, I wish to place myself on record as being in favor of accepting this gift. As to what should be done with the farm is a matter for consideration, and possibly, as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has suggested, the getting of expert advice. While I would be in favor of the Government accepting the gift, I do not think we would be justified in going to any great expense in conducting a model farm; neither do I think it would be necessary to employ any expensive experts along agricultural lines. My own opinion is that we have plenty of practical farmers in the country to select one of their number to make a beginning to work this farm so that some practical work may be done, and if found necessary, a Summer or Winter school or both could be conducted for a few weeks in summer or in winter, as the case may be, along agricultural lines, for the benefit of any young men or any older men in the country who wish to obtain a knowledge of practical farming. I would suggest that that be done, and instead of employing in the beginning, if the acceptance is finalized, a high-salaried man from Canada or some other country, one of our practical and most successful farmers be engaged. I know what some farmers have done in my own district to obtain a knowledge of farming and live-stock raising in the Dominion of Canada. I have in my mind the two Sparkes brothers of Shearstown who are making a big success of farming and live-stock raising, and the same thing applies to Harbour Grace, and some other portions of the District and of Conception Bay generally. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the farm could not be used as a place to send some of the boys and young men and even older men who find their way to the Penitentiary occasionally. I wonder if the farm was working if they could not be sent there for one, two or six months, as the case might be, and get a knowledge of farming and learn to produce something.

I am also in favour of accepting this gift because it establishes some institution in the outports. We have little or nothing of a public nature established in the outports of the country, and that is one reason why I would favour the estabilshment of this farm at Whitbourne. It would also be a great help to the farmers and those occupied in working land in Conception Bay, Trinity Bay, Placentia Bay, as well as other sections. It has been suggested that it would be a wise move to transfer the House of Assembly to Whitbourne, and if that can't be done, then the next best thing is to accept this gift and try to work the Model Farm at Whitbourne, where it will be more or less free from graft and other things existing in St. John's. That is my suggestion. I don't konw whether I can say anything else on the subject. I don't agree with going to a big expense in the purchase of live stock, etc., as in the past, but I do think that some practical man not an expert or scientific farmer, be obtained. If you can't find a man around here go to Mr. Power's district where there are a fine lot of farmers to take charge of it. You don't need to go outside the country to find a man to run a model farm or build roads or things of that sort. We have in our country men to do it, and if not in the country there are Newfoundlanders in other countries, forced to leave here, who would be glad to come back and take part in the development of their country. In conclusion, I wish to say that I approve of the acceptance of the offer, but my suggestion is that if accepted the farm should be conducted in a practical way, with the least possible expense.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, if no other member is

going to speak on this matter, I want merely to make it clear that we don't propose to take a vote of the House on a matter of this kind. Really, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, it is a matter for the Government to decide, as the gift was proferred to them, whether they wish to accept or not. It was brought forward here because we were desirous of getting the opinion of the various members of the House, and we have given them lots of time to get the opinion of the people they represent as to whether they think it advisable to accept this gift or not. I am afraid that even with that, members have not, in putting the matter before their constituents given any opinion on the stipulations made in connection with the gift. Probably most people would look at the will alone, and go no farther than that in deciding whether they would accept it—personally I felt very much that the words were rather ambiguous, and had to ask the Executor of the will how he would interpret the words "Model Farm." As has been explained by a man who is versed in these things, and to whom Mr. Paton wrote. a Model Farm is one thing and an Experimental Farm another, and it was suggested by that gentleman, whose letter I read to the House that if we stick strictly to the term "Model Farm" he would not advise accepting the gift. I asked the Rev. Dr. Bond, as I have told the House, if he would advise His Excellency what he would regard as a proper interpretation of the will and he replied definitely that the gift must be used as a model farm and that alone. He also said that there must be an independent committee in charge, appointed by the Government and having no political influence, in connection with the working of the farm. I fail to see, and a great many of my Government also fail to see, how we can possibly give an assurance that for all years to come the matter of maintenance of the Model Farm will be kept out of political management or mismanagement, or how we can guarantee against such. This Government cannot possibly speak for its successors for years to come, and this is a gift for ever—if we accept we must accept in perpetuity. In other words if we accept this, it must be forever, and it must be kept up, and that is one of the points which I can't see how I can vote for—how I, as Leader of the Government or as member of a Government can accept a proposition of this sort without a subsidy being provided by this House, and undertake it forever. That is the position I took upon this matter when I placed it before the House, and that hasn't been debated. The attitude of the Opposition members generally has been that Sir Robert Bond was a great man and that he has given this model farm, and we ought to accept it in his memory. I have expressed my feeling strongly in commenting on Sir Robert Bond's magnificent gift and on the kindly spirit which prompted it, I have had to question whether it has not been surrounded by conditions which make acceptance impossible.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, in view of what the Prime Minister has just said in regard to his interpretation of the general attitude of the Opposition I would like to say that I don't think that this country should under the present circumstances accept that gift. As the Prime Minister has just pointed out, some difficulty may arise owing to the peculiar conditions under which the gift was made. There is a further element that raises a doubt in my mind, as to the justification of taking over that farm, and that is that we have not yet got any practical idea as to what it is going to cost this country. We have had some experimental farms in this country, one time after another. They cost considerable money and

they have all gone out of existence. Why these failures, and if you take over this farm, what can you do to avoid having the same experience in the future? What is this farm going to cost to equip it completely with staff and material and machinery, and other things essential to the work of a model farm? What can you do when you take it over and start it probably as a model farm, to enable it to be self supporting? What revenue can you get from the products of the land? These and other questions would cause me to hesitate before taking the position of advising the Government to accept that gift. Certainly I don't see now how any member of the Government or the Opposition can say go ahead and accept that gift because Sir Robert Bond has made it, because we owe it to his memory.

Now we can't consider this matter purely from the standpoint of a model farm. We have got to take the whole agricultural situation of the country into consideration. Then the marketing of the produce presents a difficulty. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines made reference to that. The greatest difficulty of all is the getting our own produce into our own markets. There is the difficulty of transportation. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the utmost should be done to enable the farmers to avail of the markets in the country, before we do anything further to encourage other people to go farming, to raise produce additional to that which we cannot market at the present time.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, the last time that this Bill was in Committee I said at that time I would not offer any opinion. I have listened with a great deal of attention this afternoon to the address of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and I have received a great deal of information from his remarks. I am very glad to see that he has made an effort to market produce on the West Coast, and I am sure that his efforts are commendable. If the other departments of the Government were as well handled as the Department of Agriculture and Mines, I am sure that Newfoundland would be much better off. I think that what we need in this country is economy. Economy in the fisheries, in agriculture and in other every line. The only way to get that is to have a place where the people can be taught. And for that reason I am very strongly in favour of having a place such as Whitbourne, the bequest of the late Sir Robert Bond. The whole thing to my mind boils down to this. If that farm could be conducted on an economical basis and under economical and efficient management, and could fit anyone to enter an agricultural life and get an agricultural education, why then I think that it would be a great thing for this country. And I say and believe that we shall regret it in the near future if we let this matter drop. There are other things that must be done if we are to encourage agriculture. We must have warehouses, established in St. John's. This could be done very easily and at little cost to the Government by getting them built by the labour that is being paid for every year, and which is given by the Government. As I said before that is a matter for the Government, but I am going to put myself on record as being in favour of the acceptance of this farm for the benefit of the people of this country who wish to enter agricultural life.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one remark in respect to the statement made by the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay. I don't think that he was present when I read various statistics on the subject now before the Chair. I don't think that I did refer to the approximate cost of the Model Farm. I asked the Secretary if he would compile for me statistics in re-

gard to this matter and they are as follows:

(Reads)

Doctor Mosdel said, also, that before encouraging any more new farms in this country we should help those that are already operating. He also said that before raising any more produce we should be able to market what we are already raising. Now, is it not a fact that each year we are bringing in a large amount of produce from the outside. In that connection I would say this that we can do a great deal to assist the farmers in being able to successfully market their own produce. If you go into any of the grocery stores on Water St. or on any other street in St. John's and you will see the ladies of the homes in St. John's actually tripping over the local article that is in many cases much cheaper than the imported article. They pass the local article by. Now the only way to combat that is to erect a tariff wall. Then we will be able to see that the local article is disposed of before the imported article is allowed in at all. While we are in a position to import whether dairy or poultry produce, the products that can be raised at home and offering for the sale at that time are turned down by our own people. This is where the members of this House can do a great deal of missionary work with regard to improving local conditions for our own products. There is another matter. But I would not now attempt to go into any proposition, although that will be necessary if we are going seriously into the raising of any kind of products by our own people. However at the present time I would not suggest the launching of a bigger proposition, with regard to the establishment of markets in St. John's. But it is a crying disgrace to go up George's Street of a Saturday and to find all kinds of dirt and filth not only getting into your eyes but getting into the receptacles in which the country people are displaying their goods. We should have an established market place in this town. I have gone so far as to get into communication with the city engineer in Halifax, who has has charge of the local markets there, in order to find out what assistance has been given by the Province of Nova Scotia for the encouragement of agriculture. I have received a reply from him, and he tells me that in Halifax the Legislature voted $130,000 for the erection of a suitable market house. It is under the control of the Municipal Council, and the people are not allowed to display anything in that market house that is not pure and good. Fish is not permitted to be sold there at all, only shell fish. The proposition has been so successful that it is now self-supporting except for the initial expenditure for its erection. I have often wondered whether we ourselves could not afford it. We have been spending money lavishly out of the various departments now for fifteen years, ever since I had a seat in this House. We have been spending money on every proposition and after all we would not have to spend such an enormous sum in the erection of a market. After that we could have other markets in other sections of the island. Now here is a statement showing the imports into Grand Falls for the year 1925-1926.

(Reads)

A quarter of a million dollars worth has come into one settlement that was not in being 20 years ago. Does not that prove conclusively that there is a vast field for some body of men to enter and depart from the old rule of thumb way that we have been working by so long in Newfoundland. Here is a statement showing the total importations for the year 1925-1926, of agricultural products into Newfoundland. $4,039,171 of Newfoundland's money sent away to enrich the farmers of another country. And I say now without fear of contradiction that half

that amount of money at least could be kept in this country by producing and marketing our own products if only there was a man or a body of men with the necessary enterprise. Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to give these statistics to the Committee in reply to the suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Fortune.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in the discussion here on this subject I was much interested and amongst other things by the mention of the quantity of products imported to Grand Falls which it was said amounted to over a quarter of a million. Of course we should ask ourselves why are these products imported there, and from what experience I have had myself from being in touch with those who handle our local produce. I would suggest that if agricultural produce was protected by the tariff at certain times there should also be protection for the consumer against such things as the selling of potatoes with many barrels containing practically one-third unfit for consumption. I happened to be in a Commission Merchant's office some time ago and he had a quantity of potatoes from an outport producer and he said to me: "You talk about encouraging agriculture in this country, and we certainly do all we can to do that as far as we are concerned, but here is an instance, "I sent five barrels to a retailer in St. John's and he sends back to me over a sack of small potatoes, some not as large as a marble, some a little larger." The consequence was that that man would not buy any more local produce and we would rather pay more for Prince Edward Island produce than the local because he was sure that there wouldn't be the loss due to undersized potatoes which are so often found in the local produce. If the Government is going to seriously consider the imposition of a higher tariff at certain seasons, as I think it should, at the same time it ought to impose rules with regard to grades, specifying what they ought to be, so that the consumer can be absolutely certain that he is going to get what he is paying for, and then I have no doubt that the retailer as well as the commission merchant will handle a great deal more than he does to-day of the local produce.

With regard to the quantity of eggs imported, there is another side to the question besides what the Minister has pointed out and that is that while the eggs are procurable fairly cheaply at this season, later, in the fall, they go up to sixty or seventy cents. Canadian eggs however, can be sent in for thirty or forty cents. Are we going to penalise the consumer in St. John's and elsewhere by putting up the tariff so that people will have to pay sixty or seventy cents a dozen on the local price for Prince Edward Island eggs or for local eggs. There are certain prices we consider fair to the producer, but like others they want to get all they can and they take advantage of the scarcity to procure high prices for the fresh article and the poor classes can only buy, then, in very small quantities. S o I think when considering imposing such a tariff care should be taken to make sure and treat the consumer fairly and not allow him to be fleeced. We speak of people being fleeced by corporations but these are not the only ones that fleece a person when they get a chance.

With regard to some of the remarks on the Model Farm, in this House when we are discussing agriculture we think of potatoes and cabbage and turnips only. There are other agricultural products imported besides potatoes and turnips and cabbage. In the vicinity of St. John's cauliflower, parsnips and carrots cannot be had at the present time and the people have therefore got to buy the imported article and there are other agricultural products imported as well that can be

grown in this country. The value of the Model Farm appears to me to be as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, its value as an educational influence. A large number of people would benefit from knowledge acquired in it and again if people could send their samples of soil to ask what they are capable of producing they could get information of use that cannot be got to-day. There are a large number of people who would go in for agriculture to a greater extent than they do if they had that encouragement and information which they are looking for and cannot get but which is obtained in other countries where there are Model Farms and Agricultural Colleges. Then the Minister also referred to the question of finding a market for what we consume ourselves. There is no question that we can consume all the potatoes and cabbage that are grown in the country to-day. You cannot buy a turnip to-day in Newfoundland. You can search all over the country around St. John's and there are none available and there are scores of people to-day who want them and naturally they have to go to Canada, to Prince Edward Island and ask them to send them in. Not only do I think we should supply our own markets but I think we ought to be able to export agricultural products. In looking over the value of produce exported from Canada last year there was in the neighborhood of between three and four hundred thousand barrels of produce expoted to Cuba by Canada principally coming from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and the Customs returns value them at about $3.00 a barrel. If our outport men and city farmers could have got $3.00 they would have thought that they were getting a very good price; in fact quite a number of outport men had to sell as low as $2.00, $2.20, $2.40 $2.50 and if Canadian farmers can obtain $3.00 on the average right through for potatoes sent to Cuba where is the reason we can't do the same? It may be that they have cheaper freight rates that enable them to get down there, but that is a question the Government can well take up. If we have steamers now going to the West Lndia Islands that would take in Cuba and some arrangement might be made by them whereby they could take local produce at a low rate. I don't know whether the Minister has taken up the mater or not. Canada has succeeded very well in marketing their produce outside of Canada. They don't absorb all their own local produce any more than other countries. They can't do it; they have to find foreign markets for it, and they have succeeded in marketing it in a way that enables them to carry on farming successfully. I think the Department would be well advised if it investigated the success on the part of the farmers of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island in marketing produce outside and see if we cannot do the same and give the information to the country. I think that is information that would be beneficial and give the boost to the sale of agricultural produce that it needs to-day. I am sorry the Minister is not here just now, as I was going to ask him if he had an estimate of what would be likely to be the revenue or earnings of the Model Farm to offset the cost of carrying it on.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to make a remark or two. Probably I am one of the few who was associated with Sir Robert in this Legislature, and possibly I can speak with a more intimate knowledge of him than most. I was always aware of the fact that the encouragement of agricutlure was very dear to the heart of the late Sir Robert Bond, and although he was much enthused over the establishment of a model farm and did suc-

ceed in some degree in that, at the same time there were members of his Government and party that did not see eye to eye with him as to the methods he took. I think that all will appreciate the good intentions of the Government in bringing this matter before the House for consideration and possibly advice before the Government whom, I claim, are the proper authorities to decide whether this gift should be accepted or otherwise, should declare their decision. The gift is a magnanimous one, and I am sure is appreciated by the people of the country. The motive behind the gift, I think, is of the purest. The great character of the man is well exemplified in his giving this property which was perhaps dearer to him than anything material in the world, probably in which he spent the happiest hours of his life, to the people for their use. Considerations of sentiment make it highly desirable to accept the gift, and its value of course is considerable, and its location is ideal in many respects, and it is in perfect condition, but unfortunately the custodians of the public funds cannot weigh things by sentiment. They have rather to take the practical view of things and act in a practical manner. Now the late Sir Robert Bond, in his bequest, saw fit to surround that bequest by conditions that are such that made the Government hesitate before accepting it. Now these conditons are very, very stringent and very far reaching, insofar that the accepting of the guardianship of this farm is not a matter of to-day or to-morrow, but for all time, that that property must be maintained for one purpose and one purpose only, and it cannot under any circumstances be used for any other purpose. It is hard to conceive of a man of Sir Robert Bond's foresight having made all these conditions. It is a large valuable property comprising some 8 square miles with a good portion of splendid timber land and with beautiful lakes included in this area, and many other attractions that are entirely foreign to a model farm. The will is, however, adamant on the point and specific that this place must not be used for any other purpose. Well let us for a moment consider what it would necessitate, provided the Government took it over and utilised that section that would be suitable for a model farm. The balance of the property would require considerable care and attention, surveyance and protection all involving a considerable expenditure of money, otherwise it would be a resort for picnickers, trouters, tutors, and probably one day not far distant by the carelessness of some sportsman or some other person the whole thing would go up in smoke. I mention all these matters to show the House what had to be considered so that it will be appreciated how very careful the Government has felt called upon to be in considering before accepting the gift. The Government did not bring the matter before the House with any idea of shirking its responsibility, as I think it would be quite satisfied to give a decision, but the matter had so many considerations that were sentimental it was thought that every possible opportunity should be given for full consideration of the matter in this debate before it should be turned down or accepted. There is one point in the conditons for that gift that has been already demonstrated is not what he thought it was. He says in his will that the furnishings in the buildings and the stock are to be taken over by the Government at a price of ten thousand dollars. And the Government have already ascertained the value by the valuation experts of this town in the line of valuation of furniture and the valuation of stock and it was found that it would be worth only a little more than half of ten thousand. The trustee says that

if the Government does not take it over it has to be brought to St. John's and sold by public auction. As I said before the upkeep of this farm is going to entail a considerable amount of expenditure, and although Sir Robert Bond no doubt had the very highest intentions and ideals at his death as through his life with regard to doing what would be good in the interests of agriculture he was not without opposition as to his opinions in respect of that, because I remember in 1909 or 1910 his policy with regard to the establishment of a model farm was reversed by the Morris Administration and the model farm was dispensed with. It never amounted to a great deal. Some of those listening to me will remember it was then argued that a model farm to be worth anything would necessitate the expenditure of a very large sum of money annually and it was contended that it was unnecessary. We had then and stil have at the disposal of Newfoundland a Model Farm and Agricultural College at Truro. This has been utilized and we have had young men and farmers go up and put in a course of study there much to their own benefit and that of the country. It was also pointed out that if we wanted to analyse soil and get information as to the best fertilizer, and with regard to seeds, that was all at the disposal of the country for the very asking from experts employed by Canada. All these advantages are there for the people of this country if they are pleased to avail of them. Therefore there are always two sides to a story. As much as I appreciate the generous motive behind the gift, it must be realised there are other considerations to be taken into account. I would be the most gratified member of the House if to-morrow I could see that gift accepted and supplied with the very best stock, under the management of the most expert farmer to be procured from either side of the water, so that young men could go there and study agriculture, but all this means a large expenditure of public money, and until we can see where we can get that money without injuring public service then I say it is a matter that has to be very seriously considered before any decision is made. Now the conditions as laid down with regard to the farm are well known, and as a proof of Sir Robert Bond's generosity and still greater interest in the country, he has, characteristic of himself, very many valuable personal effects that no doubt in his life he prized highly and beyond measure, and these to a large extent he has also left to the country, and it was only two or three days ago that I had a letter from the Executor with regard to the placing of these vaiuables in the Museum.

Now it would be interesting to the House to read those clauses of the will that refer to these particular items.

(Reads)

I merely cite that to emphasize the character of the man and to show that he was actuated by the very highest motives, and as I said I believe this House and I am sure this Government would be very pleased if they could find some way to accept the gift. The gifts for the Museum have been accepted and will be placed there. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines is making arrangements for receiving and placing them, but I again say that in accepting this gift we put an expenditure on the country in perpetuity, and also the other advantages of that estate will be lost except that portion appropriate to a model farm, and I feel sure that the Government's idea in bringing the matter down here to get an expression of opinion will be appreciated, and it would be realized that the Government are acting in the best interest of the country.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman,

as this matter was brought before the House as the Colonial Secretary has just intimated in order to get an expression of opinion, I consider it my duty as a Member of the House to give my opinion on the matter. It has been said, and wisely said no doubt, by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that we should get expert advice as to the feasibility and possible success of a Model Farm in this country, and it struck me while listening to others this afternoon that after all, can we get any more expert advice that the late Sir Robert Bond could give himself on the matter of the successful operation of a Model Farm, having in mind the best agricultural interests of this country. The late Sir Robert Bond was a man of no mean ability, he was a man not only of high standards and ideals, but with great experience in connection with statecraft and statecraft involves everything in connection with the best interests of the community. He was not poorly informed therefore in connection with the agricultural industries in the country, or possibly any industry in the country, and after all his long years as a practical farmer in the country he has given his farm to Newfoundland to be made a Model Farm, and he certainly would not encumber Newfoundland with anything not to its best interests. Regarded from that point of view, therefore, we have the opinion of a practical farmer who has given years of his life, time and experience to farming, and to every other industry in connection with the welfare of this country. Therefore, we should not lightly turn aside this bequest. It is not a matter of sentiment; we have to treat it now as a matter of fact business proposition.

It has been said by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines here this evening that we practically have no agricultural policy and he deplored the fact that something is not being done to promote the agricultural interests of this country. The Minister has given an estimate of the cost of maintenance of the farm, and, no doubt, the farm itself will produce enough to maintain the stock on that farm. It may be that revenue would be derived from the products of the farm that could go towards the upkeep, and that farm may be the nucleus of an agricultural effort that may take us out of the slough of despondency so far as scientific training and practical training in agriculture is concerned throughout this country. However, it does not follow that the few facilities offered by the grant for agriculture should cease. Possibly the administration of that vote could be more effectively done at the Model Farm. I would be long sorry to feel that we should dismiss this most important question without giving the greatest thought to the spending of money in connection with it, and, if possible, to get the most expert opinion as to the feasibility of accepting this bequest. We have been told that, as trustees of the people, we have the right to accept or reject this bequest. To give a concrete example of just how conditions are now with regard to the marketing of potatoes, I had a letter from Port Retxon, Trinity Bay, from a man stating that he had two hundred barrels of potatoes on hand and could not market any of them; he added that all the people around the settlement who raise potatoes had between them over one thousand barrels that they could not market. I made enquiries from the stores in St. John's who handle this product, but in all cases nobody wanted to buy any, as they were only then handling Prince Edward Island potatoes. Now we are not doing our duty as members of this Legislative, in view of the foregoing, it is incumbent upon this House to encourage agriculture and encourage the Minister in his efforts to try and do something to produce from the soil

as well as from the sea. Then again, the opinion of Sir Robert Bond, himself a practical farmer and a man who had the interests of his country at heart, is sufficient assurance, without any expert advice, as to advisability of a model farm, and, I, consequently, put myself on record as being absolutely in favor of accepting the bequest of the late Sir Robert Bond.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to give an expression of opinion on the subject matter now before the Chair. I hope the debate will not be one-sided, as I feel it is not a Party matter at all. I have my own opinion in connection with this matter, and. if my colleagues share a similar opinion and the gentlemen on the other side of the House express no opinion whatever, it will look as if we are trying to make a Party measure out of it. My opinion is that the Government of the day as a Government has no right whatever to reject that offer of the late Sir Robert Bond. This bequest has been made to the people of Newfoundland. The present Government happens to be in office for the time being and as they are the trustees of the people they have nothing to do but accept that offer. They have no right to deprive the people of Newfoundland of a gift bestowed upon them by the generosity of the late Sir Robert Bond. If I gather the opinion of the Government from those who spoke, the Government is more inclined to reject the offer than to accept it. I hope, however, that they will still retain an open mind. It is perfectly right to discuss the question and find out the best means to be adopted whereby the farm could be turned into a valuable asset to the country; but a Government which is not representative of the people when this gift is made, has no right whatever to reject the offer. I do not know why the Government should be so seriously concerned about the wonderful expenditure they imagine would be entailed by accepting this property. It is not such a gigantic undertaking and it could be operated either on a large scale or along economic lines, but by all means accept it. The Government claim that they will find it difficult to get the money to operate this Model Farm. Well, I know that conditions are such to-day that you have no money to throw away. Yet, Mr. Chairman, this is the same Government that came in here two years ago and gave estimates that the new Dock was going to cost $1,080,000 and later on this same Government came in here and admitted with their own figures that the construction of that Dock cost $2,000,000. The difference between the Government's estimate and the actual cost to this country would represent sufficient money to operate that model farm at $20,000 a year for fifty years. In 1925 you asked here for two million dollars with which to build highroads, and, according to the figures tabled in this House recently, you spent a quarter of a million dollars more on highroads, more than sufficient to operate this venture, if we wanted to, for fifteen years, and still you quibble over the cost of a Model Farm. If we were to look through the public accounts we would probably find that the expenditure during the past year would not indicate that the Government is over-scrupulous about expenditure, and I don't see why they should stress so very much the cost of operating a Model Farm at Whitbourne. It has ben argued that a Model Farm might not be of much benefit—that there is a farm at Truro in Nova Scotia to which people can go, and that is true. I have had a little experience with the Experimental Farm there, but I should like to point out to the House that the cost of going to Truro and staying there any period to learn something about agriculture is very great, and not everyone can afford it. There is absolutely no com-

parison with the cost of staying in Newfoundland and that of going to Truro for six months, instead of getting in touch with a model farm say in the vicinity of St. John's. There is a class of people farming in this country who certainly need some agricultural education. I don't mean to say that we should try to make scientists out of them, but they should try to get some knowledge of the science of agriculture, which they don't at present possess. There is no one acquainted with the slip-shod methods of agriculture throughout the country but must realize how sadly the people are in need of practical demonstrations of how to cultivate the soil with real benefit. It is really pitiful to go around the country and find men working hard to get a living, and allowing a piece of meadowland to remain in sod for twenty years without rotating it. It is no good to tell the people what to do, without a practical demonstration. Just do in Newfoundland what has been done in every Province in Canada—give practical lessons as to what should be done, and they are going to copy them, otherwise you are simply wasting your time. You could leave town this afternoon, and if it was a little earlier, before the crops were in you would see manure piles, and all along you will find them smoking, showing a simple state of affairs that people may not take seriously, but it shows that the people who leave them that way have no idea of the fertilising value coming out of the manure. You find the straw and green boughs used to stable the cattle thrown in a pile and burnt up—the most valuable ingredient, carbon, being burnt up. It isn't much use telling a farmer that that is wrong, that he ought to conserve his manure. He won't listen. You want to give some real practical demonstration of what can be done by scientific farming. Now I do want to say that before this bequest is turned down we should stop and consider. Get practical and scientific advice, if you like; you can't get the latter in Newfoundland, and you know that if you go outside to Canada and get a man he will be unversed in our conditions, and his advice of little value. But your own commone sense should govern.

I don't think you are taking any great risk in taking this over. Accept the bequest! It was given in good faith, and by one of Newfoundland's most brilliant sons, whose memory will be revered while Newfoundland lasts, and if for no other reason than that it would be a monument to the man who has done more for Newfoundland than any man in this Chamber, can ever hope to do. When he made that bequest he had well-considered plans—he did not do it haphazardly; he had given grave consideration and was fully convinced that a model farm would be a great asset to the country. He had made an attempt in 1908 to create one, as referred to by the Hon. Colonial Secretary this afternoon, and though the Morris Party destroyed it in 1909, I have always thought that it was not very much to their credit, and that it was a severe blow to Newfoundland, because what they substituted was of very little value. This afternoon Mr. Grimes discussed the matter of marketing local produce, and I would like to say that while I advocate taking over that farm and turning it into a model farm, because I see no other way out, it would be a most ungracious act and unfair to the people of the country and we have no right to do it, at the same time, unless some sort of agricultural policy is formed, I fear the model farm won't do much good. At the present time there is no policy at all—this is the only Government I have known that has taken this stand—all it is doing is backing and filling with agriculture. You have put on men and taken them off—getting so called experts and firing

them. I remember last year or the year before a gentleman going around with a petition to be reinstated; he had been given a job and the Government realized he wasn't an expert and fired him—they should never have taken him on. Just about the same time a gentleman who has obtained his degree, a B.Sc., at MacDonald Agricultural College applied for a position, but it seems that his father was on the wrong side of politics; I am informed on reliable authority that a member of the Executive took a strong stand against him, and the sole reason was that his father was against that particular gentleman in his District, and the result was that the son didn't get the job.

Now it is not much use in establishing a model farm or anything else unless we have some sort of policy. It is not much use raising turnips or potatoes or anything else unless we can market them. At the present time thousands of barrels of potatoes are rotting in cellars that can't be marketed, and in place of local articles we have purchased Canadian products. We have permitted St. John's to become a dumping ground for Prince Edward Island products. I spoke in the House two years ago and pleaded for a protective tariff, at least at certain seasons of the year for local products, I wasn't listened to. And that was at a time when the present Government was protecting big interests, as already expounded by speakers here. I pointed out then that if you take the Ropewalk and the Tobacco Company you would have no more than five or six hundred employees, and most of them little boys, and on the other side to refuse ten thousand was utterly absurd. There is no reason why protection shouldn't be placed on such things as potatoes, particularly at certain seasons of the year, so as to prevent the City becoming a dumping ground for Canadian produce, to the detriment of the farmers. It is all very well to speak of the fisheries, but there is no interest in them. It is the same with farming—the farmers gets along as best he can. I don't blame the present Government rely, because it has been just as bad in the past—there has been no attempt to help the farmer to eke out a living in his humble occupation, and we could easily make it possible if we only used common sense. I know hundreds of farmers who have given up the idea of raising cattle at all.

In conclusion I will close my remarks by reiterating that this Government should not hesitate but do the obviously beneficial thing to the people of this country by accepting the gift given them in that bequest of the late Sir Robert Bond.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Ratification of a Contract for St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service" was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Friday, June 10th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 10th, 1927.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the motion that the House go into Com'tee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion

of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting an agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman: In introducing these Resolutions to the House this afternoon I think I m ght le pardoned if I dealt as briefly as possil le with them, as I feel that it is the desire of every individual meml er of the House to see something tang ble done with reference to our mineral resources, because, I think, all will agree, that the time has arrived when the future prosperity of this Colony depends upon the fostering and further developing of our various mineral resources. The Resolut ons l efore the Committee deal only with the importation of certain articles that would le required in the prospecting for and development of minerals. As is already well known to many meml ers of this House, the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, under the 1905 Act, acquired certa n timl er lands and mineral lands in the vicinity of Red Indian Lake and l ecause of scientific efforts on the part of mining men it has been made possible to have a thorough exam nation of those areas undertaken. The Schedule to this Act of 1905 can l e added to l y the Resolutions now before the House and honoural le members will notice that Sul-section (f) of Section (2) clarifies that only certain articles shall be admitted into the Colony free of duty. We are only doing this afternoon what has been done by prev ous Governments with various industries. I think the Committee will agree that a great deal more of a gamble is taken by a Company in trying to develop mineral resources than there is in developing a pulp and paper industry, because, after all, in the latter case it is possible to form an estimate of the value of the proposed undertaking; l ut what is in the ground requires careful study in order to determine if the deposits of m neral are large enough to warrant any great expenditure of money. In the old contract that was made with the A.N.D. Company they were allowed free importat on for twenty years all the machinery and equipment for the erection of their mills. Similar concess ons were allowed the Bell Island people and the Nfld. Power and Paper Company, l ut in the present case Sub-section (f) of the Agreement provides that free importation shall not apply to fuel, hand-tools, food, clothing, or movable articles, of household furniture for, or of equipment for, pr vate houses, staff houses, or hotels or articles intended by the importer for the personal and private ownership of individuals. It may l e argued that, as in the case of other enterprises and corporations, it may happen that advantage m ght be taken of the concessions and that certain articles never intended by this House to l e imported in free of duty might be l rought in. Well Sub-section (a) of Section (3) provides that the A.N.D. Company will be absolutely respons l le to the Government for any of the work of their sub-contractors they may hire, and I think it will l e agreed that, l ecause of the past actions of this Company, we can with a great deal of hope and confidence look forward to the same decent treatment from them with regard to the carrying out of their obligations. I do not th nk, Mr. Chairman, there is anything else I can add just now, but as we go through Committee I shall l e only too glad to answer any question asked, if the information is in my possession; but if the questions are of a legal nature they can be replied to the honoural le the Attorney General.

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Chairman,— This is the first time I have seen these Resolutions and while I agree with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that we should interest ourselves and foster and develop the natural resources of the Colony ,I think these Resolutions are too broad and too loose. We have had many instances in the past in which corporations were allowed in free of duty certain materials, but advantages were taken and materials were brought into the Colony in contravention of the Acts. I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that, before we discuss these Resolutions in Committee, that he table a statement outlining a schedule of the articles that this Company wants to come in duty free, then we will be able to see what we are voting for. The. A. N. D. Company want certain materials, even for the building of houses, imported free of duty and the Colony gets no revenue and the people in the country who have to pay for this kind of thing have no opportunity whatever to have a say in the matter. Two years ago a Bill went through this Legislature giving concessions to the Nfld. Light and Power Company in connection with re-railing St. John's street car line, and everything, even pick axes and shovels, came in duty free and the country got nothing. I would, therefore suggest to the honourable introducer of these Resolutions to have the Committee rise and for him to outline exactly what the A. N. D. Company want to import into this country free of duty.

We would like to have exact information of what exactly the A. N. D. Company want imported free. Anything in the interests of development, in the way of machinery or tools for mining or getting minerals out of the earth, I think all members on this side of the House would agree in allowing to come in free, but to let everything come in free I don't think is fair to the revenue of the country or to the people of the country doing business.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman,— Perhaps it is but right in response to the very practical suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that a word be said at this stage. The very point he mentioned was not lost sight of, and a good deal of consideration was given to it before the agreement was entered into, but I think it will be appreciated that there would be great difficulty in that being carried out in fact. The difficulty is if an agreement is mde specifying articles coming in duty free, anything not in it can not come in duty free and the most trivial things would make endless controversy and endless trouble. Instead of that there are then two courses to choose from. you make out a schedule of things admitted or you make your list of articles of free admission and make exceptions. Arising out of that an amplification of clause "f" of the agreement was made. As will be noticed the Agreement was signed in January and before the time to sanction our side of the Agreement this point was given a great deal of thought and finally the Company consented to the additions now made. The point was made by the Leader of the Opposition that hand tools, pick axes and things of that kind could not be included and that is obvious; those and the other things mentioned are debarred by "f."

All these things were felt ought not to get free duty and that clause now is amended to read.

(Reads:)

Now I think it will be appreciated that this is the first time we have been able to put into effect what we have always felt ought to be in those agreements. Down through the years there has come to be a custom to in-

sert a stock form of clause such as we have in these Resolutions and that stock clause as has been very correctly said has been making trouble. As a matter of fact it is no secret to say that in connection with Corner Brook at the present moment there is a dispute between the Government and Corner Brook on matters concerning the free admission of material. The Company has imported certain materials which it is claimed don't come under the clause which has been popular in years past. For instance expressions as: "Materials necessary for construction and equipment" have been used, and the Company have alleged that certain things necessary as part of the plant come under the heading of "materials for construction," whilst on the other hand the Customs contend the opposite. Therefore there has been made as is pretty generally known a claim by the Customs for a pretty considerable amount on these items. It is to get clear of those disputes that that clause was put in these resolutions.

That is one matter; the second point is that in actual fact under the Revenue Act, under the general law of the country, the great bulk classes of equipment used for mining work, is already on the free list and the only point with regard to these is that pending development of this place that in the using or in the importation of these articles they are protected from any alteration that may be made regarding the free list. I think it will be pretty generally admitted that the encouragement of mining development has at all times, and particularly now, been a matter of great concern. The indications are that our hopes lie rather more in mineral development than even in the much talked of and hoped of paper development. Therefore I think we ought so far as possible make every effort within reason to assist a large development. . Now in this connection, therefore, I would just like to say that the point which has been taken is a point that has been deliberately discussed and has been taken up with these people, and it has been found impossible in fact to put into effect the schedule wanted with regard to the purchase of local supplies. Honorable members will remember in passing the Humber contract, the Gander legislation and other Bills there were inserted clauses, which absolutely meant nothing, some of no value, and some simply put in more for digestion outside as something that would look well and that was the form of the clauses in these contracts saying that articles which could be purchased in Newfoundland of a good quality and at a price suitable to the Company must have duty paid on them by the Company. Of course it meant nothing. All the Company would have to say is that "These nails don't suit me," "that door doesn't suit me," with something else that "the price is not right," and in all these cases therefore that the articles don't come under the agreement.

That point was discussed again as to whether it mightn't be possible to draft a clause that would be any protection to local industries and I state now that it was found impossible and I don't think even the much talked of Philadelphia lawyers could draft a clause to meet the case.

You are immediately met with the difficulty of defining what is "locally." You can't put in a clause to say that nothing will be got in duty free that is manufactured in Newfoundland. You have got to consider to what degree an article is manufactured. If a man is turning out a few things of a certain line, is that manufacturing here You have got to see every difficulty met. You can't force a man to buy articles if the quality doesn't suit him. All those points

were fully discussed and no other decision could be come to. It was suggested that possibly purchases that might be made locally would be done outside under this Act.

Their answer was one that I think is justified. They said that in connection with Grand Falls and the work of the A. N. D. Company their history down through the ages has been that they have wherever possible purchased locally. That is represented by them as being their policy and they say that the trade will confirm it, that where they can get them locally they always prefer to buy them here. They say in their own interests with the trade when suitable they prefer to buy here.

Now let us consider the third clause of these Resolutions.

(Reads Section 3)

I may say that has been a matter of considerable relief and a matter which we were very gratified to get these people to undertake, because under the terms used and prevailing in the past, where contracts were made and rights of importation brought in as in this case for sub-contractors, there were continually arising cases in which it was felt that abuses were going on. It was possible in these that a sub-contractor who would be engaged only for a short time would have the benefit of free importation and assign what he had obtained when the work was through and we had no redress. They might finish off the work and clear out of the country. Now in this case under this section the A. N. D. Company, which are permanently here, guarantee payment of duties if this should happen.

(Reads)

Of course honourable members will see that under this provision now that protection is had, for the first time in my recollection of legislation of this kind, and that the Government is guaranteed payment of its duties in the sense of any disposal of materials that are made. I think that is a principle that in the future we ought to insist on. We are rather gratified in having that contained for the first time, and I think in the light of our experience in dealing with the A. N. D. Company in the past, that it is a pretty good precedent to have to put to others. If a company like that, that is here so long, is agreeable to accept that section, then I think we can look for that from other companies in the future.

I take the opportunity of telling the Leader of the Opposition that the point raised is not by any means an idle one but one that has been thrashed out in every way and which could be brought to a satisfactory solution only as it has been dealt with.

MR. HICKMAN—I have listened very attentively to the explanation just given by the Minister of Justice, but I was anxious also to get some explanation of sub-section "e".

(Reads.)

In putting up warehouses, buildings and stores you need nails, and I am sure they are manufactured in Newfoundland as good as they can be imported and in as large quantities as required. You need brick, which is manufactured in Newfoundland as good as the imported article and is manufactured in substantial quantities. There are manufacturers of doors and windows in Newfoundland that could supply them with any quantity that might be required, and I think that the permission to bring in all kinds of materials for construction of buildings, warehouses and storehouses is giving considerable latitude to any company who have those rights. In sub-section "b" of 3 it is said:

(Reads.)

Which means that any company or person nominated by the A. N. D. Company in a letter to the Minister of Finance and Customs has the privilege of getting any of these things

duty free in any part of Newfoundland.

HON .THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —No, only in connection with this industry.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—As applies to this agreement?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Yes.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Would the Minister of Justice kindly explain sub-section "b" of 3?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —As a matter of fact the point is well taken by the honourable member; that is the section which caused consideration to be given and the discussion of the point mentioned. Local timber, nails and things of that kind, that is the section exactly that applies, and under that section they can if they want to import nails, timber or doors duty free and the answer they simply make is that they don't import them. They say if they get suitable nails in Newfoundalnd, and brick and timber that is suitable and they can get it, there is a certain class tthat they want that they can't get, but anything that is suitable they get here.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Surely they can get things cheaper free of duty, locks, doors and so on.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —With anything suitable their practice has always been to buy here. They say they find it better as a matter of trade. As a matter of fact we have a communication from the Nail Factory on the subject.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I notice in the schedule the agreement provides that "nothing herein contained shall be held to apply to fuel or hand tools". Now sub-section "b" section 2 reads:

(Reads.)

Would that include coal? If the company have to pay duty on coal I would like it to be definite. "F" in the agreement is clear enough and definite but it is not so clear in the resolutions.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is what "f" is for—fuel is coal, and I would like to draw attention also to clause 1 of the Resolutions, seventh line. They have to pay duty on coal. That section is quite definite.

DR. MOSDELL—It seems to me that in sub-section "f" of section 2 the prohibition of importation of coal is only in respect of private consumption.

MR. HALFYARD—That is the point I was trying to make. In the agreement that is very clear.

(Reads "f" in agreement.)

That is alright if left there, but reading "f" in section 2 of the resolutions it appears that the prohibition is for private houses, staff houses and hotels and so on. My reading of that clause is that it applies only to private houses, but the company as a company can import pianos or any kind of furniture.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I cant' quite see how members can read the section that way.

(Reads sub-section "f" of 2.)

That woudn't be fuel for private houses, there is a stop after fuel. I might say in resolutions is the proper time to remedy any possible confusion as to the agreement. That particular section might be made absolutely clear but putting in the word "to" after "or", so that it will read "Provided that nothing herein shall be held to apply to fuel, hand tools, food, clothing, or to movable articles of household furniture for, or of equipment for, private houses," etc.

DR. MOSDELL—In that sub-section "f" of section 2 why not have a word of two after "houses or hotels". Why not add "or for any other purpose"?

MR. W. J. BROWNE—The point is that otherwise articles might be brought in for hospitals and used for private houses. They might bring in 20

or 30 carpets for the hospital and only two or three be used. Articles might be brought in in that manner and yet find their way to private houses.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The point raised by the hon. member for St. John's West is the explanation of why those words are in. Suppose to-morrow they put up a hospital, as they will do, or a building for public use, we simply say that we are not going to allow them to import through that articles for their private houses or staff houses or hotel. We don't mind their doing so for a hospital or a public utility—that is the explanation. If we put it in the way the hon. member for Fortune Bay suggests we defeat the object aimed at. The whole point is that things in the nature of private uses can't be admitted, but if the company erects a hospital or building for public purposes, use or benefit they get the benefit of this section. That is the explanation.

MR. K. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I know very little about mining; much of it is foreign to me. I have noticed sub-section "e" of section 2. I have on my desk a letter from a man who has been 25 years in the mining business in this country, and he says:

(Reads.)

I quite agree with the writer of that letter, and it contains a whole lot of common sense. I shall not discuss at the present time the things that should or should not come in duty free, but there are one or two things that I would like to say, and that is that Newfoundlanders should get preference, which has not been done at the Humber. I can assure the House that I speak the truth when I say that Newfoundlanders have been discriminated against at the Humber, and I hope that won't take place now. Also that a certain wage ought to be stipulated for the workers who go to Buchan's Mine. There has been all kinds of dissatisfaction over work at the Humber, and if we have to give the American Smelting Company twenty years clear of duty they should give the workmen the wages they deserve. I think twenty years is too long a period because in twenty years a company can get in enough material for sixty years' operation. I shall have something further to say when the different sections are going through.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, going back to section 2.

(Reads.)

I should like to ask the Minister of Justice what is the Red Indian Lake district—what area does it cover? Does it mean that the company can prospect over any vast district as they like? I should like an explanation.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —If the honourable member will excuse me; before I go any further, the hon. member for St. John's West has suggested certain words which carry out the point raised by the hon. members for Trinity and Fortune.

(Reads.)

Regarding the point raised by the last speaker as to the Red Indian Lake district, the expression in the first place concerns the importation for the building and extension of warehouses and storehouses, and operations arising out of that special work. As to the area, if I were to follow an expression very familiar to me a few months ago I should say the Red Indian Lake watershed. We have never gotten down to geographical limits; as I understand it the special area surrounds the Red Indian Lake, and the only explanation that I take is that of the watershed of Red Indian Lake. That is the only answer I can make.

MR. HIBBS—There is nothing to prevent their prospecting elsewhere and getting an advantage?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —They can do what they like over their own land. My answer is that I

wish they would, because they would then do the same thing as they here propose, somewhere else.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, after we grant all these concess ons, what benefit is all this going to be to Newfoundland. Do we get only a day's work, or is there a royalty coming to us?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I am glad that question has arisen. I shall read the section in the act of 1905, which provides for a 5 per cent. royalty.

(Reads)

That is to say that we are entitled to a royalty of 5 per cent. on net profits on anything arising out of the agreement. The Government will probably bring in a short bill regarding Crown Royalties, and a draft is being made to that effect, so that the royalties will run with the land. I think the members will agree that it is but right to have a provision of that sort, and it is no reflection on the present Company that it is now suggested.

The point has been raised by a couple of speakers as to what is the benefit of this agreement. As far as I personally am concerned I must say that I attach the greatest benefit of any of these agreements to the number of people able to get labour; I am not a believer in the same degree in royalties and export duties in comparison with the possibility of getting plenty of employment. One disadvantage on Bell Island is that the men have been practically compelled to accpet whatever has been offered them for the obvious reason that there is no other employment to be had. I don't need to do more than suggest that to honourable members to show how the rate of wages depends on the demand. I make that remark because Mr. Brown, the honourable member for Twillingate brought up the consideration of employment of Newfoundland labor—I should like to point out that the clause which is usually inserted in bills of this k.nd is nothing more than a myth. We can't put in a clause to the effect that no one but Newfoundlanders shall be employed, as that is impossible under the circumstances—any other clause has merely amounted to this, that when men are available we are told the reason our men were not taken is that they were not suitable to the work. So the clause is valueless, and as I see it, dangerous. It is a mistaken attempt to put in a minimum wage, as we have in the past. You all know that the experience has been that the rate mentioned has previously been accepted as the highest, and I feel that the rate will be controlled by supply and demand, and if we start with a minimum rate it will ultimately be accepted as the standard—I think it is best to say nothing about it. My point therefore is that we get ultimately the 5 per cent. royalty. With regard to the question of the hon. member for Twillingate as to what we should admit duty free, my personal feeling is that we ought to admit everything in the way of machinery, for the reason that for every machine you erect it means more labor. In a country such as ours where we have to depend so much on outside people to exploit our resources, we have to go a long way towards accepting the principle that we must give concessions. But the concessions ought not be too extensive, as they have been in the past.

MR. GRIMES — Mr. Chairman,I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice if there was any strong endeavour to get a less period than 20 years.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, we did make the attempt. Their point is this, that they ask for that period, hoping this will be a huge plant, and for the extensions they believe will be necessary, 20 years is a very small period. We did mention the length and try to cut it down, but they had a very good ground in that

in the original act for pulp and paper making they got 20 years. We have in the past given periods of 50 years, and in this particular case 20 years was in the original concessions given in 1925, and they seem reasonably entitled to the same.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things that appeal to me in the remarks of the Minister of Justice, and the first is this. Can't we form some scheme or plan whereby we can protect goods manufactured in Newfoundland, and thus fostering industry? Is there no successful way of making a minimum rate of pay? Is that the experience of other countries: there are places where Newfoundlanders go and work where these schemes are in effect, and surely we can devise a scheme to the same effect?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I don't want to interrupt the honourable member. In Corner Brook we had to provide that Newfoundland workmen were to be provided were possible. But people come in from outside, and when we ask the reason, they say they couldn't get the men. I honestly believe that in practice these things are controlled by supply and demand. In Grand Falls they tell me that not 2 per cent. of the employees are foreigners, and they have a practice that if there is a vacancy it is to go to a son of an employee.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, I don't want to monopolise the attention of the House, but I think that there are some matters on which at the present time and with the limited inform ation available. I cannot form a very intelligent opinion, as to the value to the country generally of the provisions made under this Bill. Almost every session some proposition for duty remissions is brought in here in connection with industrial development, and to my mind before we give any further concessions we should proceed to check up the actual return in labour etc., for those concessions. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition made some suggestion as to a schedule. I think that he had in mind this fact that with this schedule we should get some idea as to what materials are to be given free entry and their value. at the present time we are quite at sea. We don't know what exactly is involved, or to what extent. We don't know to what extent we can expect benefits from this industry not necessarily immediately but in five or ten years time. Of course if the balance is in our favour or if things are even equal, as between returns and concessions, I would be the last one to kick nor do I think that any gentleman on this side of the House, would object either, but I think that before anything definite is done by this committee we should have some more definite statement in respect to this Buchan's mine proposition.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, I want to say first that I have listened with much appreciation to the members of the Opposition and also members on this side of the House saying that it is the desire of every member that this country should get every possible dollar that it can by way of duty for revenue. But in a matter of this kind I think that we should be very careful or we may not only kill the hen that lays the golden eggs but we may even kill her before she lays an egg at all. The A.N.D. Co. asked certain rights in the area of Red Indian Lake, and they have been for the past twenty years trying to find something out there that it would be worth while to develop, not only in the interests of the country but also in their own interests. But it has been only within the past couple of years that they have been able to bring in a method whereby the ore that we are going to deal with in this bill that we are discussing, could be separated. It is a complex ore. On account of this new

development there is a great deal of hope, although I have not any assurance that it is going to be a success. There has been a tremendous amount of money lost in this country and outside of this country in mining development. The A.N.D. Co. have been paying a great deal of attention during the past two or three years to mining in this area over which they have complete control. And they have succeeded to the extent of being warranted in bringing a scientific process which only came into being during the past two or three years. It is going to cost a tremendous amount of money, before it will be placed on a basis sound enough before they can reasonably hope to employ a large number of men. Whilst I have no reliable data to submit, but there is every reason to hope for great things from this proposition, and I take it that every member of the Committee is determined to assist in every possible way, whereby this industry can be established so that it will be able to employ a considerable number of the men to-day crying for work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the concessions asked for in these resolutions, there is nothing new about it. We have been doing the same for any company coming before this House since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, and long before. For example in connection with the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company, by an act passed in 1905, all materials necessary in the manufacture of paper, have been admitted into this country duty free. It is the very same as is being asked under these resolutions this afternoon. Here is the Act passed by the Nova Scotia Government in connection with the Nova Scotia Steel Company.

(Reads.)

Then there is the Act passed between the Government and Harry J. Crowe, allowing him free entry of various machines required in the operation of his proposed industry in the White Bay area. Then there was the Act passed in 1923 between the Government and the Newfoundland Products Company.

(Reads.)

Then take the Revenue Act itself. Items such as Mining machines are admitted duty free.

(Reads.)

Practically every piece of machinery that is required by this Company now for the development of their mine at Red Indian Lake is allowed into this country duty free. I may also point out to the Committee that we will have coming into this country the present autumn, about a hundred of the biggest mining men not only in the Empire but in the world. A meeting will be held in Montreal on August 22nd. And from the Congress in Montreal there will come a hundred of these men to Newfoundland. They are from Europe, South America, United States, Canada, and I am very hopeful that some of these gentlemen may become interested in this Island. Because of the advertisement that we have been receiving recently on account of the find at Red Indian Lake, the outside mining world has its eyes turned on Newfoundland, and there is every reason to hope that this area will be able to take care of a great number of the unemployed in this country. And it is only by a further development of the mining resources of this country, so far as I am concerned, can I see any hope for the working men of this country. We say what we will about the fisheries, and its being the staple industry of this country, but without minimising its value in any way, I want to say unless we are able to provide continuous employment for our people for months of the year, there is no hope for our being able to get back to what we call normal, pre-war times. The time has passed when the fish-

ermen were able to go away, and as a result of two or three months work they were able to sit around in comfort and ease until the fishing season came again. We must develop other industries so that when the fishing season is over, the fishermen may be able to get further employment at a remunerative wage. Until that time comes you will always have this happening, that no matter what Government may be in power, they will be coming into this assembly and putting through loans if they can get them, and spending the money on unproductive work in order that the people may live. So I am very hopeful that with the introduction of the legislation that we are discussing this afternoon, and with the men who are coming here this Autumn we will be able to develop not only that mine at Red Indian Lake, but also other sections of the Island as well. And I would also like to say that one of the best expenditures that this Government ever made was the voting of a salary for Doctor Baker, who is at present in charge of the Geological Department of the Government. He is convinced that we have in this country wealth that we don't even dream of, although at the present time we are going through a period of depression. We have on Bell Island supplies of ore that will last for millions of years to come, And Doctor Baker is also convinced that in parts of Conception Bay there are other beds of ore. I have great hopes with regard to the future of Newfoundland and I believe that in the future the welfare of Newfoundland is going to largely depend upon the development of its mineral and timber resources.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Speaker,—I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines whether or not the Government is aware of the possible value of Buchan's Mine. I can quite readily see why the concession should be granted to assist the development of a mine that may contain a certain low grade ore. But the mine that may be fabulously rich or a gold mine, I do not think that the same argument should be used as regards a low grade ore mine as a gold mine.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman,—In reply to the junior member for Twillingate I must say that I had generally regarded a mine as simply a hole in the ground for sinking your money in. It is now nearly twenty years ago since the A. N. D. Company began development of the mineral resources of Buchan's Mine and it has taken all that time to carry out the process of separating the ores so as to make the thing a success and now they have got the American Smelting Company, one of the biggest of its kind in the world to come in and do it. The member for Twillingate seems very anxious to know what is going to accrue to this country through the introduction of this Company into Newfoundland or through its operation here. I say that this is a case where you have a great benefit in getting into the markets of the world all minerals of Newfoundland, through this Company. We recognise that there is only room for one or two more paper plants in the country. Consequently, we cannot look for more development of that kind with any ray of hope, so that the great hope is the development of our mineral resources. For that reason the loss of the development of Buchan's Mine would be a great blow to this country. The second reason why the loss of this mining corporation will be a blow to this country, and this is a reply to the member for Ferryland, is the amount of freight that will be carried over our railway and the value it will mean to this country in that respect. The Company will be carrying over our railway between seventy

and eighty thousand tons of concentrates per year, and in addition there will be a large passenger and freight traffic, besides the natural trade brought in there. This Company also propose to build their own railway from Millertown to the mine and are not asking the Government to build it for them. The A. N. D. Company built their own railway in connection with their plant at Grand Falls; they propose to build their own railway at Buchan's Mine and I think we ought to give them credit for that, as against the concessions in the way of importing material duty free. The proposition is in the main that the Company expect to smelt the mineral in this country and in order to do so they would require to develop a twenty thousand horsepower smelter, which would require the expenditure of another three millions of dollars. This alone is a big thing in itself, and, as I stated on the opening day of this Legislature, Buchan's Mine is going to be a bigger thing for this country than the Labrador. Besides we will get five per cent. on the nett profits of the Company in addition to the immense labor possibilities. Listening to some of the American people here now, they can hardly believe that we spent so much money in trying to win the Labrador case. So that altogether I really believe in course of time the business and revenue derived in connection with the Buchan's Mine project will have the effect of paying off the annual deficit on the railway of ours, apart from the labor earnings for our people. I do not agree, sir, with the member for Twillingate that we ought to mulct this Company, because I believe that if there is one Company in this country that deserves consideration from the hands of the Government it is the A. N. D. Company.

MR. MOORE.—Mr. Chairman,—I am thankful for the explanation of the Prime Minister because it puts a different complexion on the proposition we are now discussing. I shall not attempt nor is it my intention to stop any Company or any corporation from endeavouring to develop the resources of this country, provided that our people get employment, which is so badly and urgently needed at the present time; but I hope that the A. N. D. Company will not get the same concessions as regards free enteries as did the Bell Island Companies.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, with reference to the observations of the Prime Minister in reply to mine, I would like to say that I want to try and introduce capital into this country to develop our natural resources as much as any member in this House or outside this House, but I think that the period of twenty years for concessions should be cut down. My remarks earlier in the afternoon were that it should be seen that the country would not be mulcted through this project in any way, and I think that the words of the Prime Minister are uncalled for this evening. But I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no guarantee in these Resolutions that the company has to smelt their ore in Newfoundland. If there is, I would like the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to point it out to me. I consider it should be smelted here in Newfoundland.

As I said in speaking on the Address in Reply in reference to twenty years' duty being asked for, I said it is too long a period, and I maintain that now. I can't blame the A. N. D. Company or any other company for asking for concessions but we are here to protect the people's interests and though it is not my intention to knock the A. N. D. Company or any other company coming here to open up Newfoundland, I intend to try and protect the interests of the people, and when

I can't do that I will tender my resignation to His Excellency. I consider that this period of twenty years can be cut down and I will suggest that it be cut down, and then if the company comes back in five years and says they want further concessions, let that be considered then and the Government will be in a better position to know whether it is best to grant concessions for a further five or ten or fifteen years much better than now, unless we feel that the enterprise is one of doubtful success. That being the case it would be our duty to try and look after the country's interests by encouraging it, but I do not feel that we need to, to that extent, if it is felt that the industry is going to be a success.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity in connection with the development of the first mine in the interior of Newfoundland to say a few words on mining development here in general because I have on many occasions, as will perhaps be remembered, contended and stated here that the great future of Newfoundland lay in her mineral possibilities. I was very strong in advocating the acquisition of a first class geologist, and I think we have one in Dr. Baker, a man eminently qualified and whom I believe in a few short years will have justified the existence of his position and do untold good for Newfoundland. When one realises that all through the ages the only mineral developments we have had have been on the coast, and we have had several mines all around the coast worked successfully, as the Tilt Cove and Little Bay Mines.

And when these discontinued it was owing to their petering out or becoming no longer workable.

Well I always contended that if that was true of the coast that it must be true of the great unexplored and unknown interior, and said with great confidence that the future of the country lies in its mineral posibilities. We have before us to-day the first consummation of that anticipation. We have the beginning of the first great mineral development in the interior and from all that we can gather prospects are bright for its success. I don't agree with Mr. Ashbourne that if the proposition looks a valuable one for them they should not have any lengthy concessions. The more successful they are the better for Newfoundland. If the employment that will be given by them will be anything in keeping with what we anticipate, then I say it is a dawn of a new era for this country. As has been mentioned too it will bring revenue to the railway. It is then a mater for congratulation that at least something coming here is going to be a help to the country and people generally. We know that the American Smelters Company are not coming here for any idle purpose. They are a wealthy company fully equipped with a staff of scientific men and engineers and they don't do anything unless they mean business.

I want therefore to reiterate, have said many a time, that I think Newfoundland has greater possibilities in the development of her mineral resources than we have any idea of to-day.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, while I agree that we should do everything possible in this country to-day to encourage that industry, at the same time I think we should not lose sight of the industries we have got. If we are going to encourage industry I think we should begin right here, and I would suggest that there be inserted a provision that articles manufactured in Newfoundland should not be allowed in duty free to this company. We must not forget that while these people are coming in here to develop they are not doing this for the good of the people, and while we welcome them,

their main object is to make profit, and while we hope that they will do that, as it will be in the best interests of Newfoundand also, we still must remember that our industries should be patronised. With regard to that part of the resolutions which deals with the admission of materials for construction and so on, I think it is a mistake to allow them to get in brick duty free and nails and lumber when these commodities are manufactured in Newfoundland. It is reasonable that the companies engaged at these industries should be assisted and that money should be kept in the country, and I think that if that were put up to the company they would see that this is only reasonable. They have been long established here, and I think that they would see the reasonable argument behind the suggestion that all goods manufactured in Newfoundland that are to be used by the company in connection with this mining industry should be taxed to protect our own manufacturers. They should be given a chance. Around Trinity Bay and other sections there are mills for brick making but they can't sell the brick they make. I know one man who has been in my office several times and who has been in the business 40 years who told me that he has been discriminated against in connection with public buildings. I don't think that is good enough to people who are trying to establish a busines and to make two ends meet. I think therefore that it would be reasonable to protect them. Of course, as the Honourable Colonial Secretary pointed out, there is not a great deal of these goods manufactured in this country that will require it—we could count lumber, nails and things of that sort that I think should be protected, and if we place goods on the free list for twenty years, it should be with the exclusion of such goods as are manufactured in Newfoundland. That is only reasonable, and I direct it to the Prime Minister's attention. I am sure he would be glad to protect, as far as possible, industries in this country.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I have just a few remarks. I agree with the principle that a Company of the magnitude of the American Smelters should be encouraged to come in this country and try to develop any minerals we may have here. At the same time I feel that this Company which is coming in and developing Buchan's Mine has caught us in a rather unfortunate condition, and possibly they are taking advantage of the fact that we are—I would go so far as to say "poverty-stricken"—and I don't think any honourable member will take exception to that, because practically every man in the country is looking for work.

In looking over the resolutions I haven't seen anything of very great benefit to the ordinary people of the country. I agree with the minimum wage rate being inserted, but I don't agree with a Company coming in and taking advantage of our poverty by paying half nothing. I feel they should pay just as much for our labour as they do in other countries where living is much cheaper. Furthermore I have seen nothing about an export duty on ore shipped out after the mine is developed; I feel somewhat inclined to suggest that an export duty be placed on ore shipped out in its raw state, and free from duty if they erect a smelter and smelt the ore in this country. There is nothing in the resolutions to indicate that they will erect a smelter. It has been suggested by the Prime Minister that they will probably erect a smelter costing in the vicinity of three millions.

The general principles of the Bill are the same as that of every contract which has come up in the House, especially in the last three years, taking advantage to the fullest of our poverty. If precedents are of any value

we should learn a lesson from the Humber Deal—we gave concessions on everything, and where are we today? Certainly there is no guarantee asked for in this contract, but we are taking money from the revenue in that we allow these people to come in and exploit our resources and give nothing but some labour, and if they make a profit they will probably cut their accounts in order to show none, and leave it to the Auditor-General to see if they have made a profit or not —if that happens I trust the Auditor-General will make a better job than he has made of some things in the last few months.

There is another aspect of this contract. The people working in the Mines should be protected in the sense that business should not be confined to one or two who have a monopoly and fleece the people as they do in other sections. I understand that a certain Company belonging to St. John's is going to have the sole right to do business in that area with the result that they can charge what they like and the people have to pay or go without. I suggest to the Government that they take this matter up and see that the people are allowed to compete in business, and not have it confined to one or two sharks from Water Street. It is very well to say what a wonderful thing this will be for Newfoundland, but like any others, they are not here for the benefit of their health. I hope not, anyway. But at the same time there ought to be some protection for the people going there to work. I don't know what rate of pay they are giving now, but if it is like the Humber, with a minimum rate of 25c. which is fleeced out of them as soon as it is earned, by those allowed to go in and do business and charge as much as they like, there isn't much in that.

I agree with the principle that we should encourage capital to come in and attempt to develop our resources, and I trust that this Company will have every success, but I also trust that the Government, whether it is the present one or a future one, will see that unless the ore is smelted in this country, that an export duty be imposed on any shipped out of this country to be smelted in the United States or other places. We shall then be doing something to further our own interests and also to encourage foreign capital to come in.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chariman, I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice as regards the contract which we are now discussing, whether there is anything in it to prevent the Government putting an export royalty on ore?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No. Regarding that point, there is nothing at all in the 1905 Act that in my judgment would prevent doing any such thing, except that it might be regarded as a breach of faith by inference. I should say that the construction that would be put on the 1905 Act would be that the 5 per cent. royalty would be a substitute for an export tax. That would probably be argued by the Company. But as far as the present Act goes, it in no way affects the position the Company is in; whatever rights the A.N.D. Company have they have under the Act of 1905, and this Act is concerned purely with importation of materials. That is why I suggest that the Government will introduce this session a general Bill dealing with royalties, and providing that where any companies have concessions the royalties will run with the land, and the assignee be bound thereby. Secondly, as regards providing machinery that an export tax be placed on sales of ore, I shall give it some consideration and if it is thought well that an export duty be taken up, I should be pleased to bring that in, not in connection with the present Act, as this is only secondary to the Act itself.

Regarding the point as to export duty raised by the honourable member for Ferryland, we must not forget that in the A.N.D. Company case we get advantage of the 5 per cent. clause, and that is a different position from the Bell Island Mines, for instance. The intention would be that where there was no royalty the export tax would operate—it strikes me that if this proposition is going to be what we hope it will be, the 5 per cent. will provide a very substantial royalty and equal a fairly substantial export duty. As that has been raised, we might take it up when dealing with the general Bill.

MR. CASHIN—Might I ask if it is correct that in the contract with the A.N.D. Company originally there was nothing that lets them off with the Business Profits Tax?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No. If we bring in the Business Profits Tax this year there is nothing in this legislation that affects it.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, as this contract is going to last for twenty years, I think the Minister of Justice might give us an explanation of a phrase commonly seen in contracts of this sort. It occurs in Subsection (a) of Section 2:—"But not in substitution for old." How far would the exemptions be whittled down by a following section where these words are not inserted?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman,—In reply to the hon. member I may say that it is clearly the intention that there be no substitution at any time. The words in clause A, I take it, govern the others. If the hon. member will refer to the agreement in sub section A clause 1.

(Reads.)

It seems that that will be the construction.

MR. BROWNE.—Is not that doubtful, though.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —To my mind there is no doubt at all. The object of the first section A is the governing clause throughout all the concessions. That is as I see it. I may say for the information of the hon. member that one of the reasons why our attention was brought in particularly to having that clause in the Bill was that as regards that particular clause it was distinctly had in mind, that as regards the actual place in the sense of the mill site or the headquarters for the machinery it was felt that as to the mill to be put up they ought not to be allowed to substitute the new for the old in that. But as regards transportation and things that might wear out, such as rolling stock on the railroad or engines, of course if they got worn out the situation would not be the same. That explains why that clause got attached to that part of the agreement.

I think, however, that the hon. gentleman will appreciate the fact that there would not be any need for a court house if it was possible to anticipate every objection. I take it that the governing spirit of this thing is going to be the bona fide of the A. N. D. Company, and in that connection your Customs' Department has got to try and keep ahead of the situation, in seeing how far the spirit of the agreement is complied with. If you think that you can draw up an agreement that is going to be totally water tight against the man who wants to be a crook, that cannot be done. It is not possible to draw up an agreement of that kind, no more than any Auditor can possibly undertake to say that he can make a system that a clever crook cannot beat. So we have got to consider one thing and that is whether the A. N. D. Co. are likely to live up to the spirit of their agreement.

MR. BROPHY.—Mr. Chairman,— I am fully in acord with the Bill be-

fore the Committee, and I trust that the returns from this mine will be as splendid as the Prime Minister anticipates. I am sorry such latitude was given to this matter, and I would like the Government to take its time and not rush into this bill too quickly. He certainly must realise the conditions of things, and all members of this House I feel sure are anxious that these conditions of things should be remedied as soon as possible. But I think that we should not give or extend any more concessions to these companies until we have more definite knowledge to go on.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Mr. Chairman,—I have listened with a great deal of attention to the discussion that has taken place this afternoon on the resolutions now before the chair. First of all I want to say that I think it is a pity that we are obliged to go and take contracts of this nature that have been drafted years ago as our precedent to guide us in making a new bill. The practise now seems to be to hunt up a contract of a similar nature and be guided by that in drafting a new one. It is plain to me to see that we are learning nothing by experience and doing very little new things off our own bat. I want to go on record as being thoroughly in accord with these resolutions as regards encouraging this company to come into this country and develop our mine areas. But there are some sections of the resolutions that are objectionable. One of these is section two which gives them twenty years exemption from duty. Now if they have as I am lead to believe they have such a great thing in Buchan's Mine, then they ought to be prepared for a shorter period of exemption, and the Government ought to press for a shorter period. I contend that the twenty years is too long.

The second criticism that I have to offere is in connection with the general wording of sub section A, section 2.

(Reads:)

I don't agree with that at all. I don't see why these articles that are going into the construction of workingmen's houses should be imported free of duty. Most of these things in any case can be manufactured in Newfoundland. We learn by experience, and we ought to profit by that experience and by the mistakes that have been made in the past. We have got before us now the story of the Humber, and no man in this legislature but knows that things were absolutely put over on us. Now in sub section B section 2.

(Reads:)

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that this is making provision for what might be quite another industry entirely outside the scope of the present resolutions. I have in mind what sooner or later we must have in this country and that is an aluminum plant, which might be entirely different from what is contemplated in the scope of these resolutions.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Chairman, I apprec ate the position taken ty the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and the point raised ty the member for Fogo, namely, that, if this Buchan's Mine project is going to be as good as we are told it is going to be and .f we are anxious to safeguard the interests of the Newfoundland Railway, the Company should not be given such a period of twenty years exemption of duties on such materials as are mentioned in Sub-section (e) of Sectoin (2). We should tenefit ty the lesson of the Humber where even the build ng of private yachts was charged to construction, according to common reports. I feel that, in order to encourage local manufactures and local industries, everything that can te produced here for this project should be produced. Neither should monopoly be given shopkeep-

ers within the area concerned, as was given the promoters of the Grand Falls industry, as this system that has prevailed in the past is detrimental to the purchaser and tends to fleece him. The Government should strike out against this and see that the common worker is protected against profiteers. Reports of the Aud tor-General also in connection with profits of this mining industry should le carefully watched in view of recent revelations.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Comm ttee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.

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

On motion of Hon. Colon al Secretary the motion that the House go into Comm ttee of the Whole on Resolution respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission was deferred unt l to-morrow.

HON THE SPEAKER—In refer nce to the questions proposed to be asked by the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Brophy, and the hon. member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, relative to the invoice cost of, and amount of duty paid on certain importations by two private parti s, I should like to draw the attention of the hon members to the fact that I fear this type of question intrudes upon matters of purely private concern. Rule 92 which covers the asking of questions says that "Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to any bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House," but surely it was never intended to permit enquiry into matters of a distinctly private character unless there was ground for supposing that there was some wrongdoing in connection with it which made it a matter of public moment. If for example it was alleged that the transactions were fraudulent or that there was collusion between the Customs officials or the valuator and the importer, whereby the revenue was defrauded the quest ons would be permissible because public interests would be affected and it would be a matter of public concern. But where there is no suggestion that there was anything illicit about the matter—and I presume that the hon. members who seek to obtain the information, do not allege that there was—I do not think that questions should be asked, the answers to which would disclose information of a private nature. Under our fiscal and commercial system private parties are required to give to certain Government departments information of the most confidential character; for example, income tax returns, (the secrecy of which is specially protected by statute) and, as in the present case, invoices and other particulars of importations which under the Customs Act cannot be publicly disclosed except under process of court. If therefore questions were permitted which tended to the disclosure of matters of private business, public confidence in the secrecy which should be observed by departments in reference to such transactions would be lost and a very serious state of affairs would result I therefore suggest that hon. members should hesitate before exercising the inherent right which lies in the Assembly of obtaining the fullest possible information on all public matters so that there would be no intrusion into private affairs—unless, of course, as I have stated, there were reasonable grounds for alleging fraud or illegality which would make it a matter of public concern and the subject of proper public enquiry.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to say to the House, that in connection

with the remarks that I am going to make I have the consent of Mr. Thos. Smythe to lay the matter on the table of this House. Dur.ng my time as Finance Minister a considerable quantity of second hand cars were imported into this country. Not having a man in the department who I considered qualified to exam:ne cars I endeavoured to find one. Now I don't think anyone in this House would doubt that man. We have had a great deal of friction over the matter, because certain people complained that this man was a dealer in automobiles. But unless he was a mechanic he would not be qual.fied to put a true valuation on those cars. Most of the complaints alleged that he valued them to protect the motor business. Now I have every reason to believe that Mr. Cocker was absolutely square and above board, and I don't think for one minute that Mr. Thos. Smythe would have any influence in the appraisement of this car. And until a few days ago I did not know myself that Mr. Smythe imported a car, and I don't know what k nd of a car he has got to-day. I had a drive with him the other day and he told me that he had brought a car down with him second hand. The value of the car was simply the valuation that Mr. Cocker puts on every other car. I have much pleasure in laying this answer on the tal le of the House if it will g.ve anyone much pleasure after they get it.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, June 13th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 13th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Grimes, from Middle Arm, re Coastal Service.

Hon. Minister of Justice presented the report of the Select Committee on the petition of Holyrood Pond Fisheres, Ltd., as follows:

"June 13th, 1927.

To the Hon. the House of Assembly:

Your Select Committee appointed to consider the petition of Holyrood Pond Fisheries, Ltd., beg to report that they have considered the petition and find that the Rules of the House relating to Private B.lls have been complied with and recommend that leave be granted to introduce Resolutions in accordance with the prayer thereof.

Respectfully submitted:

(Sgd.) W. J. HIGGINS,
" M. S. SULLIVAN,
" W. C. WINSOR,
" T. W. G. ASHBOURNE."

On motion th.s Report was received and adopted.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on certain Resolutions respecting the confirmation of an agreement between the Government and Holyrood Pond Fisher es, Ltd.

The Hon the Prime Minister gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act respecting Education.

On motion of Hon. the Min:ster of Finance the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting the Incorporat'on of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Cair of Committee.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr Chairman, honorable members are no doubt aware that for the last

year or more there has been operating in this community a committee of young business men who have styled themselves "The Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Bureau." This bureau was started for the purpose of developing and encouraging tourists to come to this country. The work was taken up by nine or ten young business men at the request of the Government and they took upon themselves the responsibility of raising certain funds by public subscription. The Government agreed to subscribe dollar for dollar for every dollar they raised for this object. The past year they collected I think something in the neighbourhood of $3,250 and the Government subscribed an equal amount which made an entire revenue of some $6,000 and odd. This year of course it has been considered too great a hardship to those who are voluntarily working for this matter to have to go round and solicit these subscriptions. As a matter of fact they pointed out that it would be impossible to get these subscriptions this year. The spade work of this development in this country has been accomplished I think very satisfactorily and to those men who have voluntarily undertaken the work, who have given their time, who have worked assiduously and have acquired a tremendous amount of knowledge and information with regard to what steps should be taken to make successful the tourist policy which has been incorporated in the policy of the present administration, a very great amount of credit is due. I cannot speak too highly of the self sacrificing efforts of this committee because they have in season and out given their time and attention to this work and all through the winter for the past two years they have been meeting continually, communicating with people outside the country, and in every way possible arousing an interest in the attractions of Newfoundland. Their work has been performed gratuitously and I am sure that the House will admit that their work has been accomplished with tremendous advantage to us in this respect.

Last fall we had a visitor here from the United States, a lady by the name of Miss Boggs who was representing the American Bureau of Commercial Economics. This bureau is comprised of representatives of people in all parts of the world and their idea is, by lectures and other means of communication and information to make known the attractions and merits of one country to another; in fact it might be styled a bureau for introducing one people to another. When Miss Boggs arrived here last fall it was represented that it was essential that Newfoundland be represented on this bureau and to give effect to all the benefits of this bureau, some person would have to be found to go about and lecture about Newfoundland; not only as a tourist resort, but with regard to its advantages from a commercial and natural standpoint. I had prepared a resume of the actions of the bureau since its inception, and with your permission, I will go through it, because I think it covers pretty well all the points with regard to the Bill just now before the Committee.

(Reads)

So I submit Mr. Chairman, that as we have accomplished the preliminary work in connection with the establishment of this bureau, that it is nothing but right that some security should be given to the continuation of this work and to the financing of it which I am sure will receive the approbation of this House. When we come to think of a tax of $2 or $3 on persons going to any part of the United States or to England or any other place, on first class passengers, it is not a very onerous tax on those people who in the great majority of cases can well afford to pay it. I might say in explanation that this payment is also applic-

able to round-trippers. Arrangements have been made with the transportation companies that when they issue a ticket they have to be responsible for two dollars for the outward portion of that ticket, so that every round-tripper coming here will have to contribue $2 towards this fund, and in that way we will get from those people who are here on pleasure practically the entire revenue to support this bureau, and some amount will be collected also from our own people, those who go away occasionally,once or twice a year. It doesn't apply in any way to people en route from England to the United States or vice versa. Those people being merely on their way though they passed through Newfoundland it wasn't considered that we had the right to tax them being merely in transit. The Bill I think has been well founded on the experience of this bureau and the different sections that are referred to will show that it has been well and thoroughly thought out. The first section has reference to the constitution and the management of the Commission. The first sub-section gives the numbers of the commission and the next the names of the original founders of the Bureau. Those names are the names of those gentlemen to whom I referred a few moments ago that have done such good work in the original stages of this, which I consider will be very useful. They have done the work without any hope of reward. They have done it because of the interest they have in the country and I am sure that the House will appreciate their efforts up to the present time. They are prepared to do the work without any compensation. The only official being paid is the Secretary, Captain Gerald Byrne; he was my secretary when I was Minister of Militia; and all those who came in contact with him will agree with me that a more competent and capable official it would be hard to find. He was also employment officer last summer and had charge of the placing of men and everything he did was done with that thoroughness and gentlemanly conduct that he is well known for. I am sure that the Bureau is fortunate in having so obliging and capable an official; much will depend on him because he has the organizing and he has to come in contact with people and he has to show a great deal of initiative and ability to carry on the work and he has well demonstrated this in the past. The next section provides for vacancies. The next refers to the election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and so on.

(Reads)

At the end there is a section referring to hotels. The idea is of course to get the hotel people interested in standardization of hotels if possible. We have people coming here who want information as to where they can go to be comfortably housed and it is unfortunate that in the past we have not been able to supply good accommodation for tourists except in very rare instances. Now I think that a word should be said with regard to a body of citizens in St. John's who have recently got together and have made substantial improvements to the hotel at Placentia known as "Fulfort's." I might call them a number of philanthropic citizens, because I don't think they will ever get a dollar out of the money they have spent, who have placed from five to ten thousand dollars at the disposal of the hostelry to make extensions, instal hot and cold water, electric light, and making it thoroughly up-to-date, so that people who are used to them can find comforts in that place. They have shown a great public spirit, and I believe we will benefit. We are great imitators in Newfoundland, and if this proves successful, it will be an incentive to others to go in the same line, and improve their properties. Whatever may be said of the Government

for building roads, and for improving conditions for tourists, those of us who believe in the Tourist policy and who have advocated it will have to live only a short while to see its benefits. They are not coming suddenly—it may not be this year or next, but I feel sure that what we have expended will bring a great revenue, and we in turn will get our share as time goes on. I have these expectations, and I feel sure from the information received from the Bureau and the Transportation Companies as to the bookings on the various steamers, that practically every steamer will be full this summer .In this connection the New Hotel has played an important part, and everyone will agree that it has justified its existence. Although it has not been running one season, and that cannot be considered as an average of its possibilities, even during the winter months it covered expenses, and I feel sure that in the months to come it will be crowded, and will make considerable profit. The manager, Mr. Quick, has been largely instrumental in bringing that about; excellent conditions are maintained, and as time goes on we will see greater evidences of progress and prosperity. I don't know if I can say any more on these matters, but feel that the bill will be explained as it goes along, and if there are any suggestions I shall be glad to receive them and give them consideration.

MR. HICKMAN—I should like to ask the Mover with regard to Section 3, making the tax a charge on the fare. Who pays that—the passenger?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—When the Company issues a ticket it puts a stamp on it, which it has bought from the Bureau. The Company has to make good to the Bureau, and I suppose collects from the passenger.

MR. HICKMAN—What does the Steamship Company contribute?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is supposed to be a tax on passengers.

MR. HICKMAN—But what do they contribute? Shouldn't they contribute as well as the passenger.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—They are not doing it anywhere else in any other way. It must be borne in mind that the Transportation Companies have invested a large amount of money during the past few years. It may mean more passengers for them, but I doubt if they are making any great amount of money. We put the tax on the Company, and presume it will be carried by the passenger. I did hear that some Companies were considering absorbing the tax, but think they found it more than they could handle.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I notice that Section 5 gives the power to employ clerks and pay salaries—I have no doubt that they will use it. I should like to thank the honourable introducer for the interesting account of the Tourist Bureau and its work to date. If these men have worked without remuneration it is very commendable on their part, and I suppose that this House, having adopted a Tourist Policy, will have no great fault with this piece of legislation. It is no great addition to the revenue of the country, but will aid the work of a number of men who no doubt have a great interest in trying to advertise the country and increase the number of people visiting us and spending their money here. That is commendable, and we thank them for their efforts in that respect.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable introducer said that if a tax of $2.00 per head had been imposed on first class passengers last year, sixteen thousand dollars would have been realized —that is, that eight thousand persons bought first class tickets. That is quite a number, and I suppose the Bureau has sufficient data to make that esti-

mate. He also said that there would be no tax on second class passengers as it is generally understood that persons leaving to seek employment travel second-class. There is the only objection I have to this Bill, the system of taxing. I feel sure that hundreds of young people went out last year seeking employment in the United States and bought first-class tickets; I asked why this was and found that it made it easier to pass the immigration officials. Now it is bad enough to be subjected to such conditions that people have to leave here, but to tax them going out is doubly bad and regrettable, and if we can amend this so as to be sure not to tax our people seeking employment, it will be following out the spirit of this bit of legislation, and not have the same objection. A man who goes on a trip for business or pleasure hardly feels the paying of $2.00 or $10.00, and it is little enough for him to pay this $2.00 extra. But we should not make it apparent to those leaving for employment that they are being taxed going out. We can't support them here, and leaving make it more difficult. Some of these have to borrow funds to make it possible to travel first-class, and I should like for the mover to give consideration to this and receive it in the spirit in which it is given.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Chairman, I quite appreciate the idea of the honourable member. I am afraid that prior to last year there was a great deal of trouble in getting into the United States, but I think it can be successfully contended that since Mr. Warren has taken the post of Consul for the United States there is a marked improvement in facilities for passengers on arrival. Now I have travelled back and forth a great number of times, and found that usually all passengers are treated alike—the immigration Officers come into the saloon and all the passengers pass along and have their papers vised and go ashore. I have yet to experience any distinction being made between the passengers. I think however it will be found that there has been a vast improvement. However, this Bill will be coming up for a second reading, and I shall ask the Tourist Bureau if that might be arranged. They may formulate a scheme to meet that contingency, and I shall be glad to put it before them.

MR HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, just at this stage I do not propose to say much, any more than that I think the sources from which the Commission hopes to derive its revenue are equitable and reasonable as any I can think of. With the exception of what my honourable friend Mr. Halfyard has referred to, that hardship may be inflicted on those who are leaving seeking employment. Personally I don't feel that there would be a great many of these seeking employment who would travel first-class, but no doubt there are some, and I hope the honourable introducer can see his way clear to safeguard these.

My own view is this—that we embarked on a Tourist Policy, spent a great deal on roads and hotels, and of course our paramount object now is to get tourists here. We all hope the policy will be successful. The men who compose the personnel of the Commission deserve to be congratulated—I have reason to know that they have given time and toil and interest. I had the honour of being a member of the Commission, as did also the Hon. Colonial Secretary, I think, but perhaps we were not good publicity men The Commission deserve credit, for they have worked hard. and I think men of that kind should be encouraged. There is too little effort of that kind in this country, and they should be patted on the backs. Candidly, I don't see any better way of raising the money, which doesn't bear at all on the laboring tax-payer. I should certainly object if

it did. This seems to be a way of raising money in which the more well-to-do persons alone are likely to have to contribute. It is just possible that some people will travel first-class who can't affort it, and who are seeking employment, but I don't think that will be a large number. For that reason I don't see any objection to the resolution at this stage. However, when it comes in the form of a Bill I may have some suggestions. I agree with the principle of the Bill.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, a couple of weeks ago when I was called home owing to sickness, I felt that I was challenged by the Prime Minister as being an obstructionist. I have been away two weeks, and would like to know what has been done during my absence? You have brought in resolutions that are weak enough to make anyone sick. If someone brought in anything about the fishery you would spend a tenth of the time on it and then throw it in the waste-paper basket. If the members of this House would go to the South-West Coast today and see what is going on, they would close up this House and get to work. People on the West Coast are producing—every schooner has an average of 1400 quintals of fish. You are doing nothing here, and the Prime Minister tells us we are obstructing legislation—what has he brought in? I have seen nothing, and we are down here on the thirteenth day of June talking about the Tourist Policy, wasting the people's time and money. If we don't soon get a constructive policy it is better for the people to get out. The thirteenth day of June and nothing done—it makes me sick.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I feel somewhat like my honourable friend Mr. Lake. I feel that we should sympathize with the Colonial Secretary for having to bring in this sort of legislation on behalf of the Government. When the Opposition were talking of the Address in Reply, we were told by the Prime Minister that by our talking we were obstructing constructive legislation—I haven't seen any since the I have seen nothing, and we are this evening on a thing so foolish that sensible men can hardly talk about it. You have brought in Legislation on Buchan's Mine and nothing else of a constructive nature, and I would like to know where we are going to get off? Have we got to depend on a Tourist Policy which has been encouraged by the present administration?

There is nothing drastic in this Bill, neither do I intend to oppose it, because it is only a joke. But where is the constructive legislation that the Prime Minister told us he was going to bring in? Surely you don't look upon the Buchan's Mine agreement as constructive? I intend to deal with that later. It seems to me that the present session has been deferred until members who have to attend to their business had to stay away. I feel like moving that the thing go through without further comment because it is a joke.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the Hon. Colonial Secretary that he go one step further than that suggested by Messrs. Halfyard and Hibbs. I think that something ought to be put in this clause to relieve any persons, not only those looking for employment, but those people who do not go on business to other countries, but to visit their children and for other purposes, and would find themselves taxed. They are taxed enough now without being compelled to find a tax for the operation of the Tourist Bureau. I think that taxes and taxation have gone the limit, and here we are attempting to do something to make them worse. There are lots of people whom I know who buy first-class tickets, and who go to visit their sons or daughters who have not been able to get home to see their parents, and have sent the money to go and see them. They find it hard

enough to provide the money. There are other cases that might be enumerated. We should go a step further and relieve our own people of this tax. We may be able to apply it to the people who come to this country, but to tax our own people for the purpose of keeping this Bureau going, because they buy a first-class ticket, it is not good enough. We should get it from some other sources, and I suggest that this be stipulated.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I may say that while I sympathise with the idea of exempting the people who are not over-endowed with this world's goods, I am afraid that it would be difficult to discriminate. How would we find out whether people are going to visit their relatives? If would be difficult to draw the line, but I shall take a note of the suggestion and see what can be done.

Regarding the member who referred to this as a "piece of nonsense," I don't agree with him. We had 6,000 tourists last year and according to estimates of the Bureau they averaged an expenditure of $100.00, which totals $600,000.00. Now that is a fairly big income, and if it can be doubled it will mean much. It is absolutely absurd and ridiculous to entertain the proposition that we just want to get tourists in and give them a good time; these people spend money, and that is what we want to see, and further we might interest them in the development of our natural resources. And that six hundred thousand went to the taxi-man, the hotel-man, the river-warden, the store-keeper and the curio dealer—they all got the benefit, particularly from the people who stayed over—the round-tripper is not of so much benefit. This is going to be a big source of revenue. And as I pointed out in giving the list of enquiries to Mr. Tait, people are asking not only about scenic beauties and fishing, but other things, and we want to get them and see if they can't find things that will bring them here for other reasons. We want to put Newfoundland on the map, and to try to make this a revenue producing movement, so that we may justify the amount of money spent. I believe that in two or three years' time we will wonder why we didn't do this before.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, the point taken by the Honourable Colonial Secretary is alright as to the outside tourist spending his money, but what I object to is that a tax should be levied on our own people who have to buy a ticket. If I want to go away to-morrow and go to the steamship company to buy a first-class ticket, why should I be taxed one, two, or three dollars as the case may be? Tax outsiders as much as you like. It brings back to my mind a ballad written by our old friend, Johnny Burke, some thirty years ago. In writing on the effects of Confederation, he said:

"They will tax your dogs, cats and
canaries,
And the blakeys you wear on your
shoes."

And we are getting to that point. And that is what I object to. Tax the outside tourist all you like, but for Heaven's sake place no more taxes on our own people.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlemen who form this Committee deserve to be commended for the public spirit that they have shown, and their desire to help the country in giving their services free of charge. We ought to show our appreciation of the work they have done, particularly when they have got such results ;they have given good value, and the country has been the gainer.

One thing that strikes me particularly, and that is the part contained

in Sub-section D of Section 2, that part of their work is to be to discover, preserve, mark, restore or provide means of access to matters or places of sporting, scenic or historical interest. Our neglect of our landmarks must be patent to every Newfoundlander and every visitor, and something of which we ought to be ashamed. If I bring a man around to see the Battery, there is nobody to take an interest in seeing that marks are preserved, or forts and relics maintained. I remember having been a member of a history club a few years ago, of which Hon. John Harvey was a prominent member, and he brought up the idea of asking the Government to give a grant to repair these places, but there was nothing done. And here we have these men who are willing to devote money and care in preserving these places. If a man goes to Boston, or the Old Country or Canada he sees every place of historic interest marked off. A man can get a guide book and discover about prominent personages and places, and say that he visited there; I should like to be able to see that here. There must be numerous places around St. John's and Trinity Bay and the Northern districts, where we would like to know where such and such things happened of historical interest. And thousands of our own people who come back from the United States and Canada to visit us, if they knew these places were marked off they would spend more money to see them —they would be willing to incur the expenditure to be able to show that they had visited these places.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I am disposed to favour the principle of these resolutions, although I am not prepared to admit that they should occupy such a position of importance as they appear to have taken in the deliberations of the House. I have before during the session done my best to impress upon the Ministry the seriousness of the situation which confronts us in this Colony, and I had hoped and possible still hope that ere the session draws to a close something can be done which one can anticipate may further the essential industries of Newfoundland. When we realize, as every honourable member must, that the major industry of this country is starving to death, not slowly but rapidly just now; when we realize that the duty of the Government is at least to make some effort, well or indifferently, towards the resuscitation of that dying industry, it does seem an anomaly to find ourselves here this afternoon expending time on a measure that is of no financial or other benefit to the country. The mountain has laboured and brought forth a mouse, and I presume that for that mouse we must be duly grateful. I do trust that it develops the element of possible profit outlined. I quite appreciate the position taken by the Honourable Colonial Secretary when he says that any effort that will induce tourists to come here will be a factor in bringing in revenue. If these tourists come here and spend from fifty to a hundred thousand dollars, I suppose from fifteen to thirty thousand of that will be profit to the revenue, and if in order to obtain that amount we have to expend ten thousand, the balance is favourable to us. It has been suggested that this will mean no cost to the Colony—with that I do not agree. An income is provided for the Tourist Bureau which is to be raised by vote of this House, and as such is an expenditure of monies that could otherwise be at the disposal of the Colony I admit that I don't like expending money raised by a vote of this House otherwise than for essentials, which will lighten the burden of the working people. But I suppose the benefit derived by the workers of this

country by the addition of this small amount to the revenue be a small boon to the people, and when one takes into consideration the possibilities which I, with the Colonial Secretary, believe to exist in connection with the expansion of this Tourist industry, I feel justified in supporting the measure. I agree with Mr. Grimes that there are many places of historic interest which are slowly but surely falling into ruin and disrepair, and that is nothing less than a national calamity. One of the greatest assets of a country is its old historic places and scenes—a shining example of that is England today. I suppose that most of us at some time or other hope to have the opportunity of visiting the Old Land and see the scenes where the great events of history have been enacted during the past 1500 years. They hold a glamour not only to those who were born in that country, but to those of us who are descendants of the native born, and even to foreigners who have no blood ties in that land. We have around St. John's today many places of this character which I can call to mind, and which are in fact crumbling in decay. If it is possible for the Tourist Publicity Bureau to preserve them it will have done something to justify its existence and our action in supporting this measure.

I haven't any definite idea as to what revenue they are likely to derive from this source, but possibly from ten to fifteen thousand dollars. I fear that with that amount it will be impossible for them to do very much in a substantial way towards rehabilitating and restoring historic places, but with an expansion of the tourist trade which may follow their efforts, their revenue will be materially increased and they may have sufficient funds to undertake that work.

I feel that I must support this measure, although as I said before I dislike appropriating funds of this Colony for other than essential purposes, but I believe that there are possibilities in the tourist trade. Whether we catch the mackerel for which we are now throwing the sprat I do not know, but let us hope the efforts of these gentlemen will be successful. Up to the present they have confined themselves to the United States. Might I suggest that there are other countries from which trade of that kind may be drawn. There are European countries which have people with money to spend, who are looking as it were for pastures new, from the standpoint of the pleasure seeker .England herself is a country with a very large population, and Newfoundland is occupying a large place in the eyes of Englishmen today. We are gradually becoming known all over the world. Might I suggest that the Bureau extend its field of operations and take in England and some Continental countries. In conclusion I have only to say that I support the principle of the resolutions, because I feel that they contain at least a scintilla of hope of profit to the Colony and the small expenditure is therefore in my opinion justified.

MR. HALFYARD—I would suggest to the Honurable Introducer that Section 3 be deferred.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If I may be allowed to interject, it seems quite obvious to me that it will be impossible to have that suggestion carried out. This has been drafted purely to exempt a class as a class, and second-class passengers as a class are exempted. When you come to deferentiate among first-class passengers, I think honourable members will see that the method adopted is the best that can be done. It would be manifestly unfair to have the same size of tax on a short trip such as from Port aux Basques to Sydney

where one dollar would be paid. It is hardly square to charge the same as for a person travelling quite a distance. Take the other two divisions comprising fares between ten dollars and one hundred and over one hundred dollars. I remember distinctly that the feeling was that first-class passengers generally speaking are best able to pay the imposition of this tax.

The position that we are confronted with, as pointed out by honourable members to-day is: If a Bureau of this kind is to ge assisted, as it is largely in the nature of experimental work, largely in the nature of assisting what is not yet an industry of the character that the honourable member for Port de Grave referred to, it was felt that the method of assisting had better come in an unusual way. It will be generally agreed that the imposition of this kind of a tax is a very much fairer method of giving assistance to that Bureau than a general levy out of the Colony's funds. It is a levy in a direction which, it is felt, is the fairest form to make a levy. The great bulk of this taxation is of necessity bound to fall upon those people from outside and those of our own people who go outside who are best able to bear it. That will, generally speaking, be the position, and I think it must be assumed that if that be the general position, it is hardly possible for us to meet all cases. You will have the exceptional cases which may be a certain amount of financial inconvenience, but, generally speaking, that is not so. The remark here I would like to avail of, in confirmation of what the Colonial Secretary has said, and I say it in fairness to him, because one would imagine that this was some sort of a pet child or some kind of a novelty of his own that the introducer was carrying alone. One honourable member made some remark about the fact that, having waited for some time, this was the constructive legislation. I think that the honourable members present in the House will be good enough to understand that that remark is hardly quite in line with the fact that there are certain measures on the Order Paper to-day that will require very serious thought in the sense of being regarded as constructive measures in the way of industrial work. Amongst them we will notice confirmation with regard to the St. George's and Bay of Islands services. That is a measure that we will have to introduce legislation for in the regular way. It is not professed to be in itself the whole progress of the Government, but, as the Colonial Secretary has put it, I think it is very likely to develop into a much more important side of our life than one would at first be inclined to think. Right alongside of us in Nova Scotia the value of the Tourist Trade is $5,000,000 a year. It has become an industry. I do not think we could very well expect to get this overnight. Already there is undeniable evidence of a very considerable incoming of people, and, if we can by a levy of this nature, impose on people a tax that is going to be a contribution in a form that will not be generally felt, I do not see myself that there can be any reasonable objection. In this respect I agree with certain members who have already spoken, and I am very glad to find that some of the honourable members opposite see as the Government see. The mere fact that this year alone we have evidence of certain people coming here for conventions and meetings indicates that this is slowly but surely becoming a substantial asset in the life of the community. My point was to say that it will probably be found that, despite desires of many persons to try and meet the situation indicated there

as regards exempting our own people, that practically is going to destroy a large proportion of the revenue that the bureau might expect to get from a class of our own people who, if they were not paying such a tax here, would be paying it somewhere else. I do not think that the average first-class passenger is going to object; the people who come here on this round trip by the Clark Steamship, I do not think they will object to the imposition of a couple of dollars tax.

I would suggest to the Colonial Secretary that perhaps we might leave the entire section stand.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I do not think there is much to be said about this Bill. The matter speaks for itself, and unless there are any questions to be asked on any point that honourable members are not satisfied with in respect to Clause 2, I would suggest that we read it.

MR. GRIMES—I should like to hear the point explained as to whether the holding of licenses on Labrador would affect the possible sale of that peninsula.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The position, as I understand it, is that we practically have granted the whole of our timber limits on the Labrador before this Government came into power, nearly 30,000 square miles. Of that we took back nearly 20,000 since we have been in office. About two-thirds of the area granted was forfeited by means of cancelling the licenses. As has been explained by the Minister of Justice there is a claim put in by some of these parties, to be tried in Court as to whether they do not still hold their rights. The Government contend we have a right to cancel these licenses. I understand that one of the largest of those timber grants was held by the Hamilton Pulp & Lumber Company. Considerable license money was paid on this grant, and I understand they are going to look for their rights under promises that were made. They have in the neighbourhood of 2,000 square miles.

MR. HICKMAN—5,800 square miles, for which there are arrears of $163,000.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The position is that two-thirds of the grants issued have been taken back by this Government; the licenses have been cancelled. It is only as regards those who have paid their rentals that it is proposed that, in this clause 2, they are not interfered with. Those people have, as far as I know carried out all provisions of their licenses except those called upon to erect a mill within three years. Regarding many of the claims brought before us in connection with three or four of those icenses, I think the Attorney General was of the opinion and the Justice Department advised the Government accordingly that we should extend that time and give them three years from the time when the Labrador boundary question was settled. It is not unreasonable that when licenses had been paid up to that time, they should be given three years from the time that Labrador was definitely settled to be ours to erect

the mill. As far as I know, the Attorney General will correct me if I am wrong, that is the only condition which they say has not been complied with, and in two cases already it has been agreed by the Government to permit that, and I think there are one or two others.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: Attention was directed on the last day to an important point, and that is the position which the Government took as regards those who had paid rentals. It was purely from equitable reasons, not from any accepted legal right, that the Government felt they ought do with them, what the Prime Minister has stated, give them two years as from the settlement of the Labrador question. Many cases have existed, of course, in which that feature has never been lived up to. As honourable members are aware, the great bulk of the holdings of timber limits in Newfoundland have been created by the various administrations acquiescing in the mere acceptance of the rentals and not insisting on the carrying out of the conditions. The Government, therefore, having cancelled the licenses of those who had not paid, in justice to the condition existing in the country itself as regards adherence to the Crown Lands Act, felt that it was equitable to permit those who had paid, two years from the date of the settlement of the Labrador question within which to erect their mills.

MR. HIBBS—In the case of failure to carry out the provisions of a license, that is not a matter in which we should be sentimental and talk about equity. We should regard the rights of the people of Newfoundland in that case, rather than the rights of half a dozen people.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It would be expected in any Court of law to give a person a reasonable opportunity before cancelling his license. The Government have cancelled every license on the Labrador where the licensee has not conformed with the conditions of his license, as regards payment of rental.

MR. HIBBS—The matter is very far-reaching. It might have the effect of embarrassing the Government in any sale they might wish to make. When we come to consider the condition of this country to-day, all agree that we cannot go on as we are going. We are in a position today where we cannot pay our bills; cannot collect sufficient revenue from the people to make two ends meet. Things are getting worse and worse, and it looks as if we will not be able to carry on. We are getting nearer and nearer to a bankrupt state. One redeeming feature which we have realized during the last few months is the fact of a favourable decision of the question of the Labrador. There was a hope that we might be able to dispose of the inland portion of Labrador at a price that would enable us to pay off our national debt. About 25 per cent., if I am rightly informed, of the valuable timber lands of Labrador are being held at present by people who have violated the terms of their licenses. Just for sentimental reasons, or for other reasons that we do not understand the Government hesitates to cancel. I I think that in every case where the licensee has not conformed with the terms of his license, the Government should not hesitate to cancel that license. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice has given a legal opinion. He put it "for equitable reasons." Those words "would expect to give a person a reasonable time to carry out provisions." A number of years have elapsed and people have made no attempt to carry out these provisions. I am of opinion that they never had the slightest intention of doing so. Is it not a fact

known to us all that the majority of those who get licenses on Labrador and other places do not get licenses with the intention of operating mills. They merely get them for the purpose of speculating, selling off at a p ofit to some other person, thereby making a fortune.

I notice that another gentleman on Water Street has secured a license, I think, dated 18th May. I wonder does he intend to erect a mill or a pulp mill or is he only hoping to-day, like many others, and we cannot blame him, is he hoping to transfer this valuable property over to the hands of some other speculator and clean up $200,000. That is the object behind it all. The far-reaching sight of the situation is the fact that the Labrador peninsula is not going to be much benefit to Newfoundland unless they can sell at a substantial sum. The hope of Newfoundland to-day lies in turning that valuable asset into cash and paying off the national debt and relieving the people of the burden they are sinking under. The interests of the Government must be in the people of this country and not in a handful of speculators. If their licenses are cancelled, let them go to the Courts.

Well, I would say if you want to salve your conscience pay back the rentals to the capitalists, then we won't lose anything. They have forfeited their titles to the property because they have not carried out the provisions of the act. They have no claim there whatever. Their license should be cancelled as they never even intended to carry out the canditions of the act. I think that every member on both sides of this House, not the Opposition alone, but the Government as well and the rank and file members of the Government have no interest in Labrador but they have an interest in their constituencies. Here you have an asset that has been handed down for years and years and only now our claim has been substantiated and just when we have come around the corner your object is again thwarted by speculators who are trying now to take advantage of the victory we have won to enrich themselves at the expense of this country. This is the biggest question that was ever before the Assembly. They tell me that twenty-five per cent. of the timber lands on Labrador has been taken up, that is about twenty thousand dollars worth. Suppose you have to pay back one hundred thousand dollars in rentals, that is all they can demand. I don't think any law court in this country or in any country will substantiate their claims under the circumstances. I feel very strong about this matter, Mr. Chairman. I think every gentleman on this side of the House should immediately consider not to allow this bill to pass until some understanding is given, that those licenses will be cancelled.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I just want to state the legal position in this matter as regards the difference as to the powers of cancellation for the non-payment of rent, and non-compliance with the terms of the contract in respect to the non-erection of a mill. The Governor-in-Council has absolute power to cancel licenses for the non-payment of rent, but he has no such power as regards the non-compliance with the terms of the lease calling for the erection of a mill. The only remedy in that event is for the person to take action against the party for the non-compliance of the terms of the lease. I would like members to understand that whatever position the country is in will not be affected by anything done under this bill. Therefore honourable members may approach this agreement with an absolutely settled mind on this point.

With regard to the point raised by

the Hon. Member for Ferryland, that is rather a different point. To suggest that the Government should cancel every right on Labrador, is a very tall order. When you come in and do what has been done, now, and when that is questioned, and as I say the mere fact of that being questioned, and legal opinion being sought to question that right makes me feel that they have good reason to question the attitude of the Government.

The other phase of the question in connection with the cancellation of leases is this, that I think that it will be found under the Crown Lands Act the penalty for non-erection of a mill is the imposition of a fine, and not cancellation.

The trouble I say, Mr. Chairman, is this, that it is going to be very difficult to arrive at just what should be the minimum rate. Some people in this country to-day have not got the high idea of the value of Labrador as we have here. The practice has prevailed as this House is aware all down the years of accepting a rate of two dollars a square mile, and there has never been more charged. And I have been even told that that is actually what Labrador ought to be got for now. The Government does not even think any such thing. The danger that I see is what are we going to make the rate. And I think that when we have considered this matter in every aspect, it will be found that we want to be careful that the minimum price is not too high to scare people from doing trade with us, and also that it is not too low to give them the idea that the land could be got for that price. I am sure that the Government's attitude in this matter in connection with any proposition that might be made on Labrador was that it would not be an arrangement for two dollars a square mile or any such price.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to Mr. Mosdell who asks whether the Government have in mind a survey of the timber lands on Labrador, I may say that in discussing the Gander proposition with the International Paper Company the other day, they threw out the suggestion that if we would fall in line with their proposed project, or if we could come to any kind of terms whatever with respect to the areas that they are looking for on the Labrador, that they proposed to have a survey made of the timber lands down there, with a view to selecting for themselves certain areas after they had made the survey and that survey would then be at the disposal of the Newfoundland Government. I just mention that to show this House that there is no time being lost as far as the Government is concerned, but at the same time there is no reason why we should rush in and employ surveyors to go over that territory just now. At any rate it will not be until this House has had an opportunity of discussing these big industries.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, if a survey is made of Newfoundland I certainly don't want to see the International Power and Paper Company make that survey. I rather think if they survey Labrador with the intention of getting any idea of the timber lands there, that the account that will be given of Newfoundland and the amount of timber that is there, will not be very favourable to Newfoundland.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Government has not seen fit to fall in line with my suggestion that timber limits in Newfoundland (if any exist) should be included in this bill. It seems to me that after all if we have anything that ought to be safeguarded it is the timber limits in Labrador and Newfoundland. I entirely concur with one of the previous speakers,

who referred to the reservation of any mineral resources on that peninsula, and suggested that they should be included in the scope of this act. I quite appreciate the point raised by the Minister of Justice in connection with the rights of discovers of minerals. But that does not cover all the rights in respect to minerals that may be acquired, under the Crown Lands Act to-day. Under that act it is true that the discoverer acquires rights to a certain area and there is not any reason why he should be disturbed. But the moment that a discovery is made, we know that speculators immediately rush in and grab up sections all around discovery location. I think that every location outside where the discovery is actually made, should be reserved for the country, and there should be clearer indications on the part of the Government, that they intend to protect the interests of the country. They should go furher and include all mineral rights except discovery locations, within the provisions of this act.

A great deal has been said sir, with reference to the persons who have held and now hold timber licenses on the Labrador,—and in Newfoundland as well for that matter,—and who have not carried out the provisions of the Crown Lands Act or complied with the conditions under which they received these licenses. And it will be suggested that the fact that they have not carried out these conditions and provisions is the fault of a previous Government. In that I entirely concur. But at the same time, I do say this, that no previous Government had the right to forego the performance of those conditions nor has the present Government. A license to cut timber under the Crown Lands Act is in the nature of the agreement made by the Government by the authority of this act. It is a grant subject to plain unvarnished conditions, and these conditions, under the act, have to be put in the license. I think that it will be found, as I think I have already said, that some hundreds of licenses have been issued by the Newfoundland Government to cut timber either in Newfoundland or in Labrador and hardly one attempt has been made to carry out the stipulations contained in those licenses. And every hon. member in this House knows that so far as Labrador is concerned, most of the holders of licenses not only did not carry out the conditions of the licenses with regard to the building of a mill but they even failed to pay their rental until they found that their licenses would be cancelled unless rentals were paid. And then they offered as their excuse that their titles were not clear. As to the performance of the conditions contained in the licenses they never made the slightest attempt to carry them out. Now they have failed in their duty in that respect, and so far as this country is concerned we are under no obligation to them. It may be illuminating to some members of this House if I draw the attention of the Committee to some of the stipulations under which these licenses were issued.

Under Section 30 of the Crown Lands Act you have provisions which enable the Governor in Council to relieve licensees of the duty of erection of a mill under certain conditions, but unless these conditions are fulfilled they cannot be relieved of the obligation. Then it is contended by some people that in spite of that expressed provision licensees can ignore the terms of their licenses. Here is a clear undisputed law that this must be done, and only under certain specific circumstances can the Governor in Council relieve the licensee of that responsibility. It is suggested that these people have some moral rights. My moral vision may be somewhat limited but I don't see

where these people have any moral rights at all. As a matter of fact, as the Minister of Justice has just pointed out, we can sue these people for compensation for failure to carry out the stipulations of the license, and the fact that we have permitted them to fail as a Governmen does not alter the law at all. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines can sue tomorrow every one of these holders who has failed to carry out the terms of the license and mulct them to the sum of $10,000.00.

(Reads Section 28, S-s. 8)

I am not prepared to agree offhand with the Minister of Justice that that should be interpreted as to the days after conviction. I am rather inclined to think that it is capable of another interpretation, namely for every day after the period named in this act, during which the default continued. Be that as it may, I am only interested in the preservation of the timber lands of this country which in the past have been the football of speculators. I am particularly interested in abrador, because of course its chief value consists in its timber property. The people who hold these limber licenses are interested in them purely from a speculative point of view, and purely for the purpose of selling them to somebody for a large amount when they get an opportunity. In other words they are speculators pure and simple trying to make a large sum out of the property belonging to the people of this country, and only given to the many conditions with which they have failed to comply. I say that they have no moral rights whatever. In my opinion sir, the Government should immediately take such steps as may be necessary to thrash out this question at once. But whatever the future may bring, there is little doubt but that a great part of our valuable property has passed out of our keeping. We have only half Labrador to sell to-day as far as our timber rights are concerned. And it is an undisputed fact that timber is becoming more valuable every day. I read an article only the other day wherein the writer said that in a very few years countries like the United States would have so depleted their timber resources, that the value of timber itself for particular purposes would be nearly doubled. One can imagine from that the great difference that it would make to this country if we could hand on to some purchaser the timber wealth of Labrador unimpaired. Nothing in that regard can be done under this bill. That is quite clear. I do want to impress upon the Government the absolute necessity of fo getting all individuals who ave no moral right, and of strainiy every effort whether by the cancellation of licenses, or by the conviction and the fining of these delinquent holders, and the consequent seguestation if necessary in order that we may be enabled to again obtain the title to the best of this property that has been given to us by the Privy Council within the past few months.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, do I understand the Prime Minister to say that the Executive Government had intimated to one or more license holders that they would be given two years to perform the terms of their lease?

THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. HALFYARD — Then you are worse than I thought you were. Here we are trying to reclaim what has been legally and illegally given away, and you as a Gov't are trying to conserve the timber lands of Labrador, and is there no possible way under Heaven to recover those valuable lands out of the hands of those speculators, for the benefit of this country. And this Government has said to those people who have not complied with

the conditions of their lease, "We will give you two years longer now, and ı you will own the right to those lands." Well, that is an admission. I am surprised to hear that because I did not think that this Government committed any sins, at least in connection with the timber lands on Labrador. It is an outstanding reflection of what is agitating the minds of the members of this legislature at the present time.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to tomorrow, Tuesday, June 14th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 14th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Halfyard, from New Harbour, ıe a wharf.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred.

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

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Holyrood Pond Fisheries, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, this bill being a private one I was asked to introduce it and I would like to explain that apart from the ordinary petition of the Company asking to introduce it that there is an additional petition that has been here on the table of the House from the people of the neighbourhood; a petition from St. Vincent's and St. Mary's that might be of some interest to the Committee. This petition is signed, I think, by all the fishermen of that district and it shortly sets out that:

(Reads)

The petition of the Company itself sets out:

(Reads)

The Resolutions as it will be noted provide that: under section 2:

(Reads)

Section 3 provides:

(Reads)

That section as members will appreciate is a technical provision so as to allow the working of the plant

Section 4:

(Reads)

It was clear that there ought to be some provision in the event of taxation of a municipality; there ought to be some provision towards contribution to this taxation and the amount was fixed at $500.00.

Sections 5, 6, and 7 set out that:

(Reads)

In connection with the agreement proper it shortly provides:

(Reads)

In regard to Section 4, I would like to say that the application of the Company was for a period of twenty years and then provided the expenditure was made there would be a renewal for a further period of twen-

ty-five years. It was felt that instead of binding some future legislature to a period of twenty-five years that a straight period of thirty years would probably give them ample protection for the reason th t if the operations are successful thirty years from now whatever leg'-lature is in power will see that they do not suffer by reason of that for whatever investments they have made.

(After Section 6.)

I would like to say that clause was put in because it was felt that there has been occasions, very rarely, I understand, in the past when it has been necessary to anticipate that that might happen and this merely provides that irrespective of anything the Company may do, power is given to the people to protect themselves under the circumstances mentioned.

(Reads)

I don't know, Mr. Chairman, that I can do more than merely say that I was instructed by those interested in this proposal that it is largely an experiment. For very many years it has been felt by the people up there that quite a fishery could be carried on in the waters of Holyrood Pond. The present proposal is to try out the fishery in the general sense to a certain degree, but I think the idea is largely something in the nature of a fish meal plant. Those interested feel that if Holyrood Pond is as prolific and as regular in the matter of fishery wealth as has been estimated that the industry ought be not alone beneficial to the residents of the locality but should be a profitable one to those seeking these concessions. As I said however it is largely in the nature of an experiment and for that reason I do no more than say that it has this advantage in this particular instance that it is supported and practically requested by the people themselves who are largely concerned in that fishery.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have just been able to follow the honourable introducer of the Bill in Resolutions and while I have no objection to this bill being put through, with regard to the general rights to the people in utilising the pond and the rights of fishing in the pond, I think there are some extremes. In the Resolutions I notice in paragraph 4 that:

(Reads)

Why confine it to the residents of places between Peter's River and Mall Bay? I understand that it is a fourteen mile inlet of the Bay and supposing fishermen from somewhere else wanted to go there and fish why shouldn't they be given the same rights and be allowed to go there and fish with hook and line and bultows?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If that were so it would not be much use in these people putting up the plant. If the whole country can go there it is not much encouragement to them to try and make a success of this proposition. It was felt that the only persons to operate there should be the residents of these places.

MR. HICKMAN—I don't see why the sea should be confined to people of a particular section. Why shouldn't the people in other portions of the Island where there are similar enclosed salt water ponds ask for similar rights. I don't think there should be anything in these Resolutions to confine those waters to any particular residents.

Section 4 says people shall have the right of catching fish there by hook and line including bultows and of catching bait fishes there by any means available, but so as the Company's operations shall not in any way be unreasonably interfered with. Certainly they can't fish there with

bultows if this Company is going to use trawls or have traps or nets there. So it is brought down after all for those people to catching fish by hand line and that is about the only right given and that is given to a small section of the coast.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say that we telegraphed the Parish Priest there to ask if the people thoroughly understood that they would have no right to fish with bultows there and that they really understood what they were confined to and he informed us that they had expressed themselves as perfectly satisfied.

MR. HICKMAN—Paragraph 5 says:

(Reads)

They have access to the rivers but not to the sea?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Sometimes they get in and can't get out for two years.

MR. HICKMAN—Why is the provision in paragraph 8. What does that ten thousand represent? Will the gates cost that much?

MON. MR. SULLIVAN—They may cost a considerable amount. They have to experiment to find out what is suitable. They must under this erect a plant and continuously operate.

MR. HICKMAN—Paragraph 12:

(Reads)

What is that plant and fixtures? What sort of material do they require to erect their buildings—felt, locks, doors, sashes and putty and such things? You are allowing them to bring in these things free of duty. I think it should be specifically provided that they are not to bring in anything manufactured in this country.

These are a few observations I considered as the hon. introducer was speaking, and I think they should be taken up.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I should like just a word. I fully appreciate the points raised, but I should like the Committee to understand that this is a case where the people of the place distinctly say that, as far as they are concerned, there is no misunderstanding. The Prime Minister has been in touch with Father Battcock, and he clearly says that. It says here:

(Reads)

Now I don't think this ought to be viewed as an ordinary arm of the sea, as it is practically almost like an inland pond, and the situation has been that down through the years the prospect of development by someone has been alive. The honourable member himself would be the last to go and develop a proposition of that sort without reasonable protection, and these resolutions merely provide that. Instead of having a general right to fish, the people of the vicinity are given a right to fish there. There is a decided difference between this particular area and an ordinary arm of the sea.

The other point is answered by saying that there will not be an elaborate admission of materials after all, except a few hand tools and things of that sort. And it may be safely anticipated that in view of the fact that this undertaking is confined to a Company who will not probably spend at first more than $10,000, that only by growth of the undertaking is the expenditure likely to increase, and it may be considered that growth may be most beneficial in the interests of the people and the fisheries there. If it develops into a great big success it is a matter of very considerable moment in fishery development.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Minister of Justice to justify this because this was somewhat in the class of an inland pond? Is that a justification?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—

I said there was quite a difference between an arm of the sea and this place.

DR. MOSDELL—You referred to it as an inland pond and gave that as a justification.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No; I said that it compared more with an inland pond than an arm of the sea. I did not use that as a justification, but it would perhaps require different treatment.

DR. MOSDELL—If you admit that as a justification, you can go anywhere and do the same with inland ponds. My deduction is that you justified the proposition by describing this particular body of water by saying that it was like an inland pond, and that it was therefore quite justifiable to give an exclusive right to it. Is that the position?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You can make any deduction you like from a wrong premise, and I submit your premise is quite wrong. However that is somewhat of the position.

DR. MOSDELL—Then if you give the exclusive right to fish to this Company and the residents, couldn't that apply to the Salmonier River?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There is nothing very remarkable about that. It has often been argued that we should lease the Salmonier River.

DR. MOSDELL—Yes, but that is a policy which every government has avoided.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Yes, because we haven't had sense enough to take advantage of it.

DR. MOSDELL—Do I understand then that this is the beginning of a new policy? You are forming a precedent.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Certainly not. I should like to say in connection with this, that I do not think there is any analogy. So far as the exclusive rights of fishery are concerned, we have almost that condition with regard to drawing for berths by fishermen. It is not so in law, but is nearly so in actual practice. But the second point is interesting because I have decided views on that line—the point raised is not an indication of the Government's views, but if it were there would be a good deal to be said in favor of it. The Game and Inland Fisheries Board has been discussing with the present and previous administrations to hire out the pools, and that has been a subject of debate for years. Every honourable member knows that there are rivers where scarcely a line is thrown, and the ordinary fisherman doesn't even see them. Even if that were our policy there would be nothing in it to be alarmed over. But the Bill does not foreshadow anything of that sort; it is designed merely to meet the proposition put up, and instead of giving absolute exclusive privileges, the rights of the people of that part are preserved.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—There is no fish up there to catch unless they put up these gates, and if they can get them to work they can hold the fish. They will be able to get more fish, and this ought to be a great boon to the fishermen. This thing has been suggested long before I went into politics, and I remember Mr. Neilsen was sent up there, and some attempt was made to put up a gate with no measure of success. The only thing I am afraid of is that this company will not be successful in putting up their gates. It is a very exposed piece of beach—the Leader of the Opposition knows it as well as I do, and what difficulty there will be in putting the gate up and keeping the gut open. I am very much afraid that their culvert will be filled up, as the gut is at the present time.

MR. BRADLEY—What is the size of the pond?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—It is about

15 or 16 miles long and a mile or a mile and a half wide. The water is very deep, going to 90' within 200 feet of the beach. There is no outlet, and in the spring the people have to get out and dig a trench through the beach to see that the water goes out and does not flood the homes and stores of the residents. This culvert will provide for that, if the sea does not heave the beach up on it.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask who is connected with this proposition, and what are the standing and resources of these people? They are getting great concessions, in the 30 years' exclusive rights and the 20 years' freedom from duty. Is the Government quite satisfied as to the bonafides of the company, and why they should want such a lengthy period? Take the Hudson Bay Company who are operating the cold storage plant in St. John's. They took it over and were satisfied with two years for experimentation in connection with the fisheries of the whole country generally. Theirs is an experiment on a large scale, and why should we give these people 30 years to experiment? It looks like giving a chance to speculators.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Regarding that point, they wanted two years merely to test it out; if they decide to carry on they may then make their request. The other point, regarding the personnel of the company is of more importance. As I understand it, the gentlemen mainly interested are Hon. R. B. Job, and Mr. P. H. Cowan who is the secretary—I think he is the main promoter. Regarding the whole venture, I have intimated to my associates, the members for the district, that they have to bear the burden of establishing its wisdom or otherwise, as the case may be. But I do want to say that from information given me by Mr. Job this morning, when I asked if they would be likely to enlarge, he told me that it was absolutely an experiment—it may or may not materialize, but it was absolutely impossible for him or anybody else to say whether it would be a success or not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a word or two in this matter, because I can say as far as Mr. Job is concerned, he is not very keen about the business. He has been urged to promote it because of the pressure brought to bear upon him by the people of St. Vincent's and St. Mary's. He said to me only the other day that if it didn't go through soon he would give it up, and when we substituted 25 years for 50 years, he said he thought he would drop it. He is not keen, and would not be disappointed if it were dropped. But the proposition as I see it is that the fishermen of St. Vincent's and St. Mary's often find they have bad fish and don't get much returns, and the result is that they are looking for a way of getting better returns, and I see it in this proposition of Holyrood Pond. The gentlemen on the other side have been talking a great deal about the Government doing nothing for the fishermen, and here are a number of fishermen asking for something that will benefit them. They are willing to have it tried out, and Mr. Job is willing to undertake it. I have no doubt of his being able to finance it, but I feel that if he senses opposition he will drop it.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I happen to know something about Holyrood Pond. This is the first time I ever heard that they make bad fish in St. Mary's; I thought they made the best of fish. Holyrood Pond has been up in St. Vincent's since Newfoundland was discovered — of course wherever you find lawyers you will find lots of debate. I did not stand up here to knock this but to support it, and if it is going to be a benefit to the fishermen of St. Vin-

cent's and St. Mary's I give it my hearty support. There may be some technicalities arise for discussion, but this is the first fishery legislation since the Monroe Government took office, and it affords me great pleasure to support it.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word or two to what has been said in connection with this matter. I take it from what I have heard here that the company controls the waters of Holyrood Pond once this Bill is passed. I presume they intend building a culvert so that the fish can go in at high tide, or built in such a way that when the tide goes out they are in something like a trap, and then the company will proceeed to catch the fish in the Pond and will debar the fishermen from fishing with trap or seine. The Pond is only one and a half miles wide, and the company will get all the fish and the fishermen nothing, except, perhaps, a little employment. As far as being allowed to go in and use nets is concerned, I don't think they will be able to do so.

In view of the fact that they want it themselves and that they have petitioned for it, I suppose they have got to suffer for themselves.

With regard to the proposal, I want to give it my hearty support, and I also want to put myself on record as saying that as far as every individual fisherman is concerned, the only thing that he is going to get out of it is a little work; that as far as catching fish and selling it is concerned, that the company are probably going to use their own gasoline trawlers and cod seine or trap skiff and they will catch their own fish and ship men every summer to do it, but there will be no great deal of selling to the company.

I do not know whether the men understand that or not, but if they don't understand it and don't want it, then it is up to us to throw it out; but if they do understand it and want it, then we should help it.

I agree that the principle should be laid down that fishermen from all over the island should have every right to come in and fish there. One end of the country belongs to the other end just the same. Every fishing settlement no doubt has its own local laws with regard to catching fish to try and carry the prosecution of the fishery on to the best interests of those in that particular locality.

I think that I can for the first time stand up and extend my hearty congratulations to the Government. I feel that it behoves every member of the House and every member of the Opposition to extend congratulations to that august body known as the Monroe Administration in view of the fact that after three years in office some proposal has been put up to them to do something for the fishermen and they have condescended to bring a Bill before the House to do it. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think every member on this side of the House and every member on the Government side should get up and congratulate the Government on introducing these resolutions; but, true to its traditions, it has introduced legislation to give control, as it has been giving during the past, to a company. It is wonderful that after a petition has been presented the Government has condescended to carry out the prayer of the petition. It would be interesting to see how many other petitions have been presented and have not received the same consideration as this one got, but no doubt if we had associated with these petitions people of the standing, of the aristocratic standing, I might say, of those associated with this one, those other petitions would have received the same consideration as this one. Why, the petitions presented to this House could start a bonfire and no doubt it would form an effigy to the Monroe

Administration. I say I congratulate them sincerely on having at last granted one, and I trust the promoters of this company shall meet with every success, which they evidently shall at the expense of the fishermen of St. Vincent's and Mall Bay.

I understand that also one of the objects of the company is the putting of fresh fish on the market at St. John's. Well, I trust that will be successful, but I don't know that the local fishermen of St. John's will be very pleased to have a company control the fresh fish industry where they have been accustomed to sell.

I again congratulate the Government and I trust that within the next twenty-four hours that we shall have another piece of legislation with regard to the fisheries, even though criticisms on it may not be considered constructive in their minds. Even so we are always ready to help any proposition in the best interests of the country.

DR. MOSDELL—I would like the Minister of Justice to explain to us with regard to Section 9, what kind of a fish plant is proposed. The nature of the operations as referred to in these Resolutions is very vague.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The only information I can get is that the operations will be twofold. Presumably it is to be a fresh fish proposition, but that in conjunction with it is this fish meal plant. Their intention is to store fish in cold storage.

DR. MOSDELL — The proposal seems to be something like this. Here is this Company prepared to spend $20,000, the price of a good sized fishing premises. Take for example Harvey and Company's premises at Belleoram, costing, perhaps, fifty to sixty thousand dollars to instal. Because Harvey and Company have that plant at Belleoram they don't claim the right to keep other fishermen away from there and prevent the fishermen there from interfering with them. They take a chance on enough fish being supplied to them. This Company for undertaking to spend $20,000, an amount that can do very little more than construct the gate referred to in the Resolutions, insist on getting all those very valuable concessions. I quite agree that the wishes of the people of this section should be acceded to as far as possible in the matter but are we sure that in assuming the attitude of complying with the wishes of the people the promotors of the Company are not exploiting the popular wishes and that the people are fully aware of all that is involved in this? The Company for expending $20,000 gets a monopoly of this pond. That is what it amounts to, because, as has been pointed out, if the Company is to use a lot of fish nets as they are permitted to by this Act, and the fishermen can only use the methods approved by the Company, that the rights of the fishermen as to the use of appliances there are going to be very restricted. The Company are allowed concessions of free entry.

(Reads)

Also they get property worth something, perhaps only for purposes of speculation.

I contend that the passing of this measure and granting of these concessions will be setting a precedent that is going to cause a deal of trouble.

My objection is not that you benefit only these fishermen, but that you are setting a precedent that may give trouble regarding the exclusive fishing rights or monopolies on specified sections of our coast. Then, too, it appears to me that the major portion of benefits under this measure goes to the promoters of the bill, that it is, therefore, not desirable that the bill go through in the present form and that the Government should be

ready to consider reasonable amendments thereto.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chai:man, I should like to reply to the last speaker. I fully appreciate the position that the various speakers have taken, and say in all humility that I am thankful for it. I told the honourable member for Burin that we waited for him to get back, and that is the explanation of the first Fishery Bill. I want to say now that the honourable members who have taken the position that Holyrood Pond has been up there all these years, and that this is an attempt to try it out, have hit the nail on the head. That is all it is.

I don't think the points raised by the last speaker need worry us. I don't say that the imprimatur of the parish priest binds us in any way, but I do say that so far as it represents the wishes of the people, the honourable members can be absolutely sure that there is no doubt about it—there is no possible doubt about the attitude of the people. They have been kept in touch with this—Father Battcock was present at a meeting at which Mr. Job, and the Clerk of the House, who is assisting in the work of my department were also present, and all phases of these resolutions were gone into, so that honourable members may accept the assurance from me that there is no misunderstanding in the mind of that gentleman, who came there in the interests of the people. It is not a question of the people not understanding the ramifications of this—it was all thoroughly threshed out, and I might say he is a very intelligent gentleman, and thoroughly appreciated the position. I will say also in fairness to those concerned that it is an actual fact that the people of the locality are clamoring most for this, as the Prime Minister has said. When the Government started to restrict the period of years. the attitude of Mr. Job was that he had been asked to try this out, and that he wasn't over-enthusiastic, that it was simply an experiment, and might be a success or a failure. But his attitude indicated that if undue force was operated against it, he would not be over-keen about the matter. What I would like the House to understand is that the pressure to instigate this comes from the people themselves.

There is nothing in the way of an exclusive right given to this concern. But accepting the charge that it tends to give an exclusive right to the fishery, we have been handing out for a number of years, exclusive rights in other industries, and I think that if these people are going to exploit something new, it is only reasonable to give them some protection. I might say for myself that I would pass a Bill of this sort for any section of the country at any time. I am not binding the Government by that, of course. Isn't it the history of every enterprise that someone has to go in and start it, and usually not for their health—it is a business proposition. It has to contain a reasonable indication of success or they would not tackle it. I do think that with regard to the views of honorable gentlemen who have spoken, which I respect, there is nothing that we ought to feel alarmed about.

MR. BRADLEY — Mr. Chairman, without desiring to delay the Committee, I have a few remarks to make before we proceed further, particularly in view of what the Minister of Justice has said. First, it seems that this Pond has never been of much use from the standpoint of the fishery, and looking at it from that angle, it would appear that any proposition to develop it so that it may produce is desirable, and it seems reasonable to give any fair concessions that this company would require. But I find that they ask concessions,

not merely for the development of this particular pond, but for associated enterprises. If the concessions asked were confined to the free entry of those articles which are requisite to build that trap or culvert, or whatever they require in that line, it would be clearly reasonable, and I don't think that the residents of that or any part of the Colony would object. But I doubt if those persons who are most closely concerned in the matter—namely, the fishermen—really understand just exactly what these people are asking under these resolutions. Section 12 reads as follows:

(Reads.)

Now that is practically a blanket clause for a period of 20 years under which they are entitled to import all these things duty free. It seems to me that they could obtain an electric lighting plant for supplying light to towns, and that has nothing to do with a fish plant. No doubt they want power to run their fish plant, and to develop it for that purpose, but does the Government know that in Petty Harbor there is a fish meal plant on which duty was paid, and why should this company have an advantage over another concern—this seems to me to clearly discriminate between these establishments. I agree that so far as the gate or culvert is concerned we should give them free entry on all things necessary to erect that gate or culvert, but so far as subsequent operations are concerned, other principles apply. Surely the placing of the gate or culvert is what is going to give them the fish, and they ought to be permittted to bring that in duty free. But when afterwards we undertake to give free entry to everything for factories, or developing water power or electric light, we are discriminating against firms already operating. I know of one fish meal concern operating at Petty Harbor to-day which is paying the ordinary duties, and you are going to allow these people to obtain an advantage over them, to give them an undue advantage by lessening the cost of production. I don't usually speak for capitalists, but I feel that it would be unfair to allow one capitalist to gain an advantage in this way over another. If one can carry on without concessions, and pay the ordinary taxes, I don't see how you can justify giving any concessions for the carrying on of that industry under the present resolutions.

As I say they operate at Petty Harbor by steam and have to pay ordinary duties. They even had to pay duty on coal that came in through St. John's; they had to pay duty on all piping; in fact on the whole plant. Now it is contemplated to allow these people to get a plant in duty free. We would be quite agreeable to giving free entry to those things which are requisite to turn that Holyrood Pond into a fish producing body of water. This project, however, should not get any advantage over any other concern. Such discrimination will tend to drive independent men out of business altogether.

MIN. OF AGRICULTURE & MINES —Mr. Chairman, to get back to 1913, one of the first officials I had anything to do with came from a part of the section dealt with in these resolutions. In 1914 or 1915 a company was formed here in St. John's, and I think Mr. Dove, of Steer Brothers—Mr. Wilfred Dove—was sent away to the United States to try and secure sufficient capital to inaugurate the industry outlined, and consequently I might say that the agitation so far as the people in the section referred to in these resolutions is a very popular agitation. I want to give my support to the resolutions. In the meantime I want to go on record that I am not in sympathy with any legislation or proposition that would give an exclusive right to any one section of Newfoundland against the other.

I have on former occasions given expression to that sentiment. I think that so far as Newfoundland fishermen are concerned there should be no restriction. Men from Twillingate should be permitted to come to Placentia Bay and fish. I am not in sympathy with the fishermen in St. John's being able to bar fishermen from other parts if they want to come here and fish. If they are able to come in contact easily with the House of Assembly or the members thereof I do not think it is fair that they should be successful in getting restrictions placed on fishermen of other sections of the Island. I do not think it would be fair to the residents of Groais Island to be permitted to restrict persons who have frequented that section year after year. Twenty-five or thirty years ago I went there myself as a fisherman. If I wanted to go there to catch fish I would feel sore if I discovered that this House of Assembly had passed legislation that I had to go back to Little Bay Mines. Why I am giving my support to these resolutions now before the chair is because these do not deal with the coastline operated by the fishermen. This is a pond, a winter place, and we are dealing with a proposition whereby this company say they are going to convert Holyrood Pond into a codtrap eight miles long and one and a half miles wide. There have been certain years when the Gut did not open at all, and there is a certain season of the year when the fish chase the caplin to the land. If the Gut is open when the titde starts to rush in a large amount of fish could be had—it has been said hundreds of thousands of quintals, nobody knows. On the rising tide the fish rush into the Gut. The Gut is somewhat similar to Placentia Gut. The fish go in on the rising tide, and when the tide starts to fall the fish run out. I have had no conference with any members of the Government, but I take it for granted that what the company propose to do is to erect a gate which will not interfere with the tide running in. If they see a large amount of fish going in on the rising tide they will close the gate and the fish is caught. Regarding that section of the resolutions giving the people between Peter's River and Mall Bay the exclusive right to go in and fish with hook and line, I had my doubts as to whether the people were satisfied and thoroughly understood what was being done. I brought the matter to their attention, and I am now informed that the reverend gentleman who has been looking after these interests telegraphed that the people were satisfied. If the people are satisfied, so am I. Dealing with section 4 of the resolutions, the honourable member for Burin, Mr. Lake, in referring to the resolutions raised the question as to whether or not fishermen from any part of the Island would not be permitted to catch bait fish in Holyrood Pond. Up to now there has never been any person go there to look for bait fish; certainly very few, but it is impossible to say what change is going to be brought about when the natural course of events is interfered with. By purely artificial means it is hoped to trap a large amount of fish in there. Whether we may not find that a large amount of bait will find its way into that pond we do not know. We have no knowledge of what these various fish will do and have very little knowledge of what any of our fish will do. It might be possible that a large amount of bait fish would find its way into Holyrood Pond; it might multiply and might be so content with its home that it would not want to go back to the Atlantic Ocean.

I would like to see inserted in Section No. 4 an addition whereby if bait should be found in sufficient quantities, fishermen from any section of

the Island would be permitted to go in and get it. I do not think there could be any serious objection to this suggestion. The whole thing is purely an experiment. I am not surprised to find that Mr. Job told the Prime Minister that he was not very particular as to whether the resolutions went through or not. To my mind it is purely an experiment, and I would not be at all surprised to find that, after the resolutions had gone through and this House had closed, very little activity would be displayed on the part of the promoters of the company for the carrying out of the contract and the expending of the money involved. For the past thirteen years I have been listening hour after hour to members making enthusiastic speeches in support of resolutions and bills with regard to propositions, but as soon as the House closed and we had all got away home and the promoters had received the assurance that the Bill had gone through, that was the last we heard of it.

I offer this suggestion to the honourable father of this Bill with regard to that section of clause 4 giving exclusive rights to fishermen from Peter's River to Mall Bay that, in the event of bait fish in sufficient quantity being found in Holyrood Pond, that all Newfoundland fishermen should have the same right to get this fish in the same way.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Speaker, it is very pleasant to be able to listen to the honourable member making statements along lines with which I entirely agree. I have placed myself on record that I think no fisherman should be interfered with in this country. My idea is that no legislation should be brought into force at any time, present or future, that would in any way interfere with any fishermen, with the one exception, and that is that they shall not use small mesh traps. I have said that before the measure should be carried out and those few words inserted in the fishing laws of this country. We have no sound fishing laws at the present time. A man should be permitted to catch fish when, where, and how he likes. As regards the matter of bait fish in this resolution, I trust the honourable father of the Bill will see to that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — It is natural, of course, to advance such a proposal. When we come to that matter we will leave that section open. I will be only too glad to consult the people about it.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact in connection with all bills for duty free purposes that saving clause regarding Newfoundland made material, about which the Minister of Justice is sceptical, that should be inserted.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — I was rather taking it as apart from the Newfoundland make.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, as a matter of general principle, I think the proper procedure would be that, where Newfoundland goods are obtainable suitable for the purpose, those goods should be used exclusively.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, perhaps we might, if honourable members care to do so, read the resolutions. I will not close the resolutions, I will leave them open for adoption—these points, the matter of the duty and the matter of the bait fish.

MR. HALFYARD—Schedule 9 of the schedule (reads) . . . . . That means continuous operation.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — The point of that was to secure the fish. That is what we call a fee simple grant.

MR. HALFYARD—If these resolutons are passed to Section 3 (reads) . . . . . I suppose if the company begins to operate at all they will re-

tain the 200 acres whether they continue operating or not.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — It would not amount to much—200 acres at 30 cents an acre.

MR. HALFYARD—By Section 4 the company is given the exclusive right to catch fish in this pond, with the exception that residents on the coast from Peter's River to Mall Bay shall have the right of catching fish. It goes on to say: I think I had better read it.

(Reads)

If they have 200 acres around the shores of the lake the fishermen will either have to go outside to the Atlantic Ocean to split their fish or go to the head of the pond to get clear of those 200 acres owned by the company; otherwise they will not be able to split fish.

(Reads)

The point raised by one or two of the speakers in connection with the proceeding that we are now instituting with regard to the granting by Legislation of exclusive rights to any of our fishing coasts is that it is a new procedure. We can make our legal laws for the community; can make legal rules and regulations with regard to the setting of traps, but I don't think the Government should ever give exclusive fishing rights to any section of the country. This is only a matter of sentiment. I think we could leave out Peter's River and Mall Bay and substitute, "The residents of Newfoundland shall have the right of catching fish in said Holyrood Pond," and I think the people of Peter's River and Mall Bay can go there and I believe they are the only ones who will. It is not the object of anyone, of course, to postpone this bit of legislation or otherwise obstruct it. It is honest criticism that has been given from this side of the House. If these people say that they undertake to build a factory up there, I hope they will be successful.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to ask whether or not there is any objection raised or any protest received by the Government from any parties in this vicinity.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Not the slightest. The other way about. The principle enunciated about the care we ought to exercise with regard to an exclusive right, is quite agreeable. Not alone has there been no objection, but the other way about —a great desire expressed from all the people. If the Committee does not mind we shall proceed as far as we can, leaving for further construction Sections 4 and 12, so that, not alone out of courtesy, but as a duty to the House, I shall ascertain what I can do about it.

I may say in advance regarding troubles regarding these kind of matte s that, where we have signed an agreement and restricted it down as narrow as we can get it, what I am concerned about is as to whether we might be told that the whole thing is off. The point raised by the honourable member who just sat down, as regards that clause 12, that suggestion about the extent to which use of the beach might be permitted, it is possible that it may be an interference. I would like members to understand that, on these points, I will take it up with the company. If I cannot manage to succeed, I hope it will be understood that I tried to do the best I could. There appears to be not altogether too much enthusiasm on the part of those who are going into it. They merely say it is an experiment, and they are not over enthusiastic.

DR. MOSDELL—If the company takes up these 200 acres, they will take up strips of land and shut off the pond.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I had that very contingency in mind.

I can conceive it might be possible. It is hardly likely, however, because a long strip of land might be taken. The answer to that is that care ought to be taken to exercise discretion on the part of the Government to see that such does not occur in giving the grant.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, we are here creating a precedent. It seems to me that if we allow these people the free entry of material and machinery to erect their plant, we cannot very well refuse any other corporation that seeks the same exemption from paying duty, and I think that,, in this matter, we should be very careful when we allow any company free enry of goods.

We should be very careful when we allow any company free entry of goods for a period of twenty years I just want to go on record as regards that point.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned this debate in the Committee stage last evening, there was apparently some comment on the fact that certain lease holders had been granted a two-year extension in order to put their mill up on Labrador. The member for Trinity particularly told us that we had been worse than he even thought we were. Now in this connection I want the members of this House to consider what they would have done under similar circumstances. It has been explained by the Attorney General and others that it was quite impossible for any Government to do anything more than take action as regards the non-compliance with the terms of that part of the contract, that the Executive Government could not cancel the lease because the mill was not put up, but that they could have apparently taken action and said that "because you have not put up a mill, we are going to make you put it up or fine you for not doing so." That apparently was the position and it was not acted upon. It has not been acted upon for all these years that the Labrador question has been under consideration. What we did during our regime of office was to notify those who were in arrears, and give them three months to pay up, and they did not pay up then. Then we gave them another three months and when they did not pay up after that time we cancelled their lease altogether. But those who did continue to pay up were apparently within their rights. And now the proposition comes up to the Government, from two or three lease holders interested. They come forward and say, "Tell me, when do you think is the proper date from which to claim that we should be compelled to put up this mill on Labrador, it being clearly understood that we were not allowed by the Canadian authorities to do so before." We say that from the date when the Labrador boundary question was settled, is in our opinion the proper date, and I still claim that it is. We should give them an extension of two years in order to give them an opportunity to put up that mill. We can't do anything else. We can't take their money with one

hand, and take action with the other against them. But I ask is it really open to debate whether any Government should take action against people because, they did not do the impossible (that being to put up a mill that would be torn down by the Canadian authorities, as Mr. Dickie's was.) Sir Robert Bond's Government gave a leasehold interest to Mr. Dickie for water power rights on Labrador for 99 years at thirty dollars a year for the purpose of driving machinery for his mill. For all I know that lease holds good to-day. Mr. Dickie is dead, but the Canadian Bank of Commerce is following up the case, and has been following it up for the past number of years, and are claiming their rights under that lease. We are criticised in large type this afternoon in The Tribune for this terrible matter of having given two years for those people to put up their mills. I want to point out that it was only brought to our notice quite recently that in connection with the Corner Brook propositions, rights and water powers on Labrador, were given to the Products Company and they forwarded or transferred their rights to the Power and Paper Company. These rights would have expired in 1925, but the last administration gave them a renewal for eight years and therefore it will not be until 1933 that these people will lose their rights in connection with that big water power on Labrador. That lease was renewed by the former Government of which Mr. Halfyard was a very prominent member. Why, I do not know. There was no more reason for that being done and less I may say, than for us to take upon ourselves the responsibility of cancelling the right of some people who have paid their rentals right up to date.

It has appeared to me in certain remarks that have been passed and certain question that have been asked, that there was a sort of insinuation that I was influenced in this action because in one of these properties, in Lewis Bay, my uncle, J. H. Monroe was one of the partners with Tobin and Baird in the ownership of that property. Now I want it to be understood that I have no interest whatever in that property. I never had an interest. That property means no more to me than any other. In fact I did not know anything about the claims coming before this Executive until they actually did. I never heard a voice on the Executive other than one opinion that there was nothing else to do but to give them two years concessions. It never occurred to me that we were doing anything except what appeared to be the right thing in the matter. I just wanted to make that explanation.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. the Prime Minister I want to say that the circumstances in connection with any act of the Government was altogether different from the conditions that obtained previous to the settlement of the Labrador Boundary Question. And previous Government never did consider the selling of Labrador. Even though we had our rights on Labrador confirmed and we thought that we would have to trust to outside capitalists to develop it. But the thought that has occupied the minds of the Government of Newfoundland for the last year or two, is the selling of Labrador. Now if we have anything to sell we don't want to have its value impaired in any way, and if there are any encumbrances we ought to get clear of them. Now if these people are confirmed in their titles, I don't suppose that we will ever sell it or if we do it will be for very little. So we can dispense with that thought of ever selling Labrador. Now we are blaming the present Government or the past Government anyway for

what has been done, but really the thought that runs in the mind of the ordinary citizen outside of those who a e in public life is "Can we get possession of those timber rights on Labrador" except about 587 square miles belonging to people who have conformed with the terms of the lease and erected mills. Is there any possible way of Newfoundland coming in possession of those timber lands? Now we have to deal in this matter with the whole people of Newfoundland. A lot of the lease holders may think that they are not being treated right, but they are not the only s to be considered. And if there is any way of getting back those timber lands, in a legal way, we have to consider the welfare of Newfoundland in this particular. Never mind the sentimental part of it. This matter must be treated on a purely unprejudiced basis even if it means that we will have to compensate them to the tune of three million dollars, for any monies that these people have spent in connection with the rentals or anything else. That is the thought that has been in my mind. Perhaps the Government have made mistakes. I don't want the present Government to bring in an act that is against the interests of the people of Newfoundland. It would be no doubt of great advantage to the lease holders of property on Labrador now when they see the opportunity no doubt of selling their timber lands down there and make a lot of money out of it. The trouble with us as a people and as a Government is that we don't go about things in the right way. We do not yet know our legal position in connection with those people that the Government has made contracts with. In a few days we will be dealing with another question of outstanding importance in connection with Corner Brook and the Gander. The Minister of Justice will bear me out I feel sure, when I say that he has no data in his office that will enable him to state without hesitation the claim that Newfoundland has against these two companies, the Corner Brook Company and the Reid-Newfoundland Company. And that is the reason why we make blunders. We get left every time. Penny wise and pound foolish. We are going on in the same old way. What have you done in respect to the appointment that has been made in connection with a representative of the Newfoundland Government in the International Power and Paper Company. That is a purely political appointment. Just because you want to give the job to somebody you make that appointment. This is a position where you must have the best abilify and the best expert knowledge. And while we do these things how can we expect to be any better off than we are in connection with our contractural obligations. But what is the good of talking about these things. I thought that you were going to be something different as time passed, that you would learn by experience to govern yourselves accordingly, but apparently you are going on in the same old way, and I think, as I stated here in my speech on the Address in Reply, that it is about time that we had a change of Government and get the whole lot of us out of this Assembly and get in some one that will do something different from what has been done in the past.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I would just like to draw the attention of the House to a matter. In a newspaper of this date under the heading of Parliamentary Indecency, appears this item:

(Reads)

I would just like to say that neither Higgins, Hunt and Emerson nor any member of that firm is acting in any way for the International Paper Company, in connection with any matters now under discussion of the Government, nor will they be acting in any matters that may come up for discussion in their negotiations with the Government.

MON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would also like to reply to an item in the same paper.

(Reads)

I had occasion some three or four years ago to deal with the same matter, and I think that the hon. member for Fortune will bear me out in this. I wrote a letter to the Daily Star of that time denying that I received any salary from the A.N.D. Company. I never consulted the A.N.D. Company about going into politics. Nor did they ask me what side I was supporting, or did they care as far as I knew, or the position that I was going to take up in this country. I received no salary from the A.N.D. Company except the remuneration that I had for the sale of wrapping and newsprint. The gentleman who wrote that article knows that is the position that I occupy today. I am no servant of the A.N.D. Company. I intend to take my stand on every subject that comes before this legislature, and as far as making myself officious in connection with the legislation now before this House, I want to ask in what way have I acted that would intimate that I have been officious in connection with the present legislation. Up to this moment I have not opened my mouth in connection with the debate now before the chair. And the Prime Minister knows that in the discussion that I had with him in this connection and before this matter came before the House, I was of the opinion that we ought to curtail some of the requests of that company. I trust that this explanation will be satisfactory. I don't mind fair criticism, but I think that this is hitting below the belt, when it is said that I am here as a servant of the A.N.D. Company. I know something about some of the measures that are shortly to come before this Legislature, and I am going to fight to get the best deal that we can for this country. I hope that this explanation will be satisfactory.

It was moved and seconded that this House, at its rising, do adjourn to tomorrow, Wednesday, June 15th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 15.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Godden, from Clarenville, re roads.

Dr. Mosdell, from Bay du Nord, re telegraph connection.

Mr. K. M. Brown gave notice of question.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, the Bill which is now before the House is one of the most important, probably the most important, which will engage our attention this session. It prohibits any person from getting any land on the Labrador except through the avenue of this Legislature. I note there is nothing in it regarding mineral rights on the Labrador being reserved in like manner. My objection in speaking for a while is this, that while I agree to a large extent with the principle laid down in the first paragraph, I think it should also include minerals as well as timber. And there are very good reasons for that. To begin with, I understand that in these modern times instruments are being used to discover minerals, and I feel that no Executive Government should have the right to grant mineral licenses any more than timber licenses. While I am no legal mind, Mr. Chairman, I speak on this Bill from the standpoint of preventing would-be speculators from getting in, inasmuch as we have been told that the people who applied since this question has been in dispute have been told by past and present governments that their application has been filed and will receive consideration, but that until the Labrador Boundary case was decided nothing definite would be given. Well, looking at the Labrador Boundary from every angle, I feel, and believe that honourable members on both sides will agree with me, that the duty of this and every Government is to hold the Labrador for the welfare of the country. During the past few months we have been told by the press supporting the Government, from the house-tops that now that we have won this case we are in a better financial position inasmuch as we can probably go into the money markets and get credit, strengthened by the addition of the Labrador, representing approximately one hundred and twenty thousand square miles. I agree that that position should be held intact, and that the people who have violated their agreement with the Government and who now or during the past few days, even since this Bill was introduced, have been given authority by the Executive to carry out the terms of their agreement. I have before me letters of aplication written by three companies to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and no doubt passed on by him to the Executive Government for consideration—these applications are dated April 25th, May 13th and June 4th, 1927. Why I would know that it is 1927 is that it wouldn't be necessray for the companies to apply at all otherwise, because it is only owing to the fact that the Labrador Boundary case has ended, and that Newfoundland has won, that they ask the Executive Government to give them further time to carry out the terms of their agreements; the reason pointed out for their failure to have done so previously was that they weren't certain whether Newfoundland was going to win or not, and if Canada had won their money would have been gone. But here is the position as I take it: If the Canadians had won where would they have gotten off with regard to the money paid by them? Would the Newfoundland Government have to refund it? I feel that the Newfoundland Government would not have had to refund any money paid in by these people for licenses on the Labrador, not for any purposes of development, but merely for speculation, just as much as a man going to the stock market and buying stock to hold until it goes up—that is the position in which they had placed themselves. And in spite of the fact that the Government introduces a Bill to prevent further grants on the

Labrador, at the same time they give these three firms a further extension of time to carry out their agreement. And we knew nothing about these when the Bill was introduced. If the Government had been honest the Prime Minister would have told the House that certain firms had applied for and been granted a further two years. The Government has not been honest but has attempted to put something across. I look at this from a commonsense point of view, and I am fighting this clause on principle; perhaps I read it differently from others.

(Reads.)

That would mean to my mind that the leases granted to people who hadn't carried out their agreement that the Government could take action and they would lose these properties on the Labrador. We well remember that a few years ago the Legislature granted concessions to some people who were going to build pulp mills and who were going to spend fifty thousand dollars annually

(Reads.)

What does that mean? I take it that "Government" means "Executive Government". Now, Mr. Chairman, we might as well get down to brass tacks—isn't this a case where favors are being shown? Should we give them further extensions? I say "No," in the best interests of the country, and to prove I am right I shall read an extract in the Daily News from the Toronto Star, quoting Premier Taschereau.

(Reads.)

I agree with what he has said as applied to the present Government—it is fruitless if we are to continue to grant concessions to people who go away and gamble with them; and we have no better example of that than the action of the present administration during the past few weeks, and the way they withheld information until it was dragged out of them that they were giving extensions of licenses to people—for what? I can tell them for what, or at least one could get that construction out of it. Some of these companies have options to sell their properties on the Labrador, one in particular—a company over in England has an option to buy a property of 2400 square miles for £400,000, provided the title is right, and that company has placed in the Bank of Nova Scotia in Newfoundland $5,000.00 as a guarantee that they mean business—if they don't carry out by the end of 1927 they forfeit the $5,000.00. If that is worth two millions to that company, what is it worth to the country? I may be talking green stuff, but these are actual facts. We found that out of 1141 3|5 square miles granted only approximately 500 square miles had conformed wtih the terms of the licenses, and not one of these who are given this Minute of Council. Not one. When speaking the other day the Minister of Justice asked how we could expect them to spend money on an area in dispute. How is it that other people did it? They haven't conformed with their licenses and it is our duty to cancel them, even if we have to pay back the money.

MON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — A man couldn't conform unless he operated, and they weren't allowed to build. They were afraid to build because of the Quebec Government.

MR. CASHIN—And these people came in and took licenses in spite of the fact that they couldn't build. The probabilities are that Dickie has an action against the Quebec Government Are we going to allow the Labrador to become the prey of a crowd of greedy speculators? If we are, let it go, but to whom are we responsible? This country is, as members on both sides will admit, in a precarious financial position, and we look to the Labrador to take us out of the hole, and we ought not to al-

low it to go out of our hands. They have picked the best portions and left the rocks for this country, and what we have always had—the fishery—it is just as well if we hadn't won at all. Why did these men who got licenses agree to build? It was none of our business that the Quebec Government stopped them; their agreements with us were that they were going to build mills costing anywhere from $250,000. They didn't do it and it is our duty to cancel their licenses. It looks as if the Labrador will be a feast for the lawyers for half a century, and now you are putting something else on the Statute Book to entangle our minds. It is hard to understand what is meant. I shall just read one letter from Mr. R. S. Fulton, chairman of the London-Labrador Corporation; evidently he wrote it after having received legal advice from lawyers in England.

(Reads.)

Evidently he was told that unless they had carried out, or the Newfoundland Government had waived objection, they had no title, and that bears out conclusively the position that their title is not clear, and that the Government can take advantage of that.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, and I feel every member will agree, that this letter was written by a legal mind, and he evidently knew that they had no legal right to the property on the Labrador, not having carried out their agreement, but having an easy fish in the present Government, they were immediately given two years to carry them out, and consequently if one accepts the construction that all actions of an Executive are legal, these men own 512 square miles that Newfoundland can't dispose of. I object to the funds of this country being given away, so to speak, to any people who have no interest in it, except what they can make out of it. We should legislate not only for the present generation but for future generations, and if we barter away every part of Labrador, as we have started to do by giving away 5,000 square miles, where are we going to get off? We are selling something that doesn't belong to us. I believe that the feeling of every member when that case was won was that we should dispose of Labrador to pay our national debt and make the country somewhat fit to live in, but the Labrador is not of much value in the hands of a Government who are prepared to give it away to a crowd of sharks. In 1921 an Act was passed in this House. I will read a section of it.

(Reads.)

This evidently wasn't an incorporated company, and to-day they have applied for a further period of two years, and this company has an option of two millions—this same crowd that didn't carry out their agreement. That agreement ceased in January 1927, and here on April 25th we have the Executive Government receiving a comunication from the same aggregation asking for a further two years to carry out what they should have done in 1922, and you went and gave it. Isn't that giving away what don't belong to you? I would go as far as to say that it is like my going to-morrow and stealing a suit of clothes and selling it. Why did the Government conceal the fact that these concessions were given until Mr. Halfyard got it out of them? Why didn't they lay their cards on the table—it is something which a man with what you would call a diseased mind might have put a strong construction. What I object to as a Newfoundlander who will probably have to live here for the remainder of my life, is for the Executive Government to barter the rights of the country, which have cost us between $500,000 and a million cold cash, and all the bills are not paid yet.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that this bill ought to be thrown out here this afternoon or the greater portion of it, and that a bill ought to be brought in cancelling the licenses on the Labrador, and that we take a chance on winning if we went to Court. If you are not prepared to do that, apart from political feeling, you are not here in the best interests of the country. It looks as if people look upon this country as something to make what they can out of it at the expense of the common people. It is just the same as if I went to play a game of poker this afternoon and kept filling all the time until finally I got a full house or a straight flush. This crowd have been given a straight flush by the Executive Government here the other day. Well, are we going to stand for it? Furthermore it looks to me as if the second clause in that bill is put in for another purpose. I am not a lawyer but I think that I have a certain amount of ordinary common sense. The people who have applied for licenses as already stated may come in under this bill and may claim the licenses they have applied for on the Labrador and then where are we going to get off. Those comprise the best of the Labrador, some ——— thousand square miles. It would be very interesting to know and I intend to put a question on the order paper to find out what individuals or firms have been promised that they will get licenses by this administration or any other.

You have given away what we have waited for and what the people of this country looked to, to take them out of the mess which your Government helped to put them in, and what I might say your Government claimed all the credit of winning when the Labrador Boundary Dispute was settled; a most indecent action. One would imagine that those opposed to the Monroe administration were absolutely opposed to the country winning the Labrador dispute if one read the comments and the applause that appeared in the press since that dispute was settled.

It would appear that all the patriots in Newfoundland composed the Monroe administration's party. But I could put a different construction on it and say if I were absolutely in order, that all the brains of Newfoundland, so to speak were confined to the Executive Government or the Monroe administration. I feel that we should stop right here and now, unless we want to forfeit our rights on the Labrador and unless we want to go insolvent.

What I object to is not being given definite and accurate information in this House. It has been going on since the House opened. I want to know right now if it is the intention of the present Government to make a test case out of the various licenses now outstanding. What I mean by that is this. These people who have paid up to date their rentals for licenses but have not complied with the terms of the licenses; is it the intention of the Government to grant them a further two years to carry out the terms of their licenses. I would like to know right now from the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: It seems to me that we have to repeat things over and over again in this House to get some members to understand what we are saying. We had this question up yesterday and the day before and I thought it was fully explained by the Attorney General and by myself and by others that we had given nothing away whatever as far as the Labrador is concerned. On the contrary, we have been busy since being in power in re-claiming the Labrador. When we came into power 30,000 square miles of the Labrador was given away, practically all the timber on it, and we have reclaimed over

half that amount, nearly two-thirds. What we did was that we asked how these licenses stood and we found that there were some people in arrears, who had been in arrears for years and nobody had taken the slighest notice of it. We said that notice should be sent immediately by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to inform the holders of these licenses that their licenses would be cancelled unless arrears were paid up by a certain date. Some didn't pay, so we sent a second notice in order that they be treated with every deference in respect to what money they had already paid in. The honourable member for Twillingate made the perfectly correct statement that it is not likely that this Government or any other, in the event of this property passing to Canada instead of to Newfoundland, would hand back the money to those who had paid it in. Those people were paying in money for licenses, payments in hundreds of thousand of dolllars on the off chance of Newfoundland winning this case. Some of them after being notified and being in debt a certain amount of money, decided not to continue. And now they are coming back making legal claims on the Government and there will be a test case in connection with it. Some, however, have made us payments every year for something they did not know they would procure, and they say to us, "There is a clause in my agreement that I have got to put up a mill, and now that Newfoundland owns this property, how do you think this ought to be treated " Now I ask any member of this Committee whether, if he had been paying money for some years on licenses and Governments had been accepting that money year after year, if he would think that it was a square deal for the Government to say, "Now we have got your money and now we are going to take a lawsuit because you have not put up a mill during all the years we have been collecting money from you, and try to put you out of court." I claim it would be entirely unfair and dishonest, and I think any ordinary common sense business man would view it as commercially immoral. As is well-known, Mr. Dickie was one man who did put up a mill and he took machinery down there on the Labrador and I am told, those cases of machinery are lying there with bush growing up all around. He was not allowed to construct the mill by the Canadian Government. Any of those licensees would have been in the same position. If they had gone down there, put up a mill and brought down machinery, it would not have been any benefit to anybody, but only a loss to themselves. I think it is very unreasonable of honourable members to talk about our giving away wholesale millions of dollars worth of Labrador. We haven't given one single grant on the Labrador since we were a Government and I wish the same were true of other governments. If they had not done so, we would have the whole Labrador to dispose of to Canada or whoever we might get to buy it. We have given nothing away, but we have interpreted the act by what we would call fair-play, and in a way I am certainly satisfied would be the interpretation of the Supreme Court. If the Minister of Justice told me to-day that he thought we had a good case to go to the Supreme Court to put those people out of business, I couldn't vote for it, because I think it would be absolutely unfair treatment of persons paying licenses so many years and we have accepted their money. Some reference has been made to the International Paper Company wanting timber limits on the Labrador and in Newfoundland at $2 a square mile. I think that $2 is a perfectly absurd valuation, and I guarantee that we are not going to

give them or bring before this Legislature anything to give them land on the Labrador for $2 per square mile.

The whole intention of this Bill is to protect our rights on the Labrador and to prevent them from being given away in the future or being granted except by the Legislature. It is not intended to affect anybody in or out of the House. I had a suggestion from the Attorney General in connection with Clause 2 with regard to the objections made in that espect. He suggested an amendment and if it appeals to the House as better securing the interests of the country, we shall be perfectly willing to substitute it and let Clause 2 read as follows:

(Reads)

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: Following upon what the Prime Minister has just stated, there appears to be a slight misconception of Section 2, a perfectly honest one, with which I have no quarrel. Section 2 is what we call a negative section, which means it has no effect whatever on any rights that any parties have. It is not a declaratory section declaring any rights. I hope I won't go on record as endeavouring to deliver a school master's lecture when I respectfully suggest that, with the most honest intentions in the world, there has apparently been a misapprehension of Section 2. Section 2 as it reads to-day is as follows:

(Reads)

The Prime Minister has stated that the object of the act is absolutely and entirely confined to one point, that nothing in the future can be done with lands with respect to timber rights and water power right, on the Labrador, except through Act of the Legislature. That is the object of the Act, that and that only and in Section 2 it is merely declared in order that there be no contention made that the legislation is not interfering with any rights, any legal rights, that persons may have there, that nothing here shall effect such rights.

(Reads)

Now that particular clause consists of two parts in the main, before the amendment suggested by the Prime Minister is considered at all.

The first says:

(Reads)

That merely enacts that any person who has got a concession in law is not affected with regard to that by this enactment. The second clause says, "Or heretofore with approval of the Legislature agreed to be given granted or issued by the Government of this Colony."

(Reads)

I would like to say for the information of honourable members that there were two classes as regards the outstanding rights on the Labrador. There is for example first the class of the ordinary Crown Lands Act grant, the straight grant from the Crown, and the person having that grant has complied with the grant, or under the grant from the Crown contends that he still has the right even when he hasn't paid rentals to hold the grant. There is a subsidiary to that class consisting of those that it was suggested have Minutes of Council giving undertakings that when the Labrador Boundary dispute was settled that they were going to be given grants. That is the first class referred to under the section. Then there is the second class that comes under the heading of any persons "hertofore with the approval of the Legislature" having undertakings to get grants. There is an outstanding case in mind, that of the case of the grant given in 1915 of water powers in Labrador to the "Products Corporation" which right in due time was transferred to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company and which right as a matter

of fact is to-day extant in their opinion; as regards the fulfilling of their conditions of compiling a survey and expenditure of five millions at Corner Brook these have been complied with, and there remains the expenditure of ten million dollars on the coast of Labrador to entitle them as of right to a grant. The Government of the day in connection with this very important water power will practically have to make up its mind as regards its attitude towards this and I think I may take the liberty of saying it has made up its mind. Honourable members will remember that, not this administration but a previous one, transferred to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company in 1923 all the rights of the Newfoundland Products Corporation to those water powers on the Labrador and they will also remember that not alone did they transfer all their rights to that water power on the Labrador to this company that did not require that water power in connection with its Corner Brook enterprise because the proposal to utilise the power on the Labrador had nothing to do with making of paper or pulp; not alone were the rights of that company transferred to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company but an extension of time was given them and time was to begin to run instead of 1915 from 1923 with the result to-day. I merely make the statement of fact and am not speaking c itically, that instead of the Colony owning that water power again as it would if that extension had not been granted, that the Company have completed two of the conditions and now the expenditure of $10,000,000 on the coast of Labrador will entitle them to a grant. Now that is one of the cases as to what is the meaning of talking of "heretofore with the approval of the Legislature agreed to be given or granted or issued by the Government of the Colony." In other words the object of that section is clearly to state or make it manifest that this Legislature is not interfering with obligations that the country is under. The Prime Minister has called attention to the fact that since the present administration came into power there has been no grant in any shape or form of concessions on the Labrador with regard to timber or water powers which are the subjects of this bill and has also stated with regard to the grants that were drawn attention to by the Member for Ferryland that there was a legal impossibility for these companies to comply with their agreements by reason of the interference with that property popularly known as the Dickie property by the Quebec Government and the continuance of that interference. It is in connection with grants of that kind where it was the agreement to build a mill was not complied with for that reason that we are taxed with the responsibility of having given away the Labrador. This Government or any Government during the past three or four years was in this position that it had to do one of two things. Certain rights were outstanding on the Labrador; a certain number of leases had been issued by previous administrations; of these leases a certain number of people had regularly paid their rentals; a certain number of others had fallen into arrears. Now as the Prime Minister has stated it would be manifestly unfair for a Government after accepting rentals when the dispute was outstanding to take action when it was settled for not having erected a mill. I want to make the point that we could not cancel a man's license merely because he didn't erect a mill. What we did do was the only thing we had power to do. There were two clauses there and they were all circularised. Not one of these license holders can complain

of not being given the opportunity to pay up. That had been done also by previous administrations and had not been put into effect, so a second notice was sent. We felt that there were a certain number of people taking chances on paying rents and taking chances on the result, when it was possible and likely that if the dispute had gone the other way, they would have had no redress from the Quebec Government. They certainly could not compel them to make returns for what they had paid in. We found ourselves then in this position that we had either to allow them to continue or say to the people in arrears: "You have either to pay up or we will cancel your licenses." We had that power expressly under the Crown Lands Act. We had no power whatever beyond that; therefore, the only effective steps that could be taken to put into execution all the legal powers of the Government were taken when these people's licenses were cancelled. The second position that arises is an absolutely different one altogether. It is suggested that now, the dispute is settled, that the people who had kept their rentals paid up and from whom the Government had accepted rents, and who were in good standing in that respect should not be allowed the benefit of the condition under the lease of two years to erect a mill. Now, I think it will be agreed, no matter how members view this question, that it is not a personal question, it is a question, not of honour, but a question, as a matter of fact, of an absolute obligation for any Government as to what is proper and right. When the Labrador Boundary dispute ended and the title of the Colony was confirmed, it was absolutely clear that those people no longer had the answer they could make previously. If an action was taken for the erection of a mill before, they had the answer behind them of the actual facts of the Quebec Government stopping the mill running. Therefore, I say with due deliberation and the fullest appreciation of the seriousness of the statement that there was no other course open to any administration but to say to these people: "Yes; your two years will be construed from the date when it was first possible for you to proceed with the erection of your mill." I do say, further, that if an extension beyond the actual terms of the lease, which, I think, is two years, were given; for example, if these people were told that, "Now, you are in a position to have an undisputed title, we shall give you three years or four," then I say we might have been accused of giving a concession. But I think they could insist on that construction of their agreement which allows the time to run from the date of the settlement of the dispute and I don't think it is right that we should leave the country under the impression that anything at all in the nature of an act granting concession has been done in connection with these people. Now just one word more with regard to the suggestion made probably without full consideration as to these grants of that class. I have heard the reference repeated, "Wipe out everything on the Labrador. Bring in an Act here now to say that any people who have rights on the Labrador shall lose them and all licenses shall be cancelled? I merely want to say that when that is said I trust it will be considered what the possible cost would be to be paid for an action of that kind. I trust that if the country decides on an action like that that it will endeavour to see the way clear to be able to meet the result. It would be improper for me not to say in passing with regard to that that any Legislature of a self-governing Dominion who repudiates the Act of its Legislature its own Crown grants,

then very serious consideration would have to be given as to where that is going to land you. If we had before this country to-day some proposition; if we had as a matter of fact, as has been so often suggested, a proposal from some people who were going to buy the Labrador, about which we have heard so much, and if it were so that these people made it a condition that they would buy the Labrador provided we gave them an absolutely clear title, we would then have to consider how much of that money we could afford to pay to those people who would come back on us. Candidly, however, I don't see any terrible rush for the Labrador. There doesn't appear to be a general clamouring of bidders for the purchase of that territory and while one would like to feel that we are able to sell the Labrador overnight, I don't think so. I think its immediate value is simply additional credit to the Colony. I think that is its only value at present. I trust that the immediate value will be increased in the near future but I have no delusions about our being able to sell the Labrador now, and certainly in the light of the present situation it does not appear likely to me that offers are going to be as elaborate as we would be disposed to think of suggesting.

As to the second section my idea in suggesting the amendment to the Prime Minister and which he has referred to was that I thought it would remove what appeared to be a possible doubt in the minds of honourable members. As now amended, of course, it makes it perfectly clear that the section only applies to Acts of the Legislature.

(Reads)

In other words if it be felt that that section is of any value as giving any protection to any persons outside, put it that way and it is confined to rights outstanding by Acts of the Legislature. I suggest that may remove any possible discrimination. There is none in mind anyway.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Is not one of the conditions of the lease the erection of a mill?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Yes.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—This lease here says that in case the lease holder shall make default in any of the conditions herein contained then in that case the lease shall be null and void.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —There is also a provision in the Crown Lands Act. That is not what we call a condition precedent. A condition precedent to cancellation would be in the case of rentals.

(Reads Crown Lands Act)

I was dealing with the grant from the point of compellability. It is a condition that doesn't make liable to forfeiture. It is merely a technical distinction. I stated that in one case you automatically forfeited and in the other there is no forfeiture but the remedy is by an action.

MR. HALFYARD— With regard to the erection of a mill within a certain time under the lease you say that it has to be done within two years. When is that to commence?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Within two years of the settlement of the Labrador Boundary question; from the date of the judgment. The two years begin to run from that date. It has to be completed within two years from that date.

MR. HALFYARD—The time referred to in the license appears to be different. It says.

Reads)

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

It is as there in the license. If I said two I correct myself according to whatever is in the license. It is simply interpreted as beginning from the date of the judgment, they are

given the time stated to comply with their agreement.

MR. HALFYARD— They are given two years to comply?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — They are given nothing. They are to understand that the date of the lease is the date of the judgment..

MR. HALFYARD—Then instead of the lease being dated in this case, November 1923, it will be dated March 2, 1927. You will simply make a change in the date of the lease is that all?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — The terms of the lease with respect to the building of a mill. That is all they asked about.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, they have not got a license or lease or grant, they merely got an agreement, an understanding with this Legislature by the Act of 1925, that if they performed certain conditions they would get a grant of water power. That case has got to be considered. They have got to make election as to what water powers they are going to take. If they carried out the other conditions of the lease they would be granted three years to do that.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I am glad at any rate that the few words that I did have to say have brought about an understanding as to where we stood in connnection with those people holding property on Labrador. It is all very well to talk about what we should do for these people who have invested their money in this property in the way of paying rentals. They have gambled, sir, and if the Canadians had to win I would have no sympathy for them. It is time now to end our sympathy for gamblers. The two hundred and fifty thousand people in this country have got to be considered just as well as those who gambled at the expense of this country. From the time that they invested that money they were up against it, inasmuch as they could not build a mill but they agreed to build one. And now this Government gives them two years further extension in order to build them.

There is another point that I want to make clear. You have given this company two years' extension, and you have also given this company, the Pulp and Paper Company of America, a further extension to export pulp wood after that mill is built. I say, sir, that we are now in a worse position regarding the Labrador than we were before this question was settled. For this reason, that these people who have gambled at the expense of the country have been encouraged by the present administration. I take it that after this Bill passes the people who want extensions can get them from the Executive Government, and after this Bill passes it will not be necessary to come into this Legislature to get these concessions. Now I feel, sir, that a clause should be inserted in this Bill to the effect that these people should have to come to this Legislature and then we would know where we were getting off. The point is the Governm't in introducing this Bill should have told us that many people had been granted extensions. Two or three days ago this Government gave extensions to one crowd and we heard nothing about it whatever.

I have no sympathy for gamblers, and that is all you can call them—gambling at the expense of the country, and going down into this department and that department and taking out land grants, and going around then, if they get stuck, looking for sympathy. These men have no complaint to make, seeing that they took it upon themselves to build a mill on Labrador. They knew that this man Dickie had been thrown out by the Canadian Government, and even in spite of that they went and agreed by Act of Parliament, some

of them at any rate, to go down and build mills on Labrador. Morals! Why those individuals don't even know the meaning of the word "moral". They have no morals, as far as this country as a whole is concerned. I don't want to be personal, but I am here to try and protect to the best of my ability the interests of the people of this country, and while I am here I am going to try and do it. Aftetr I get out, whenever that may be, let somebody else carry it on; but I don't think it is right that this Government should come in here and take upon its own shoulders all the morals of a crowd of people who don't intend to spend five cents of their own money on Labrador, and to-day they have that land sold, some going to England and more to America. Why did you not come in here and tell us that they had done that? That was hidden from this House. If those people had you or the country in a similar position, there is no doubt what they would do. If you feel like throwing away Labrador we cannot stop you. I want to know now whether, when you gave these people the extension of two years, you also allow them to export pulp wood free of duty from Labrador.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — That matter was not raised at all.

MR. CASHIN—Anyway the words that I have said this evening upon this matter I don't think can be construed as obstruction. These few words I feel have brought about a certain amount of debate from both sides of the House, and also a lot of information which was withheld from the Committe has been given us this afternoon. I think, Mr. Chairman, that you will agree with me that regarding the Labrador question it has been a question of dentistry. I think that you will agree with me that we did our duty as far as lay in our power, and now we know that the present administration has adopted the policy of encouraging the art of gambling, and gambling with real estate, in Newfoundland. I think, sir, that the public morals of the people of this country have been despoiled by the action of the present administration, and I do not think, sir, that the interests of the country as a whole have been served by the actions of the present Government during the past few months.

I have listened this afternoon to the remarks of the Minister of Justice with regard to the disposal of the Labrador territory. I realise that it will take considerable time to sell Labrador, but we must remember to look to the future, especially as regards this paper industry. At the present time the demand for that article has fallen off. But you will agree with me that in a neighbouring country of ours they have gone short of raw material, and in a few years no doubt they will be looking elsewhere for their raw material to feed their mills. At the present time I understand that the International Pulp and Paper Company have eight or ten mills not in use, due (1) to the lack of raw material; (2) because the demand is not as great as it has been. And I contend that in giving these people those concessions on Labrador, we have given away to-day the principle parts of that country which should be left for Newfoundlanders. It is all very well to say that these concessions were granted by a previous Government and that we were not to blame. But they were granted purely as a gambling proposition, and when the time arrived that the bluff was to be called, Newfoundland had a straight flush in her hand and these fellows had ace high. The point that I want to get at is this, that it is our job to try and get the whole of Newfoundland Labrador together, in order that when the time arrives, when we will be in need, it will be of finan-

cial assistance to us. Because all the Government has to do is to look at the financial situation of this country to-day, and the people can tell you that we are up against it. We are to-day at the point where the national responsibilities of this country are in the neighbourhood of $80,000,000, and how long further are we able to go along? I think that the ordinary individual realises that when we arirve at the $100,000,000 mark we are broke. What is going to happen then. Go to Labrador and you will find as you say that those gamblers have put it all over you and you have nothing to sell. The Minister of Justice has said that the Labrador has added to our financial borrowing facilities. I agree with him. But has it added to any considerable extent to our paying abilities? Not one cent. The ordinary man has not been enriched by the acquisition of Labrador by Newfoundland. How can you expect to borrow large amounts of money on properties that are not producing anything. I don't think that it is over-populated. The housing situation is not such as to call for grave consideration.

No, sir, the Labrador, in my opinion, if we continue along the path that has been adopted by the executive Government, has brought us to the point where it is going to mean financial bankruptcy in four years. I say that this evening knowing what I say, and I mean it. Because we cannot get along at the present time, paying out four millions of dollars in interest, and having to come in here again this year and borrow another five or six millions anod pay off deficits, which the Auditor General says we have not got. I say that the information tabled in this House with regard to the actions of the present administration have been withheld from this House, just the same as the information tabled with regard to the financial position of this country is being and has been withheld, and what information has been given this House was incorrect. And how can we on both sides of this Legislature, how can we expect to discuss legislation properly in the interest of the people of this country when we are deceiving each other.

Mr. Chairman, I want to apologise this afternoon for taking up so much of the time of this House, and I trust that the Government itself and the members of the Opposition will agree with me that whilst I have not lived up to the legal traditions of this House, I have brought about an understanding with regard to the Labrador Boundary question. I have laid before this House the tactics of the present Executive Government which I personally did not agree with, because I feel that any hopes for the future welfare of this country depends to a large extent upon the guarding of our rights on Labrador, but I regret to say that the sentries are asleep at their posts.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, during the past few weeks the whole country has gone into ecstasies over the Labrador Boundary question, and the people in this country, if I read them aright, feel that they have something now that they can sell. At least that would help to reduce the national debt. Now it seems to me that during the past month or so we have been living in a fool's paradise. We have been flattering everybody from the Minister of Justice down. I say the Minister of Justice because I claim, and feel and congratulate him on being one who had a great part in settling the Labrador Boundary question. And now we find, as the Minister of Justice has just told us, that about 30,000 square miles has been given away and leased to parties inside and outside this country. But this afternoon we have gleaned considerable information. This afternoon we have gleaned much informa-

tion about the properties that are owned in the territory. I do not feel competent, Mr. Chairman, to speak on this subject, but I am a man that has a stake in this country and I thought that with this property we perhaps could make a sale of that territory down there to Canada or perhaps the United States. But now I find that the property that we thought we had we have not got. Instead we find that from day to day the present Government has been giving away certain rights on Labrador, or at least giving an extension of time to those owning rights on Labrador. The Prime Minister stated a few moments ago that he thought it would be right to give a square deal to those who have taken out leases on Labrador. I am very glad to see that the Prime Minister has at least tried to give somebody a square deal. But they are evidently not the people who elected him to power, or at least only a small majority of them. I don't know who they are, but I do know that it is not myself. I have no property on Labrador.

Now while we were on the Address in Reply I made some remarks about the Labrador Boundary. I was very pleased to hear from my hon. friend, Colonel Sullivan, that he at least made the statement that showed to me that we would see that Newfoundland was going to get a square deal as far as Labrador was concerned. I trust, and I have faith in the Colonel, that he will see that Newfoundland does get a square deal. We have heard a lot about square deals but we have seen very little. Has this country been considered as much as those "poor" individuals who have had licenses on Labrador. It is they who are getting justice by having their licenses extended over two years from the date of the settlement of the Labrador Boundary question. Now I say that this country should be very careful and the Executive Government should be very careful about what they are going to do with the Labrador. The Minister of Justice has spent a lot of time on the Labrador question, and now we come in here and try to put through a Bill that has been changed since yesterday, or is at least about to be changed, and it reads a little different from what it did before.

(Reads.)

According to this anybody that has had a lease before can get it extended if it is valid even though he has not lived up to the terms of the agreement. It seems that we will have to make new laws in this country if we are to live here. Not only the Crown Lands Act but many other Acts will have to be changed.

And the question now arises as to what. we are going to do with this matter. Are we going to pass this Bill or are we going to let it lay, or are we going to still give away our birthright, so to speak. I contend, like the hon. member for Ferryland, who has preceded me, that we should think about future generations in this country and not so much about ourselves. We should try to conserve the territory of Labrador for future generations, and make this country fit to live in, because, as I said before, you cannot live in this country at the present time. And while the Minister of Justice said a few minutes ago that we may not be able to sell Labrador very quickly, yet I believe to-day that we should make an effort to sell it, and my suggestion would be that the Government of the day or the incoming Government should immediately tryto sell what is left before the Government gives away what we have left now.

The land at Labrador is waiting to be claimed by certain individuals who have already enough of this world's goods, and these are the people who are getting the protection from the present Gov-

ernment even while this House is in session. I do not wish to be personal, but we all know that there are people reaping rich rewards from this Government and looking for more, and we must swallow that and come in here to make laws for hungry speculators, while if a hungry man stole a piece of bread he would be put in clink for months. And you call that justice. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this country will see and the Government will see that they are at least given some sort of justice—I mean the fishermen, the laborers, the clerks in the stores, and the mechanics—all the laboring classes are given a square deal, not the hungry speculators, not the land sharks, but the people that are the bone and sinew of the country, whom the Government has neglectd. Unless the Government of the day sees that they are protected, we are in a sad state of affairs. Here we are with nearly 80 million dollars debt, and all classes thought that we had at least the Labrador to depend on to reduce that debt, and now we find that we have the Labrador with a great deal of it given away. I think that is a sad state of affairs at which we have arrived, and I trust that someone will see that something is done in the very near future to give the people what the Monroe Administration promised —"a square deal."

I don't want to do any more obstructing. I was told I was an obstructionist, but I went home for two weeks and found nothing done when I came back. They said they had to wait for me, and I am glad to know I am of such importance. I am opposed to giving extension of grants on Labrador, I want it for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the gentlemen who are speaking realize that the object of this Bill is to hold Labrador for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. It has been suggested by the hon. member for Ferryland that he didn't like Clause 2; we are prepared to amend these in any proper way suggested. I would like for members to debate the resolutions, and if there are portions they don't like, give us their suggestions. I will read an amendment which has been drafted to Clause 2, and if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition or the members consider it an improvement we will adopt it. There is no object in this Bill except to protect Labrador for Newfoundlanders. We are not protecting any particular persons, and we will alter the bill in any way the Opposition wants, in line with the object, that is to prevent the Labrador being given away by this or any other Government. I made it perfectly clear that we have given nothing away—we have done nothing but interpret an Act in existence. Now if members feel that Clause 2 ought to be altered, we will alter it it in any way to meet your views, but in the meantime the Clerk and Solicitor have put their heads together and drafted an amendment which may improve it, and I would suggest to the hon. member for Ferryland that it meets his objection.

(Reads)

If any hon. member thinks he can improve upon this, and suggest any alterations, we can adjourn the committee to give him time to consider it, but I want it clearly understood that we have nothing to hide; we are doing this to protect the Labrador. I took it by the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and some of his followers that they were thoroughly in accord with the principle that we should protect the people, and prevent the giving away by this or any future government. But let us get down to talking about the sections and see if we can agree.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, if you

will permit me I would like to make a suggestion as to how the man on the street is concerned in the Labrador Boundary — the man on the street seems to be frightened. As to what the legal position is I don't know, but if it is possible I would say that the Government should take back the land now under license, and pay these people the money they have paid the Government. That is the part that concerns us. If we have the Labrador, is it going to be any use to us in paying off our public debt? If we are going to give some to these speculators, and more to any company coming in next week; if it is going to go in dribs and drabs we will have nothing at at all. The Opposition to-day is in a kind of fog regarding why the Government is bringing in this legislation—if it is to protect the Labrador I certainly will support it, but not if it is going to give away parts of it to every Tom, Dick and Harry that comes along. And these communications show that you are trying to protect someone. Pay back their rental and take the lands, since they have not carried out their agreement. That is where you are going to have trouble with the Opposition. And if we are going along like this when the Estimates come down, we won't get out of this till Christmas.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I feel kind of responsible for bringing about a certain amount of discussion about this Bill. There may not be anything very grave about the Bill, but the point that I was making, and the criticisms I was offering was that the Executive Government should not have given extensions of time to anyone. And I am absolutely opposed to that still. I can't understand it because these people who are given further time to comply with their licenses are not going to develop this property; if they were going to develop it they would have the hearty support of the House, but we all know well enough that they have no intention of doing so, any more than I have of jumping over Shea's wharf. I would have been agreeable even if they hadn't carried out their agreement, if when asking for an extension of time the Government had said: "Look here, we are going to conserve the Labrador and get the properties all together; legally we can cancel your license, or otherwise take an action against you for non-fulfilment of your contract and have you fined $10,000 and $100.00 a day. But we will tell you what we will do—you will find us to be decent and honourable —we will refund you the money you have paid in." Then we will own the Labrador, but we all know that for years speculators have been gambling with our rights, and it is time to put a stop to it, whether under this or any future Government. If I have obstructed this Bill, I hope the Government will reflect, and instead of giving renewals, they will decide that these people have no right, morally or otherwise. The point has been made by me, if I do say it, that when Dickie was turned out of Labrador by Quebec in 1905 (I wasn't in public life then) this is clear, that these speculators knew all about what happened to Dickie, and went in with their eyes open; they knew they couldn't go in and build, and they have no right to-day, morally or otherwise, on the Labrador, as I see it. As far as I am concerned, I am going to fight it to a finish. If I don't accomplish it I will do my best.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in moving that the Committee rise, at the suggestion of Mr. Scammell, I should like to suggest to the hon. member for Ferryland that he obtain legal advice on one point. Supposing this Government had told these people that they were going to cancel the licenses or take an action for non-complying with the

terms of their agreement, would we have gotten a judgment in any court? I don't believe we would get a judgment. We have been taking money for rentals year by year, and then at the end of the term it is suggested that we take action to eject them from the land, or try to have them fined an enormous amount because they were not allowed by the Canadian Government to carry out their agreement. Surely scuh action would be unjust.

MR. MOORE—We might not be sustained, but at least the Government would have done its part.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — We could only ask the Justice Department if it looked as if our case would be sustained. We don't want to take action for doing a thing that in our opinions there is nothing very wrong about, in order to get back lands when our own lawyers advise us that we have no case. That is the only point I would like to have hon. members satisfy themselves on. I beg to move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the ratification of a Contract for St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — This Bill has been already discussed in Committee and some amendments were suggested. The sections 3 and 4 have been amended and now read:

(Reads)

The honorable member for St. George's communicated with Captain Butler asking him to reduce the rate and he didn't want to reduce the rate as suggested for produce in barrels without reducing it on other things, so he has consented to an all round reduction from 25 cents to 15 cents as the rate per barrel.

I would ask that these two, section 3 and 4 being the only ones altered, be read.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Prime Minister, with regard to the matter of Section 1, the classing of the ship A1 at Lloyd's. Is Captain Butler going to take steps to have it reclassed? How is the Government going to take steps to see that it is reclassed after this?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am afraid it can't be done this year. The vessel was passed last year. The owners contemplate some very extensive alterations and Captain Butle thought he could not have her surveyed this year. However, the Government has no reason to think that there is anything wrong with the boat.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Government waived the condition as it would be in the public interest to carry on the service.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the bill 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 bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second Reading of Bill "An Act Respecting Education."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I would like on this occasion of the introducing of the sec-

ond reading of this Bill to make some statements in connection with the Bill and for the purpose of greater accuracy I will refer to some notes I have in this respect.

(Reads)

I have been Minister of Education now for four terms of this Legislature. I don't know but this may be the last term of this administration. If it is or is not I feel that I would now like before giving up the position of Minister of Education to be able to have to my credit the passing of legislation which is in the opinion of the educational people of this country advisable. I cannot find that there is any contentions about it. Everybody, church, teachers and all others interested believe that this legislation is necessary. We have saved for this country four thousand dollars a year in the salary of a Minister of Education, seven thousand dollars of a contribution will immediately come in from the teachers themselves. I don't know of any particular reasons why this particular bill should be in any way contentious. It is quite possible that Dr. Barnes may come back as a member to this House again and it might be advisable to have him head of the Department of Education. I am not going to comment on that, but I am going to say that while he was a great educationalist, that it may be possible that a Government might come into power in which there will not be found anybody particularly interested in the educational work of the country. It is much easier in the party of twenty or thirty members to find a Minister of Fisheries or Public Works, than it is to find a Minister of Education, consequently it seems to me that we should create a bureau that will comprise representatives of each denomination. Whilst we have denominational education, and personally I was never in favor of it, but here lt is and here it will stay; while we have that in this country, I do claim that really men who have made an absolute study of denominational training in this country as have the Superintendents of Education, should have more voice in the affairs of education than they have under the former administrations For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I commend this Bill to the House, and hope it will not be contentious. I hope we will not have to go through it clause by clause and argue it out. I do not want to hurry the House about it but I want any member that is at all likely to take an active interest in this Bill, to take it home, read it, consult his friends in the educational world and find out whether this Bill is not desirable, and if he finds it is in the interests of the country that he will give it his support.

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Education" was deferred until tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, owing to the fact that when this Bill was before Committee before there were one or two matters that were discussed and I promised to investigate and find out from the Tourist Publicity Bureau with regard to certain points raised by Mr. Halfyard and others. I have been in touch with the Bureau and with the permission of the Committee I will read the reply that I received to the

communication I sent in reference to the subject matter of these contentions.

(Reads)

About one dollar up to thirty dollars and from thirty dollars to sixty-five, that is from the United States, from Halifax here I think the tax is five cents on every five dollars. Now with regard to the idea of people going into Halifax. Honourable members will appreciate that there are very few passengers that stop at Halifax from here. It is only a place en-route, and any distinctions made with regard to that would be hardly worth considering. Another point that must be considered is, that a person now going to the States, if he pays his two dollars or three for a tax on tickets he is now obviated of the necessity of providing a passport. The United States does not require a passport for anyone going from Newfoundland at the present time, so we are now saved that expenditure.

(Reads)

I may say that one of the representatives of the Bureau since I wrote them have interviewed the American Consul and the representatives of the Furness Withy and the Red Cross Companies, and they said if you are going to make any exception you are going to cause tremenduous confusion and going to interfere with the regular operation, so I submit that the clause which we suspended the reading of at the last sitting should be now read, and I commend it to the consideration of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that the Committee had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had passed the same without amendment. On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that leave be given to introduce a bill accordingly.

On motion the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for other purposes" was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to move the House now rising do adjourn until to-morrow at three of the clock.

MR. K. BROWN—On the motion to adjourn I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to grant any special moneys for Public Works this year?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Government has not come to any decision about that. It is a matter for the House rather than for the Government.

MR. BROWN—I would like to say that it is about time for the Government to take up the matter because things are getting pretty serious. I have a message here which says:

(Reads)

I have a message from Springdale:

(Reads)

Now several places in the district that I represent, Mr. Speaker, have roads impassable, bridges broken down and the people can't get over them;can't get by with horse and waggon or motor cars. From the answer of the Prime Minister I suppose we can judge that the Government is not going to grant any special money for public works. Well, if that is not done it is just as well for us all to go and commit suicide.

While I am on my feet might I ask another question. Is it the intention of the Government to do anything in the way of finding employment for people now out of employment in St. John's

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the hon. member I may say that the Government have had

a few interviews, at any rate, with a large committee of the unemployed. The members from St. John's East have had numerous interviews and we have pointed out to them that $90,000 has been spent by the Government in St. John's and that we as a Government don't see where we can find any more money to take care of the situation in St. John's; that there was a certain responsibility with regard to people in destitute circumstances, but we claimed that responsibility; if there is to be work done in St. John's and work is needed in St. John's badly enough; it is on the taxpayers of St. John's to pay for it and not on the taxpayers of all parts of the country and for that reason we have sent those people who have come to us to the Municipal Council. They were sent back to us and they have been battledored and shuttle-cocked about; but I can't see what the Government, under present financial conditions can do in the way of granting money for employment in St. John's any more than for many other places where I know there is a great need for employment.

I find in my district the matters the hon. member for Twillingate has put up this afternoon. It is no way new. We have had representations that bridges are falling down in my district and other districts. We are getting letters and messages all the time about people starving; about people needing to be fed, and people needing work and I don't think even if the present Opposition were in power to-day that it would be very much better able in the financial condition of the country to cope with the situation than we are. That is all I can say to the hon. member as far as the people of St. John's are concerned.

MR. K. BROWN—I thank the Prime Minister for his explanation and I may say I am sorry the duty falls on me to bring the matter before the House this afternoon when I am not representing that particular district. Altogether from the answer I received from the Prime Minister it seems that nothing can be done and these unemployed and their wives and children must starve. That is the answer; nothing else can be arrived at only that the unemployed in this city must starve and if there are unemployed in the outports they must expect the same thing. With scores of people going to the United States and more left home to starve it is just as well to get out of here right now. To bring this before the House is in my opinion the duty of Mr. Linegar, the member for that district. I wouldn't be talking about that but that so many unemployed have met and asked me to bring the matter before the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Or of Mr. Brophy.

MR. K. BROWN—No; I say Mr. Linegar because in 1924 when your Government was returned to power, Mr. Linegar rose to second the address in reply, if I remember rightly, and the honourable gentleman got up and congratulated himself on being the first labour representative elected in this country. I told him if that was an honour that honour fell to me in 1923. If Mr. Linegar is proud of having that honour of being a labour representative I am sure he ought in the interests of his constitutents and those that are starving to-day in the city of St. John's live up to that honour and get up and say "I want relief for those unemployed and I'm going to have it. If I don't I am going to walk across and take an independent seat." The Government can do something. In 1923 and in 1921 when the unemployment situation was acute something was done. They gave them rock sheds or something to keep them from starving. But nothing is done to-

day. I assure the honourable member for St. John's West that if he makes a motion in this House in the interests of the unemployed in St. John's or elsewhere I will support him right to the limit. Now, however, I am presenting the case for his interests. I realize that to-day people in this town and their children are starving. I know; people have asked me and have asked you for money and said they didn't have food to eat in the house, and they didn't have enough to buy a loaf of bread. That is all very well for us who have enough to eat. I will support any member who will get up in this House and speak in the defence of the unemployed in the city of St. John's or elsewhere—and I hope that the honourable member for St. John's West will see fit to grasp the first opportunity of taking the matter up in this House and at party meetings to see what can be done for the unemployed.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion to adjourn, as Mr. Brown, member for Twillingate has brought the matter of construction of roads and bridges to the attention of the Government, and also the prevailing unemployment in St. John's, I may be regarded as remiss in my duty if I did not say something on behalf of Trinity District. Numerous letters and messages are received by me weekly and daily and 99 per cent. of these contain requests for sums of money to repair roads and bridges or asking for employment. A number of men left for Millertown, and through the good offices of Magistrate Fitzgerald they had to be passed back at Government expense. The conditions in Trinity District are somewhat similar to those obtaining in other districts, and I don't know what can be done. I presume it is agitating the minds of the Government as to what can be done. As summer advances and many find nothing to do, they ask themselves what will happen when the winter comes. Mr. Speaker, all I am asking for is enough to make bridges passable for people to walk over from one place to another. Roads can be gone over, but bridges must be kept in repair, and I trust the Minister of Public Works will see that the Government finds money for the absolutely necessary cases, suppose they have to anticipate another loan. It won't take a great lot—if you would only put to the credit of Trinity District just what it cost to build one mile of road in 1926 I would be satisfied.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, following the hon. members for Twillingate and Trinity, I just want to confirm that with something which I took up with the Department of Pubilc Works to-day, I was instrumental in having Mr. Gosse sent out to inspect two bridges, the Gallows Cove Bridge in Witless Bay and the Mobile Bridge in Mobile, and I understand Mr. Gosse reported them to be in bad condition. I asked the Minister of Public Works what would be done, and he said he had no money, and that he would see the Minister of Finance this afternoon. I want to tell the Government that while I am a member for the District I hold myself morally responsible for accidents that might happen on these bridges, and I place that on the shoulders of the present administration. There ought to be a special sum allocated to put them in passable condition. I shall defer any further remarks on that until the Estimates come up, when I shall criticise the action of the Government in spending other money.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Thursday, June 16th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, June 16th, 1927.

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

Hon. Colonial Secretary tabled the Report of the Superintendent of the Tuberculosis Sanatorium for the year ending December 31st, 1926.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act respecting the ratification of a Contract for St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service," was read a third time and was ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I might say in reference to the amendment suggested by the introducer of the Bill that it doesn't cover the requirements of the members on this side of the House. What we want is an amendment to that Bill to prevent any further extension or renewal of licenses that are supposed to be held on the Labrador at the present time. We consider that licenses were renewed and that it is not in the interests of the country nor in the interests of the people. It is unnecessary and uncalled for and we think it is illegal and we want if this Bill goes through, to have it stipulated that no further licenses shall be extended or renewed on the Labrador. We haven't had time to give it quite all the consideration we would like and we thought that perhaps in view of this the introducer of the Bill might be good enough to have the Committee rise at this stage and see if they could give further consideration to what we suggested.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I think we would be perfectly satisfied to have the Committee rise. As I explained yesterday we have done all we can through the various legal minds on this side of the House and in the Department of Justice to provide for the very point the Leader of the Opposition raises, and as far as we can get it to do so the Bill covers the very point he raises. In other words we claim that lands or rights can't be given away after this Bill is passed except by the Legislature.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION — Perhaps you misunderstood. I said no further extension or renewal of these that are held.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — No further extension can be given after this is passed.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—You said you have given a further extension. You said you have renewed leases. You have provided for two years to erect a mill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — My point is that we simply interpreted the legal position under the Act as we understood it; that under the Act as it stood that they had legal rights and we couldn't prevent them from having two years after the declaration of the settlement; that we couldn't prevent them from having that term to put up a mill. That was the legal advice given to us by the Justice Department as I understood it, that was in their opinion what the Supreme Court would decide if the matter was taken to the Supreme Court and was only interpreted at the request of these persons that put the question up to us. We referred to the Justice Department and they gave us to understand that if we were to attempt to tell these people that because they had not

erected a mill that their leases were forfeited, in spite of the fact that their rentals were paid up to date, that the Supreme Court would not stand behind that decision but would have given judgment to the contrary.

MR. CASHIN—Try it out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Governments as a rule don't try things out like that unless they think they have got a case.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I can only say in reply to the Prime Minister that I don't see how the Prime Minister or any other legal man can say what the Supreme Court is going to do.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — You can't say that; you can give an opinion what it is likely to do.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—In every battle that comes off you find two men of different minds and they don't know until the decision is handed down. When you gave that two years to erect a mill that was certainly an extension. Yesterday the Minister of Justice told us that it was about 1905 that the dispute arose over the mill put up by Dickie. If that dispute was in 1905 every one of the leases held by people to-day on the Labrador was issued since 1905, and they certainly accepted the leases with their eyes open to the fact that they were not able to erect a mill, and they simply took a gamble as to whether for paying in money they be allowed to retain their interests on Labrador. Now it has come to a point that the Labrador means so much to us that the Government should take some steps even if it should cost a bit of money to find where we stand. Even if the case should have to be taken into Court it would only amount to whatever would be the cost of the case, and if you lose you have only lost the cost of the suit, and if you win you have all Labrador given back to us and have something to dispose of for Newfoundland's interests.

That is the position we take, and we take the strong position that no extension should be given to the holders of licenses, as we would be only compromising that which we secured at great cost by giving the best part of the Labrador territory to private speculators.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, in response to the statements of the Leader of the Opposition, it appears to me like arguing in a circle. As he very aptly said, one can only give an opinion and I have not that presumption of my own opinion to think that it is perfect any more than any other member has. So long as we have the Privy Council so long will a case, if taken, be liable to appeal there. Differences of opinion in law will exist up to the last court of appeal. With regard to the views expressed respecting the interpretation of this Act, as to what ought to be done under a given set of circumstances, there is no court in the world, as I see it, humanly constituted that is going tomorrow to give rights to an action for damages and penalties taken by a Colony against a man who had paid his rentals all along, because he went in with his eyes open and with the knowledge that this Labrador dispute was on. The fact that a man went in while the dispute was on is ample proof that he took a gamble for what it was worth. The object of this Act lies in one direction—and no other—and that is to ensure the disposition of lands on the Labrador should go through the Legislature. Then so far as we are able we draft legislation to carry out the intention of the Act to the best of our ability, and so that there will not be any misapprehension, if there is any other member of the House who is prepared to make a better draft I am prepared to accept and I

feel that the other gentlemen associated with me are also. Primar ly the advice tendered the Government as to the action it ought to take towards the two parties whose rentals were accepted down the years and waived any attempt to erect the mill would, in my opinion, be endorsed by any court of law, despite the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition to the contrary. Now when one talks about trying things out one must remember that it is not altogether a matter without results. Trying test cases costs money. If you lose you lose on two counts. First of all you lose your money, and secondly you are held up to public opporobium. A case is now threatening testing the power of the Government to cancel licenses wh ch had not been paid. If the Government had not power in this, they certainly had not power where rentals had been paid.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, the trouble is that sufficient attention to licenses has not been paid and the Government has been too easy and too lax. I hold in my hand a license issued to John C. Hepburn, dated May 6th, 1927. Previous to that date Mr. Hepburn never had a license on the Labrador. There was a property down there in the name of Messrs. Baine, Johnston & Company and which property was first in the name of H. J. Crowe. Now, I understand that Mr. Hepburn never held the license so that there was no necessity for the Government to issue a new license to a man who never held one before. Now it is specifically stated in this license:

(Reads.)

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the Leader of the Opposition right with regard to the statement he made in connection with a license he held in his hand in relation to Mr. Hepburn. This is not a new license but merely a renewal of transfer. I called up the office a few moments ago and ascertained the facts from the Deputy Minister. This lease was originally granted to Walter B. Grieve and he made an assignment to Mr. Hepburn. From him it was transferred to Mr. H. J. Crowe, who recently transferred it back again to Mr. Hepburn. So that it is in no sense a new license but simply a confirmation of title.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines I have but to say that the Minister of Justice knows well that it is not necessary to issue a new license in the name of a different party.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: This document does not affect the title of the property. It is not a new lease, but simply a confirmation of the title. Nothing more was given than that had been previously held. This procedure has nothing in the nature of anything wrong about it. The original lease had been transferred and re-transferred and surrendered back to the Department and for which lease the Department merely issued a new license in confirmation of the title. The mere presence of Mr. Hepburn's document now did not affect that property at all and he got no better title than before.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Chairman: The Government has been three years in office and the Department of Agriculture and Mines must have known that the conditions of the licenses were not carried out. You knew the circumstances respecting the Labrador territory last autumn and you should not have accepted rentals last year from speculators. Now, having accepted the rentals, the Government should return the rentals to the people who paid them within the past three years.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: Respecting the subject matter now before the Committee, I might say that in 1925 when the licenses were cancelled on the Labrador one of the parties interested came to me with regard to the cancellation of his lease. He pointed out that he owed a large amount, but that as he had paid a very considerable amount he claimed a vested interest in the property. I told him that in order to retain his vested interests he would have to pay all his rentals. He then asked me if it were possible for us to give him a title to the property—the Labrador Boundary case was then in dispute. I told him we could, because, if we had taken any other course and balked at the authority we claimed we had, we would have admitted the weakness of our case and admitted doubt in our title to the Labrador. The Government then gave three months' notice of cancellation to those who had not paid up their rentals. We were not arbitary in the matter and we gave them a further three months' notice. I remember when the Morris administration was in office the same idea was intended, namely, to cancel the leases for people holding large areas on the Labrador. Suddenly we found we were losing revenue from that property because some were paying and others were not. But, sir, you got to put that class of people on the same level and it was only in 1925 that the matter was taken in hand seriously and effectively by the present Government, and it would have been suicide if any lessee could have the evidence that Newfoundland had doubted her rights to collect rentals just as it would have been good evidence for the other side, but we claimed that Labrador belonged to us, and, if we did not maintain that position, we would have been weakening our own case. I remember some ten years or more ago during the Morris Government, in Governor Davidson's time, the Governor General of Canada suggested that no further leases be granted there until a settlement of the dispute was arrived at. I do not know whether the Morris Government or any other former Government carried out that policy; but since the present administration assumed office there has not been a single lease granted on the Labrador; those who have been in arrears and have not paid up their rentals have had their leases cancelled.

Regarding the erection of a pulp mill. I do not know the legal aspect of the case, but I do know something of the moral aspect of the case. These people who have paid up their arrears, I have no doubt, would have erected their mills, if they had been permitted to do so; but the Quebec Government interfered and would have prevented them if they had attempted to carry out the terms of the lease. After the title was made clear and absolute, the Government of Newfoundland gave these people two years' extension to carry out their contract.

I merely submit these ideas, Mr. Chairman, to the House because I think the position of the present Government now is absolutely unassailable.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I have listentively to the various arguments put up from the Government benches. My reply is that, if I were one who had not half carried out what I had promised to do, I would have been nervous that any person would let me off. No doubt, the parties in the transaction on the Labrador were in a similar position until they found that in the present Government they had a soft crowd to deal with. Those speculators agreed with past Governments to build and operate mills but did not do it. Still they are able to hold the pro-

perties and are granted extensions of their leases. Another lease that expired some years ago has been renewed. The whole trouble is, in my opinion, that the present Government made a mess of the whole thing. If past Governments are to be blamed now for these legacies, as we are told they are to blame, why cannot we put something in this Act now as a safeguard for the future.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It's no use.

MR. CASHIN—Well, then, if it's no use, this Bill should be cut out entirely, as the point of this Bill has nothing whatever to do with these old leases. It looked fishy from the start and I maintain now that when the Bill was introduced that it was fishy because the Government never told this House that you had extended those leases. The Opposition were not told what was being done and what information we did get we had to drag it out of you. Evidently there is something rotten in the State of Denmark.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We don't tell the Opposition everything we know.

MR. CASHIN—I agree with the Prime Minister. The Government has not told the truth and a lot of wrong information was given to this House by Ministers of the Crown when they were asked for a true statement of the country's affairs in this House. You thought you were dealing with an aggregation of children here. But, I agree it is a crowd of children who are controlling the destinies of this country because my three-year-old child would manage things better than the people who are managing the affairs of this country at the present time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I understand that the Leader of the Opposition wants this to stand over until they have an opportunity to draft legislation which they consider more protective. If that is so I shall move that it stand over, but I don't see the sense of it. We have a bill that apparently covers every contingency, and if you are going to strain things to cover what happened in the past I think it will be difficult. However, if the Leader of the Opposition wants it I shall do so.

MR. HALFYARD— Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, I should like to thank the Minister of Agriculture and Mines for the copies of the letters sent his Department by the parties asking for an extension of time to conform with their leases. I agree with some of the speakers—we seem to be arguing in a circle, and we do not seem very clear on the statements we make. At first an extension of two years being granted was spoken of, but the Prime Minister added to the complication by saying that the Government gave no extensions. I thought that if I were speaking to the matter again, I should try to give expression in so speaking in terms that meet that interpretation put on them by the Prime Minister, and that I would say instead that new leases had been given. Well, if that has not been done, what has? Nothing? Well, for the information of the House I shall read the letters that were sent to these people.

(Reads)

Well, they have been given two years from the settlement of the Labrador Boundary dispute in which to complete their agreement. I suppose that can be interpreted as an extension of time; I think it will take a Philadelphia lawyer to make out that there was no extension. At any rate we can say that it looks like an extension.

Another point. The Colonial Secretary and I usually see eye to eye in things which affect the welfare of the country, but strange to say we usually come to a different conclusion on the different acts and clauses. The

Colonial Secretary, in answer to the Leader of the Opposition as to the action of the Government in not cancelling the leases or not taking the rentals, gave as his reasons that it might affect the title to the Boundary, and that it might make a bad impression.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I beg your pardon for interrupting, but I think you misinterpret my statement. What I said was that one of the people who was a delinquent, and who wanted his title to be accepted without paying rental, and I told him that we couldn't admit that there was any question as to our title, and that he must pay his rental or otherwise we would have to refuse it.

MR. HALFYARD—That is all in the point of view. Cancelling the licenses for non-performance of the terms would not affect your case in the Labrador Boundary dispute, and that is no excuse for the present Government not cancelling them. There is no excuse whatever. You accepted their rentals, and because of that some want to argue that you are morally responsible. That all depends on the people with whom you are dealing. I take the attitude that you are dealing with a crowd of speculators and gamblers; I don't believe there was scarcely a license holder on the Labrador who intended to operate. They were speculating—they wanted to sell out and make a great gain. They were gambling and we allowed them to gamble, but we are not obliged to extend that one second longer than necessary to develop. And these people had all kinds of time before the Labrador was settled, and could sell out and make their money but now their time for gambling and speculation has ceased and we want to sell the Labrador. They have gambled and lost and we are under an obligation to the people of the country as their representatives. We have allowed them to gamble, and no doubt they would still like to sell and make some money, but that doesn't suit us, and it is not in the best interests of the country to continue.

HON. THE LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Prime Minister, I understood him to say that he would be willing to have the Committee rise, giving us the right to change the Bill to cover what we require. We shall be very glad to make some suggestions between now and the next meeting of the Committee if the Prime Minister will do that.

Now, I must make a few remarks regarding the letters read by Mr. Halfyard. Here, on June 14th, two days ago, after the Bill had been before us and before it could be thoroughly discussed and all points taken up—in face of that the Government only two days ago gives an extension of time to erect a mill. That is unfair. The Bill was before the House and they should at least have held off until we reached some conclusion. And an extension has been given on the 10th and also the 14th of June for large tracts on Labrador—it looks to the House very much as if it was done on purpose before we could prevent these being given.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for other purposes."

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move

the second reading of this Bill, and in deference to Mr. Scammell, whom I believe wasn't here when I gave the information asked for regarding Mr. Tait's services. I beg to state them again. The first year of the Bureau they collected from the public $3,300.00 and the Government agreed to pay dollar for dollar. In addition their requirements have been $5,000.00 which included Mr. Tait's salary. The matter will be going into Committe to-morrow and I will have accurate information! I suggest, therefore, that the second reading be gone on with now.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I have not prepared any special address to deliver to the House on this occasion, but merely rise in my place now on this second reading to give expression as to how I feel on the matter which is now before the House. In my humble opinion this Bill now under consideration is nothing more or less than a waste of time and with-al absolute trash. I am very much inclined to the opin.on that if some one brought into this Assembly to-morrow some Bill to place a tax on something for the encouragement of the fisheries or to lessen the burden of taxation which is crushing the life out of the people of this country, honourable members opposite would not display the same avidity towards its successful issue as they do to this piece of nonsense. Briefly, we are here to-day, and this is an echo or tail-end of the Tourist Policy which the Government has seen fit to inflict on the people at their expense. If a man gets up here and talks about something practical he is almost told to close up and no one is prepared to stay and listen to him. But when a half dozen gentlemen from Water Street get their heads together on a scheme of this nature all the House is prepared to cons.der it. If this is the kind of legislation the Government intends to bring in; if this is the way they hope to make a Paradise out of Newfoundland, there is little hope for us. I have tried to impress on members the absolute farce of this Tourist Policy; we have the country in the position where the people are driven out, and now being taxed further at the behest of a few sports. I rise to protest at this Bill which is brought before the Assembly; I consider it an absolute disgrace that the time of the House should be taken up with such stuff as this Bill now befor us.

MR. RUSSELL — Mr. Chairman, since we last discussed this Bill, I have made certain enquiries and received certain information, but at the same time it has not changed my opinion very much regarding the placing of this tax on the travelling public of the country. I notice that the only people who will be called upon to pay this tax to support the Tourist Policy will be those travelling first-class, whether on steamers or trains. There are a number of people in the country who, if the Tourist Policy develops, will benefit thereby—the hotel-keeper, the boarding-house keeper, the steamship owners, the railway, the shopkeepers and numerous others—but none of these as such are called upon apparently to pay a cent of this tax. But the man or woman, or family man or woman going out of the country, perhaps with two or three children, is called upon to pay a tax of two or three dollars on every ticket they buy. I say it is wrong in principle, and I strongly object to it. If it is the policy of the Government to develop a tourist traffic, and if they think the Tourist and Publicity Bureau is going to be of any benefit in the direction of development, I claim that the revenue or funds to support that should come out of the general funds of the country, to which everybody who buys a ticket is already contributing. I am not sure that this

is going to warrant any large expenditure, but admitting that it will, I claim that it ought to come from the general revenue of the country and not from a few individuals who happen to travel to add that additional expense to their passage. It is all very well to say that it doesn't apply to second or third class fares, but there are lots of people not very well off who try to scrape enough together to secure decent accommodation from this country to Canada or the United States or any other country. They are entitled to do so, because in many cases second and third class is not a very good way to travel. So I say that I wish to place myself on record as being opposed to the Government levying a special tax on our people who travel first class from this country to any other in order to support a Tourist Publicity Bureau.

On motion of Hon. Colonial Secretary the Bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for obtaining Statistics of Tourist Traffic and for other purposes" was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Education" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Since the Committee was on these Resolutions there has been a material change in sub-section F of Section 2.

(Reads.)

That sub-section has now been divided into three sub-sections.

(Reads.)

That is the only change that has been made since the Committee last met.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, under Section 2 of this measure the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. Ltd., or "its lessees, assignees, licensees, agents and any person or corporation undertaking actual work in or about" these operations or this industry, is granted concessions for duty free import of numerous and valuable articles in respect to an area defined as "the Red Indian Lake District". Surely that definition is altogether too vague and too general. I understand that a strict interpreation of that provision would bring twenty-six hundred square miles within the scope of these concessions. Does the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. own all that property? If not, who are the owners, and if there be any such, apart from the company, would the company be in a position under this measure to transfer any of its rights and privileges hereunder to such independent owners? This Committee should be provided with more exact information as to the extent and the ownership of properties to which the privileges in these Resolutions are to be accorded. If the Buchan's Mine property is as valuable as has been represented to us and to the general public, surely it would be sufficient encouragement to development of that property, if these concessions were made to apply to a specifically limited area including the mineral discoveries so far announced as made and proven. The Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., I understand, are owners of two thousand square miles of territory in this district.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, in answer to Dr. Mosdell, I may say that that practically represents the whole area out there.

DR. MOSDELL—I wish the Honourable the Minister of Justice would be more specific, Mr. Chairman, because if the ownership of all the territory comprehended under this Act is not vested in the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., that concern, under Section 4 of this measure, is enabled to vend its concessions to other owners of territory in the Red Indian Lake District.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, in reply I may say that this Bill covers any development that may take place, not alone as regards Buchan's Mine but any other mineral development in that area. This contract, in other words, is not confined to the immediate place that, perhaps, will be called Buchan's Mine.

(Reads the Act)

In other words, any mining exploitation that is done within the Red Indian Lake District during the next twenty years will get the benefit of this.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, the provision of this Bill whereunder the Company are allowed free imports during twenty years strikes me as very objectionable. Why such a lengthy period?. Very much less time than that is sufficient for the development of such an area as that at Buchan's Mine is declared to be. The idea, I take it, is to encourage the industry in its infancy. Then, why propose to continue to lead it by the hand when it has attained to man's estate? Assistance having been given to the establishment of the industry at Buchan's and in the district immediately surrounding that locality, all that is necessary has been done on its behalf. Five years should prove amply sufficient for a test of the possibilities of this area. Then, if the industry proves able to stand on its own legs, why continue to make concessions to support it? If the industry cannot thrive at Buchan's, where the deposit is said to be so large and so rich, it cannot reasonably be expected to thrive anywhere else in the Red Indian Lake District, as the Bill describes it. Make a liberal allowance of territory that is to be covered by the concessions granted under this measure, but do not blanket a district of such extent wholesale. Give the pioneers of the industry every reasonable chance to prove the value or otherwise of their deposits, but after that their successors or their own extension operations are no longer being conducted on chance and should be left to their own devices. In other words, encourage the establishment of an industry at Buchan's and others will be shown the prospects are good for realisation of satisfactory profits on their investment. Non-success at Buchan's would scare them away; success will encourage them to come and take their chances in a proved field. Government bonuses or subsidies or concessions are then unnecessary and unjustifiable.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr Chairman, while I see eye to eye with the hon. member on the general principle of avoiding admission, over lengthy periods, yet it is only right to say that if one looks at it from another point of view, we have had free admission for longer periods for enterprises coming into this country, and a twenty years' period was chosen in this case on the idea that it was a reasonable time for the full development of this proposition. The period of years is only of account in the case of certain new stuff coming in. In other words, supposing, fourteen years from now, some new development should take place, that would only mean new stuff coming in. It is not as if that during that period of years we were giving wholesale

exemption of duties. Exemption is not for repetitions. It seems to me that it is good business to give a fairly reasonable time in the way of encouraging an industry. As a matter of fact the last agreement with the Pulp and Paper Company at Corner Brook was for a period of thirty years. With regard to what the hon. member says, I don't think that twenty years in this industry is an unreasonable period of time. I think, as he says himself, whilst the object is to encourage an industry in its infancy, at the same time under the words of the resolutions, where free entry is confined to extension, it seems to me that we ought to encourage the development for the next twenty years. I imagine that the period of twenty years in the life of a big industry would be very short.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I think I am correct in saying that in constructing Section 2 of this Bill the Government followed the procedure aforetime usual to the making of such agreements. In other words, the old tariff was found of no use in such connections and was absolutely ignored, duty exemption clauses being framed to suit the necessities of any particular negotiations as they were undertaken. The position under the new tariff, adopted in 1924, is different, however. When that tariff was being framed, developments like the present were taken into account. Practical mining men were consulted and, acting on their advice, the Tariff Commissioners framed Sections 204 and 205 for the guidance of Governments in making future agreements in connection with the development of our mineral areas. These sections are definite and specific. They stipulate what materials and equipment shall be admitted into this country duty free for prospecting purposes and in connection with the development of a mine and for the equipment of that mine. Instead of the dangerously vague and general provisions of Section 2 and its multitude of clauses, this Bill should have embodied the specific and definite provisions of Sections 204 and 205 of the Tariff of 1924. The company would then have had a list of the equipment on which it was permitted free entry and customs officials would simply have had to check off that list instead of engaging in wrangles over the interpretation of general clauses, as is bound to be the case if the Legislature agrees to the passage of this measure as at present constructed.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, in reply to Dr. Mosdell, I may say that that very criticism was made by the Leader of the Opposition, and that may be a better way to have the contract drawn. It was pointed out by Mr. Wood, the solicitor for the A. N. D. Co., that it would be practically impossible to enumerate all the stuff in a schedule and it would be a tremendous schedule because there would be so many things to enumerate. As a matter of fact that section as it stands there in this Bill is the result of a consultation with the Deputy Minister of Customs.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Minister of Justice I must say that I can see no insuperable difficulties in the way of the Company compiling a catalogue of goods they desire to get into the country duty free. They can take Tariff sections 204 and 205 as the basis for such a list. The list could, of course, be amplified to include necessities of the case not provided against under the Tariff sections referred to. While these sections were based on the recommendations of practical mining men, there may, quite conceivably, be important omissions therefrom. The company, indisputably, should be allowed free entry of whatever is necessary for prospecting, for the actual development and working of the mine. Now,

as any honourable member can see by reference to the provisions of the Bill before us, the concessions proposed to be made cover a multitude of things far beyond the scope of the Tariff Sections I have cited, things that no practical mining man regards as essential to the purposes now under discussion.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There are a number of things that come under this Bill that are not covered by Sections 204 and 205 of the 1924 Tariff Act. Cement, for instance.

DR. MOSDELL — And boats and ships. My contention, Mr. Chairman, is that when we get away from the granting of concessions in respect to the actual necessities for prospecting and mining we should be exceedingly careful what we do and should specify exactly what articles are to be considered as coming within the scope of the concessions. Take the case of ships, for instance. Wooden ships can be obtained in this country; steel ships cannot. The present Bill does not differentiate between the two kinds. Why not? The general experience of this country has been that when once mining or other promoters get the concessions they want they start in to develop their business with only so much consideration for the rest of the country as the terms of their agreements force them to show. Well, then, we must now proceed to make this measure serve the interests of Newfoundlanders generally.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines has made reference to the large quantity of goods of very considerable value irregularly permitted free entry in connection with the Corner Brook development. My personal attention has been called to the fact that local goods were discriminated against, even when of equal quality and price to the foreign article. I am creditably informed that that discrimination was practiced to such an extent that goods were imported even when they could have been obtained locally and at considerably lower prices. I am by no means anxious to hamper the development project of this company with unnecessary restrictions, but I earnestly claim that the duty concessions accorded its undertaking should be qualified by providing protection for goods of local manufacture. Where it is possible to turn out goods suitable for use in connection with a project such as we are here considering, of quantities and qualities and at prices that meet foreign competition, then the preference should be assured the manufacturer of the local article. Otherwise, discrimination is certain to be practised and, in our anxiety to ensure the establishment of a new industry we are bound to inflict hardship and loss on industries already established in the country and being conducted in the country at considerable expense to our general population.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the clause which says:

(Reads)

What should be regarded as a local article. For instance if the company is going to fit up their private houses or their staff house with stoves or furnaces, will that come in free of duty.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—So far as furnishing private houses is concerned sub section a of section 2 says for "the installation of water, sewerage and lighting systems." I certainly don't think that a stove in the ordinary sense would be a part of the heating system of a house. I take it that a water system would be plumbing fixtures in the ordinary sense. I don't think the Customs House or a court would regard a stove as part of a water system.

MR. GRIMES—What I want to be

clear about is this: The Bill says "provided nothing herein shall be held to apply to fuel, etc., moveable articles of honsehold furniture for, or of equipment for, privates houses, staff houses or hotels; or articles intended by the importer for the personal and private ownership of individuals." It seems that it does not apply for the personal and private owenrship of individuals living in houses but it does, that is, these things may be imported free when they are for the use of the company. Will the company be allowed to import stoves for the heating of houses free of duty?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I should say certainly not. The Company will not be allowed to import stoves for the heating of houses. As I read it under sub-section a water systems to serve houses and towns may be imported free.

(Reads)

I take it that means pipes for water, and say in the sense of buildings like hospitals and of that kind, but I don't think the plumbing outfit of private houses or that are going to become owned by private individuals would be regarded as being free of duty.

MR. GRIMES—A very clear definition should be given of clause "f".

(Reads)

I am not now referring to heating systems installed in houses for the purpose of hot water. There may be a system just for heating houses put there by the Company and it is part of the house for which the occupant is paying rent to the Company. Would that be regarded as coming in duty free? You say articles intended by the importer for the personal and private ownership of individuals are excluded.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Let us take stoves. You clearly can't import a stove "for the equipment of private houses, staff houses or hotels, of if intended by the importer for the personal and private ownership of individuals." It seems perfectly clear that if you can't import a thing for a private house, a house not a company house, or can't import it for a staff house, which is used as the name implies only by working men or employees, you couldn't import it for a house owned by the company in which an employee lives and pays rent to the company. That would be still a private house. Therefore I don't think they would have any right to import an article such as a stove. I say that it comes under "equipment of private houses." I think it is clear from that first part of the section.

DR. MOSDELL—If the company owned the houses; say if the company build a number of houses all as part of a plan, they are company houses, not private houses.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No! They are private houses still. A private house does not necessarily mean the house owned by the man living in it. If you let your house to somebody, you can't go in on him at any time nor could the company in their case. As I understand there is no intention whatever to ask for moveable articles or equipment going into houses erected by the company. If that can be made more clear, the Bill might be changed to make it so.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman: I think these terms are quite generous to the company, and I think that we should make sure not to err on the side of generosity. I think several of the sections are so comprehensive that at the first glance, one does not get a complete idea of everything that might be entailed by them. On looking over the Bill, some-

one has drawn attention to clause E. It says:

(Reads)

"All materials . . . equipment of transportation and shipping facilities." It is quite conceivable that quite a few articles necessary for the equipment of those transportation and shipping facilities could also be used in other connections; could be used in private houses and then too, there are certain clauses which allow the importation of articles which are excluded under section F; for instance, office furniture, office equipment, steamer equipment and store equipment. So that , some article which will be entitled to be imported free, for the use of an office, would not be permitted free for the use of a private house or a staff house. I am not saying that it would be done, but it is possible that the loophole might be taken advantage of, and the equipment imported for a man's office might be used in his house. Then referring back to sub-section A, they would be entitled to import a furnace and radiator equipment. I think that will be admitted. The section says too "Including materials for house building." I don't wish to be dogmatic on the point; I am just pointing it out. We are not acting on behalf of the company. They have very good legal minds to look after their interests. With regard to a stove, I would imagine that it would be necessary to complete a water system where there is a hot water system. The system would not be complete unless water was circulating freely; so, if a hot water boiler is not connected with the stove, you have not got your system working. A lighting system is not complete without lights so they might be enabled to import all kinds of bulbs, piano lamps and things of that kind.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN — These would be "moveable articles of household furniture."

MR. BROWNE—They are parts of the lighting system. I just point these things out as they occur to me. Perhaps there is nothing in them. If there is nothing in them, there is no harm done.

DR. MOSDELL—The Honourable member for St. John's West, Mr. Browne, invites further attention to subsection (e) of Section 2 of the Buchan's Mine Bill. Honourable memmers on both sides of this House would do well to give repeated and careful attention to the provisions thereof. It is provided that, for twenty years from the 20th day of January, 1927, the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, shall have the rights of importing, duty free, "all materials, machinery, parts, plants, utensils and implements for the construction and equipment of transportation and shipping facilities at and between mines and railway points or ports in Newfoundland including ships, docks, lighters, boats, railways, tramways and conveyors of any kind, wharves and docks; and all materials for the construction of buildings, warehouses and storehouses." We have already had some unfortunate experiences in connection with the Newfoundland Railway and industrial developments in this country. When the Corner Brook development was projected, we hoped that the amount of freight made necessary by the creation and operation of this industry would retrieve the fortunes of the railway. We were sadly disappointed. What has happened is that the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited, has made an independent contract with an outside concern and the result has been not only to deprive the railway of freight charges on the great volume of goods it was anticipated would be hauled over it, but, in effect, it has transformed that

section of the line between Corner Brook and Port aux Basques into a branch line, while much of the usefulness of the steamer Caribou has been destroyed.

The Prime Minister, speaking in connection with this Bill, said he hoped to see a freight business created in connecton with this industry that would be sufficient to wipe out the deficit on the operation of the railway. But there is nothing in this Bill to guarantee such a very desirable development. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the Bill to ensure the continued use of the railway by the company at all. Moreover, there is here in subsection (e) of Section 2 a provision that all the equipment and materials for a railway shall be admitted duty free, if the Company desires to make such imports. It is to be presumed that if the company gets permission to import such materials it will not be prevented from using them. The only use to which they can be put is the construction and equipment of a railroad. Evidently, then an independent line of railway, owned and operated by the company and joining their mining operations as directly as possible with some port is not impossible in the future. Such a line may not even cross our own railroad. It may be built to a port on the southwest coast where shipping facilities are available all the year round. Without stressing the point further, I take the position that this agreement affords no adequate protection to our railroad; that it permits duty free imports of materials and machinery for the construction and operation of an independent line of railway and that it creates the inference that that is permissible under the provisions of the present Bill itself. This is a point of major importance and one that should be made clear and specific, whatever the intention of the Government and the company may be as contractural parties to the agreement.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the remarks of the member for Fortune Bay I may say that I quite agree with him that what has happened at Corner Brook so far as the Clarke Steamship Company is concerned is very unfair treatment to our railway. But the two cases are altogether different. The A. N. D. Company can never do this for the simple reason that they can get no stuff to the scene of their mining operations unless it is brought over the Newfoundland Railway system The honourable member who has just sat down said that there is nothing to prevent the A. N. D. Company from building a railway down to tidewater and that they might treat our railway as they treated the Reid Newfoundland Company. Well, I do not know anything about the Reid arrangements, but I do know that under this contract this Government will have the authority in their own hands whereby they will be able to put the A. N. D. Company or any other company or corporation in their places. The A. N. D. Company or any other corporation can put a railway where they want to build it, but they have to go to the Government first and get permission to build it. It is true, as suggested by the member for Fortune Bay, that the A. N. D. Company has a railway to the sea already. That applied to the Grand Falls project only; but in the present instance we have the matter in our own hands so far as giving them any rights to build a railway is concerned, even if they wanted to build it? I have a sentimental regard for the Grand Falls Company, as I worked for that Company for ten or twelve years. I am not an employee of the company now; I wish I was. It is a pity we have not more such companies operating in this country. Then, again, Mr. Chairman, it must be remember-

ed that the promoters of this Buchan's mine proposition are not asking for any guarantees on their debentures, nor are they asking for a railway to be built for them, so that their case is not analogous to the ones cited by several members of the Opposition. And even if they do want to build a line of railway from Buchan's mine to Millertown Junction, it is not likely they would have Pullmans on their trains. They have to bring their traffic to Millertown Junction and our railway will carry it to Bishop's Falls in summer time and to Argentia, the probable port of shipping, in the winter time. Regarding exemptions on taxable goods, I might say that when this Bill was drafted I asked Mr. Laycock why he was asking to have the exemptions on barges and steamers and he told me that the intention was until the mine was developed sufficiently to ship forty tons of concentrates per day from Buchan's to Millertown. Later they decided that, if given a right of way they would build a railway to connect with main line at Millertown Junction, and they would ship two hundred tons of concentrates per day instead of forty tons; they will not be shipping any raw ore from the country, it will be concentrates or smelted into metal. In 1909 I was Assistant Manager for the A. N. D. Company and up to that time they had spent $150,000.00 in locating this body of ore, but it was only recently that the process for separating the zinc from the other ores has been succesfully accomplished.

It is quite likely that the Company will at an early date go ahead with the erection of a smelting plant which would mean a further 20,000 tons horsepower development for the hydro-electrical power to treat this ore and an additional outlay of three millions of dollars. The promoters of this project should be given every encouragement and I think it would pay this country to give this company the concession asked for in these Resolutions. Although I have no authority to speak for the company, I do not think it is the intention to have stoves or movable articles of furniture admitted free of duty.

DR. MOSDELL— Mr. Chairman, with reference to the point raised by the honourable member for Placentia and St. Mary's, I think that in view of the two or three experiences we have had in connection with railroads, surely we are not going to commit another mistake and allow the Newfoundland Railroad to go further in the hole than what it is now? We should make it positively certain that this thing is preserved against from Buchan's Mine itself and that it is not competed against, as is threatened by the importation of railway materials which are provided for in Sub-section (e) of Section (2) of these Resolutions. If you are going to give this Company general and unlimited rights to those materials, you are going to give them the right and permit them to have a railway parallel with ours. If this Company are getting vast and valuable concessions, we should take steps at the initial stage of the undertaking and make sure that a public institution like the Newfoundland Railway, which has cost so much to us, should not be put in a position to be destroyed by the operations of the Buchan's Mine just as the value of the steamer Caribou was destroyed by the Corner Brook people contracting with an outside steamship company.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, if it is not perfectly clear to the Committee that this Company cannot build a railroad parallel with ours, then I say it is for the legal minds of the House to make clear. I take it that the Company cannot build a railroad without asking for a right of way to do it and they cannot get a right of way without asking the Governor in

Council and if then granted it must be confirmed by this Legislature.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I think the answer of the last speaker is a complete one; but at the same time I agree that the provision suggested by the honourable member for Fortune Bay would not do any harm. If the Company, though, shall not be allowed to build other railroad lines parallel with ours, I don't think that, at least, we ought to put it up to them because in that sense it would be in the nature of a private bill.

MR. SCAMMELL— Mr. Chairman, there is another point on this matter of a railway. Isn't it a fact that for some years the A. N. D. Company has been looking to the South Coast for a port? It is possible that they have large timber areas well south of the present railway line, and isn't it possible that they might contemplate the South Coast port, not only for Buchan's Mine, but to carry paper from their mills, and things of that sort. That seems important, and I don't think we are making proper provision for things of that sort, by providing that they shall not build parallel to the railway. They might contemplate the South Coast Port, and no doubt they do as regards paper. Mr. Sullivan referred to the Charter given the Company—he said they had a Charter. I thought it was the privilege of the Legislature only to give charters, and I heard nothing of any Charter. What is there to prevent building a line to the South Coast without a charter?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, a thought arises from the remarks of the hon. member for St. Barbe. As far as a business proposition is concerned, they might go to the South Coast—this requires a lot of thought. If this is going to be a big proposition they will naturally have to complete a new line of railway—it seems to me to be an extraordinary way to legislate to say that the longest way round must be taken. The point is well taken, and I suggest that the Minister give it some thought. But to say that they can't build a railway seems hardly possible; I was hoping that the Buchan's Mine may develop to such an extent that they will take over the railway. One of the hopes we have always had is that someone may become a millionaire overnight and take over the railway.

DR. MOSDELL: Mr. Chairman, I had no idea that the range of effective legislation was so limited until I heard the pronouncement of the Honourable the Minister of Justice on the subject. I, in common with ther honourable gentlemen on this side of the House, have urged that this measure, commonly known as the Buchans Mine Bill, should include a provision making it mandatory for the company to use Newfoundland workmen as exclusively as possible in connection with their development undertakings and their subsequent permanent operations. he Minister of Justice demurs. is of opinion that no legislative enactment could ensure the end at which we aim.. The fixing of a minimum wage rate has also been advocated by members of the Opposition. It has been and is being claimed that protection should be afforded our workmen against the possibility of he company fixing a wage rate substantially lower than that paid for a similar class of labor in connection ith plants operated in other countries. The Minister of Justice dissents again. He expresses the opinion that if we set a rate for labor as the lowest that shall be allowed to e paid to our workmen, it will presently develop that that is the highest the company will offer them. Surely, if the rate we set is in keeping with rates paid elsewhere, nobody would have any complaint if

the company did presently adopt any such policy. Our effort should be to give the Newfoundland workman the greatest possible protection, to ensure him preference in employment on developments in his own country and to make certain that he is not forced to work at starvation wages, while imported workmen are paid the much higher rates obtaining in the countries from which they come. Then, too, for many years past this country has sacrificed a great deal in an effort to build up manufacturing centres in our country. We have aided these undertakings with duty concessions. We have given these undertakings high tariff protection. The revenue has suffered in our zeal to foster manufactures and the taxpayers are still suffering through our desire to maintain these plants in full operation. Now, we are considering a new industry. The establishment of that industry should open up a large additional market in our own country for goods manufactured in Newfoundland. It should, but under the terms of this measure as now submitted to us, it will not. The Government proposes to grant the company interested in the exploitation of Buchan's Mine such wide duty concessions that it will be hopeless for local manufacturers to expect orders for local made goods. Under this Bill even boats and ships, obtainable in Newfoundland will be permitted import to the country duty free. Such a policy is so obviously injurious to our local workmen and is so utterly at variance with the procedure in, say Canada, where such concessions are permitted only when Canadian goods are not available, that I am positively amazed. The Minister of Justice asserts that this is a condition to which we must submit, because we have no effective means of protecting our workmen as a preference in employment and a scale of wages or our goods as to exclusive use when they are obtainable at qualities and at prices that are as advantageous as goods of foreign manufacture. That, I submit to the honourable gentleman has not been the experience of other countries. They have found and applied means of protection of their workmen and their manufacturers and we can be equally as successful if we are equally as earnest in our endeavors as they have shown themselves to be.

The Honourable the Minister of Justice is also of opinion that we are powerless to assure to the Newfoundland Railway retention of the benefits of the great passenger and freight traffic, particularly the latter, which will be created as a result of mining developments in the Red Indian Lake district. Why not ? At present, Buchan's Mine is accessible to passengers and freight via the Newfoundland Railway only. Well, if we do nothing under this Bill to create or permit the creation of a rival road for any purpose whatsoever, then our present railroad must continue to hold the monopoly of passenger and freight traffic. That is the reason why I have so carefully examined the clauses in the Bill that have reference to railways or tramways or transportation generally and that is why I have so urgently called attention of the Committee to the fact that one of these clauses appears to me to give the company a right it does not at present possess, that of creating its own transportation line. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, we are hoping that the establishment of this industry will ensure employment of Newfoundlanders on a large scale; we are hoping that the industry will in large measure restore the prosperity of Newfoundland. The Prime Minister has expressed the expectation, shall I call it hope that the operations in connection with this industry will enable us to wipe out the deficit and the losses created on op-

eration of the Newfoundland Rail-
-ay. We are, in other words, living
on hopes for the future and we have
a real or definite assurance of any-
thing in this connection.

That is an awkward position and an unnecessary one. Moreover, it is an extremely dangerous position, when our railroad interests are considered. We should put ourselves in a definite and an established position in this connection. As I have already observed, the simplest way of doing this is the most effective. It consists merely in making it plain that this measure accords the company no right whatsoever to create its own independent transportation lines, railroads, tramways, or any other. As the Bill stands at present there is considerable doubt on that score. Don't let us forget what has happened in the past when similarly dubious clauses in legislation have had to be interpreted by the courts, by lawyers or by arbitrations. To a pretty uniform extent, the benefit of the doubt has been given to the corporation concerned. That is likely to happen again and to grave loss to this country and to our people generally unless we now proceed to make the provisions and the intentions of this measure so specific and so plain that he who runs may read and understand it. We cannot afford to permit anything to be vaguely understood; there must be no obscurities and there must be no indefinite understandings. Let us consider some of the warnings of the past against such a risky policy. When the Grand Falls enterprise was undertaken, there was a sort of "gentlemen's agreement" between the Anglo - Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, and the Reid-Newfoundland Company, Limited, whereunder the latter concern was to handle all the traffic of the former. If I am correctly informed, the Reid-Newfoundland Company convinced of the identity of interest between their own concern and the Anglo-Newfoundland Co, transferred to the latter for "a mere song" valuable lands and rights essential to their pulp and paper operations. It was, however, not very long before the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company set up a claim for lower freight rates than the Reids considered they could grant. The Grand Falls concern then proceeded to construct their own independent transportation line to tidewater at Botwood and the Reids were powerless to object, because they had an understanding with the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company merely that and not a hard and fast agreement that could be taken into court.

Consider an even more recent experience of ours in connection with our railroad. One of the outstanding advantages claimed for the Humber proposition when it was submitted to the electorate in 1923 was the claim that it would create traffic enough to wipe out the railroad deficits with which we had become so consistently and so painfully familiar. The railroad did get the benefit of that traffic for a while, but only long enough for us to learn its immense benefit to that railroad if it could be permanently retained. To cope with that increase of traffic, we made improvement in our railroad terminals, its rolling stock and its roadbed. We invested half a million dollars in a new steamer to ply on the Cabot Straits. And then all our railroad advantages were suddenly filched from us. The directorate of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited, made a contract with a Canadian concern to run a line of boats from Montreal and other Canadian ports direct to Humbermouth. That line now handles all the freight that formerly passed over our railroad and is, besides, a formidable competitor for regular passenger and

tourist traffic. As a result of this competition, that section of our railroad between Bay of Islands and Port aux Basques has been reduced virtually to the status of a branch line, during the summer months, at any rate. Our investment in a new steamer for Cabot Straits is virtually lost. The 1923 contract in respect to the Humber Proposition embodied no hard and fast agreement in connection with the railroad and the result is that a concern that has received huge concessions from us gives the business we helped create to foreign concerns rather than to our local railroad and steamers. That is an experience that we cannot afford to repeat. We must carefully protect ourselves against its repetition. We have no such protection under the provisions of the Bill now being considered by this Committee or the House of Assembly.

Wide publication has from time to time been made for claims that at Buchan's Mine there has been uncovered an ore deposit totalling five million tons and having an estimated value of close on two hundred million dollars. The proposition is to create an immense industry for the mining and concentrating of this ore and, possibly as the Prime Minister observed, for its smelting and manufacture into articles of various kinds. The American Smelters, an immensely wealthy concern, are undertaking this development, because they have faith in its profits in the future. We are asked to give the development assistance by relieving it from taxation and by extending other benefits. To that extent, and it is a very large one, Mr. Chairman, we, the People of Newfoundland, make an investment in that undertaking in the Red Indian Lake district. We become partners in the enterprise. What, apart from a certain and indefinite amount of labor, and that mostly unskilled, can we hope to get by way of returns from our investment ? Nothing at all commensurate with the assistance we now propose to give the undertaking. I claim that, as the industry, by virtue of our interest and our assistance, is established on a paying and a profitable basis, a percentage of such profits should accrue to the People of Newfoundland and should be payable to the Newfoundland Treasury. But this Bill places us in no such position of ultimate financial advantage through the Buchan's Mine operations.

Why not a royalty at a rate worth while , to become effective if and when this concern is established on a profitable basis? At present, I understand the Minister of Justice to claim the only future liability of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. or its subsidiaries or assigns is in respect to the payment to the Government of a royalty of five per cent. on the profits of mineral developments on its properties. The honorable gentleman is of opinion that we cannot impose an income tax because we are in duty bound to observe the provisions of the 1905 Act under which Grand Falls was created and its operations are now being conducted. But the Company does not propose to operate solely under the terms of the original agreement. A demand is here being made on the Legislature for new and sweeping concessions such as are not included in the Act of 1905. A new agreement is, therefore, being made and it is utterly absurd for the Company to claim that it must receive the broader scope of new benefits under the new arrangement, while this Country must content itself with the restricted benefits that accrue to it under certain conditions through the operation of the old Statute. If we are to amplify Newfoundland's investment in this concern then we must insist on the recognition of our right to a

large share in any prospective profits. I am in favor of the application of a royalty much bigger than the original five per cent. one, applicable as soon as the company has had a chance to get on its legs and to continue in operation until the company erects smelters and manufactures here and exports only the finished article. Then the royalty will cease because no unmanufactured Newfoundland products will be exported. The income and business profits taxes can then assure the Newfoundland Treasury due profit from the operations of the company in this country. At present we are assured only of the five per cent. royalty and appear to be ensuring ourselves a repetition of our unfortunate experiences in connection with the export of iron ore from Bell Island.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The income tax or business profits tax will still be applicable.

DR. MOSDELL —How much have we ever received from industries of that sort through the medium of the income tax? Very little. Unless something specific, such as I have suggested, is undertaken, this agreement will not be worth the paper it is written on, as far as any concrete benefits to the people of Newfoundland are concerned.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — We have different views on that. As far as I am concerned I would admit anything free of duty into this country that I thought was going to create an industry. The principle I go on is that of employment. Secondly, regarding the royalty—it is very questionable how much we will get, or as to whether a royalty is the best method of getting returns. But the labor part of it appeals to me.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the remarks of the honourable members who have spoken, I maintain that what this country needs to-day is a political economist. We have no authority to go to find out what value Buchan's Mine is, or as suggested by the Minister of Justice, the Boot and Shoe industry. That is where we lose—we can't find out what value any particular industry is to us, and we become the prey of investors who seize on our poverty and lack of labor and ignorance to come in here and get concessions that we shouldn't normally grant. And in our ignorance we don't know where we stand.

As I said the other day, the period of 20 years for free entry is too long, on general principle. The man on the street wants to know why the Government is prepared to grant this company 20 years free entry; the Minister of Justice told us that it is not an unreasonable period. The Prime Minister said the other day that he hoped Buchan's Mine would be the means of paying off the railway deficit. There is nothing incorporated in this Bill that they are going to haul one ton of ore over the Government Railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — They can't get it out any other way.

MR. ASHBOURNE—But they are granted free entry on railway locomotives and irons or whatever they want. What is there to prevent them from building a railway to Botwood from the Mine, then where does the Government Railway get off? As far as we know they may have the right to do so now. Here is a section.

(Reads.)

Isn't there some continuity implied in that? What is there to prevent them from building their own line as they have done to Millertown? As I said before, here we are making a dangerous precedent which we may be called upon later to re-enact for another company. And the prospects may not be as good as Buchan's Mine. As regards the encouraging of local industries and local manufactures, I

am in full accord with that. I don't see why that free entry should be granted those people. If we could afford to give those concessions it would be alright, but how much of an asset would six or seven million dollars be to the revenue of this country if we denied them those concessions? There is fifteen million dollars' worth of goods coming into this country duty free, and I think that the position here to-day is that anybody that has got an iota of conscience is asking whither Newfoundland is drifting. Where will we be in three or four years' time? Now we should see that nothing else comes into this country duty free except what is permitted at present. In the position that we are in to-day we cannot afford to be letting in many things duty free. It has been mentioned that the A. N. D. Co. has in the past pursued the policy of buying as much as possible from our local industries. But we cannot go by what has been done in the past. Our duty is to have it laid down in black and white.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I would be glad if the hon. member would frame us some clause that would be acceptable to the A. N. D. Co. in regard to the protection of our local industries. I made such a suggestion, but it was claimed that I made this suggestion because I was trying to protect myself, as I had large interests in a local industry. But still I do agree that there is great difficulty in framing a clause that would compel any company of this kind to buy its material in this country just because there are local manufactures in this country, while it is desirable that it should be so. Take the case of the Colonial Cordage Company for instance. Suppose the Act said that this A. N. D. Co. could only buy cordage that was manufactured in this country. There would appear to be nothing to prevent that manufacturing concern, with the bad reputation that it has, according to this House, from putting such a price on its material as would make it almost prohibitive. Of course that is rather an extreme case. But that is the point that makes it difficult to absolutely stipulate that any company has got to buy in this country anything that is manufactured in this country.

Another point in connection with the very excellent suggestion made by Doctor Mosdell, to compel the company to bring the ore over our railway, is this. Some time ago one of the things that came up for consideration in connection with this matter was the possibility of a railway being built from Red Indian Lake right through to Grand Falls, and that it would be a shorter route than to come around by our railway. It was pointed out to me, as it has been expressed by one member here this afternoon, that they cannot cut a line of railway along that territory without the permission of the Government. So I am satisfied that we are protected in that respect. But at the same time, if anything could be done in other respects that would protect us, I would be glad to know. I got the Minister of Justice, Mr. Wood, and the Deputy Minister to work for several hours trying to bring about a clause that would take care of that injustice. The matter was first brought to my attention by Mr. Angel, the representative of the Nail Factory. I would like to see something done that would be fair to the country and the local manufacturers, but I am sorry to say that so far I cannot see where the solution lies.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairmaan, I have not yet heard from any gentleman on the other side of the House what reason there is for the granting of these concessions. In the first place it strikes me that it will mean

a considerable loss to the revenue by permitting the importation free of duty into this country everything with the exception of pianos, and one would naturally look for some justification. What is the company giving to this Colony in return for the huge and long continuing concessions that are involved in these resolutions.

This game has become a habit; it is even more than a hardy annual. There is a profuse crop each year of requests for free entry by everybody who wants to start an industry. Whilst I am not adverse to giving reasonable concessions to any organisation, provided that it can show that it is going to give the Colony some adequate return, yet at the same time I fail to see why we should tumble over ourselves to give just what happens to be asked for. If everybody who starts an industry in this country is to be given every concession for which he asks, where will it all end?

Only a few days ago an organisation came in here named the Holyrood Pond Corporation, which is going to begin some kind of industry—we don't know what—at that pond. In the course of the debate on the resolutions it transpired that it was going to start a fish plant. And it was also apparent from the resolutions themselves that it was going to enter the electric light business in the near future or far distant future. For all these purposes—purely visionary—it required free entry for a period of years of almost everything under the sun. And this House of Assembly in Committee was seriously considering giving these people all the concessions for which they asked, and I suppose, as the resolutions seem to have the support of the Government side, they will probably get them.

It was pointed out by me in that connection that there is already a fish plant in existence in Newfoundland, and that the owners of that plant are compelled to pay a tax on their machinery of every kind and description. But this company with a visionary scheme fathered by Mr. Job and Mr. Peter Cowan can get what concessions in the nature of free entry which the imaginations of these gentlemen may suggest to them.

Now we have the A. N. D. Company coming to this Legislature again and asking for huge, far-reaching and long continuing concessions. I think the A. N. D. Company have got enough out of the taxpayers of this Colony already. They have a closed town at Grand Falls where nobody is allowed to trade, or even enter, without their permission, and now they are endeavouring to get another closed town for themselves. Everything imaginable, under these Resolutions, is to come in duty free; but if somebody in St. John's or any other part of the Island wants to build a house he has got to pay the tariff on the material he uses. I would like to see a statement from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who fathers these Resolutions, as to what this corporation undertakes to do for this Colony in return for remissions of duties and for permission to import practically everything they can for the next twenty years. There are always two sides to a bargain This House of Assembly is not a charitable organization, I take it. We are here to protect the people and the revenue of the people of this country because every cent that this corporation does not pay in the way of duties upon their goods the people have got to pay. That is the question we want answered. It has been suggested here that their undertaking is in the nature of an experiment and that they are investing a lot of money; but it is not suggested that the millions they will spend will give no returns .No, the evidence is to the

contrary. I cannot understand what possible justification there was for proceeding with these Resolutions nor can I understand what benefits this Colony is going to get in return for the huge concessions asked for by this corporation. I ask any member of the Government who may be in possession of the information to state what benefits that corporation is going to confer on us and what they will do in return for what they get?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES — Mr. Chairman: I have listened attentively to the lengthy debate on these Resolutions, but so far little progress has been made on them. Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Bradley have repeatedly asked me to tell this House just what benefits the country is going to derive from the concessions asked for by the A.N.D. Company. That is rather a tall order, but I shall endeavor to give an instance of the benefits to be derived by the people of this country by the establishment of this new industry to the best of my ability, and as far as the expenditure of public moneys in the near past is concerned. This company imports say $500,000.00 worth of machinery and mining equipment and on which we would levy a duty of 20 per cent., or in other words we should collect $100,000.00 in duty. We are doing away with that $100,000.00 by allowing the Company free entry on their importations. Against that this company will employ two thousand men. In fact they have more than that number employed now at excavation work. Well two thousand men at a minimum wage of $2.50 per day is $5,000.00 per day or $150,000.00 per month or $1,800,000.00 per year. That represents the earning power of the laborer because of the continuous employment. We have been told time and again that the laborer and the underdog pay back in taxes to the revenue of the Colony between fifty and seventy-five per cent. of their earnings. Well let us take the lowest figure and fifty per cent. of the $1,800,000.00 would bring back to the revenue practically one million dollars a year by the employment of these two thousand men. You lose on the one hand by allowing in material and machinery duty free $100,000.00 and on the other hand the revenue gets one million dollars. Just one other point and that is is connection with the railway, as I think the point was well taken by the gentleman who made it and is worthy of the best consideration of the Committee. Now we must not forget the fact that the A.N.D. Company operate their own railway between Botwood and Grand Falls. They also operate their own private railway between Millertown Junction and Millertown and now they are building a railway between Millertown and the scene of Buchans Mine. There will be only a short space between Millertown Junction and Grand Falls for transhipment. I have an idea, and I sincerely trust if the idea is put into effect by some company or some Government, that the day is not far distant when you will have the Topsails eliminated with much saving to the cost of operating the Newfoundland Railway in that territory; and if the opinion of some eminent mining men turns out to be correct you will have a valuable area between Buchans Mine and Howley. It may be possible to divert the main line of railway up through from Red Indian Lake to Howley, a distance of twenty-five miles extra, and even if you cut out that costly portion of the railway, it would have the effect of increasing the traffic for the railway. This country is not forfeiting anything by allowing the concessions asked for in these Resolutions. The only thing we are doing is allowing them free entry for twenty years on

their importations, and I think, under present circumstances obtaining in the country, that we should give all the encouragement we possibly can to the promotors of this project in order to develop our natural resources. We have no absolute proof that the company have discovered any valuable body of ore. The A.N.D. Company or the American Smelters are not publishing broadcast what they have discovered. The people today all over the country are looking for honest employment, not snow shovelling or such unproductive work that was carried on around St. John's a few months ago. The present Bill is the first ray of hope I have seen for some time, and I would ask the Committee if it is not far better to forfeit $100,000.00 now by giving the Company free entry on their machinery when we can get one million dollars in return from one year's employment for our working class of people ?

Mr. Chairman, I would like for these few thoughts of mine to be taken into consideration, and if any members are honest in their wish to assist to make this country better the time has arrived. We have men in all sections crying out for work; they don't want the pauper dole. I read a letter in the public press the other day from Canon Smart, of Trinity, making an appeal for employment for people who did not want to accept the pauper dole—his letter might have represented the views of the people East, West, North and South. There is not a man in the country anxious to get papuer dole, he wants work whereby he can earn an honest livelihood and be as independent as men who are better placed. This bill is the first ray of hope for some time, and I trust the committee stage will not be much longer delaryed, so that this industry can be started on a sound basis, and may encourage other people to come in by the concessions we have given.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises I should like to offer one suggestion to the hon. introducer, so that this legislation may get ahead. There is one point that we are all agreed on, and that is that the machinery ought to come in duty free, but we are not agreed that everything covered under this bill can come in. I would suggest, therefore, to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Government that he submit a list or schedule of what requirements are to come in duty free. The information we have is not definite enough, and if, therefore, you will get the tariff list at the custom house and get someone representing the A. N. D. Company tick off exactly the articles that they wish to have come in and lay that on the table so that we can discuss it, and safely arrive at a conclusion. If that is done, and it is satisfactory to the A. N. D. Co. and to the House, work can go ahead and the people have labour without getting the dole. I make that suggestion to the hon. introducer and to the Prime Minister and to the Government.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—That is a very wise suggestion, and I am very glad it has been made, because honestly it is very difficult for a layman to specify what is meant—I am not able to do so myself, and consequently it is hard to expect others to do so. I will be glad to take the matter up when the committee rises. I now beg to move that the committee rise and report progress.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN— Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw the attention of the members to a matter. In picking up the Tribune dated June 6th, I find that I am supposed to have stated in the House yesterday that St. Mary's people have al-

ways made bad fish. I contradict that emphatically — St. Mary's has made excellent fish always. We were discussing St. Vincent's, and I said that they made excellent fish, but that under the handicaps which they suffered it was in a bad state when they got it aboard; that there is no harbor, and the fish is brought off under trying circumstances. To make matters worse, Mr. Moore is quoted as saying that he didn't like to hear Mr. Sullivan say that these people made bad fish. Mr. Moore did not make any such remark, and I feel sure that he will be good enough to admit that. I think that if we are going to be quoted, it should be in the way we said the thing.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Bradley gives notice of question.

MR. MOORE — Mr. Speaker, will you permit me to say just a word regarding the matter brought before the House by Mr. Sullivan, and in justice to him I wish to say that he made no such remark; that was made by the Prime Minister. He said they didn't make the best of fish in St. Mary's Bay, and when I stood up I said it was the first time I had heard that they made bad fish there. In justice to Mr. Sullivan I make these remarks, and it only goes to show had badly we must feel when We are misquoted by the Government papers. But we don't want any papers to fight the Government, because they are absolutely gone now.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Friday, June 17th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 17th, 1927.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of question.

Answers to questions Nos. 285, 288, 289 and 290 were tabled.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Speaker, with your permission, sir, I would like to make a personal explanation. Referring to my remarks yesterday on the Publicity Tourist Bill, I am reported by the Daily News this morning to have said that "it was a pastime for Water Street business men." Now I do not wish to retract anything from my attitude of yesterday, but what I meant to imply was that the Bill was a pastime for Water Street sports. It would be rather a big order to say that it was a pastime for business men.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION —Mr. Chairman, yesterday when the House was in committee on this Bill the Prime Minister suggested that we draft some amendments. I might say that we have made some amendments, which we think will be ac-

ceptable to the Government and to the House. They are not quite ready yet, but they will be ready to submit to the House at the next sitting. I would, therefore, ask that the honorable introducer defer the Bill until Monday?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman. Would the Hon. Leader of the Opposition let us have any of the propesed amendments beforehand so that we may have an opportunity of knowing what they are before they are dealt with in Committee, because a couple of days have now gone by and when we go into Committee of the Whole on Monday next we will be in the same position again, if the Bill is drafted until then, unless we see the amendments and have time to consider them in the interim?

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION —Mr. Chairman. As Monday is the next sitting of the House, I think it would be quite possible for us to see that the amendments are submitted before that time.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attitude of the member for St. Barbe regarding the question he asked yesterday and which have some bearing on this Bill. I might say that it is unfortunate he was not present when the House was dealing with the Resolutions and when I gave somewhat of the information he asked with regard to the amount paid Mr. R. H. Tait for lecturing in the United States and also the amount paid to the Publicity Bureau since its inception. I think that when the answer to Mr. Scammell's question is tabled on Monday it will be found that the sum paid Mr. Tait, including all his expenses, was $5,000.00.

At the outset the Publicity Bureau entered into an arrangement with the Government that they would collect from certain people a certain amount of money to inaugurate this work. They collected $3,300.00 and the Government agreed that they would subscribe dollar for dollar for the amount collected in subscriptions. Accordingly, the Government subscribed a like amount. At the end of the year the Publicity Bureau required further finances and I think the total amount paid them, including the amount paid to Mr. Tait was $,8300.00 so that the full cost of the Publicity Bureau's activities to date is $8,250.00.

I might say that an advance was made this year of $5,000 to finance them until the passage of this measure. The tax that will be imposed upon passengers leaving the country will go into immediate operation after passage of this measure and they will refund the $5,000 that they got from the Bank under Government guarantee early in the spring. That is the situation with regard to the question the hon. member asked.

DR. MOSDELL—Before proceeding with sub-section 2 might I ask what is the idea of appointing these gentlemen. Is it considered that they made such a good showing?

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes. We consider that they did.

DR. MOSDELL—Is there some record of their activities?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—They have sent in a report and it will be tabled.

DR. MOSDELL—Might I ask what powers are given the Commission by sub-section B of 2. The word "promote" has a very broad meaning?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—The idea of it of course is to give information and advice and plans or anything of that kind. Any person who wants to get advice with regard to improving hotels may ask for it from this Commission. They are not authorised to spend money for the promotion of hotel enterprises. It is possible as suggested that the section be given a different construction from that intended. I don't know if that can be put in any other language that would make the intention clear.

DR. MOSDELL—Why not put in "Provided none of the funds of the Commission shall be utilised for this purpose.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary who looks after the getting up of the advertisements for Newfoundland. In the Financial Post recently there appeared an advertisement in which the information was not accurate.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I might say that it is done under contract with the Government by a gentleman named Dow who comes down from Canada every year. The last two issues of the Financial Post have given Newfoundland a special place with a view to bringing before the travelling public in different parts of Canada and the United States the attractions of Newfoundland. I know there was objection taken to the wording of the advertisements. The Deputy Colonial Secretary has been looking after it. Was there any particular information with regard to it that the hon. member was anxious to know?

MR. SCAMMELL—I wanted to know what the cost of the advertisement was?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—A thousand dollars. We have changed our policy with regard to advertisements. There has been a great deal spent on dull and drab and uninteresting advertisements in English papers and we have instructed the High Commissioner not to give any more advertisements except something of some moment or use. These have been cut down and I think a considerable amount of money, considerably more than spent in the Financial Post, will be saved on that account.

DR. MOSDELL—When this Bill goes through will the matter of advertising be left entirely to this Tourist and Publicity Commission or will the Government go on advertising as well?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I don't imagine that altogether everything will be left in their hands in that respect, for instance the Minister of Agriculture and Mines may want to have some advertising in some mineralogical paper that the Publicity Bureau have not anything to do with. General advertising with regard to sport and attractions and everything of that kind will now be left to them and will be paid for by this Bureau as well as the cost of lectures, moving pictures, etc.; and anything of that kind that is required will not in any way be provided by the Government after this Bill goes through. I don't think the country will be called on to pay much with regard to advertising except perhaps some special advertising. Hon. members will appreciate that it may be quite desirable for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to have a special advertisement in some paper

drawing attention to Newfoundland in the connection of the special subjects the paper is interested in.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that under "5" of the previous section, it strikes me that this Tourist and Publicity Bureau might quite conceivably use up all the funds they have received to pay several officials monthly salaries and then when it got down to advertising, the thing really wanted, there would be nothing left.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I don't think the Commission will give us any worry on that account. As a matter of fact the only one being paid is Capt. Gerald Byrne, the Secretary of the Commission. Of course he is a full-time man. Outside of him nobody is being paid. They may have a stenographer down there. I presume they will. Outside of that I don't think they contemplate any expenditure on salaries. They have taken rooms as an office in the Hotel. The Hotel have given them that at half price on account of the Hotel's interest in this movement because they want to encourage it and work with it. In that way they are economising and I think the Hotel will get in return sufficient patronage to warrant it. But I don't think there is any possibility of such a thing as suggested happening. I believe these men are sincere about this so that there could not be any misappropriation of the funds in that way.

DR. MOSDELL—I can conceive of misapplication on any large scale of the funds of the Bureau being as fatal to its ideals as misappropriation of such moneys would certainly be. I make not the silghtest insinuation that gentlemen of such standing can possibly be suspected of the latter offence, but I can understand how, in their zeal for the cause in which they are interested, those charged with the management of the affairs and the funds of the Bureau may get together an army of officials for various purposes, legitimate enough, but also big and expensive enough to use up all the Bureau moneys for payment of salaries. I think the Governor-in-Council should have some check on the extent of such employment, at least, to ensure the application of sufficient of the funds of the Bureau to the essential purpose for which it was created and incorporated and is now being endowed with revenues at the public expense, namely widespread publicity abroad of Newfoundland's eminent suitability as a tourist resort.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—You can make a provision for that of course. They are responsible to the Governor in Council as it is, and they have to make a report to the Governor in Council.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—By doing that would you not be likely to destroy the whole object of the Bill? To begin with what would the Governor in Council know about the necessity of the number of officials? Isnt' it a case of what you simply do is to depend on the earnestness and competency of those whom you have appointed and they will give a report yearly, and if it be discovered at the end of a year that the amount spent in salaries is inordinately great wouldn't that be the time to deal with the situation? It seems too that if you start a commission who work for you voluntarily and then tell them that they can't take on a hand unless you approve of it is immediately going to destroy the whole object. The impression will be created that it is merely another case of Government appointments. I submit that it is going to mean that instead of having that matter under the control of those who are capable to manage it, you are putting it in the hands of a crowd around an Executive Board who know nothing about the requirements of the case.

DR. MOSDELL—The Bill gives power to the Governor in Council to remove Commissioners.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I say that is where you have got your check.

DR. MOSDELL—We should not delegate the responsibility that is on this House to see that the money is spent properly.

MR. SCAMMELL—Who is going to pay the officials this Board engages? Will the Government pay them?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—No.

MR. SCAMMELL—What exactly has been done with the money that this Bureau has got?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The report will be tabled. Every dollar will be accounted for.

DR. MOSDELL—I think before proceeding to further discussion of this Bill it would be advisable to rise and defer the matter until that report is tabled so that we may have further information to enable us to properly discuss it.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: The point that seems rather objectionable to me about this Bill is that after it passes every individual going out of the country to earn a living has got to pay a tax in order to enable half a dozen Water Street sports to amuse themselves. Now we had seven or eight thousand dollars spent by Mr. Tait. Seven or eight thousand dollars is a nice lot of money to send to a man in the United States to lecture on tourists. Seven or eight thousand dollars is a pretty good salary. If we got paid for talking here we would earn quite a lot of money too. If all the speeches we have made here since the House opened earned us money at that rate we would be quite wealthy.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—We are prepared to give all the time necessary but we wanted to get this Bill through so that the Board can function. This tax goes into operation as soon as the Bill passes.

MR. GODDEN — Mr. Chairman, I think it is distinctly understood that second class passengers don't pay taxes.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Education" was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting an agreement between the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Ltd. and the Government was deferred until a later hour.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and Holyrood Pond Fisheries, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I think the last day in Committee, the Committee was good enough to rise leaving in reserve two sections only, Section 4 and Section 12; Section 4 on the point whether it might be possible to include in addition to the right of bait fishing a general right of bait fishing, and Section 12 as to the admission of some materials, the point was suggested as to whether such things as nets and twines would be brought in duty free.

On the first point, I took up that matter with Mr. Job, but felt in anticipation that his attitude would be as I found it that I could not get him to agree, and for very obvious reasons when you come to think of it. Bait fishing there by any methods is allowed to the residents, and the residents, in turn, I have no doubt, will be glad to supply bait to any person coming there, but, in the sense of allowing the pond of itself to become a bait fishing ground for everybody, the company say, if that is to be granted, they might as well abandon the whole thing. That strikes me as a reasonable position to take. In connection with the second point, in the first place I don't see any necessity for it. The suggestion was made that under this section the company might bring in such things as seines or lines and twines. I submit that, under the section, as it reads, that cannot be done.

(Reads)

I don't think one could fairly say that would include them, but the Company has no objection to putting it in. But I would like to remind the House that it seems a sort of anomaly that we should be insisting on the purchase of nets locally, and of lines and twines, from a factory, the President of which is Mr. Job himself. He told me that he had no idea of importing nets and such like, but if we wish to insist on it we can put it in, for it will be only helping that factory. I don't see how they could possibly be included under that material but if you think it would be he had no objection whatever.

DR. MOSDELL—Reads Section four. This is the point, that in Section 12 it refers to all materials and contriv ances, and I take it that under Section 12, these things as well as other material might be imported.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—With all respect, I submit not. I take it that means clearly the fish plant, and that would be the actual factory. I don't think equipment for fishing would be part of the fish plant. Fish Plant has a specific meaning here, and I think that is bordering on a fish meal plant. The only thing I want to draw the attention of the House to is that they have no objection to putting it in, and I think there is no point in putting it in. It seems a bit of an anomaly that in one breath we talk of local monopolists and in the other we give them further scope.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, when we were in Committee yesterday on the A. N. D. matter, the Hon. introducer of that resolution agreed to submit a schedule to the House. Why can't we have the same thing here? It is a simple matter, and I think it is quite right to have a schedule regarding this as well as the A. N. D. Co., or any other matter whereby certain things are to be brought in free of duty. If we don't lay down a schedule and know exactly where we stand we will always have trouble and confusion, and the Customs are going to be mulcted, of duties. We should have a schedule of exactly what articles they desire, and all members will be only too glad to encourage the industry.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, as a representative of a fishing District I am glad, as I said before, that the Government is at last bringing in something affecting the industry. The Hon. introducer was probably referring to me in his remarks regarding lines and twines—the cap fits and I don't mind wearing it. But we are not through with that—there is another day coming. It seems strange to me that the people of St. Peter's and Mall Bay can fish in the Pond with materials on which they don't have to pay duties, but if they fish in the ocean they do have to pay them. They are free from the monopolists and not for the fishermen.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is only the Company, not the fishermen.

MR. LAKE—While I have no great love for the Colonial Cordage Company getting more duties on lines and twines, as they have enough already, as I said before, if they have to buy lines, the fishermen should have the benefit, and the clause should be put in the Bill. We were not supposed to know that Mr. Job was the President of the Company; we are not interested in who is President—the Prime Minister said yesterday that he was considered one of the big nabobs in that industry. Even if the Government has a duty on lines and twines it will only be a matter of a few months when there will be no duty. As far as this Company is concerned it wouldn't matter, but we may as well have it there.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition regarding the introduction of a schedule in place of the generic section we have here, and particularly in view of the remarks I made here a few days ago in connection with another industry operating a plant somewhat similar to that which this Company will probably introduce. It seems absurd that this Company which plans to enclose a pond and make a trap out of it, should be able to introduce certain articles that other industries already established have paid duties on. They are going to erect a fish plant, and I pointed out that there is already at least one fish plant in the country that has had to pay on the regular tariff. It seems a peculiar anomaly that one manufacturer should pay duties and another starting in the same industry is allowed the same sort of materials duty free. I wonder if by any peculiar line of reasoning any member of the Government can conceive of that as a square deal. For that reason I would very much prefer to see a schedule of articles submitted, because I desire to object to articles of a similar nature coming in free. As I have said, I have no objection to retaining on the free list articles for the culvert or gates, or anything peculiar to them, and for that purpose they can have all the free list they want, but if you are going to include articles that give one fish manufacturer an advantage over another I say that it is unfair and unjust, and it is hard for others to continue against a monopoly. It is objectionable on its face and in point of principle, and unfair, and I would therefore like to see that schedule introduced.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, I should like with the others to get a schedule completed if possible. But I should like to know what is the position of the members regarding this Bill. To begin with, as I see it, those concerned with the Bill, as I told the House, are frankly entirely of a local character, in the sense of the people there, who have backed this up with a petition. The whole thing is an experiment, and the attitude that I understood was being taken was that expressed by the hon. member for Burin, who staated that he was glad something was being done for the fisheries. If you are taking that position, what is the attitude of the House towards this? Do I understand that you don't want to encourage it, or that you want to take the position that because the man who is starting it is likely to make a success of it you think we ought to make it as restrictive as possible at the start? What is going to be your viewpoint? I can't see what assistance the Government can give this enterprise except to let them go ahead and bring in what they want for the plant duty free; if we don't do that we don't deserve any credit. If the position taken is to be that this enterprise will get strictly

what is la:d down in a list, duty free, :nd nothing else, that isn't much encouragement. As I said the other day, the whole proposal is simply to try out a plan that has been suggested for Holyrood pond for years, to utilize the fisheries there. I have heard it in this House and outs:de for years. Then largely through the enthusiasm of Mr. Cowan, he enlists the support of Mr. Job, who says he will try it out, and the only thing the Government can claim credit for is the offer to bring in necessary things duty free. Is it the idea of the Oppostiion that we are going to be as restrictive as possible. I have frankly approached it from a different aspect, and regarded the permitt:ng things to come in duty free as encouragement of the fisheries—that is my viewpoint. If I have the wrong angle, and you are viewing it from the other standpoint, you shouldn't say that you are anxious to do anyth ng for the fisheries. The only way we can deserve credit or approval is to take a position in support of this Bill and say that we are not going to worry much about it, provided they don't start and bring :n something totally unconnected with the industry. I am only passing along the statement that has been made to me that these people have no overburdening desire to go in on this, that they only would do so with a fair amount of encouragement, but if the Committee thinks they should be tied down to a schedule I am perefctly prepared to try it .The force behind this is the people who have been looking for it, and if we are going to try to discourage :t, I am quite willing, but it is all to no point.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to discourage this, neither do I want to be a party to anything for which we will be sorry. How much better :t would have been when the Humber deal went through a schedule had been arranged so that the customs would have known what should have come in and what should not. It is a very simple matter, and not as hard as you would have us believe. If these people want to put up gates, we are satisfied to have the material come in duty free; if they want machinery to manufacture fish and make fertil zer, everyone would be satisfied to have that come in duty free; if they go as far as to want the cement for the culverts and things of that kind, we might be satisfied to have that come in duty free; but if the company wants to bring in everything like nails, paints, plaster, varnish, lines and twines, dories, oars, grapnels and so on, I don't think they should come in, and we ought to have the opportun ty of striking out things of that nature. They could be bought here at a little more cost. If I were in the place of Mr. Job I would be very glad to submit a schedule for my own protection so that there would be no trouble in the future with the customs or the Government, aand certainly I would know what I expected to come in duty free. There is no objection to putting :t in writing and submitting it to the House of Assembly and have it finalised and fixed in the interests both of the company and of the country. I have no objecti:on at all to the Bill; I would like to see the project go ahead and the thing encouraged, but I do not want to be a party to putting anything through that we might be brought to book for in a few years. The trouble in things of this kind is the amount of latitude given; the Government interprets them in one way, and the party interested in another, and this cannot happen if we have a schedule.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, if I might be allowed, I should like to say something regarding the remarks of the hon. member for Port de Grave, who told the House that he knew of fishermen

in Petty Harbor paying duty on a fish meal plant, and that this was unjust when the Holyrood Pond Co. would be getting their's duty free. I entirely agree with him, but I can't find that any application was ever made to the Government to admit a fish meal plant for Petty Harbor. The Minister of Finance and Customs is the member for that place, and if one of his constitents was desirous of getting anything in duty free, he could go to the fountain head, and if the Minister of Finance and Customs thought he didn't have the authority, he could take it up with hte Government. But I undertake to say that if the Holyrood Pond Co. plant comes in duty free under this Act, the Government will be pleased to give a rebate in the case of the Petty Harbor importer. I don't think any person putting up a fish meal plant should have to pay duty on it, and I entirely agree with the member for Port de Grave. But if there is no appl.cation, the Minister of Finance and Customs cannot be expected to find out if a man has a plant and to tell him that he could get it in duty free. If that man had come in and been told by the customs officials that the plant was dutiable it is not too late now, and he has a perfect right to look for a rebate.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, anything that is brought before this House by way of encouragement to the progress of the fishery will have the firm support of every member of the Opposition as well as the Government, but when a proposition is brought before us, honourable members should consider what is the personnel of the company who is asking for concessions, and what is their ability to make success of the venture possible. I think that an essential to success is enthusiasm, backed up by confidence. If I am correct, the Minister of Justice has informed us that the more powerful man of the two interested didn't care very much whether it went through or not. If that is so, and Mr. Job is only half-hearted, success is not assured.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — That is not quite what I meant. I drew attention to the fact that he was not the kind of monopolist that we had been mouthing about. He has not been lobbying about the Government as we are ordinarily accustomed to seeing; he hasn't regarded it as the kind of thing that he is going to stop awake at nights for. He is doing it personally because these people have asked for it, and are pushing it; it is an experiment absolutely to him, but if we don't grant it he is not going to make too much fuss. That is the way I view it.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the Minister of Justice that fish meal is getting more and more in use every day. There are other places in Newfoundland where in the near future people are going to make fish meal, and if you give unrestricted concessions in this instance as the Minister of Justice would like to bring in you will have to give the same concessions to every other man in Newfoundland who wants to start, and it will be in the interests of this company to state exactly what machinery they want to bring into the country. I think the promoters of the company should outline a schedule and place it before the House so that we may know exactly where we stand. That is the way I view it and that is the reason for my remarks. It is not my intention to put any obstruction in the way of the Bill.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to state briefly the reasons that underly my displayed attitude on this Bill. In the first place, permit me to say I am not desirous of putting obstacles in the way of this development or of embarrassing the company in any manner whatso-

ever. Nor do I want to be misunderstood as wilfully withstanding the declared wishes of the people of the particular section affected under this measure. I am as anxious as any honourable member of this Committee to co-operate with fellow-countrymen in any undertaking on which they embark for the betterment of their condition in any rspect.

I must, however, take exception to the assertion of the Minister of Justice that the principle involved in this measure is a very small one. On the contrary, I regard that principle as very important and as calculated to have far-reaching, very embarrassing, effects, if made of general application. And, if we now endorse that principle in connection with this measure, we must in all fairness hold ourselves in readiness to apply it to other sections of the coast and to the undertakings of other sections of our people, if and when such demand is made on this Legislature. If the people of this section are conceded exclusive rights to the fisheries of their section, then it is not at all impossible that other groups of fishermen will in the future make similar demands and we must be prepared to show equal sympathy with their wishes. I know, as the Minister of Justice has observed, that the situation at Holyrood Pond is in many respects unique, but it will be difficult to persuade fishermen of other localities, if demands similar to those connected with the present measure be refused, that they have not been discriminated against.

Then, to my mind, the Company concerned in this development are pledging too small a total expenditure to justify the concessions asked for, which are sweeping both as to the items covered and the length of the period involved. This committee should be provided with a schedule, or list, of the articles in respect to which duty free entry is required. That is a broad principle that should now be adopted in connection with all Bills embodying concessions of similar tenor. Its strict observance would enable us to avoid the disputes and troubles of the past and would prevent further large losses of revenue, without in any way hampering the development and the operations of any particular company.

As I have already observed, Mr. Chairman, I have no desire whatsoever to be obstructive in this connection, nor am I at all hostile to the project of this particular company. I am, though, anxious to make sure that capitalists are not taking advantage of local necessities to secure unnecessarily large and far-reaching concessions for their own particular advantage; for the most part I am, frankly, inclined to be a bit suspicious of an undertaking which mixes up hydro-electric and similar projects with what was at first understood to be strictly a fisheries proposition. The latter is the more important to us. It should be divorced from projects foreign to it. Otherwise we take the risk of presently having submitted to us and urged on our favourable consideration projects ostensibly marine in nature but really used as an excuse to gain concessions of a radically different and more profitable kind, such as water power and hydro-electric developments.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman: I know the early history of this subject. It is thirteen years ago since this proposition was first mooted, and then as now it was asked for by between four and five hundred fishermen. At that time I took an active interest in it, not because Mr. Dove was the promotor of it, but because I saw some hope and some encouragement for the fishermen of that section where the fishermen were laboring hard under great disadvantages. Not only were the fishermen anxious at

that time to have the project, but they had embodied in the original agreement with Mr. Dove that they ere prepared to pay fifty cents a quintal as a royalty to the Company for fishing in that pond. Even with that Mr. Dove and his associates had to go to the United States and failed to get the capital because the proposition did not appear to be sufficiently attractive. Now, because Mr. Job and Mr. Cowan and others, along with four or five hundred fishermen are going to benefit by this new project, we hesitate and put all kinds of barriers and obstructions in the way. Certain suggestions are offered by members of the House, no matter how honest they are, they can have but one effect and that is we may wake up to-morrow morning and find that Mr. Job and his associates will throw up the whole proposition. I have a greater hope now in this project than I had thirteen years ago. During the past few years a great deal of interest in these by-products which is now only in the experimental stage, but I look forward to the time when fish meal will become one of the greatest parts in our industrial life, and as this is the first attempt made to establish such a plant, it is for that reason, if for no other, that I am particularly anxious for this Company to get all the advantages possible. The fishermen in the particular section involved, that is, between Peter's River and St. Mary's Bay, have not got the same facilities that are to be found in other sections of the Island. Most of them are situated on a wild bleak shore and are handicapped by other elements. In this proposition I have hope where they may be able to increase their earning power largely and the people given a means of livelihood that they otherwise would not have, so I think the Committee ought not put any obstacles in their way that may hamber this project. There is no Government but must bear criticism for its actions, but a proposition that is going to benefit the common people should not be brought under the guns of the Opposition or of any other section, because Mr. Job is not very keen on the proposition and may possibly throw it up. I take this opportunity to say, Mr. Chairman, that I would not in any way associate myself with any aggregation of men who would criticise the fishermen of any section of Newfoundland. All of us here rise in our places from time to time and support and eulogize the underdog and go on record as almost being prepared to shed our blood on their behalf. Well, if we are sincere now is the time to give them what they honestly deserve—the operation of this plant. If the present venture is a success, and I have no doubt it will be, it is only a matter of time when you will find similar plants established all over the Island and when the same concessions that are asked for Mall Bay fishermen will be given to the fishermen of other bays, and, if the opportunity offers, I shall be glad to endorse any such concessions for the fishermen of any section of the Island. I would not attempt to insinuate that any deliberate attempt is being made to hamper the welfare of the people interested in the present project, but I would suggest that some people be not overzealous in trifling matters and, at least, focus our attention on the main issue and that is to try and get this country out of the rut she is in to-day. I trust that we will not have to rise the Committee this afternoon, but allow the Resolutions to go through in their present form. I think I ought to thank the gentleman in charge of the Resolutions, on behalf of my constitutents, for the patience displayed by him during the period the Resolutions were before the Committee, but I do not think

there is any hope of having any schedule, as asked for by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: I can quite sympathize with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in reference to the Resolutions before the Chair. Like him I believe in doing everything possible to encourage the development of the fisheries and we ought to do everything possible to assist any body of men willing to vest capital that will foster the fisheries and give employment to the fishermen in any way; but there is a principle involved, as maintained by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Fortune Bay, and that is as to whether we are going to allow clauses to be put into a Bill which will leave it to the Company to decide for themselves as to what is going to come in duty free. I am not questioning the motives or the intentions of those interested. They might be willing to deal honestly with the Customs. We have had experience of free importations by corporations and the Customs and the country suffered and that is my reason for asking that a schedule be outlined of what is to come in duty free. As is well known, in the past large corporations under clauses like this took advantage of the concessions granted and thousands upon thousands of dollars were lost to the revenue of the country. On the West Coast things that were brought in such as dry goods, pianos, etc., were not duty free articles and these goods were brought in by persons who had no regard whatever for dealing straight with the Customs of this country. Therefore, if the Customs have to be protected, we must ask to have a schedule laid down. We are not mistrusting anybody by asking for a schedule through which no man can question the purpose behind it. By asking for a schedule, surely no man can say that we are deliberately attempting to hold up the proposition, rather it is in the interest of Mr. Job and his company and in the interest of the whole country that a list be submitted indicating what is to come in duty free. I think that it is only proper for the introducer of the Bill to put forward this point I have raised to the promotors of the proposition in order to prevent what has happened in the past.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman: With the principle laid dwn by the honourable member for Twillingate I am in entire accord, namely, that we should not permit duty free any articles not covered under these Resolutions; but does not section (5) cover the point raised and prevent a repetition of what has happened in the past. I cannot see how it is possible to include pianos, gramaphones, etc., under these Resolutions, except you are dealing with a crowd of disreputable men who have no object in view but to beat the revenue of the country.

HON. MINISER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, just a final word. In the first place there is no quarrel as to the principle of the operation in any other contract. The present proposition is not a parallel case with the contract of the N. P. and P. Company. Your duty exemptions can only come in under your Resolutions. What any court is bound by is what interpretation would a court put upon these Resolutions? Now hon. members need not endeavour to imagine that I have any professional connection at all with this thing, except in the manner of piloting it through the House. My opinion is given honestly and without bias. I cannot see how any court could by any stretch of imagination allow anything else brought in duty free, except what is covered by section (5) of the Resolutions. No such construction could be put as that raised by members of the Opposition,

as regards lines, twines, nets, etc., because they are not a part of the construction and equipment of this plant, in my opinion. Section (5) says:

"All material, plant, fixtures and machinery required for the construction, equipping and installation of the Company's gates and for steel nets, culvert, factories and fish plant, and electrical and hydro-electrical plant and works connected therewith, both for original installation and further extension, but not in substitution for old, and not including fuel or hand-tools, shall for a period of twenty years from the date hereof be admitted into the Colony free of taxes and duty."

Mr. Job not only held a similar opinion but he had been advised so by his Solicitor. To satisfy the Committee I asked the Prime Minister to ask Mr. Job if he was able to form a schedule, and the answer is that he is not. With regard to the objectionable feature raised by Mr. Grimes, I have but to say that the case of the West Coast people and the present one are not analogous.

I think it will be found that the analogy is not the same. Surely it could not be set up that nets would come under materials for the construction and equipment of the factories and plant of the Company? I don't think that a court would hold that.

MR. GRIMES — With regard to equipment for the plant, they said that they were perfectly within their rights in importing rubber boots and oil clothes duty free.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, but there is a substantial claim against them by the Colony; the Minister of Finance and Customs has as a matter of fact instituted a complete research into the records of the Customs House and the Company and all these things are to be claimed for.

MR. GRIMIES—If we had a schedule we wouldn't be up against that sort of thing.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I say candidly that I am very anxious to let somebody get a chance to try out this Holyrood Pond experiment.

HON. THE LEADER OF OPPOSITION—Would the hon. member give the House a definition of what a plant is?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in answer to the request for a definition of a plant by the Leader of the Opposition I can only give the old definition that a plant is a plant and I want to say that I can make it any kind of a plant overnight according to what side I am acting for. A plant it might be said is one of these kind of flowers to which the saying might apply "the rose might smell as sweet by any other name." We get round to a fish plant. What is the plant that the gentlemen concerned in this venture are going to put up? We know that we have people here we trust. We know Holyrood Pond and we know that this thing is an experiment. We know this Holyrood Pond proposition is an experiment and that Mr. Job is not going to go into it and throw money away and that the plant is not going to break the country by any pianos or gramaphones that are going to be brought in. I don't think he belongs to that class of "Water Street sports" and that he is going to put in a lodge for tourists or something. I think he is going to get such things only as are necessary in the opinion of a practical business man for the operation of the plant. I can only say that a plant is just whatever you like to make it. I admit that.

HON. THE LEADER OF OPPOSITION—I would like to be in a position to vote for these resolutions but if that is the definition of a plant whatever you like to make it, then I say we are giving the people con-

structing this plant the opportunity of importing into this country anything they like.

HON |MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I refer you to Section 3, where we can get a definition of this plant.

(Reads)

I should say for this plant therefore that is the definition.

HON. THE LEADER OF. OPPOSITION—Well as I have already stated we are going to have a lot of fish plants in this country if the Government are prepared to give concessions to this particular plant to import everything they need for the use of the plant, well then we have to give it to every other. In this particular case we have not to take into consideration who is connected with this, who is the promoter or the president or the directors. The personnel of these companies changes about and perhaps while we may have one man as a promoter of a company today in a few years that man might be dead and somebody else have succeeded to his place who perhaps would not have as good a reputation, and I don't think anything of that kind should be taken into consideration at all. Our consideration should be to conserve the interests of Newfoundland. That is what we are elected for. I maintain that it is no hardship on the promoters of the Company to submit to this House, to be attached to the Resolutions the schedule of what they require to carry on business.

I don't want to say anything to knock the project or keep it from going on because the people in that section of the country want this and as long as they want it I think it is up to us to let them have it; but at the same time we owe a duty to the country as a legislature and as representatives of different districts to protect the people as far as it is in our power and not to go too far in granting concessions, and then find we have to give the concessions to a large number of people.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—I may say I went out and spoke to Mr. Job, and he has told me, that he particularly didn't desire to have any nets included in this free entry list; and that his lawyer is of opinion that he can't have them free under this. He framed the resolutions with a view to avoiding that; and that it is only the plant or any part thereof that is required to be free. As a matter of fact he thinks it is quite all right not to have such things as nails and paints admitted free; he wouldn't be at all likely to think of importing these things in connection with a small proposition of this kind, and in any case he doesn't feel inclined to make a schedule or both about it, if it can't go through the House as it is.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I do not want to oppose the Bill, in fact I would like to see the Resolutions go through the House, but I wonder whether Section 5 could not be tightened up. It seems to me a rather broad construction might be placed on permission to have free entry for material etc., for an electrical plant.

(Reads)

I take it that according to the definition of the plant to which our attention has been called as referred to in Section 3 of the Agreement that the main idea of the plant is as outlined here:

(Reads from Section 3)

Perhaps under this some fifty or sixty or a hundred houses might be linked up and considered part of the plant and be equipped with electricity. It is a small settlement and quite a few houses may spring up around this fish plant and they may be connected by electricity, the supplies for such an extended electric plant having been got in duty free.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What I feel about the possibility sug-

gested by the Honorable Member for St. Barbe, is that if that did happen wouldn't it be a decided advantage. If it should happen that they should erect an electric plant and extend it to be used by the people out there, I don't think we should object. What has happened in the past is that we have always given any lighting companies for lighting towns and settlements the privilege of getting lighting materials in duty free. The idea behind encouraging those was that it was felt that it would benefit and encourage development throughout the Colony. It has been the policy of the country to encourage free admission for lighting plants anyhow on account of the benefit to the people, so even if they should do that I don't see why we should object. I think encouragement should be given them to do it, if they should put up an electric plant in connection with this fish plant and they want to extend it for the use of the settlement as a large lighting system.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I should lige for the Mover of these resolutions, the Hon. the Attorney-General, and Mr. Walsh to understand that while we have criticised this Bill we have not done so for the spirit of wanting to hamper it. We have done so because we feel that it is yearly becoming more important that we must be careful in all these matters, and in that spirit we criticised them somewhat contentiously. But I for one wouldn't like to have it go abroad that the Opposition was trying to hamper this measure.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I don't only think that there was no such desire, but I want to thank the members for the spirit exhibited here this afternoon. And I say further that I agree with the principle enunciated, and think it an ideal one, and one that we should in future carry out. I do not regard this Bill as setting a precedent, nor do I regard the attitude of the Opposition as captious or objectionable. In this case we made an endeavour to get a schedule, but I merely want to draw attention to the point that where a contract is already made it is difficult to change things. I want to thank the Hon. Members and I have looked on it as a case where they were honest and sincere.

Mr. Speaker resumer the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had passed the same without amendment. On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that leave be given to introduce a bill accordingly.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Holyrood Pond Fisheries, Limited," was introduced and read a first time, and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, As I promised the Committee last evening, I had consultation with the Solicitor for the A. N. D. Company, and I found that a few months ago, every possible angle of his matter was explored by the Solicitor and the Attorney-General and the Acting Deputy Minister. He told me that it might be possible to get a more definite statement from the Directors of the A. N. D. Company if we were prepared to delay the measure for a month or six weeks longer, but even with that he gave me the assurance that there wouldn't be any

material affected other than that set out in sub-section F, which seems to be the whole matter of contention. Personally as a layman it is very difficult for me to analyse the long-drawn out sections, but I am satisfied that the Department of Justice has seen to it that our country's interests are safeguarded, and I am doubly satisfied considering that we are dealing with a Company with such a record as that of the A. N. D. Company. They have always been entirely up to the letter of their obligations, and I am sure they prize their reputation highly. For that reason I feel that we need have no serious misgivings regarding the possible outcome of this industry. Regarding the possibility of a repitition of what happened in the big industry at the Humber a year or two ago, I want to thank the members for the anxiety displayed to see that we don't have a recurrence of that, but I don't think we are likely to get in serious trouble regarding the sub-section to which the Leader of the Opposition referred to last session, and asked if it would b possible to have a schedule.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed in what the Hon. Introducer has said. He assured the House yesterday that he would have a schedule prepared.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Pardon me, I said that I would consult their Solicitor. How could I give an assurance?

MR. HICKMAN—You led the House to believe that you would get a schedule. I think that we have had legislation enough of this nature, and I intend to oppose it; I am not going to support anything to let a Corporation get everything they want in duty free, when it is a simple matter for their Solicitors to sit down and make out a schedule. Then there will be no necessity for the Department of Finance and Customs to go through their books every few years and have to take an action for duties. Who is there in the Outports to pass on these articles, to know whether they should come in duty free or not? What Customs Officer is there capable of construing an Act drawn up by legal minds? I venture to say there is not one. If any Corporation wants to put through an Act whereby they can bring in articles of machinery for development of an industry, free, I am prepared to vote for it, but not by a broad Act that can be construed by different parties to have different meanings, and allowing a Corporation to bring in lots of goods on which duty should be paid. Unless the Hon. introducer is prepared to bring in a schedule, why not let this stand over for a few weeks; there is no possibility of the House closing in that time. Unless that is done, and the tone of the Act made clear, I will not support it for any Corporation.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to point out that I would like to be able to facilitate the Committee, but I have no guarantee from the Company. I have been in conversation with the Solicitor who has been in Communication with the Directors of the Company and he was informed that even after deferring the matter for two or three weeks a schedule might not be possible to get.

MR. LAKE — Mr. Chairman. It does seem strange that such a corporation as the A. N. D. Company cannot get up a schedule to apply to their own line of business. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines tells us it cannot be had for three weeks and then we may not get it at all. I state right here and now that I think that, if this House intends to vote for Clause "2" of these Resolutions, they are throwing away Newfoundland's birthright. I shall not vote for this Bill and any Newfoundlander with his country at heart should not vote for it. It is an outrage on the

people of this country because this corporation wants everything in the way of concessions and are not prepared to give anything in return, except that a few hundred laborers will be hired to work for possibly $2.50 per day and be made slaves of like they were at Corner Brook. I do not want to repeat what happened there because it is all too plain to members of this House. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines intimated that we were trying to obstruct the passage of the Holyrood Pond Bill. Well, I do not see why we should give the promoters free duty for twenty years, much less to give the A. N. D. Company exemption for twenty years in connection with Buchan's Mine. Last year $27,532,00 worth of merchandise was imported into this Colony. Of that amount $10,232,000 came in duty free. In other words duty was collected only on a little over fifty per cent. of what came into the country. Still we allow the A. N. D. Co. and I suppose other companies to import oiled clothes, rubber boots and pianos and everything else they want duty free. I wonder if an employer of the fishing business asked to have his goods imported free what would the Government think of him? He would be laughed at. I think that if the A. N. D. Company cannot make up a schedule of what they want to import they are poor business people and they are different people from what I thought them to be. This Act now before the House is all for the A. N. D. Company and not for this country. There is nothing in the Act for the protection of the workingman to see that he is properly housed and properly fed while he works like a slave in the woods for the paltry sum of possibly $2.50 per day. No Newfoundlander there will get any kind of a job just like men were imported for the good jobs at Corner Brook where the Company got in everything free of duty and Newfoundlanders had to pay for it. If the rest of the Opposition members feel about this thing as I do this Act will never go through this House. If I had the power I would hold up the House on this Bill until the end of this year because the Bill is aimed to assist monopolists. It is an outrage to perpetrate this sort of stuff on the people of this country. And then they come in here and say they do not know what they want to get in duty free. It was stated here yesterday that the N. P. and P. Company put it over the Newfoundland Railway. Well, I think the A. N. D. Company, having the same chance, are out for doing the same thing at the expense of our railway and the taxpayers of this country. They can build a railway line where they want to, under this Bill, and forget that the Newfoundland Railway ever existed. The Prime Minister stated here some time ago that, owing to the depletion in the Government ranks, he was not in a position to put through any drastic legislation. He stated what was quite true, and I feel that the Government, as at present constituted, have no right to bring into this House the Resolutions that are before us to day. It is an outrage for the people of this country to have to swallow such drastic legislation, which will mean nothing but poor wages, poor food and poor lodgings for a handful of people. I suppose we will have the International Paper Company coming in here soon and asking for a grant of all that is left of the Labrador. Then all the Newfoundlanders that are left in the country will have to get out. I have no great faith from the workingman's point of view in Buchan's Mine, although some people are inclined to think there is a Klondyke in it.

There should not be left an opening to bring in anything duty free that is manufactured locally. We should try to help concerns in this

country and make sure to prevent that. If they want to under this Bill they can bring in several things that are manufactured locally. I don't suppose they'll want any lines or twines so it won't affect the Colonial Cordage Company, the Prime Minister's hobby, but it will affect other concerns in this country. I think the hon. member from St. John's West suggested that they might be able to import stoves duty free. I understand that not a stove was bought in Corner Brook from local contractors. Whether that is correct or not I am not prepared to say. I am not interested in the companies or corporations that I say should be protected but I am interested in the working man and I think we should protect every industry we have and every manufacturer up to a certain point, and if the A. N. D. Company is going to import nails, stoves, brick, boots and shoes (I suppose that's clothes), and all the rest of it, I think, right here and now we should insist on a schedule for this Bill stating exactly what is to be allowed to come in free of duty. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. introducer of the Bill state that it would take three or four weeks to prepare a schedule.

HON THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES— I said it would take several weeks, if you were going to carry on a conversation by telegram or letter.

MR. LAKE— That is what I said you stated. You stated it would take several weeks. I believe that you yourself (not to talk about the A. N. D. Company) could have it drawn up in three or four hours. You came in here a few minutes ago and brought in a Bill in connection with an industry at Holyrood Pond and told us evrything about it, and that was quite satisfactory.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I am trying to tell you everything about this.

MR. LAKE—I thought you had said you had thought that they could very easily get a schedule with regard to Buchan's Mine? What is the use of our admitting everything here duty free and in a few years time the Minister of Finance may have to get an auditor to go through the books to find on what they have to pay duty on. I think that now is the opportunity, and it should be laid down that every company coming in here looking for concessions shall state what concessions they want and on what particular articles they need concessions. I think no company coming into this country should get over five years protection. If a company can't get things in shape and have a mill erected in five years then I don't know what I am talking about. I admit I don't know much about mining but I contend that our giving a company as here twenty years is absolutely outrageous. I am told by people who profess to know that they have $180,000,000 of ore at Buchan's Mine. These figures are so big that I can hardly utter them; $180,000,000 worth of ore at Buchan's Mine; and I undersand that they can get out of that 50 per cent. which works out as is obvious $90,000,000. Well, if a company that has $180,000,000 in sight comes into this House and asks for twenty years free entry, I don't think it is good enough, and I don't think we should allow it to pass, unless on the other hand they give us some concesions as far as the Newfoundland labouring man is concerned. I see nothing to protect the labouring man in these Resolutions, nothing to protect the labourer in the slightest degree. The labouring man has got to come to his member or a merchant and try and get money enough to go to Buchan's Mine and when he gets there he is at the mercy of some employer who tells him he isn't wanted. If he does get there I suppose he has got to live in a shack not fit to live

in and perhaps eat miserable food. He is the slave and the Company gets all that's in it. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves if we allow that thing to pass in its present state, and I for one will say here and now that as a representative of the District of Burin and the people of Burin, I don't intend to vote for that measure in its present state. What the other members are going to do I am not prepared to say. I am standing here alone as far as that is concerned. But I shouldn't suppose that all the members of the Government would vote for it, but perhaps they will, being a party measure, they have to do what they are told or get out. It would be better if they did get out when this kind of thing is brought before them. It is what I call outrageous for a Government to bring in such resolutions as have been brought in and expect honorable members representing the labouring classes of the country to vote for them.

Section "f" of section 2 says:

(Reads).

"Hand tools." That means because they are used by the labouring classes. I think if you are going to allow everything else you might as well allow hand tools also.

I did not intend to speak for any length of time and I shall reserve any further remarks I may have to make for when the Bill comes to the Committee stage.

MR. BRADLEY— Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Hon. the Attorney General give his interpretation of sub-section "e" of section 2 in respect of its effect on the Newfoundland Railway. Will they be in a position to transport over a route of their own freight that would otherwise go over our road?

HON MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honouraable member, as I understand it the only route at present is shipping by Botwood via Bishop's Falls. They would have to utilise the railway in the winter time. If on the other hand they wanted to construct a railway to some short port they would have to get from the Legislature a franchise to traverse Crown lands. That is the point where the protection comes in. I think Dr. Mosdell asked this question yesterday and it was discussed. A right of way would have to be obtained if they wished to do that, and it seems to me there is no danger.

While I am on my feet there is one point I would ask honourable members to consider, and I think it is only right that attention ought to be drawn to it. I think there ought to be a time when if some improvement is made we ought to say to one another a kind word where a kind word is due. I think any honourable member who reads this Bill and reads the provisions now made ought to agree with what I am going to say. I don't say it is not what ought to be done but as a matter of fact I say that for the first time at least, whatever our opinions may be about different Bills, for the first time in many years, I think the first time since the Legislature has granted concessions, there has been a great advance in the way of getting over difficulties which have to be met. When you provide the things that you simply can't bring in duty free that is a step further than ever was gone in the history of legislation in the past. Section "f" provides:

(Reads.)

I think we at least ought start with this thing. It is quite easy to get up and talk about what has happened in the past, but there has never yet been a contract before the Legislature in this country in which such a clause appeared. I want to say, and I say it with the approval of the Customs Department, that it has been a distinct step towards the realisation of the hope that we have been endeavouring to bring to that realisa-

tion in making it clear that certain things would not be brought in under the general terms that have been used in the past.

That clause was put in by the Govt. arising out of the very position that has been referred to regarding the schedule. We discussed the idea of a schedule honestly, but found it impossible to get a contract on that basis, and we then went the other way about it. It is only a matter of viewpoint; we say you can't admit these things, but they can't include such and such. If we say this can't apply to hand tools, clothing and articles of household furniture and office equipment, that is because these things were notorious in Corner Brook. All these things are remedied by that clause, and at least hon.members will be good enough to say that this is a considerable advance. Then in clause 3 the country is protected by the provision as to the disposition of any articles that have received the benefit of the free list and may have since been sold.

MR. BRADLEY — Mr. Chairman: The word contract used in connection with this agreement is a bit amusing. Of course as it stands this is technically a contract. But to the ordinary man a contract implies the giving of some thing by both parties to the agreement in consideration for something in return. I have looked through these resolutions, and, maybe, I have missed some essentials, but so far as I have been able to discover up to the present moment, all the giving is on the part of the Newfoundland Government and all the taking on the part of the A.N.D. Company. There is no giving on the part of the A.N.D. Company .Yesterday afternoon when we were in Committee on this matter, I asked the Hon. the Introducer of these Resolutions, if he would be good enough to point out to me what Newfoundland was getting for the concessions that were being given to this corporation. The Hon. the Minister of Agriculture in reply pointed out to me what he thought would be the benefits that would accrue to Newfoundland, and they were purely visionary on his part; hopes which exist in his mind, and which I trust will fructify, but of which I have the gravest doubts. It can hardly be contended that what the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture hopes will be the benefits that will accrue to this country through the passage of this bill, is a "Quid Pro Quo."

We have for a number of years past, being introducing into this House and passing through their various stages to completion agreements giving concessions to this, that and the other company. And there have been various reasons adduced from time to time to justify the giving of these concessions. Amongst others it has been advanced nearly always that if these concessions are not given these corporations and promoters will be frightened away, and the people of this country as a result will not get the labour. I have been agreeably surprised, sir, sitting here during the consideration of these Resolutions and down to the present moment have not heard any member of the Government suggest that this corporation is going to run away unless they get these concessions. We can then take it for granted that these people do not intend to run away. They have got a proven and a valuable property. Whether we give them these concessions or not they will continue their preparations and operate these mines. They are not philanthropists. They are not down here to expend money in the interests of the people of this country. They have no more regard for us than they have for any other country in the world, and so far as this corporation itself is concerned, Mr.

Chairman, it will be found that if any benefits are to be given to any one, it will not be to Newfoundland. That is borne out by sub-section C, section 2.

(Reads)

There is only one object in that, and that is for the purpose of exportation. In other words, they will take the raw material out of this country in these bags to be manufactured in the United States of America. The labour is to be given to the Americans. And then they ask us to admit free into this country articles to take the raw material out of this country that the Americans may get the benefit of the manufacture.

No, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing whatever to intimate that the promoters of these resolutions will withdraw from the operation of this valuable property even if they do not get these concessions. If they have $200,000,000 worth of proven ore down there,—and I heard a member of the present administration say that it is a wonderful property, then even if we refuse to grant them the concessions they are asking for, they will still continue to operate that mine. Why then I ask should this Legislature tumble over itself to relieve these people of obligations to the revenue of this country, which the ordinary person has to consequently assume. If the A. N. D. Company will come into this House with a proposition that will show us that it is, in the interests of the Colony, essential that these entries should be allowed free, then I would be the last man to stand up here and oppose the Resolutions. But with my friend Mr. Lake, who has just sat down, I say here and now that so far as I am concerned these Resolutions shall not pass. I am prepared to stay here until Christmas to prevent their passing. If on the other hand that corporation is prepared to prove to us that in order that the undertaking can be carried on, it is essential to have these concessions, then we won't be here two hours. But I want that proved, and I am not prepared to accept the words of any corporation, particularly when it is associated with an American Trust. You have only to consult the records of the American Government to see what the practices of these American Trusts usually have been. Monopolists of the worst type. They have been squeezing concessions from Legislatures down through the history of the American Republic for the last hundred years. We have the asset down there in the mine. It is in this country, and the Government should see that that asset is kept and protected not for American speculators, nor for the A. N. D. Company, but for the public of the Colony to whom it belongs.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines came in here and told us that the solicitor of the corporation, refused point blank to give us any information about what they wanted to import under these Resolutions. Why? If they are honest about the matter and if everything is fair and above board, then they ought to be only too glad to give us the information that we are asking. Surely they cannot contend that they don't know what they want. If that is the case I sugges that these Resolutions be stricken off the order paper. If they don't know what they want they have no business here at all. They say they can't give us the information. They are not going to tell us down to the last nail just what concessions they require. They can if they will, prove to us whether it is essential that they should have this blanket free entry, and for that period of twenty years. But they make no attempt to do it in the first place, and when we ask them to do it they point blank refuse and intimate that whether we wait for three weeks or

six weeks they will not give it to us. That is the position taken by the solicitor of the corporation. And I give them the credit for having a very astute solicitor too. Now how much of all that is bluff and how much is true I would suggest that we call the bluff at once, and refuse to proceed with these Resolutions un-'il they are prepared to give us the information that we require. They come to us for concessions, asking us to relieve them of thousands of dollars of duty. We ask them for nothing. And surely it is the duty of the party asking for concessions to tell the party from whom he is asking that concessions, what he wants. Now my methods of logic may not be correct. Perhaps my mind does not run in logical channels. But if there is anybody here that is able to disprove what I have stated, or is able to deny that my logic is correct, then I shall be glad to hear it. I don't pretend to have any particular ability. I don't pretend to know very much about mining, (and I know that that statement will be repeated in the Daily News to-morrow morning), but I do pretend to have at least the ordinary common sense. And I do want to tell this House now that the attitude that I have taken at the present moment is the attitude of 90 per cent. of the men on the street today. The whole of this country is up against these resolutions in their present form. I am sick and tired of seeing this Legislature put through from time to time, bills giving concessions to corporations of this kind merely because they are afraid that we will otherwise lose the labour. While the Honourable the Introducer of these resolutions does not say so in so many words, the fact that it is his belief that we are going to get this labour from these Resolutions, at least shows that he has in mind, that maybe we will not get that labour if we don't pass these resolutions. I don't agree w th that position.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, if the last two speakers are a fair indication of the attitude of a considerable portion of the people of this country, then I think that it is valuable waste of time for members of this House to be trying to put through legislation that is absolutely in the interests of the people. And I want to take this opportunity, I don't want to wait until this Committee meets again, to absolutely disassociate myself entirely from the attitude taken by the last two speakers. Mr. Lake gets up and makes a first class political speech, and nobody can doubt but that it is purely political from start to finish. In one breath he refers to an extract of the Revenue Act, that class of material that we are allowing in duty free, of the admission of articles required to operate mining ventures. And in the next breath he takes up the act, and entirely and absolutely disagrees that all such articles should be admitted in duty free, and then he refers to no provision being made for the underdog. I remember when the hon. member had a seat on this side of the House and when he was connected with the great big enterprise that we are talking about now, and I did not hear him get up here and make any lengthy speech with regard to the labouring man being treated as a dog. Last year in the House when the Government and this House discussed as to whether or not we should assist the mining venture up in St. George's District, every member on both sides of this House got up to recommend that we should hand out $100,000 for testing as to whether we had in St. George's coal in commercial quantities. Why was that done? Where is the consistency of these members who last year were inclined to give $100,-

000 to see if we had coal or not, and I for one thought they were in earnest. And here now we are asking as I pointed out yesterday to assist a company to develop a mine. This is the first time in my recollection that any legislation has been brought forward to assist in developing the mineral resources of Newfoundland. There was a period after the death of Mr. Howley when nobody gave it the slightest attention. And this Government has now made an earnest attempt to try and assist that important industry that we have been discussing under those resolutions. And these are the fruits, and I claim some of the credit of it myself.

Mr. Lake has said that twenty years is too long. I want to tell him that in twenty-five years from now that prospecting will still be going on up in that two thousand mile area around Red Indian Lake. It has been going on for the past forty years. It is thirty years since the mine at Little Bay closed down and ever since then prospecting has been going on. My friend, Mr. Ashbourne must know that there has been large amounts of money spent in Green Bay to develop a mine up there without success up to now. But now a new scientific discovery has been made whereby the sulphite ore can be located, and the A.N.D. Co. are making an earnest attempt now to develop that mine.

. I also want to tell the last speaker, that I entirely disagree with him that 90 per cent of the people of this country are opposed to this legislation. I want to assure him that the man looking for employment, and I am not referring now to the crowd on Water Street, but the man that wants honest employment and is prepared to give a hundred cents to the dollar, I want to tell the hon. member that that class of man is not in opposition to the proposition that is going to give him honest employment at a decent wage. And now that brings me to the question of wages, and I want to say that wages depends on supply and demand. The price of labour is like the price of fish; it has been said in this House that so and so made the price of fish. The price of fish is what supply and demand makes it.

Another statement was made by Mr. Bradley to the effect that we own the property. We don't own the property. In 1905 the Bond Government made a contract with the A.N.D. Co. and gave them two thousand square miles of land in the watershed of Red Indian Lake. They gave them the right to the minerals as well as the wood and water, in fact everything in connection with the area. So that the A.N.D. Co. own the property. But the minerals are of no value to them in the bowels of the earth, but they are making an attempt to bring it out and turn it into dollars and cents. I don't at all subscribe to the attitude taken by these two gentlemen who said that we are going to get no returns. For instance if the value of the output was worth annually $5,000,000 20 p.c. on that, plus the employment of two thousand men at $2.50 a day, would mean a benefit to the revenue of nearly two million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I get warmed up to this subject because I am a practical mining man myself. I worked in Newfoundland and out of Newfoundland for eight or ten years underground. I am particularly interested in this property. I am in contact and connection with large numbers of men of my own class and my own associates who are very anxious to see the mineral resources of this country given a fair chance. In the course of debates here, we hear the various avenues of industries spoken of, but rarely do we hear a word about what I am convinced is going to be a very important branch of our local industries and that is mining.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to a reply that he gave to question 1 on to-day's order paper.

(reads)

That is true to some extent. I know that when that steamer was discharging rails at Clarenville there was quite a number of men employed from Trinity District. The question that I asked did not refer to that. I asked about work on the railway. I was informed, for the benefit of the Prime Minister, and no doubt it was brought to his notice also, that there is quite a number of men in Trinity District out of employment. They went to Clarenville seeking work on the railway. They were employed by the agent there, but a man from Placentia District, one man at any rate from Placentia and St. Mary's, got employment and the man from Trinity District working on the railway, was dismissed because he was told that the man who went there from Placentia had got his certificate from his member. And in other cases men from Trinity District were dismissed and others were taken on in their place. I don't know whether the Executive Government knows the truth or otherwise of that statement, but this was told me and I have not any reason to disbelieve it, because one man was actually treated in this way. I don't think it is fair. These men come to me and they say that the members representing a Government district are sending men in and they say, "Why cannot you give me a job?" But I have no authority, and I do not know anyone else that has any authority. I have treated these requests through Mr. Joyce. I have left the matter entirely in his hands. This thing has been going on that a man from Placentia and St. Mary's and other districts go there with a note from their representatives, and the men from Trinity District have been dismissed. I don't think that is a square deal. It is a matter of such importance that I take this opportunity of bringing it to the attention of the railway commission, so that they may investigate the matter and find out whether that is the actual condition of things at Clarenville or Shoal Harbour. I don't want to elaborate on this but poor old Trinity District is getting the treatment that it does not deserve, and I do not want to make it apply to the poor individual outside of the general situation affecting the whole district.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word. It is presumed that I must be that man, well I want to inform the Hon. gentleman and this House that I have not given a note to anybody in my district to get employment on the line. If men from my district want to get work I tell them to ask Mr. Joyce. I also believe that the Hon. Member does not believe all he hears about taking men on, and putting others off, and I am sure that he is willing to accept my explanation that I had nothing to do with the incident to which he has referred. I have made this explanation to put myself right.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Russell gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, June 20th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 20th, 1927.

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

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of Question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of Question.

Mr. Bradley gave notice of Question.

Dr. Mosdell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of Question.

Mr. Lake gave notice of Question.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights on Labrador" was deferred until to-morrow.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman, Since the last sitting I endeavoured to get information requested by members of the Opposition in respect to moneys paid at different periods to the Tourist and Publicity Bureau. I have also an answer to the query of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the estimated revenue from the tax imposed under this Bill; and I have also got some general information from the whole operations of this Bureau since its inception in 1925. I might say that, in 1925 when the preliminary step was taken by the Government for the inauguration of this Bureau, certain gentlemen got together and discussed the desirability of having some effort made to increase the facilities and adopt some policy to give assistance and information to visitors coming to this country, particularly during the Summer months. The idea was taken hold of and developed in a preliminary way and the Government were approached to give some financial assistance. Whilst at the time the Government felt that this was an effort on the part of citizens of St. John's primarily, they considered it of sufficient public importance to give it some financial aid. Accordingly, in that year the sum of $1000.00 was voted and the preliminary work of the Tourist Bureau was inaugurated. In 1926 the Government were again approached by these gentlemen with regard to financial requisites for this Bureau and the Government told them that they thought the community itself should be given an opportunity to subscribe something towards this object. Then an agreement was come to and the Bureau was informed that for every dollar they would raise by subscription that the Government would subscribe a dollar willingly.

Through their efforts, which must have been strenuous and took a great deal of their time, these gentlemen raised $3,300.00 from the community of St. John's, including subscriptions from the transportation companies. The Government then sent the Bureau a cheque for $3,000.00, which was practically sufficient to cover all the expenses for that year. I think it will be borne in mind that the Bureau kept well with their limits because at the end of the year they were only a hundred and odd dollars short in their requirements; but having promised to contribute dollar for dollar the Government still owed $300.00. However, the Bureau made requisition for $200.-

00 which amount was handed over to them by the Government and that completed their finances for 1926. In addition there was a question, as I pointed out the other day, of connecting up this proposition with the Bureau of Economics at Washington. A lady came down here and waited upon the Government and discussed the proposition. It was decided that the best and most effective way of introducing each other and becoming better known was by lecturing tours and moving pictures. Accordingly, at the suggestion of the Tourist Bureau here, Major Tait, who was then living in Boston, was appointed to do publicity work in the States. Previous to this Major Tait had done a great deal of work through the medium of his small newspaper in the general interest of Newfoundland and in doing what he could for visitors going to Boston, and generally giving the country all the assistance he possibly could in the way of boosts. It was then reported by Major Tait that he had done this work without remuneration and that he could not continue to do so. He pointed out that his home had become a place of reference for all things connected with Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, he was fulfilling the duties of a High Commissioner or Trades Agent, without remuneration, for Newfoundland. As a true Newfoundlander, he naturally did it for love of country. But it is not possible for anyone to live on sentiment alone and he found it necessary to make application for some financial aid. The Governemnt appreciated his efforts and decided to give him encouragement, pointing out to him he had to put up a proposition. His proposition was that he would move in a more suitable office, as his office then was in an obscure part of Boston. He got an office on Washington Street, one of the principal centres, and he promised to do all possible for the people who came there for information. The Government agreed to pay him $500.00 every three months up to $2,500.00. Mr. Gibb, his associate in the office, looked after that part of the work during the absence of Major Tait on his lecturing tour. Up to the present time only $1,500.00 has been paid Major Tait and the balance is still on hand. That probably explains why the figures did not coincide with those tabled in the House, because I stated here the other day that the total cost was in the neighborhood of $8,000.00. We gave the Publicity Bureau $3,200.00 and $5,000.00 we subscribed towards the lecturing tour of Major Tait and that is what it cost the country last year. I think that will explain the figures that were submitted here and the report of the Committee that I wish now to table will also further explain the details.

With regard to the question of the Leader of the Opposition respecting the estimate of income for the Bureau for this year, I have this memorandum from the Secretary of the Bureau, which I think will explain exactly the position with regard to the probabilities of what they will receive. If this Bill had been in operation last year, owing to the fact that some eight thousand first class tickets were sold out of this country to different places in Canada, the United States and England, we would have collected on that eight thousand tickets at $2.00 per head $16,000.00. It is hard to estimate for this year because half of the year practically is gone. Even if the Bill passes to-morrow it will not be enacted into law before the first of July, and that is one of the reasons why I am desirous of giving all possible information, so that when the Bill becomes operative we will be able to anticipate the revenue to be derived. Here is a memorandum from the Publicity Commission.

(Reads Memo).

I think I might give the Committee this information also, because I have

been asked on what authority those bills have been paid and from what funds. For the fiscal year 1925-26, $1,-000.00 was paid by Minute of Council out of general Contingency Account on July 31st 1925; on February 28th, 1926, $1,000.00 was paid on same authority and out of same account; $1,000.00 paid on March 31st, 1926; $1,000.00 paid on June 30th, 1926; $1,000.00 paid October 12th, 1926, by Minute of Council from the Loan of 1926 and on November 17th, 1926, another $1,000.-00 was paid out of the Loan Account of 1926. These are five payments of $1,000.00 making a total of $5,000.00 to cover Major Tait's expenses. I may say in this connection that we have a statement from the Bureau of Commercial Economics, Washington, that gives an absolute account of every dollar that was spent, and, strange to say, there is a credit balance to come back of over $140.00. The $5,000.00 guaranteed by the Bank of Montreal for this year's operations and is an overdraft against the Bureau and which $5,000.00 will have to be paid out of the revenue received by the tax provided for in this Bill, so that the Government is no longer liable up to the end of 1926, except for $250.00 due on the previous year's account. The balance in the Bank against the Bureau will now come under the immediate jurisdiction of the Publicity Bureau because it will be used primarily for the purpose which they have control of. I think, Mr. Chairman, these are all the facts that I have to give to the Committee and if there is any further information I can give, and am able, I shall be only too glad to furnish the House with it.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman. From the very outset I was opposed to this touirst scheme and I am strongly opposed to it to-day. I object for any man or woman leaving this country having to pay a tax of two dollars for the benefit of this Tourist Commission. Three years ago at the first Party meeting of the Government after coming back from the country I asked the Party to have one million dollars devoted towards the encouragement of the fishery and one million dollars for Highroads, but both myself and my colleaguee were voted down. I have not altered my opinion since and for the reason stated I object to the passage of the Bill, and, in the interests of the people of the district who sent me here, I am going to vote against this Bill.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, will the Government, after the passage of this measure, continue to spend money advertising the country in foreign publications, or has a decision been made to cut out such expenditures thereafter? It is possible that the payment of officials might use up the major portion of the income of the Bureau and that the Government would then be asked to supplement their revenue. Are any safeguards provided against such a possibility I am interested in hearing from the Honorable the Colonial Secretary just what the plans of the Government are in this connection. I have here to declare that, despite the explanations and the championship of that honorable gentleman, the Bill proves no more attractive to me now than it did when I made my first observations on its provisions. The principle of exacting a transportation tax from people who have to go abroad to seek a living appeals to me as utterly wrong and entirely unfair. There must, surely, be a more equitable way of finacning whatver foreign publicity Newfoundland may require to attract tourists to our various resorts.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman. It is definitely understood, I think, that the Government are not to be called upon to supplement or subscribe any further moneys to be expended by this Bureau. With regard to advertising, I

realise that a lot of money has been paid for advertising, particularly on the other side of the water. It is a very expensive item and very little returns come from it. I remember in the days of the Morris administration I drew attention to the fact that hundreds of pounds were spent yearly for advertising in English periodicals and magazines and very little good came from that source, and it is only within the last two months I wrote the High Commisioner in London instructing him to cut down advertising in the English periodicals to the very minimum. It was only on Friday last I had a letter from him stating that he had carried out our instructions and that he had got some sour looks from those who were receiving this patronage. In that connection I think that considerable saving can be brought about. I think the intention of the Publicity Bureau is not to advertise in papers or periodicals. Their advertising will be done through lecturing tours, moving pictures and illustrated books and folders showing the attractions of the country. There is a very excellent work in hand now. A Mr. Palmer, who for the last eight years has been connected with the Reid Newfoundland Company's Natural Resources Department, has compiled a book for the purpose of advertising the country. It is one of the most elaborate volumes imaginable and will be valuable to visitors coming here. It deals with eighty salmon rivers, most of them unknown before and points out to visitors how to get to them and the possible cost of getting to them. The book is in the hands of the printers now and I understand that Mr. Palmer has already received large orders for the book from the Red Cross Line and Furness Line. The book will be on sale for a dolalr a volume. I saw a draft copy of it and it struck me as a valuable and atractive publication. To give an illustration of publicity. A member of the Tourist Bureau told me the other day that while on a Rotary Convention abroad he knew that there was distributed between Maine and New Brunswick thirty thousand circulars to tourists and those circulars were all in regard to the attractions offered in Newfoundland. One cannot imagine a better kind of advertising than that. It is the kind of advertising that catches the eye and it is a very comprehensive way of doing it. There, I submit, that it is quite competent for this country to develop a very large influx of visitors and it is not within the province of anybody to say what that will mean for the country. The only thing to guide us is what is wanted for other places. Honourable members know that in most of the Provinces of Canada the tourist traffic is looked upon as one of the most valuable assets and lucrative enterprises. I think we can secure a reasonable proportion of that money, if we can attract the Americans to come here. We are not after the Americans themselves; we are after the money they have to spend when they get here. It is like a man doing business. He makes his shop as attractive as possible, not that he wants to converse with the customers, but it is their money he is after. The same applies to the tourist project. We will never do anything unless we try and I have no doubt there will be ample demonstration of the efforts made by attracting visitors here. I understand that both the Furness Line and Red Cross Line steamers have every passage booked coming into this country from now until the end of September next . I do not claim that has been brought about by the Tourist Bureau, but I do claim that they materially helped to advertise and make this country's attractions known in the far-flung parts of the United States. Then,

again, the Red Cross and Furness people have greatly improved the transportation facilities of their steamers so that intending passengers can travel on this route with more ease and comfort than heretofore. With regard to the sentiments expressed by Mr. Moore, I may say that it is not the man who goes second class that is taxed, and even if he is going first class he will be asked to contribute $2, but, after all, the number will be very few. At all events it is not the idea to tax those people who are going away looking for employment, but it is very difficult to make a ruling on that point, as there are always sure to be some exceptions.

MR. HALFYARD —Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was first introduced I objected to the system of taxation to get revenue for the Publicity Bureau—by taxing people going out of this country. The Colonial Secretary said that he would take the matter up with the members of the Publicity Bureau and see if they could devise some means whereby people going out of the country looking for employment would be relieved of that tax.

Now that is the objection that I have to the bill. I do not think that any one going out of the country, either male or female, going to Canada or United States, seeking employment should be expected to pay a tax whether travelling first or second class. People leave this country and go to Canada, to the United States and other parts of the Empire to seek employment but none of the people leaving Canada are coming down here to seek employment. There may be one in a thousand. In that respect we are different than other parts of the Empire. People leaving the Old Country and going to Canada get every encouragement to go there. They practically get a free passage just to encourage them to go. We are dealing with unemployment in a different way altogether.

And because of this hardship which it is imposing the Government is going to be spoken of unkindly for taxing the people who are going out of the country to seek employment, and I presume that the Government as a Government has considered that and made up their minds to stand or fall in the opinion of the people in connection with this extra tax which the people leaving the country seeking employment are to have to pay.

That is the one point that I am interested in with reference to this Bill. There are a great many people who travel on a first class ticket because it is easier to get into the United States when travelling first class than if they went second or third.

I do not want to labor the question but I feel that I shall have to vote against it for that reason.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, there has been so much of an obscure nature said about the Tourist Bureau proposition since it was brought into this House that I have to ask a great many more questions because, as the honourable the member for Trinity District has said, we must have all posisble information before the measure comes to the vote, so that we can then take intelligent action on it. Frankly, at the present time, I feel inclined to vote against the Bill, not only because of conscientious objections to its general principles, but because of the methods proposed for raising the money necessary for financing the expenses of the Publicity Bureau. It may be that my prejudices are unfounded. If I discover that to be the case, I shall certainly have no hesitatoin, later on in the debate, in withdrawing the objections I have voiced or may voice as the discussion proceeds.

The Honourable the Colonial Sec-

retary has given this Committee some figures showing the value of the tourist traffic to Canada of recent times. These figures prove nothing, as far as Newfoundland is concerned. We do not bear the same relation, geographically, to the Un ted States as that country does to Canada. We cannot in reason expect to profit to the same extent from the American tourist trade as has the Dominion of Canada. Hundreds of thousands of Americans can cross the border into Canada, driving their own motor cars, as easily and as cheaply as the c.tizens of St. John's can make the tour round Conception Bay to the attractive and thriving towns of that section. It is a far different thing for the American tourists to vis.t Newfoundland, bringing their motor cars with them. A large expenditure of time and of money would be involved in any such undertaking. It will be useless, for a good many years to come, to anticipate any considerable influx of tourists of this leisured and wealthy American class, and certainly not until we have more local attract ons and conveniences to offer them than happens to be the case at present.

The Honourable the Colonial Secretary, quoting from the report of the Tourist Publicity Bureau, asserts that six thousand tourists came here by various routes last year. Well, how many of these thousands came because of any presentation to them by the Bureau of the case for Newfoundland as a holiday resort? How do these figures compare with the tourist stat stics of previous years? What is the significance of the figures just quoted? Do they mean that six thousand tourists came here, sojourned in the country for a while, billetted at our hotels and spent their money in the country? On the other hand, the statist.cs of last year's tourist traffic may merely signify that six thousand tourists, or the great majority of them, entered St. John's Harbor, making the round trip on some steamer or other and affording no outstanding or substantial benefit to anybody but the transportation companies that brought them here and ferried them home again.

The only class of tourist that it is worth Newfoundland's while to encourage and attract here is that which is prepared to holiday in our m.dst for weeks or months. That, however, is the monied class, one which expects to pay for whatever he gets but expects to get the very best for what he pays. Except as far as hotel accommodation at St. John's is concerned, we are not prepared to receive and to entertain such tourists. Take them away from this city to our sport.ng resorts, to our best scenic resorts, or to spots especially suited to those who seek rest and quiet after the rush and hurly-burly of big city life and they must simply rough it, as far as hotels and boarding houses go. This is an experience to which the majority of them are not prepared to submit. They want to holiday in comfort, in luxury even. Other countries offer attractions equally as great as those of Newfoundland; our outstanding lure for these people is our strangeness. They regard us as a field for hol.day exploration. Countries that rival ours as tourist resorts are prepared to give their holiday visitors adequate and most modern living arrangements. We are in no such posit.on and we cannot hope to attract and to hold any large and lucrative tourist traffic until we make provision to overcome this handicap. Moreover, until we are in such a position we w.ll seriously injure our future prospects if we induce, or attempt to induce wealthy tourists to pay us a visit.

The Newfoundland traveller, therefore, whether he goes abroad on business or on pleasure, must now submit to a tax exaction designed to attract

wealthy tourists to a country that is prepared neither to give them the sort of welcome or the kind of accommodation that is calculated to satisfy them to retain them here for any considerable period or to induce them to return here when vacation season comes round again next year and for years afterwards. They are certain to go away dissatisfied over the fact that outside of St. John's there existed no up-to-date hotels or boarding houses, and that our boasted scenic and sporting resorts might just as well have been non-existent, as far as they were concerned. The transportation tax is bound to hit hard that class of Newfoundlander who goes abroad to earn his livelihood, returning to his own country to spend some months of the year with his relatives. His own country cannot provide him a means of earning a livelihood. He has to seek employment elsewhere. He is taxed to ensure an influx of holiday-makers to the very land from which stern necessity drives him. That, as the honorable member for the District of Trinity has just observed, strikes one as an absurd and an unjust policy.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, the Colonial Secretary stated that the tax was to be collected from the round trippers as well. I would like to know how you are going to collect that?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Chairman, the steamship companies have agreed to assess the tickets when leaving New York. The agent here will have to be responsible for the amount.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that clause 8 be added by way of amendment to Section 3 to this effect:

(Reads.)

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Chairman, I might say with reference to the point taken by the last speaker, as I pointed out before, I took the matter up with the steamship owners and they told me that it was absolutely impossible to make any discrimination or any difference. Everybody would be going looking for employment. Of course this tax is going to be paid by people who can well afford to pay it. There may be some cases where the tax will prove a hardship, but as I have already pointed out, a short time ago everybody going to the States had to have a passport for which they had to pay $2.50. This has now been wiped out. In some cases I give identification letters, but this is not always necessary, and there is no longer the tax on the passports which the people paid and did not trouble about it. The tax is smaller and the number of people leaving this country to seek employment who travel first class is very small.

I would very much like to be able to meet the wishes of the honourable member in this connection but I think he will appreciate the fact that it would be very difficult to bring about any discrimination as suggested.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know the immigration laws of the United States as to whether there is any tax on men going there to seek employment. Do they encourage people to come in there looking for employment?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Chairman, I think it is the other way about. The immigration laws are very severe. They don't want men going in there looking for jobs. They want to keep people out who are seeking employment. They know that if these people get jobs they will be keeping some Americans out of a job, and that is what they do not want to have done. When an outsider has a good job there they feel that he is standing in the place of some American who should have that position.

I have advised many men going to the United States that whatever they say not to tell them they are going to take a job.

As an example, I remember one case when four men—I think they were from Trinity, and the honourable member for Trinity will probably remember the occasion—went there and made the mistake and were sent back. They said that they were looking for work and were immediately sent back. Now their immigration law is not as severe on Newfoundland as on most other countries. Nearly every country has a quota—that is only a certain number of people from that country can enter the United States during the year and when that number is reached nobody can go in to stay; but Newfoundland has no quota. Canada has no quota. No matter how many Newfoundlanders go into the country there is no trouble with regard to the quota. In that respect we are much better off than most countries.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I think they have a law in the United States against contract labour. Under that law no one can go out and contract to bring labourers into the United States.

Would it not be advantageous to put a tax on all workmen coming into Newfoundland to do lumber woods work? I do not see why our men should be taxed and have to pay a head tax of $8.00 or $10.00 and their workmen can come here into Newfoundland without any trouble or check. There is lots of unemployment in this country which this tax would help considerably. I merely offer this as a suggestion to the Government.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable member will agree with me when I say that very few people come into Newfoundland seeking employment and most of those are Canadians. If we were to impose a head tax on all Canadians coming in here the Canadian Government would put a head tax on our people going in there and we would be the harder hit when you consider the hundreds of our men who go to work at Sydney.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, will the Honorable the Prime Minister, Chairman of the Railway Commission, be good enough to inform me whether the increase in passenger rates for coastal steamers applies also to the cross-country service. The steamer rates were increased some time ago.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — When do you mean they were increased?

DR. MOSDELL—During the last month or so.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — That has no connection with the matter.

DR. MOSDELL—The steamer rates were recently increased forty per cent., and what I am asking is does the same increase apply to railroad fares?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — No. not the same as the steamship rates. They were increased to the same level as the railroad rates, I think.

DR. MOSDELL—Then, if a person who is leaving this country takes the cross-country train to Port aux Basques and there buys a ticket by the Caribou, he can get to Canada for less transportation taxation than if he go direct by steamer.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — He will save a dollar.

DR. MOSDELL—That may make the Newfoundland railway more popular.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — As a matter of fact, it costs a lot more to go by rail to Boston than to go there by steamer.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

Bill to them referred and had passed the same without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Holyrood Pond Fisheries, Limited" was read a second time and by unanimous consent was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I was wondering whether the Government is certain that this bill is going through. Have they given any thought to what it involves? It certainly doesn't look much if it on the face of it. In connection with this Bill nobody seems to know what a plant is. The Honourable the Minister of Justice gave us his definition of a plant.

There is no doubt that there will be in this country very many fish meal plants in the next few years and having given the concessions under this Act to the first concern we will certainly be compelled to give them to every other concern and I was wondering whether the Government has given serious consideration to the position and to what they really want brought into this country duty free. I would like to see the Bill go through. I would like to see the enterprise start, but I certainly wouldn't like later on to see this House sorry for this and be forced to give hundreds of other concerns concessions which we will not want to give. If the Honourable Introducer of the Bill would get the promoters of the company to outline in schedule what they required I think everything required to get the plant started would be allowed to come in duty free and this side of the House would be satisfied to make no objection in respect of those things. As it stands it seems to be giving them concessions in a way that is rather a broad order. I know a great deal has been said about the personnel of the company but that is not what we must work on, because the personnel of these companies changes very often, and if abuses are allowed to creep in they might be taken advantage of by somebody in the future and I would like to call the serious attention of the Minister of Justice to the position. I don't think it is any hardship on the promoters to give a statement of what they are asking for in detail and then whatever happens in the future in reference to other companies starting here we will know exactly where we stand.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I thought when the Committee rose everything had been agreed to in connection with the Bill and that there was nothing left but the ordinary matters of form to be gone through. In the resolution stage of the Bill I thought that we had thrashed the matter out fully, and now all that I can say is that I can only repeat what I then said. As to what a plant is I said the only definition I could give was that contained in Section 5 of the Bill which intimated that a plant in this particular Bill is a fish plant "including a factory or factories, wharves, docks, piers, stores, stages, flakes and other erections in connection with the Company's operations and rights of way to and from the said fish plant or the said Holyrood Pond." Secondly, as to the admission of duty free materials, I said that I didn't think that in this particular case so far as this Bill

was concerned that there was anything at all to be worried about, and that Section 12, as governed by Clause 5 of the Bill, limited free entry to things that are for the plant. I can do no more than say this, and I say it with full regard to the point raised by the Opposition that I don't egard this thing at all as more than a case which the House approaches with an absolute conviction that we are only dealing with something under different conditions from ordinary legislation. The people simply have asked to have this thing tried. I don't know that it ever will be tried. I don't know that anything will be admitted duty free. You won't find many men like Mr. Job who are prepared to go so far as to try it. There is quite a doubt about the success of it. The fish may go in the pond and they may not. Even if they do come in, they may not be in quantities to warrant operation. They may come in one year and not the next sufficiently for the operation of the factory. So far as I am concerned, speaking as a layman and with all respect to the point raised, I rather look upon it as a thing which is being tried now after we have heard it talked of for so many years. As to the point raised about a schedule, the position with regard to it has already been discussed by me. The Leader of the Opposition asked whether the Government have considered the extent to which things may go as regards future requests. I can't speak for the Government, but I certainly will speak for myself, and I say with anything of the nature of a new industry duty exemption does not give me much concern. I don't say the consideration ought not be given to the matter in the fullest degree. I don't suggest for a minute that any man ought be entitled to import anything for his private benefit when he is given free entry for a plant, but I only say that I consider that in starting an industry here which has not been here before, I am not much worried about giving it duty free exemption. I don't Know that I can say very much more on the matter. I understood when the Bill passed resolution stage that the matter was disposed of, and I don't see that I am able now to make an alteration, and I can't see that anything more can be done. I was anxious to have it put through today so as to see it start this year, and, as the matter has to go through another chamber, I thought possibly it might be put through and sent up to them and give them something to do .I don't see any way in which we can improve it.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION —I wanted to ask if you had given that due consideration.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I have.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION —And you consider the Act fair to be placed on the Statute Book?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I can't see any danger myself.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

Whereupon with unanimous consent the Bill was read a third time presently and was ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking their concurrence in its provisions.

Second reading of Mill "An Act respecting Education."

HON LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, in reference to this Education Bill, Mr. Halfyard has asked for the report of the Department of Education and certain information has been sought by questions to be asked to-morrow by Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Bradley, Mr Lake, Dr. Mosdell, and I don't think we could get very

far with this Bill until such time as that information is forthcoming, and if the Prime Minister will be good enough, we would like to have the second reading of this Bill deferred until we are in a position to talk on it intelligently.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would be quite prepared to have the Order stand over until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Education" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, since last we were in Committee on this matter, I have got in touch with the Solicitor of the A.N.D. Company. He telegraphed the Managing Director at Grand Falls to ask if it were possible to have a schedule something along the lines of what was asked for by the Leader and members of the Opposition. The Solicitor has given me a copy of the reply he received from Mr. Harris of the A.N.D. Company which reads as follows:—

(Reads)

This is the only further information I have to give the Committee. I merely want to show the Committee that at least all that can possibly be done by myself has been done to meet the wishes of the Opposition with regard to a schedule.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. introducer of the Bill, and he tells us that the party to this Bill, the A.N.D. Company, refuse to give information that the House requests. It looks to me very much as if these people are dictating what legislation shall be put through this House. It is only natural for them and for their solicitor to say that they cannot submit a schedule, but it is the duty of the Government to say, "You must submit the schedule if you want the legislation put through." We should certainly not allow them to dictate what is going to be put through. It is up to you to say that they must submit it. The position to my mind is very much worse than it has been at any time. When a statement like that is put forward by people who want concessions the position I want to take and take very strongly is that they must submit to the request of the House. On this side of the House we protest very strongly.

We protest and protest very strongly against such action, and, if the Government will not take the matter up themselves, then we, the Opposition, might take the matter up and demand that legislation that passes through here will meet the wishes of the people of Newfoundland and not the legislation that suits the A.N.D. Company. I would suggest now that, after what we have heard, the hon. introducer of the Bill have the Committee to rise and demand the information required.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I have had very little to say on this Bill thus far. It is, in my opinion, an utter impossibility to lay down a schedule that will cover what is really meant by free entries. In my experience there is a possibility of doing ourselves more harm than good and we have had many concrete cases since I assumed control of the Department of Finance and Customs of what it really means, nor do I think that the House as a whole understands the true position. Take for instance a piece of machinery, which would cost

say $20,000.00, that would be laid in position to-morrow morning and one month afterwards it became broken and went out of kilter, what would happen? I feel that the Leader of the Opposition and those associated with him, particularly the member for Fortune Bay unless he has changed his mind, want to be fair and we are trying to do the best in the country's interests. For that reason I would very much like to know who wrote the article entitled "Why not submit a schedule" in last Saturday's issue of the "Tribune?"I never saw or read this article until my attention was drawn to it. I never saw this paper before and to be honest I don't even know where it was printed I feel convinced that the members on the other side are interested enough in the welfare of Newfoundland as not to play politics with Buchan's Mine and I hope that Mr. Hibbs, whose name is on that paper as the Printer and Publisher, wants to tell the country what that Bill contains and what it really means, and I know he would not for a moment drop out the essential part of it. I am sure that the members of the Opposition would not like to see anything in the interests of the Colony left out. Now I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition to read the editorial of this paper under date of June 18th, under the caption of "Why Not Submit a Schedule," and he will notice that the main clause (f) is left out entirely. May be it was done by accident, but, I think that if you are printing a Bill, surely it is not the custom to leave out the principal clause of that Bill. Now clause (f) says: "Provided that nothing herein contained shall be held to apply to fuel or hand-tools, etc. etc." I would like to know from Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Grimes or Mr. Halfyard who is the editor of that paper? Seeing that I cannot get an answer to my question from these gentlemen, may I ask the Colonial Secretary who the editor of that paper is?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I will make enquiries and let you know to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—According to the Custom House records the A.N.D. Company had imported only three million dollars worth of goods duty free for twenty-five years of its operations, as against twelve million dollars worth of free entries for the N.P. and P. Company for only three years of operations. Yet because the promoters of Buchan's Mine are asking for certain concessions in the way of free entries—an absolutely new industry—the Opposition cry horror! horror! The answer given to me by certain members of the Opposition is that it is not because we did wrong in connection with the Humber proposition that this Government should do the same. Now I contend that, if the people who are promoting Buchan's Mine told us to-morrow that if they did not get the concessions they wanted that they would withdraw, the Opposition would be the first to kick and cry out, "Give it to them." Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this Bill, as I believe that anything in reason brought in here and employing anywhere from two thousand to twenty-five hundred men, particularly at the present time when labour is so scarce, it is my bounden duty to support, and I think that this proposition is the best that has been brought down here for some considerable time.

I think this Bill in connection with Buchan's Mine is better than any bill that has been introduced in my time or previous to my time. There is one thing I would like to say about the A. N. D. Co. people—I have no reason for saying it but I would give praise where it is due—to the pioneers of the paper-making industry in this country. They have done a tremendous amount of good and particularly through em-

ployment they have brought a lot of money into the country. Everyone knows, and the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Godden and others will tell you, that in dealing with the A.N.D. Company people they have found that they purchased everything they could in Newfoundland, and it is very unfair to intimate that the A. N. D. Company will take any unlawful advantage of the duty or betray the trust of the people of this country.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, What does the Honourable minister of Finance refer to as impossible?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What you know is impossible, what I know as Finance Minister as impossible for any industry that is worth while. You must know as well as I do that there are a lot of things on the tariff that come in free that the people get the benefit of it. The Deputy Minister of the Department says that this is the best bill ever introduced and he has sufficient ability in handling such maters. The Finance Minister only comes in for three or four years but the Deputy Minister has to keep the work going and carry out the business of the Department.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—The same gentleman was there in the time of the N. P. & P entries.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Yes, but there was a different bill in force in that connection. The Deputy Minister is the man who knows the work. In most cases the Finance Minister goes in there and doesn't know the first thing about the job and tells the Deputy what he has to do. If the Deputy had been allowed to have a free hand in some of the matters that took place in the past the result would have been more beneficial for the country.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Honourable Minister to tells us how much the claim is against the N. P. & P. Co.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I don't mind telling you how much the claim is. We contend under the Customs Act that we are entitled to $423,000.00.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—If there had been a schedule there would have been no claim.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The claim would have been worse. It could never have been definite and this bill has been carefully made up.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—What class of goods are you claiming duty in respect of—from the N. P. & P. Co.?

HON. HINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—A good deal of what is set forth in Clause F. For example there were certain grinders which, I think, cost a thousand dollars a piece, and were needed for the mills. We contended that when the mills were equipped with these grinders they could not get any others in free of duty supposing they smashed in a week. We claimed that the next stone that came in they would have to pay duty on and that was just what happened. There was an unlimited amount of goods brought in on which duty should have been paid—private furniture etc. We are claiming duty in respect of all these goods which they had no right to bring in and the claim has been made up very carefully. I might say in connection with the Corner Brook plant that I don't think for one moment that the servants of the Custom House were capable of taking care of the great quantity of goods that passed through their hands. They absolutely lost track of a great deal. But even under the Act there was a lot of stuff provided against in Clause F that we contend they are indebted to us in respect of. I am fully convinced that if this Bill goes through you will have no

difficulty in carrying out the Bill and the Finance Minister, whoever he may be, will have no trouble in connection with same, and we will be out of the hole we're in now before we know where we are.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I did not quite grasp what the Honourable Minister of Finance was trying to say. He was speaking of the Honourable member for Fortune and at the same time was looking at me and I am not quite sure as to whether I am to reply for the Member for Fortune.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Honourable Member for Burin, I beg your pardon.

MR. LAKE—The Honourable Minister tried to infer that I was not sincere on Friday, when I made a statement here.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Excuse me, I did not say that, I credited you with being very sincere, but in speaking I said that the Member for Fortune, which I now correct to mean Member for Burin, like many others did not understand the matter.

MR. LAKE—I did not see the copy of the "Tribune" to which he refers and in fact I did not know of the matter. I am not the Editor of the "Tribune."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Here it is.

MR. LAKE—Now, Mr. Chairman, I know to what the Honourable Minister refers, and even if he did not accuse me of being insincere, then I have to challenge the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who said that I had made a first class political speech. Now, I want to tell the Honourable Minister that I was absolutely sincere in my remarks on Friday and any other remarks that I make in the House, and I want all the members on the other side of the House to understand that. The Bill before this House is an outrage, as I said on Friday, and I repeat it to-day. I f I could afford the time and had the ability I would remain here until the thirty-fist day of December before I would let this Bill pass. And I am not playing politics. I am not the same as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I have no axe to grind, perhaps he has. I don't hold a job with the Government. He does. My stand in this House is always an independent one in the interests of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders and as a representative of the District of Burin.

I expect that I should have felt elated when the Honourable Minister attacked me, by saying, that I made a first class political speech, but I did not take it in that light, I take it as an insult and I don't take insults from any member of this House. I was insulted by the Prime Minister or at least, that is how I take it. I don't stand for people on the other side of the House telling me that I don't know what I am talking about, whether it is the Prime Minister, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, or any other member.

I don't believe the Minister of Agriculture and Mines was sincere himself when he knows that this Bill was against the best interests of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. He stated here on Friday afternoon, that the Bill was for honest Newfoundlanders who would give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay and he referred to the working men of St. John's. I have nothing to do with the working men of St. John's except as a Newfoundlander. The men in the gallery and under the gallery do not interest me, but they are as much citizens of Newfoundland as I am and ought to get a square deal.

I don't see much in the Bill which shows that Newfoundlanders will receive an honest day's pay. No doubt, they will have to give an honest day's work alright.

The Minister of Agriculture is interested in the . . . .

MR. CAHILL—Is the Honourable Member making a political speech now, may I ask.

MR. LAKE—I am not addressing my remarks to the Member for Harbour Main, I am replying to the remarks made by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that I can have that privilege without being interrupted.

THE CHAIRMAN—You have every privilege as long as you don't repeat yourself too much.

MR. LAKE—The Honourable Member, Mr. Walsh, Minister of Agriculture and Mines said that he did not hear much from me when I was a Director of the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company. Perhaps I did not get much of a chance. I did my duty to the best of my ability and brought into the House reports from time to time and made out these reports and gave them to the Government, but I am sorry to say that though I asked for a report on the work at Corner Brook, on the first day of this session, that same has not been forthcoming.

I was told that I was bought by the Humber job, but I think I proved that I was not bought by it. I would not say anybody else was bought with that job, but I know it was taken from me very quickly and I can think what I like. I enquired into the labor situation at Corner Brook when I was on the Directorate of the N. P. and P. Company and submitted detailed statements from time to time, but we have not yet seen any report from anybody since I came off the Directorate. A month ago I asked for the present Government Director's report, but it is not forthcoming. It has been insinuated in this House that I was at Corner Brook during the construction period, but such is not the case as construction was completed when I went on the Directorate; but I do know that there were laboring men from the United States and Canada who worked side by side with our Newfoundlanders and got twice as much wages, and it is high time to have legislation passed governing foreign labor so that our people will get a square deal at the Buchan Mine. If there were mistakes in the Humber Bill it is the duty of the Government to see that they do not occur again. There should be a clause in the present Bill to take care of workmen and also a schedule of goods to be admitted free of duty, as asked for by several members of the Opposition. For the benefit of the House I propose to read a letter showing how free admission of duty has been refused machinery to be used in connection with the dory industry at Grand Bank.

(Reads Letter)

Now it was suggested here that I was afraid to make statements because I was a Director of the N. P. and P. Company, but such is not the case.

I feel that the Minister of Finance and Customs is going to do what he can for the interests of the fisheries. Therefore it is very hard for the Sub-Collector of Customs at Grand Bank or any other place to know exactly what to do as far as the Customs Laws are concerned. It is a very difficult law. I state here now that I was sincere when I stated that it was not clearly outlined in the schedule made up as far as Buchan's Mine is concerned. The people who are coming to me are talking about it. There is nobody that I have heard yet in favour of the Bill that is now before the House, even people who are Monroe admirers so to speak, have stated to me that Buchan's Mine agreement is outrageous. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines was trying to tell this House on Friday that because I was a Director of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, for which I received a certain amount of money that I was afraid to get up here and

make a certain statement. I want to tell the minister that I have no fear of making these statements either in this Housee or outside, whether as a member of the Government or not. I am surprised to see that there are not more members of the Government side to-day that have not more independence in them. The man who represents the labouring classes in this country instead of being over there watching me now should be up on his feet and fighting for the rights of the people of Newfoundland. That is not talking politics. That is sound common sense logic.

The Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines stated here the other day that I supported the St. George's Coal Fields. I want to state here now that I would support them again as spending more money if I thought that it was in the best interests of the country and the Newfoundlanders in this country. St. George's Coal fields I know nothing about, I have heard nothing about them for the past year. I am not an interested party. But if coal can be produced in this country, then I say that it is up to this country, and the Government of the day to assist the St. George's coal fields in every shape and form. And if I were the representative of St. George's and it was in my power to assist the St. George's coal fields, and if there was a bill brought before this House, I would support that bill and assist that coal field, even though I was criticised for it. I am not partial, at least I hope I am not. I want to be fair. But the people of my district would not want me here if I did not speak my mind. Thank God that is one thing that was given me "Freedom of Speech." And I intend to use that fredom of speech as long as I live. I may not be admired for it but that does not affect me.

But to compare Buchan's Mine with St. George's coal fields. Why there is no comparison whatever. Buchan's Mine that is worth $180,000,000, so they say. It would be interesting to know if the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has a report from the Government Geologist, and what he says about it. Also what he would say about St. George's coal fields. I presume that he has some correspondence on the matter. But it would be very interesting to this House and to myself to know if he has any facts about Buchan's Mine. I have heard it said that another corporation is trying to get some more land in the vicinity of Red Indian Lake. If this be true I think that this House and this country should know it. And if there are other syndicates trying for that property then it shows that there must be some development going on up there of considerable magnitude. I understand that Buchan's Mine people, or the A. N. D. Co. who I understand are the prime movers of this thing, and perhaps the chief owners in the mine, I understand that they have already large quantities of machinery imported into this country. No doubt they have had the assurance that everything was satisfactory. I don't think for one moment that because we asked this company to present a schedule to this House that they are going to run away altogether. I think that it was an insult to this House for the Manager of the A. N. D. Co. to send such a telegram to his reresentative to be tabled in this House. I don't think that it is quite good enough. I don't think that this House should stand for it. I think that we should demand of the A. N. D. Co. that they produce a schedule. And when they state that they don't know how to produce one, I should not like to say that they don't know what they are talking about. But I have my doubts. I believe and I know this that if somebody were to send me down to-morrow afternoon to provide of something apertaining

tc the fisheries, I could easily get it up inside of one hour. I feel sure that the A. N. D. Co. have men in their emloy who get up a schedule inside of twenty four hours, so that this House would know what they are talking about, and they would not have a repetition of what has been going on by the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Co. And I agree with the Minister of Finance and Customs when he makes a statement that I believe is true that the Government have had no trouble with the A. N. D. Co. since they began operations. That speaks very well for that concern, and it shows to me that the Minister of Finance has faith in that concern. I am very pleased to hear it. I have not had any connection with the Customs to know whether they did or not, but that statement satisfied me a great deal. I want to tell him that I want to be fair as far as this country is concerned, but I do not want to give away any of our birthright. And further than that to give them free admission of articles for a period of twenty years is out of the question entirely. I think that it is an outrage on Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders as I said before. And then there is this expression that bags should be admitted duty free for only a period of ten years. But it seems strange to me that they should want to put in that clause at all. Now I want to be correct about it. I don't want to be like the Tribune.

(Reads the Clause)

I do not understand why that clause is put in there, because one would imagine that would be of small moment anyway. I think that they might have left that out. Because I think that there are people in this country who could manufacture bags within a year that would be satisfactory for shipping away minerals. It would look on the face of this that they are not going to smelt the ore in this country, but it is going to be shipped out to be manufactured somewhere else. I would take that clause to mean that they are going to import the bags free for ten years and by that time perhaps they will be in a position to smelt the ore in this country. Anyway I still insist that we should have a schedule and not give them free importation for any longer than five years.

But I would like to know just what they are doing at the labouring end of it and what protection they are giving the labouring man in this country. I see my hon. friend the member for St. John's West, and I would like to know, though we don't exactly class him as a labouring man, does he think that there should be a clause in that agreement which would provide for the maintenance of a schedule of wages for the Newfoundland working man. I don't see why there should not be a clause in that bill to see that what happened at Corner Brook will not happen at Buchan's Mine. And that is that the men who went out there almost perished while doing the construction work. It seems that something should be done whereby the working man would be taken care of especially when the fall and the winter comes on, so that he will be properly housed and fed, and that he shall also get a fair amount of wages for his day's work.

The people of this country demand that all their representatives see that the working man gets a square deal along these lines. I trust that the district that I have the honour to represent will not have occasion to send any men to Buchan's Mine. I have tried very hard to get a couple of men to work there, but I have not succeeded. But the people that I have the honour to represent are most of them fishermen, and I trust that they will make a fair amount of wages at the fisheries so that they

will not want to go to Buchan's Mine. But the fishery may be a bad 'e this year, as Mr. Cahill says it 's last year. We know that to our orrow. I trust that the Government of the day will see to it that something will be done fo the labouring man in the way of wages and provisions and housing at Buchan's Mine. But so far in this bill now before the House I see nothing absolutely for the working man or for Newfoundland except for the capitalists that are coming in here to make money out of this.

It will be very interesting to know just what the House is going to do n that question. The Government of the day I understand have made a contract with the people at Buchan's Mine. And we must stand up here now and discuss those things and be dictated to by that corporation as to what we shall or shall not do. I say that we shall not be dictated to by them. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines told us the other day that we did not own Buchan's Mine. I quite agree with him that we do not own it. But I suppose that we have a say as to what we shall do with the goods that will be imported for Buchan's Mine. If we have not then I do not know the Minister of Finance and Customs, but I know him well enough to know that he knows what he is talking about, and he will see to it that Newfoundland will have a say as far as importation is concerned, even if we do not own that mine. So that argument is wasted entirely by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, because whilst we may not own that mine we have a say as to how they shall conduct that mine in this country in the way of imported goods.

Now I don't pretend to know anything about mining but the Minister of Agriculture and Mines told us the other day that he was a miner and therefore he does know something about it. I trust therefore that the honourable member will see to it that the miners are protected. And if he does not I trust that his honourable colleague the member for Placentia and St. Mary's will try and do what he can to see that the labouring man of this country is protected, but as I understand that the Hon. Mr. Sullivan is also the agent for the A.N.D. Company.

MR. SULLIVAN—You are wrong there. The honourable gentleman does not seem to know the difference between an agent and a representative. I said the other day that I was not a representative of the company but I had the agency for the selling of their paper.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Sullivan says that he is not an agent or a representative of the company. Then I would like to know the difference between a representative and an agency. You have no interest in the A.N.D. Company then

MR. SULLIVAN—No more than you have.

MR. LAKE—I have none whatever. But if I had the agency from them I would take it that I was paid by them for doing a certain class of work for them. If I was selling paper for the A. N. D. Company I would be their agent. But I am not and you are. And you are a member of the Executive Council that helped to make a bill to suit the A. N. D. Company. Perhaps if you were in Great Britain you would not be allowed to sit on the Executive Council and draft a bill for a concern that you are receiving a consideration from. But we do not happen to be in Britain. But it is questionable to me whether you have not got an interest in the A. N. D. Company. You sell paper for them, for which you get a commission. Therefore you are their agent, and I take it that you are also the representative of the A.N.D. Company. The direct repre-

sentative as far as the selling of their paper goes, and therefore you must be friendly towards them, or you might lose your job.

However I won't say anything more to Mr. Sullivan and his agency. I don't want to offend the honourable member seeing that his district is so close to mine.

Now I didn't say anything to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. The next thing will be that I will be getting embroiled with him.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman: It is about time that this House realizes that we are approaching Midsummer Day. And some members in this House have just stated that they are prepared to take off their coats and stay here until Christmas. I think that it is about time that this House put a stop to this nonsense. If this Bill means labour for our people, and that is what I am concerned about, and this is what I am approached about every day by men in my own district,then it is about time for me and every other man in this House to take this Bill seriously. We are sent here not for the purpose of delaying this House on important matters such as this Bill is to the working men of this country. The present representative of the District of Burin stated here on Friday last when he read out his gospel of the day that this Bill would not pass. I say that this Bill must, and shall pass. This is direct obstruction. You are merely asked to pass a Bill to give this company the privilege of importing into this country duty free their machinery, and here you are quibbling. You are determined to make opposition anyhow. Although at the same time , I realize that the whloe opposition must not be included. It is only a few politicians that are trying to make capital against the Government, who are trying to damn the Government. Well if these are the tactics that you are going to carry out this session, and if you are prepared to carry on as it seems to me you are, then we are prepared to fight you, man to man, and remain here as long as you are. But if you will take my advice you will treat this matter and all other matters that may come before this House seriously, and stop making political speeches. And you, Mr. Hickman, I ask you to try and control your men, and make them do their duty. You will make them work early and late, and we will then be able to get through the work here quickly. But at any rate we should not delay this House with such a good measure as this.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman: I think that the Honourable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs made the statement that I gave a political speech here. Now I think that it is about time that this House got down to business. I agree with the Honourable Minister, that we ought to try to be serious instead of turning this House into a comic opera. I try to be serious myself and I meant to be serious in dealing with this Bill. But there are many serious aspects of this Bill that need to be thrashed out, and no doubt the Honourable Minister has had an opportunity of thrashing out this bill with the Executive Council. Now this is our opportunity to thrash it out from our point of view. While I do not want to see anything for the benefit of this country going out of the Colony at the same time I do want to see Newfoundland get a square deal. I don't think that according to this Bill that Newfoundland is getting a square deal. And while I have every respect for the Father of the House, yet I think he will see that this bill needs some amendment. It needs to be overhauled and some new clauses put in. I am not a philanthropist, I have more to do. And if my home-town needs

me I do not intend to stay here until December 31st. But if I thought that I could do this country some good and Newfoundland some good then I think that it is my duty to stay here and fight that Bill and get the best ou of it. I think that the people who sent me here demand that I should do my best in the interest of this country. And if I do not do that I am betraying the trust that Burin District has reposed in me. I have been called a traitor in this House before, and if I left the Monroe party it was because I thought that it was the right thing for me to do, and I have not regretted it. You may take that down. I say that we need a clause in that contract that will provide for the labouring man of this country, of whom you say that you have many in the District of Harbour Main. I trust that the people of Harbour Main will not have to come to the Government for supplies next winter. If it is in my power, I will see that they get labour.

HON. MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises there are a few words that I would like to say with reference to a remark made by the member for Burin in his speech this afternoon. He spent most of the afternoon throwing bouquets across the House to the Finance Minister. That is his own business, not mine; but there is one remark that he made that I want cleared up right here and now. He insinuated that I was interested in the bill for private reasons and these are the words he used, "I have no axe to grind perhaps he has." I want the hon. member to explain just what he means by that statement. Does he mean that I hope to enrich myself by getting this bill through. I have been fifteen years a member of this House and have never been a party to any disreputable transactions or mixed up in any graft and if the member can point a finger at one dollar of graft that I have received during these fifteen years then I will take my hat and bid the Speaker and Chairman good-bye and leave this House for ever. Now I will take my seat and have the hon. member explain what he means.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I suppose I can make remarks in this House without having to explain everything I say. I did not say that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines was personally interested in this bill,

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—What did you say then?

MR. LAKE—I don't want to be interrupted by you.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—When was I interrupting you?

MR. LAKE—You are interrupting me now this minute.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MIINES—You said that the hon. minister had an axe to grind. You meant that I was being paid to put this bill through.

MR. LAKE—I did not mean that.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—You prove your charge or take back what you said.

MR. LAKE—I have nothing to take back.

MINISTER AGRICULTURE AND MINES—You can't prove your charge because it can't be done. Your explanations are no good.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reeported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, before the House moves to adjournment I would ask the Prime Minister for an

answer to question number 293 on the Order Paper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I was going to make a remark on the motion to adjourn the House that while we in no way are compelled unless the question was decided by the House, to bring down the minute book and we would be justified should we refuse to bring it down, yet our action might be misconstrued by the members on the other side of the House, who would think that we had something to hide and so to dispel that idea we have decided to bring down the minute book but only on the condition that it is kept within this House. We must have that clearly understood for we have not got a copy of it at the Railway office and that every day of the session that it is in this House for the information of the members it must be returned to the Clerk of the House. On those conditions the book will be brought down to-morrow.

MR. SCAMMELL—I think it will be quite safe for the Prime Minister to bring the book down as I have absolutely no intention of taking it around town for everybody to read and I think I can speak for those who will use it.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—That is what happened last year. It was taken out of the House.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I feel that I owe it to myself and to the House to make a few remarks with regard to this minute book. I remember that I was the unfortunate who asked last year to have this book tabled and I want to say that it never left the House and I want the Prime Minister to take back what he said. It never left the House and the Prime Minister should take back the suggestion that it was taken out of the House.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I never mentioned your name.

MR. CASHIN—I was the one referred to.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—You are not the only member in this House.

MR .CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I want the Prime Minitser to take back his statement that the minute book left the House last year.

HON. THE SPEAKER—The Hon. Prime Minister has stated that he did not say that you took it out of the House.

MR. LINEGAR—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something with reference to the argument that took place on Friday afternoon. I find that for some reason the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has been blamed for making some statements here in reply to the member for Trinity in connection with men for the re-railing work.

It was brought to my notice that he had spoken against the interests of the working men of this town. I did not catch the remarks passed by him and I want to make myself clear and give the Minister of Agriculture and Mines a chance to defend himself.

The terms he used with reference to the men who were here looking for work were that they were "drunkards and Water Street bums" or something to that effect. I cannot think that the Minister of Agriculture made such a statement. He is not that kind of a man. I would like the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to explain.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker, don't you think things have come to a pretty pass when members have to account for their expressions to anyone who may be hanging around the galleries of this House and have to cater to half a dozen men who may not be pleased with your words. In all sincerity and in all honesty then it is about time to pack up and lock

up the doors of this House and send the key to the Old Country.

The honourable member for St. John's West gets up to give me a chance to defend myself. I never uttered a word in my life that I had to apologise for. In my fifteen years in the House I filled a considerable space in Hansard but have never made one word of apology—nor will I apologise now. Nor do I remember the exact words that I used. I might have offended somebody. I might have said that I was not interested in the bums of Water Street. I might have said that, and if I did I repeat it for the benefit of anyone who considers himself of that class. We want to give employment to men who will give a hundred cents to the dollar return for what wages they receive, and anything that I may have said was in the interest of the public generally. I have nothing to take back. And I would suggest to the honest men here that it is about time to cut out this playing politics and get down to work and do something worth while. I have nothing to take back.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about a question that has been outstanding since the first of June regarding the accounts that were supposed to be kept by persons who went to the Labrador last year.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will get that question when I get it and not before. I have told the hon. member this on the floors of this House and I have told him this in my own home, and now I tell him for the last time that he will get it when I get it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, certaintly the Hon. Minister is exercised unnecessarily in the statement that he made. I was just reminding the Minister. I know that he is very busy and cannot attend to these small matters. But I am interested in that reply, and I will be glad to get it when the Minister receives it.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, June 21st, at three of the clock in the atfernoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 21st, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Cashin, from Ferryland, re keeping of dogs.

Mr. Grimes, from Noble's Cove, re roads.

Mr. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Russell gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Halfyard gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Incorporation of the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for obtaining Statistics of Tourist Traffic and for other purposes" was read a third time and was ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I think when we adjourned last the Leader of the Opposition was going to bring in some suggested amendments to meet the views of the Opposition.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman: I have here some amendments which have been drawn up at the request of the Prime Minister, the introducer of the Bill, who suggested that we frame something that would meet the requirements of the House. We have drawn up the amendment a copy of which I will pass to the Prime Minister. I might say that the Members of the Opposition have put in a great deal of time and have given a great deal of attention to these amendments, with a view to having something that we thought would be satisfactory to the Government as well as to the Opposition, if Members of the House of Assembly have the interests of their country at heart. This Amendment goes a little further than the Bill. It covers what is one of the main things in the Bill which is the prevention of any further leases from being granted on the Labrador and also the prevention of any further extensions and to cover the point raised by the Prime Minister, the introducer of the Bill, we have included here that those people who have licenses on the Labrador which have not been cancelled, be remunerated for the money which they have spent on lands by the return of this money with six per cent. interest. This will involve a little outlay on the part of the Government but it will be money well spent because we can redeem Labrador as Newfoundland's property and have it for the people of the country and have something which we can dispose of, and something which will perhaps in the near future, after a proper survey of the Labrador areas has been made, that will bring returns that will be beneficial to Newfoundland and help to meet our public debt and reduce taxation which is the main trouble with the Government at the present time. I might say we have drafted and redrafted the amendment until we have finally brought it to its present form to bring it in for the consideration of the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: Naturally we would require some time to go into these proposed amendments before definitely pronouncing on them, but just taking the expressions of the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks just now, it would appear that they propose, that we should hand back the money, over certain years paid by certain parties for leasehold interests on the Labrador. What, however, if the people who have these leasehold interests refuse to accept the money. It would be very easy if the people would hand back their leases just for our handing back the money. I think if the Leader of the Opposition held a lease, now, after the case has been won and the property belongs to Newfoundland, after having run the risk of having it void and valueless through the decision of the Privy Council going in favour of Canada, he would not consider taking his money back. I think, I am perfectly certain, that there is not a man on either side of the House who would consider taking his money back under these circumstances. It necessarily follows that if they didn't accept the money, we can't take the property back. It has been explained by the Minister of Justice already in this House that the only thing the Government could do would be to take an action in Court to compel these men to give up their leases because they have not complied with one clause of the

agreement to erect a mill. I have claimed before in Committee, if we have for years as the Government of the day, or as previous Governments, accepted the rentals of these people holding leases on the Labrador, and have never said a word to them about the erection of a mill even though it was in the agreement, nd should now call upon them by aking action in Court to compel them to give up their titles because they didn't erect a mill, rather than be a party to it, I would resign my seat in this House, because it wouldn't be a fair thing to do to anybody, and I think the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me, if he takes the matter into consideration. In my opinion, it would be no less than highway robbery, to actually go and accept for years and years a pile of money and then say to the men who paid it "We are going to cancel all rights on Labrador," valuable rights that they may be, and take an action to compel the forfeiture of leases, and merely pay back the money paid in. It would be an illegal action, an immoral action, from the commercial standpoint and every other and I wouldn't give consideration to any uch thing, and I would rather be out of the House than be a party to any vote to take any such action.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—With all due respect to the opinion of the Minister of Justice, I suppose he is one of the legal minds and there are many others with different opinions. I have had the legal opinion expressed that it is illegal for the Government to extend these; and not one of the people on the Labrador have carried out the conditions in their licenses, and if they want really to gamble on paying each year a rental on the property that is their own gamble and not the Government's affair. The Government have accepted the rentals and the Prime Minister having made a statement that it would be unfair and immoral to cancel the licenses after taking the money, we considered that we would include in this amendment a clause whereby the money paid as rentals be returned. Under these circumstances I don't see how the Prime Minister can say that the thing is illegal or immoral. He knows as well as I do, and as well as every other member of the House, that all these licenses were taken out as a gamble. Not one intended to erect a mill or to manufacture. It was all a gamble on the prospect of their selling their rights to people outside.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — No gamble; as far as I can see a sure loss, according to your interpretation.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—They took a chance. From the opinion we have we find that all these licenses are illegally held and we have now a chance to get back the territory and turn it into money or make it of some value to the country, and it is up to the Government to take advantage of it. Instead of that you have been extending leases. You have even gone so far as to give people extensions of time to erect mills which they never intend to erect even while this Bill was under discussion, and it looks very much to one looking on as if these people were looking for an extension or else they certainly would have waited until the Bill now before the House had been disposed of. I cannot agree with the Prime Minister that the conserving of Newfoundland's rights at the present time would be either illegal or immoral; perfectly legal and perfectly moral. If we have taken money we should not have taken it, and the most they can expect is that we can return the money with interest at the rate of six per cent. However the amendment is a long one and I will defer any further remarks until the introducer of the Bill has read it.

HON THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the amendment be read. I think it is desirable. I don't think the Members of the House can be competent to give an opinion until we hear it read.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, Following upon the suggestion of the Colonial Secretary, of course, it is only when we hear the amendment read that we can fully discuss it. The House will appreciate the fact that this requires consideration. A couple of outstanding points of course, can be considered at the outset. It is not for me to dictate to the Honourable Leader of the House, who has charge of the Bill, just what attitude should be taken towards it and I merely express my opinion. The first position, of course, is that I think that the object behind any amendment should be of course with the idea of improving a measure. In this connection of course I don't think I can do more than say in any event an amendment of this kind which involves a charge upon the colony cannot emanate from the Opposition. That is an incident to the point I want to make at the outset. What the House will have to seriously consider is just exactly whether, before any thought is given at all to this matter we fully appreciate the significance of what this probably means. I certainly say that in the history of deliberate legislative assemblies you probably wouldn't find any precedent for an act like that. I don't say that critically, but I think that the idea is novel, and a legislative assembly taking a course that would repudiate the good faith of administrations down the years is a matter that has got to be very seriously considered. I fully appreciate the fact, that it may be said that the situation here is novel; that the Labrador decision doesn't find much precedent in the sense of the magnitude of the territory acquired by peaceful conquest; and that in that respect it ought to be treated as war booty. In times of war, in the sense of what we call territory, the invader of course makes his own law, but I don't think we ought regard ourselves in that kind of spirit. Ought not we rather consider that any step that may destroy all conception of good faith in the past in this country should be seriously considered. I repeat deliberately what I told the Opposition the other day, that there is no Court today that would agree to endorsing any attitude by a Government that would come along and having accepted rentals down the years ask the enforcement of a clause that was physically impossible of performance. I mentioned here the other day that in 1902 the Canadian Government stopped the compliance with the erection of a mill in the case of Dickie. I mentioned that by despatches between the Governor-General of Canada and the Governor of Newfoundland, I think about fifteen years ago, it was agreed that pending the settlement of the Labrador Boundary no action of any nature would be taken with regard to rights on the Labrador, and the whole matter was left, like Mahommed's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth, and so far as the different Government's were concerned they merely collected rentals. Beyond collecting rentals, notice was given to those who hadn't paid and these were cancelled by this administration. But to come in and take action against people to seek the imposition of a penalty for not erecting a mill under these circumstances would I say have been a most dishonest procedure, and in that sense, I suggest here now, that to come to the stage of coming in and taking the position that in spite of the fact that they were not able to erect a mill, in spite of the fact that they would not be allowed to erect it, we now decide here as a House of Assembly to pass a law to wipe out any rights they may have in connection with this

matter, is a very, very, drastic step. The legal consequences are such that one dreads off-hand to give an opinion. When considering the suggested amendment I want you to remember that there are times when even a legislature can put a colony in very serious straits, financially. We oughtn't forget that while it is perfectly true that we can pass a law as a self-governing colony to do anything, still there remains redress even against the passing of such a law and for that reason I do quite solemnly ask Members on both sides of the House to consider quite seriously the extent to which these amendments appear to go. I have not given them much thought, but as I heard them read and glanced through them I am very much inclined to fear that they are going to land us into a situation in which the outcome is not alone not easy to see but in which the outcome may be very far reaching so far as the colony itself is concerned.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Chairman. I have not taken any great part in the discussion of the Bill before the House. The object of the Bill, of course, is primarily for the protection of the Labrador. As a matter of fact, the Executive Government have taken powers from themselves by this Bill. Hitherto the Executive Government had the right to grant timber licenses in any part of Newfoundland or its dependencies. The settlement of the Labrador boundary question has placed tremendous territory, which is considered of very far reaching value, under the control of the Government of this country, so that that territory will be conserved to the very greatest degree possible for the interests of the people of Newfoundland. The Government, as a matter of policy, have introduced a Bill that will make it almost beyond possibility and beyond peradventure that there be any dickering or wrongdoing on the part of any Government at the present time or in the future in this connection.

This House will be the only Court of Appeal to decide what grants of timber lands will be given on the Labrador. I have yet to hear from hon. members whether they agree with that statement. In my opinion it is very far-reaching and I don't suppose there is any precedent in the History of Newfoundland for the Government of its own volition to take out of the hands of the Executive the authority they possess and the rights they hold to grant timber rights on the Labrador. Now, of course, this point is to be debated; we have not heard any encomiums heaped on the Government for taking that position —some have commended it, but advantage has been taken of the fact that there is a Clause inserted purporting to establish the rights of these who have faith with the Government and with previous Governments. We have a big stake in the Labrador, and I have always taken a firm position in this and other Governments regarding the people who had rentals and had carried out certain obligations, particularly with regard to the payment of rentals. Not one quarter of the land on the Labrador to-day is recognised as that of private persons, that was previously granted to parties on the Labrador. About eleven or twelev thousand suare miles is the total extent of recognized timber grants on the Labrador.

HON. LEADER OF OPPOSITION— Isn't that the best timber land on the Labrador?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — I dont 'know and don't suppose any one else does, or can, when it has never been surveyed. I do know this, that timber grants held by persons previous to these held by the people who have paid their rentals, and which fell in arrears, and honorable

members have the information as to the amount of arrears, showing there are double the amount of arrears over rentals paid), have been cancelled, and as I said there was not one-third of the land granted on the Labrador held to-day. Why? Because they defaulted and fell down on their agreement, and their licenses were cancelled, and that only two years ago. If the present Government had not taken the interests of the people to heart and done what they did in 1925, we would to-day have over thirty thousand square miles held on Labrador. And if we were to to accept the suggestion put forward this Session, the people who had paid part but didn't continue and have now fallen down on their bargain, may perhaps come and sue the Government to get the lands they haven't paid for. I think this is a serious point, and I think it should be emphasised that the Government intends to keep faith with those who have complied. I have no personal axe to grind, and I have never had any interest in a mile of property on the Labrador; I am not concerned personally except as regards my duty to my country. And I don't suppose any members on this side have any personal interests in these rentals or having the titles confirmed. I stated the other day that one of the largest holders came to me in my capacity as Colonial Secretary when we threatened to cancel the licenses in 1924-25, and I told him then and repeat now, "We can't admit any doubt on our title; we can't accept the explanation that you would pay the rental if there was a clear title. We maintain that there is a clear title and any admission would weaken our case."

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Then who prevented the people from erecting mills?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I shall come to that presently. I am talking about the people who paid their rentals for years, and the Government decided there would be one policy and one only—that the people who did not pay their rentals would lose their licenses; that was straightforward, conscientious and honest, and according to the Act. Well, these people fell down, and didn't pay their rentals and after two or three notices, extending over a period of several months the licenses were cancelled, and I think whoever may take an action to recover them will have a hard row to hoe.

Regarding the erection of mills. It has been stated here, by the Attorney-General I think, that there is a precedent where a man did erect a mill on the Labrador and the Government of Quebec interfered and said "We cannot give you any right and hence haven't given any." We gave a man the right to cut, and the Quebec Government prevented him; from their standpoint you can't blame them, because once they admitted that Newfoundland had a right to give power to cut wood and erect a mill, and allow a man to stay there they would weaken their case. It became an issue between Newfoundland and Quebec, and the decision is that we had the right to grant a permit to erect a mill and if they removed the mill it was their look-out. It came to where some understanding was nevessary, and the Governor-General of Canada, in the time of our Sir Walter Davidson sent a despatch requesting the Government of Newfoundland to make no further concessions on the Labrador while it was in dispute, and although there is nothing on the records it has been a matter of policy ever since not to do anything which may cause friction. In the meantime the people being considered kept their titles clear by paying the rentals right up to the settlement of the Labrador dispute—there was no question of erecting a mill

ever raised by any Government. Now the matter is settled, and since under their lease there is an obligation to erect a mill in two years, naturally they want an extension of that period to erect these mills, and the Government has decided to give it.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity to go through these amendments thoroughly, but I have grasped their import, and I have to say that it is a most dishonest suggestion, to say that we go on year after year, taking their money, and leaving them in an atmosphere of security, and, when we get the opportunity, take them by the back of the neck and kick them out, and say that we don't want them around now, because the property is more valuable to us.

Is that an honest suggestion? As the Prime Minister has said, we can't do it; no Court in the world would endorse it, and what is the use of endorsing what we know to be wrong? It may be good politics, to console the people who have lost that privilege, but on moral grounds I can't refrain from raising my voice against any such action. They paid their money in good faith and kept up their payments, sometimes at great sacrifices, up to the last moment, and bye and bye when the dispute is settled we tell them that we are going to be dishonest and break our contract, that we were only fooling them, and they are to get out. In my opinion it is preposterous.

The Labrador is a matter of very serious consideration, because of the part I feel it is going to play in the future prosperity of Newfoundland, and I would be the first to advocate the retention of every acre of land for the use and benefit of the people. But I am not pirate enough to go and take land that a man has a right to, and I care not what opinions are advanced, morally it is wrong, and most laws are founded on morality! If the Leader of the Opposition and his followers consider this good tactics to use, well, I cannot congratulate them. I am perfectly satisfied that the people of this country don't want its fair name besmirched by any breach of contract such as has been suggested by the amendment brought in.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, in connection with this amendment there are just a few observations I wish to make. Apart from concurring with the statements made by the Prime Minister and particularly by the Colonial Secretary regarding the moral aspect of this question, the proposed amendment appears to be quite meaningless if not entirely ridiculous. In section one of this proposed amendment is says.

(Reads)

Now the position we take on this side of the House (and we don't say that our opinion is infallible), the position we take is that the provisions of the Crown Lands Act referred to have been complied with so far as possible. That is out position. Consequently if we are right this section will have no effect whatever on these people who have leases on Labrador —absolutely no effect. That I say is a matter of opinion. I have long held that opinion, and I know that it is shared in by the Attorney-General, who has a much greater experience than I in these matters, and I have met no one outside who has any other opinion. Consequently this section will have no effect whatever.

Take section three of the proposed amendment. Possibly there was an oversight in the drafting, but I submit that under this section, once you passed it and until repealed a person couldn't get a right or title on the Labrador anyhow. We couldn't sell Labrador or any portion of it even by Act of the Legislature. I think the person who drafted this probably omitted the clause that is in the first

section of the Bill itself, viz: "Save by Act of the Legislature of this Colony Here it says that it can't be licensed, leased, sold or given anyhow, and makes no provision for an Act of the Colony; consequently the Legislature would have to repeal this section before anything disposition could be made of Labrador or any portion of it.

Apart from these words, which are merely observations, I want to reiterate what has already been said, that I think it would be entirely without precedent in this Colony, or anywhere else as far as I know, in orderly, civilized and commendable Governments, that, holding the opinion we have, viz, that the Crown Lands Act has been complied with so far as possible, and that these licenses cannot be cancelled under existing law, that we should now, after these people have continued paying rentals, take away by the Act the rights which we led them to believe they held. I should hestitate, no matter what side of the House I was on, to think that the Legislature should be a party to any such action. It has been stated by previous speakers that they would not be parties to this, nor would I, to any Legislature which would take away rights existing under the laws of the Colony. They paid up in perfectly good faith, and we can't compensate them by paying back their money. It is stated that this Proposed Amendment would be in the interest of Newfoundland; but I say it would be to the eternal detriment of Newfoundland and a black eye for all time, from which we would never recover. I cannot concur in any such amendment as this.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises, I wish to take exception to the speech made by the Colonial Secretary, in which he made the statement that this is a dishonest suggestion. He meant this amendment which is now placed before the House by us, at the suggestion of the Prime Minister. I take exception to that remark—no one on this side drafted that measure with dishonest intentions. We are just as honest as the Colonial Secretary, and I did not expect to hear that from him. He is as dishonest as anyone. What right has he to barter away the rights of the country? What right has he as a member of the Executive to say who has or who has not complied with their leases? There is some ulterior motive in this, to safeguard people who have some interests and haven't complied with the terms.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Education" was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting an agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider matters relating to the late Sir Robert Bond's bequest.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, it is sometime now since we were in Committee on this particular subject, and I want to say again that on commenting on this bequest the hon. members of the Opposition have given their views on

agricultural and other kindred subjects, but there has been a very noticeable absence of considering the points I raised when I brought the matter up on the first occasion.

The position I take regarding this bequest is that when we got this offer of a Model Farm from the late Sir Robt. Bond, with the stipulation that it be kept as a Model Farm forever, we would be obligated if we accepted it, and in my own humble opinion I should feel so if it were offered to me privately in that way, to provide for it long after I was dead—for always, a fund sufficient to take care of the Model Farm. I consider, and other members of the House may have different opinions, that if we take this and undertake to keep it forever, that we have to get a vote of the Legislature for at least $200,000, to be perfectly sure that it be kept as a Model Farm forever. We have very often in this House talked about not legislating for anything over twenty years. We never know what may happen in twenty years, and we certainly don't know what may happen in one hundred—in that time it may not be necessary to have a Model Farm, for we may be getting manna from the sky. We don't know what may happen, and consequently I don't see how we could undertake to accept this offer under any such conditions. I haven't heard any expression of opinion from hon. members opposite as to whether we should take this Model Farm and vote an annual subsidy, and say that we are not responsible for future governments that come into power. I know there are members on this side who think that is so. Personally I do not, and I would like to have some expression of opinion from the gentlemen of the other side on that very point.

MR. GRIMES—I have stated my attitude in connection with this request before. I only wish to ask now is it fair to the members of this House, seeing that we have had this debate for several days during three weeks, is it fair that this House should not be given the information which is its due, with regard to the revenue that could be derived from the operation of this farm. Seeing that we have a Department of Agriculture and Mines, I think it is only fair to this House that this information should be given. He have heard much about the expenses that must be incurred in connection with the running of this farm and nothing about the revenue. I don't think that this is a fair way of treating propositions of this kind. The request has been made by the greatest statesman that Newfoundland has ever produced. It was given to the people of Newfoundland, if we care to accept it through this legislature, and we do not respect the memory of the late Hon. Sir Robert Bond enough to be able to go into this thing seriously, and give both sides of the question. What was emphasized in the early days of the discussion was the cost of the management. Could the country afford to run a model farm. Well we have not been given the figures as to what it would cost to run it, and I think that this House should insist that this information be given before we dispose of the matter.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to agree with the Prime Minister when he says that if we accept this bequest then we have to provide for it in perpetuity. And we cannot accept any bequest unless we are prepared to respect the obligations that go with it. But while that may be so, it does not necessarily follow that because this country has to provide certain sums of money in perpetuity to meet the expenses of the model farm, that therefore an annual loss will be entailed. I agree with Mr. Grimes when he says that we are not in possession of any facts with reference to the possible revenue to be received from that farm. The only thing that has been given us is a few bald

figures, not by any means detailed, as to the annual expense of conducting th s farm. No effort has been made to detail this expense. There has been no effort to define to this House just what a model farm is. To be quite frank about the matter I don't know. The difference between a model farm, an experimental farm, and a dairy farm are not particularly familiar to one who has not had very much to do with agriculture. I conceive it to be the duty of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to explain just what a model farm is, and in what obligations this country will be involved in accepting a bequest which requires it to conduct a model farm in perpetuity. I did suggest about a month ago that the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture should call a meeting of the farmers in the neighbourhood of St. John's, men who I presume should know more about farming matters than the average member of this House, and ascertain what the views of these gentlemen were on this subject, as to whether they think that it would benefit interests generally in this country, or whether any good would accrue to agriculture by the operation of this model farm. If they agree that it would benefit the interests of agriculture to any appreciable extent than I do say that I am prepared to vote for a measure that would place in trust a fund of $200,000 the interest on which will defray the expenses of that farm. I do not pretend to be an enthusiast upon possibilities of agriculture in this country. I am rather inclined to believe that we are not so well endowed by nature in that respect as Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island for instance. But that certain farm products can be grown in this country is beyond a doubt. And I am told that there are sections where the land is extremely fertile. Possibly the member for St. George's will corroberate that. I have always understood that considerable quantities of arable and fertile land are to be found in that District. If that be so and we can by expending $10,000 a year so encourage farming as to enable us to produce in competition with other countries those articles, for which we have to send a large sum of money out of the colony annually, then it strikes me that it would be killing the goose that lays the golden egg, if we refuse to accept a gift which under the circumstances would materially benefit the agricultural interests of the colony. I have forgotten the figures but I think that somewhere in the neighbourhood of two or three million dollars annually go out of this colony for agricultural products. It is upon these points that we need information, and that is why I suggested that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines should call a meeting of the neighbouring farmers. I regret very much that these resolutions come before this House this afternoon in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, whose duty I think it is to be here when we are discussing them. Surely if anybody should be here it would be that particular official of the Government whose duty it is to attend to agricultural matters and to see that those matters have proper and due consideration and that the necessary information is given to members of this House, who like myself know little about agriculture. I do not want our Colony to undertake anything that will not be remunerative. There has been too much of that in the past, and that is what places us where we are to-day. But before refusing this bequest which after all is a valuable one: (I suppose that it is worth $20,000 as it stands)—from a man who was actuated by the most honourable motives, and had at least some experience in farming, we should have all possible light thrown on the subject. I now suggest that this committee rise and before we proceed further, the Minister of Agriculture make

some effort to secure the information for which we asked three or four weeks ago in order that the members of this House may be in a better position to judge of the advisability or otherwise of accepting this gift.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question asked by Mr. Scammell I may say that the Rev. Dr. Bond is carrying on the farm on his own account. He wrote to me a month ago saying that the farming season is about to begin, and he wanted to know if the Government were going to accept it or not. I told him that it would not be settled until the House had an opportunity of expressing their views on the matter. We felt that it was left to the people of Newfoundland, and while the Government had to make the decision regarding it, that it was at the same time fitting that the members of the House generally should have an opportunity of expressing themselves upon it.

In reply to a question asked by Mr. Grimes, the hon. member for Twillingate as to the expenses of running the farm, that entirely depends upon how big the farm is that you are going to run. Dr. Bond considers that this farm could not be run correctly as model farm, unless we imported an expert from Canada. He would not listen to the suggestion that we had in this country farmers who could take charge of it and run it successfully as a model farm. He claimed that from Canada or somewhere else we must bring in somebody to take charge of it.

Now we may say "What has the Executor got to do with it." But the will seems to be so ambiguous that we have in deference to the testator to consider the opinion of the executor. I have a very great regard for him, and told him that we would not desire he should go back to Halifax and say that this farm was not being run as a model farm should be, that the desire of the testator was not being complied with. We have all talked a great deal about the necessity of accepting this gift because Sir Robt. Bond was a great statesman. But could we do any more harm to his memory than by accepting this gift and not carrying out the wishes of the statesman in connection with the gift that he left us. Personally I think that it would be a great deal better to refuse it. I feel that his relatives would feel exactly the same way about it.

Whilst I am not prepared to turn down the gift at the same time I want to be perfectly satisfied that this country is doing the right thing in accepting, before we make up our minds so to do. The Government will decide the matter. The Government wants to get the opinion of the country generally, and consequently an opinion from the constituencies. The Minister of Agriculture called together the farmers of St. John's. He got various opinions from these men. The Minutes of that meeting showed me that one man spoke against accepting the gift and he was I think that gentleman that questioned the motive for acceptance.

The Minister of Agriculture took a great deal of trouble in telegraphing to the large number of constituencies, and trying to get them together in the various sections to consider this proposition as well as they could with the little detailed information before them. It is rather absured to see the variety of views from those particular districts. One man said "Don't have anything to do with it, what we want is roads."

I would think a great deal more of the model farm if it was in St. George's than in Whitbourne. It does not seem to me that Whitborune is the place for people to go out and see how a model farm is conducted. The large proportion of the farmers are on the West Coast. The trouble about farming to-day is the getting of markets

for the produce of the farm. It is not the finding of new methods of farming. I think that if this country has got $10,000, it would be better to spend it on roads or the reduction of freight rates for farm products, and to try, as the Minister of Agriculture has been doing for the past two or three years to get people of one part of Newfoundland to buy produce from the other part. In other words to make the Department of Agriculture a sort of central zation for the distribution of farm products. The Minister of Agriculture himself has already told the House how last year he sold eight hundred barrels of potatoes from one section of the island that they could not find a market for. And he may be able to do the same thing this year. If by reducing the rates he has done that and if by reducing them still further, and if by organising the Department for the distribution of farm products from one part of the island to the other, we spend ten thousand dollars, I am perfectly satisfied that it would be very much better than to embark on a scheme that has already been tried on one or two occasions and has cost this country an enormous amount of money. The last model farm cost this country $100,000. I don't see why there is not a fair chance of another farm doing the same thing. Sir Robert Bond says to get a local committee in charge, keep the whole thing clear of politics, and get a man from Canada to run the farm.

I wrote away to the Agricultural College in Toronto and asked the President of that establishment what he thought about it. This gentleman said that if it is to be run as a model farm your Prime Minister is right in going slowly. It is my opinion that the information as to what it would cost to run this farm if brought into this House would convey very little to the members, for a model farm with a lot of implements and raising a lot of different kinds of produce, would cost a great deal more than simply a farm keeping a few cows, and sending milk to St. John's as Sir Robert Bond did. I don't think that the way he was conducting that farm could be called a model farm. I don't know what a model farm is. There are many kinds of farms and where the difference comes in I don't know. But we are told that this has to be kept as a model farm and it seems to be a very difficult thing to decide just what is meant. However if no member wants to say very much more on the subject I am going to move that the Chairman leave the chair, and the Government will be prepared to consider any proposition that may come from any part of this country, before we make up our minds definitely, and I think that we could get the Rev. Dr. Bond to run it for this year, and we will see what it is going to be done next year, in accepting what I don't feel inclined to accept at this moment. I know that if I had ten thousand dollars I would prefer to spend it on a breakwater in Bonavista than on a model farm. If the Chairman leaves the Chair, and it is left to the Government to decide the matter I can assure the members of this House that we will give the matter our weighty consideration before accepting this gift.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I think that it is only right that the hon. members should get an explanation of the absence of the Minister of Agriculture this afternoon. As a matter of fact it was at my request that he stayed home this afternoon. He is suffering from an attack of bronchitis. Yesterday he came down to this House with considerable difficulty. To-day I telephoned him at his house that the Buchan's Mine matter would be on. These resolutions were not expected to be on to-day.

I have discovered from an item in this evening's paper that a model farm is not an experimental farm, but

is greater than anything in Canada. All these people who give lectures about model farms have not model farms, and under the terms of this gift this farm is left us to be used as a model farm forever.

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, I was responsible for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines sending to all the farmers of the district of St. George's asking them for an expression of opinion on this matter. The farmers at Stephenville, Stephenville Crossing, St. George's, Robinson's, Crabbes, The Highlands and at Codroy Valley were asked for their views, and practically every farming section, in fact all with the exception of Crabbes rejected the offer of a model farm at Whitbourne. It is because of that I have not taken any part in the debate.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

MR. POWER—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I would like to acquaint the House that I have just received a most cheerful message from Mr. T. J. Freeman at St. George's Coal Fields:

(Reads Message)

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I think there is some ground for the matter I am about to refer to. There seems to be a growing practice on the part of Government officials in the outports to engage in business and which is not at all fair to the people engaged in legitimate trade. Now recently I received representations from my district intimating that a certain official of the Government was trading on a Government steamer and trading to the detriment of the legitimate business people. That is one instance, but I understand that this sort of thing is going on all over the country. The Government must be aware of this fact. At all events, the people generally are outspoken against it. I think the Government should cry halt to such practice and not allow civil servants engaged in a remunerative calling to be competing against legitimate business people. It is absolutely unfair and I would like a pronouncement from the Prime Minister on the subject.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member for St. Barbe has referred to this matter and no man in the civil service who receives a salary commensurate with the services he performs has any right to indulge in private business to the disadvantage of the legitimate trader. I do not know of any man who is doing it, but I will support any motion to relieve any man from his position for engaging in such a practice. There is a provision in law, I understand, against that sort of thing. Of course, there are men around the Island who act as relieving officers, but they only get about $3 a month and I do not think this objection would apply to them. At the same time I do all I can when appointing a relieving officer in my district to make sure he is not in business for himself because of the great temptation there is in the way. The Finance Committee in looking into that matter of relieving officers throughout the country and trying to re-organize it found that men who did not have stores conducted the affairs of the relief of a district more economically and efficiently than it was conducted by those who had stores. There is a general rule that it is objectionable to have a storekeeper as a relieving office. At the same time I concur entirely in the suggestion that Government officials should be kept out of business and certainly should be kept out of trading, and I would very much like if any member of the Opposition will represent a case to me.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for St. Barbe. However, I think you will find it very difficult to control men who knock off work at five o'clock every evening, that is to say, supposing a

man is energetic enough and industrious enough to work from five o'clock until late at night. I think it would be very hard to stop a man like that from engaging in other business besides his regular work.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I did not have in mind relieving officers who are poorly paid, but a Purser on a Government steamer, who was acting as an agent buying up cod oil. I could mention other concrete instances, but I just state this one offhand.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to tomorrow, Wednesday, June 22nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 22nd, 1927.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that, in accordance with the intimation received, His Excellency the Administrator would receive the Address in Reply presently.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House, and being returned to the Assembly Rooms Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had received the Address of Thanks and had been pleased to reply thereto as follows:—

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.,
22nd June, 1927.

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

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present Session was opened.

(Sgd.) W. H. HORWOOD,
Administrator.

A petition was presented by:

Hon. Colonial Secretary, from Spaniard's Bay, re roads.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of Question,

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursurant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman: When we adjourned this yesterday we had presented to us what was called an amendment to the Bill now before the Committee, but it merely is another Bill. As I pointed out yesterday I don't think that a money bill as this would be can be accepted from the Opposition, but outside of that the terms of the suggested Bill are not acceptable to the Government, and I now, therefore, suggest that we take up the original Bill and as we have already explained it, and gone into it with some amendments to Clause 2 as suggested by various members. I now move that we proceed with it.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: With the principle of the Bill that we had before us, for consideration I am in full accord, as I take it to mean the greater protection of the rights of the vast timber areas on the Labrador. The lengthly discussion that has taken place since this Bill was first introduced in relation to those who have made applications for an extension of their rights on Labrador. it would seem that the action of the Government has been considered in the nature of a compromise. I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Colonial Secretary when the amendment was introduced yesterday by the Opposition, and he thought that it was grossly immoral for an

amendment like that proposed to be attached to the Bill. Well, there are differences of opinion as to what is moral and what is immoral. The Colonial Secretary said that there was a moral issue at stake. Well, accepting the Prime Minister's statement that the amendment was dishonest, I would like to ask the members of this House, some of whom were here when the Prohibition Bill was put through this Assembly if that was dishonest? It was well known that a number of men were conducting a business according to the laws of Newfoundland, and there was not one member of this House who stood up and said that it was dishonest to go and take away business from people who were carrying on legitimate trate, and give them no compensation whatever. So I fail to see the difference between the position that was taken by this Legislature when the Prohibition Bill was introduced and the Amendment that was introduced by the Opposition in this House of Assembly yesterday. If it is proper for this Assembly to close down a business that they legalized for years and years, then it is perfectly proper to say to those holding areas on the Labrador: "Now that we find that it is more for the interests of Newfoundland to take those interests from you, and notwithstanding that we have good reason to believe that you have not conformed with the regulations governing the granting of timber leases, you have not taken a survey of the areas in which you have given the lease, you have not filed them in the Department according to the regulations the license required, you have failed to do all this and we are still prepared as Members of this Assembly to refund you the money which you have paid and to give you the interest as well, and I don't see anything else that could be done in dealing with those who have paid rentals for these areas that they have acquired on Labrador, by permission of the Governor in Council. If their contention is right where should we have been now if all those person who have been getting leases on Labrador had paid up their rentals. All this fighting made on behalf of the people of this country for the past twenty years in connection with the Labrador dispute would have been in vain. This House would not have been fighting on its own behalf, it would not have been fighting for the people of Newfoundland. It would have been fighting chiefly for the sole interests of those acquiring those lands for speculative purposes. And it would not be Newfoundland that would be getting the benefits of the territory that has been given to us by the decision of the Privy Council, it would be those who held areas on Labrador, and all the profit that we would get out of it would be the crumbs that fell from the speculators' table.

I submit that the amendment that was suggested here yesterday was far more in the interests of this country than was the position taken against that amendment, and that it was only proper on the part of the House to accept that amendment in order that the value of Labrador to to Newfoundland may be preserved. We understand that there are about eleven thousand square miles leased out at the present time on Labrador, and we have good reason to believe that that is one of the richest in timber, on the Labrador. Well supposing to-morrow we find ourselves in the position that we have got to go and find a purchaser for our timber rights on Labrador. Of what value will they be to this country if the intended purchaser finds that one-third of the best timber lands are already in the hands of those who are holding them for speculative purposes, and I am sure that the Prime

Minister feels and every member of this House feels that those people asking for those concessions have no intention as has been pointed out before of establishing any mills down there at all. What the purposes in the mind of those people when they asked for those concessions was that some day or other the demand for timber would be increasing, and it is only a question of three or four years when the paper market will adjust itself again, and we will be having demands from England and the United States for lands on the Labrador, and then we can make our pile. It is going to be a valuable asset to us and why should we sacrifice that asset. Why should we lessen its value to Newfoundland by allowing one-third of it to be held by speculators not in the interests of this country? It must be admitted by members on the other side that those interests are being held by private parties purely for their own concern. And that this House should first think of this country and not of private speculators, who are endeavouring to get this extension of time. The members of this House owe a duty to the country first. That is what we are sent here for. Before we can talk about the rights of the man who acquired those interests on Labrador, we must first think of where this country fits in with regard to the position that it is going to find itself in in the course of three or four years. I think that that matter had not been considered by all the members of this House, or else they would have taken into consideration the amendment that was proposed yesterday, and if it was not exactly as it should be, we could have perhaps made some amendment to the amendment, in order that it would better serve the interests of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we realize just what the Labrador is. I have never visited the whole of the territory myself, but I have visited a portion of it. I have not visited that portion which it is claimed of great value to Newfoundland, but I have read the accounts of men who have gone over that territory. I have read the account of a man by the name of Hickerson, a gentleman who travelled through the woods and visited Hamilton Inlet. In that account he says that there was no climate to him that was more invigorating, where the air was so balmy, and so healthful as in those places that he visited during the five or six weeks that he spent on the Labrador. He said that the timber lands there were something to him, indescribable. There were stretches of spruce and fir, and birch as far as the eye could reach. There were quantities of white spruce suitable for pulp wood of which he had not seen anything the like in his travels through Canada and the Western States, Sweden, Iceland, etc., and other parts that were similar. That is the story of a man who knows what he is talking about. He has visited other portions of the world where they are taking great interest in timberlands. He has seen those vast tracts of spruce and fir in those countries, and yet he is prepared to state over his own signature, that Labrador, around these places, and Newfoundland included, contains all those kinds of wood in greater quantities and more suitable for the manufacture of pulp than in the other countries that he visited. In his description of the Fraser River, the White Bear and another river, he saw tremenduous quantities of all kinds of wood. He said that there was sufficient quantities of berries there on the hills around these three rivers to keep all the preserve factories of Great Britain going from year to year. And he tested for himself the quantities of black berries alone. He took a piece of paper and made holes in it about three inches square, and

he found that he could pick up on the average 40 berries through a hole six inches square. That gives us an idea of the value of that property from the standpoint of berries which are more and more becoming an article of food, and when we read his description of the places in that section, and generally the people have an idea that Labrador is cold and bleak, and unsuitable to live in, but in this particular section, the climate in these places are mentioned as being equal to the best for the summer months, that he has come in contact with the world over in his travels.

Now what I would ask is this. Is it right that having an asset of that kind that we should allow three or four men to gobble up one-third of that, and all that Newfoundland is to get out of it, is $20,000 a year in rentals, when those who hold these areas may in three or four years time sell them for a price amounting to millions of dollars. If we were to handle the timber areas of this country, as Quebec does for the same quantity of land, we should be getting rentals to the total of three and a half millions yearly. Why should we come in here and sit down and calmly cast aside the suggestion that was made that we should retain our hold on that very valuable portion enclosed within that eleven thousand square miles. Here is what has been done in the Province of Ontario:

(Reads)

Now we should not give away any area in this country before we know what we are doing. We may not be able, perhaps we have not the finances sufficient to be able to survey the whole of the Labrador, but certainly we should endeavour to spend some money in surveying certain portions of it, and do so from time to time as far as our means will allow. But at least we should hold it all intact. If they are doing that in Ontario and Quebec in a similar manner, and they have found it a valuable means of getting revenue for their country, then I think that we ought to follow their example. To-day we find ourselves with a deficit of $2,500,000. To me there is no question whatever but that in the course of three or four years we ought to be getting a revenue from three quarters to one million from our timber lands. And not only does it apply to Labrador, but Newfoundland itself and I already see in this Gazette that applications have been made for the granting of timber lands around Bonne Bay, and other sections of the country, for a few men to enrich themselves at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. I submit sir, that the proper thing for the Government to do would be to decide that they are going to stop this thing up to the limit. But what they are doing is compromising themselves by saying that they are going to allow an extension of time to a certain number of persons for the next two years.

Now, Sir Patrick McGrath in his lecture in the Pitts Memorial Hall gave a very realistic idea as to what the Labrador might to be to Newfoundland. He instanced the case of Alaska being purchased by the American Government for seven million dollars, and apparently to the Russian Government it was valueless. But the United States in the course of 15 or twenty-five years found that it was worth in the neighborhood of several hundred millions, yearly. Well that territory is not as great as the Labrador. And if Alaska, a much smaller territory, is worth so much to the United States annually, what is its value likely to be to Newfoundland in the course of a similar period. We do not know what scientific methods might be introduced in another few years that will enable us to overcome those diffi-

culties that lie in the path of the development of Labrador. We may find that the airplane or the dirigible will be so developed that we will be able to go down to Labrador and carry out quantities of timber from there at a cheaper rate than it is done to-day by steamer. That may seem a fanciful picture but I submit that some things have developed within the past twenty-five years that we would look upon twenty-five years ago as a dream. But these things that were once conceived in the imagination and were never intended to be looked upon as a reality have become real, and something may happen that will facilitate the carriage of timber from Labrador to other parts of the world.

Mr. Powell, I understand, has estimated the timber areas of the Labrador at about $250,000,000, and water power at about three and a half million. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that taking all these things into consideration, we should go slowly before we attempt to barter away the rights that have been bought so dearly, for it has cost considerable sums of money to fight this before the Privy Council. And then again I have it on very good authority that offers have already been made for timber areas on the Labrador; I have been told that there are parties now ready to buy it in, in the neighbourhood of twelve and a half cents per acre in the way of bonuses, and that would net us altogether a sum of $1,-300,000. Besides that they are willing to pay the rental of $2.00 per square mile, and 25c. per thousand feet Board Measurement. If this is a bona fide offer and I don't think it would be made if there were not some financial interests behind it, and it ought to be brought to the attention of the Government. I understand that at that rate it would be worth in the neighbourhood of three millions. But if we give this away and allow these people to sell them, we are throwing away value that we ought to be getting ourselves. Are we satisfied to allow to go into speculators' pockets money that ought to go into the Treasury of this country, particularly in the position we are in to-day. And if we find that there are parties interested in this, and that it can bring in, in the next three or four years in the neighbourhood of three or three and a half million dollars, that deserves serious consideration of the Government. It shows that these people set a greater value on the Labrador than we do, for if I remember rightly the Minister of Justice stated that there was no fear of having continued ringing at the telephone by persons to find out if the Labrador was for sale or not. He took a very pessimistic view of what is likely to happen in the next seven years. In face of these parties being willing to put up a proposal that would net the sums I have mentioned—the Telegram the other day put the case in a nut-shell and it ought to be taken seriously by the Government seeing it is an organ of theirs, and represents to a certain degree the opinion of supporters of the Government. The Telegram says:

(Reads)

This is against speculation, and I take it as good sound advice, which can be taken by the Government and the country.

Mr. Chairman, we have to-day a serious proposition as far as the financial condition of the country is concerned, to face, and are we going to make it still worse by losing the value of our interests on the Labrador If we are going to give away for the next two years, for the small sum of $20,000, eleven thousand square milles of territory, we are certainly not helping the financial condition of the country as well as we might, and I think that before this Bill is disposed of, that while the

Premier may state that it is not the business of the Opposition to bring in money bills, he might accept the principles outlined in the measure, and secure for ourselves the whole of the Labrador intact so that it may be more valuable to the country than it will be with the loss of this eleven thousand square miles.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say a few words in reply to the honourable member. He seems to take no notice of the recommendations that were brought forward while this question was under discussion. We have claimed, and I still claim, that while previous governments gave away enormous tracts on the Labrador, and while they renewed for eight years rights to water power for no apparent reasons, to a big corporation and so have tied up what is probably the greatest value in one particular asset on the Labrador, the waters of the Hamilton North-West River; which they have tied up until 1933 to a big corporation, and while they gave away large tracts, we have not given away a single acre—we have not made a single grant. And in face of that this terrible accusation has been brought against us that we have compromised ourselves by catering to our friends and supporters. Now I claim, Mr. Chairman, before the House to-day, that if I were approached by the greatest enemy I have in the country, asking what rights he had under his lease, I would say that most certainly, when he couldn't build a mill during these years while he was paying a rental — when the Canadian Government would not allow him to build; when he was taking a chance and perhaps throwing his money away, if the Canadian Government happened to win—I would have nothing to tell him but that he would have to comply with the terms within the same period after the question was settled. Now these parties made their application, and we got the opinion of our Justice Department, and of lawyers in our party, and we have some pretty good ones, and there isn't one that isn't of the same opinion—and I don't believe there is one in the country — who considers otherwise than that we would be fools to go before the Supreme Court in an action to cancel these leases, and ask them to say that these people have not rights, and that after paying their rentals they had to get out. It doesn't stand in justice, to the ordinary commoner, and neither to a Court of Justice, and I don't believe there is a lawyer in town who would say that we had a dog's chance of winning. But if we did that and said that after taking their money we were going to take their licenses back, and that they could have their money back, we would be disgraced before the whole world.

MR. CASHIN—How many gentlemen or companies on the Labrador carried out as far as having a survey made, under the provisions of the Crown Lands Act?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I understand all.

MR. CASHIN—There is no record in the Department. Mr. Bradley asked the question and was told that there was no record.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is news to me. However, I say that the same argument applies. If we have been taking their money we can't possibly give it back and say that their licenses are to be cancelled.

MR. CASHIN—It might have been taken under the impression that we were going to lose the Labrador case.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That would be much worse, and almost false pretences. But because the case went for us, then we are going to cancel their rights, and take a possible action against them because they haven't built their mills.

The hon. member who just sat down Mr. Grimes, made the statement that these people have no intention of establishing mills. I want to tell the House that if they don't do so they will only lose their properties anyhow, and we will get it back. According to their lease they have to build the mill within three years; we might very well have extended to three years after the boundary question was settled, but we were even harder than that, and have said that it must be done within two years, or we will cancel. Whether we would have justice behind us in doing so or not I don't know, but it is quite possible that we haven't. But the fact remains that if they don't build in two years we will do our utmost (and any other government the same) to cancel their leases—it may be possible that we shall find out that we have no right to cancel within two years.

MR. RUSSELL—You gave an extension in 1924 for two years, which expired in September 1926, but nothing was done, and that company had another extension of time. They have done nothing, and apparently have no intention of doing anything.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They must have paid their rentals. We know they didn't carry out the terms of their lease as regards building—how could they? We have explained all that. If you consider that they couldn't build a mill, there was no point in making a survey—the whole point is that successive governments have taken their money. The grants shouldn't have been issued in the first place and there would have been no trouble. But after having taken thousands of dollars from them, we can't now very well say that they didn't carry out when we knew it to be impossible. What would have been the use of making a survey? It wouldn't help in any way at all—you would still say they didn't complete because they hadn't built their mill. You ask why we should give away areas before we know what we are doing? We haven't given any—the honourable member who has just sat down (Mr. Grimes) was a member of a Government which gave some away. Mr. Chairman, I heard the Leader of the Opposition say in righteous indignation.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, if I may interrupt. I know the honourable introducer would not wish to be unjust. But he has stated that the Government in which Mr. Grimes was a member, and of which I also was a member, was one of these that did the giving away. Now the dates of grants here are 1913, 1911, 1914, and I don't think he was a member of any Government in that time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I understood a great deal was given away during the Squires administration. I know it has been given away for years and years.

MR. HALFYARD—No, that is not correct. Squires came in in 1919, and none of these are in his time. The International Grenfell Association has a lease in 1923 which has been conformed with. Don't blame the Squires administration for everything.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I certainly don't wish to blame them for anything they haven't done. As I was saying, the Leader of the Opposition was indignant because the Colonial Secretary referred to these amendments as being dishonest. After all, I don't know why he should be so indignant on the one hand because the Colonial Secretary termed them dishonest, and at the same time we be accused of having ulterior motives in expounding the law. The suggestion has been made that we are trying to help our friends, and to put them on Easy Street, and I think that is quite as

objectionable on their part as anything the Colonial Secretary has said.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Prime Minister a question. I will read to the House a section of the Crown Lands Act.

(Reads)

Did the Government collect the extra bonus of $2.00 per square mile.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Certainly not. The very section gives the answer. For good and sufficient reasons they haven't exercised their rights.

MR. CASHIN—Yes, but even so you can collect the $2.00 extra.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In connection with this point, if I have the permission of the Prime Minister to interject a remark. That section clearly applies to a normal case. In Newfoundland to-day for example, if that is not done the only excuse would be if they could show that it was impossible to have the survey made or to get surveyors. It would be alright in a case of that sort to give an extension on paying the bonus. But in answer to the honourable member for Ferryland the point is this, that beyond paying the rentals there was no physical act that anyone could do; they couldn't build, or couldn't survey and blaze trails. They couldn't do so, first because of the attitude of the Canadian Government 25 years ago in the Dickie matter and secondly because of the Convention between the Governor-General of Canada and the Governor of Newfoundland, that nothing be done until settlement of the dispute. I make this explanation, because the difference between conditions in this country and Labrador haven't been grasped. In Labrador if an action were taken for cancellation or imposition of a fine that excuse could be made, but in Newfoundland no such excuse could be advanced.

My second point is this—that it is rather amusing to hear honourable members make the statement that the Bill is introduced through ulterior motives, and that the object is more or less to give protection and special privileges to certain people. I trust that honourable members will feel that I have too much respect for their intelligence to think that they will lose sight of the fact that if that were so the easiest thing for the Government to have done was not to have brought in the Bill at all or to withdraw it now, because without this Bill the Governor-in-Council could parcel out the Labrador tomorrow. If there was ever a case in which an administration came in and divested itself of power, this is that case. If we brought in no such proposal or if we withdrew it now, any number of people could go tomorrow and put their notice in the Gazette and the Governor-in-Council could parcel out the Labrador. Surely you can see that this is a good principle; surely you will agree that this is a marked step in advance of the old situation, and I don't think it right that that should be lost sight of. The people of the country should not be given the idea that this large and important measure has not that merit in it. I think it was Mr. Grimes who suggested that at a certain lecture a position was taken by a gentleman in the Upper House, and in the Speech from the Throne and indeed immediately after the decision was announced it was made.

As a matter of fact immediately following that first suggestion I myself must feel that a Government intending to introduce legislation to conserve the position as regards the Labrador as it is at the present time and improve it from its past situation in other respects is so placed, that surely we ought be fair enough with one another to at least say that if those people who have paid their

rentals are considered as they have been considered after very careful consideration and been put in the position they have been placed in to-day and after all the others have been by this administration, been put in the position which they were threatened to be put by previous administrations and were not by them, and taking into consideration that arising out of that fact that the Colony is threatened by an action for having done that, we ought be fair enough to say that this legislation is certainly something that ought not be treated in a way that will take from it whatever merit it has got. I want to say deliberately that I have been around this House in one capacity or another for thirty years and I have never seen yet legislation brought in by any administration that so far deprived itself of the power to do a thing that might not be in the interests of the people as this legislation does. The Government didn't have to do it. Half a dozen people could have got the whole Labrador by application in the Gazette and the Government could have allowed it; and the Government has not alone not allowed that but has come in and told the House that it feels that the situation as regards the Labrador ought to be altered. I go further and say that it is a pity in the light of experience of the past that it was not the law of the country. Honourable members have referred to the position on the Labrador in comparison with conditions in respect of timber lands in Canada. As far as our knowledge of timber laws is concerned it must not be forgotten that we are only gradually becoming educated and it is only very recently that Canada herself has become educated. (They have still the outcome there of the conflict of the export of timber from one province to another.) Only in recent years they have become alive to the situation as regards dealing with Crown Lands. We have dealt with Crown Lands altogether apart from timber and water powers, in the giving out of agricultural land in a way that has shown that the provisions of the Crown Lands Act with regard to it are entirely unsuited to Newfoundland. The provision as favored down the years is that for thirty cents an acre a man could get 160 acres of land. That was never a law properly applicable to this country. It was applicable to big prairie lands like Canada. The result has been that now there can't be got an acre of land on the West Coast and the lots will never be cultivated. One hundred and sixty acre lots are too big. These grants are away out of proportion to the size of our country, and out of proportion in particular to the size or extent of our agricultural lands. I instance this to show (as this is not a partisan matter but of individual concern) that the whole Crown Lands Act ought to be revised. It ought have been done years ago. As I am talking now a draft revision of the Crown Lands Act is in contemplation. It requires drastic legislation in the light of the experience we have had. We have only been educated in this country lately to think of things in the interior. Up to a few years ago all our thoughts were kept in sight of the sea. I would ask Honourable Members if they would be god enough to try and view the legislation in the spirit it is submitted by the Government. It is not protective legislation in the sense of individual interests. It is exactly the opposite. It is protective legislation for that section of the Labrador which we say in the light of our lack of knowledge of it, in the light of our lack of knowledge as to its worth, for all we know about it is merely conjecture in respect of that, we shall conserve for the people by allowing it to be granted only by the Legislature. I do think that we are making a long

step forward if we see eye to eye and put this legislation into effect. I feel quite satisfied that on second thought Honourable Members opposite will realise that for a legislature to come in and take the position suggested is a step that I certainly in any responsible capacity wou ld not alone declare wrong but would certainly have to oppose in the most earnest way. I think the whole object and whole result of the Bill is at least to ensure that this Government which you are naturally so glad to criticise, and we don't blame you for doing it, that this Government, which if you want to put it that way, has so little confidence in itself, and feels itself so absolutely dishonest that it thinks that overnight it might make away with the Labrador, be made unable to deal with rights on the Labrador except that it be done by the Legislature. We ask you then to put through this Bill and consider it that way if you will. Nothing could be fairer than that.

MR. RUSSELL — Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that it was well known by all timber limit holders on the Labrador that the Canadian Government had prevented the Dickie Company from erecting a mill; and considering the further fact that in 1924 this Government granted an extension of time of two years to a certain company, why did they a few weeks ago get a further extension of time?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Will you allow me to answer that question? The reason why they got it then was because we thought the Labrador case was going to trial three years ago.

MR. RUSSELL—What I fail to understand is this: Why the Government in 1924 granted an extension of time to this Company? They wrote a letter as follows:

(Reads)

Now that couldn't be any plainer. The two years expired in 1926, and still nothing was done, and now in April or May this year the same Company is given a further extension of time, the excuse being that the Labrador boundary is settled. I don't understand how that can be worked out. I don't understand the reason for that. If they got an extension of time in 1924, why did they ask for it if they thought they couldn't carry out the terms of their lease, and when they didn't do it what is the necessity for the Government to grant them another two years? I refer now to the Labrador Pulp and Lumber Company. I direct my question to the Prime Minister.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It is not quite fair to ask that question of the Prime Minister; it is really a question of law. I don't object to the Honourable Member not appreciating the point I want to make, just the same as he would excuse me for knowing nothing about a newspaper. The Honourable Member must appreciate the connection that these people asked for an extension in the hope that this matter would be through by then and that we thought the case was coming on for trial at that time. The second time they asked was when they drew attention to non-compliance. Might I say this to the Honourable Member? If he was going to finance a company such as these people would have he very probably would require full information, and outside people having no knowledge whatever of the situation here would require to be assured that what would appear to them as a noncompliance with conditions was a matter that was clear with the administration of the day. That is all that is to it.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, if the Crown Lands Act had not been complied with, why did the Government decide to grant these extensions of the terms of the leases? Strict compliance with the law cannot be the explanation of this extraordinary action of the Ex-

ecutive Council. It would really be a reason for non-interference. I judge from the remarks made by Hon. Mr. Cramm that the complete requirements of the Act had not been carried out and that the additional time has been allowed so that they may do, according to law, the things they have not hitherto done or attempted to do. Is the Executive Council competent to grant such extensions It occurs to me that they favor people who have not kept the law. How can the Executive Council, in effect, condone non-observance of a Statute?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, the extension is of no value. We will get those lands back in two years' time and I am afraid there is not going to be a flock of aeroplanes over night in the interim with people to build mills there. Any man who wants to go to the Labrador and build a mill there will get my consent without any hesitation whatever. So far as the Government is concerned, the reason why we set the minds of the people who hold licenses on the Labrador at rest is because we did it with the full consciousness that people who are putting up the money are not likely to rush here with their money and with the same spirit that some people think.

The present Bill does not alter the legal situation at all. As to the meaning of the section of the Bill under discussion, Opposition members can interpret it as I can. It is merely a declaration to assert that nothing is done that affects any rights a person has got. If they have not got the legal status already, this Act does not give it to them. This Act is made in the interests of the country and to avoid possible consequences otherwise.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, now that the ownership of the Labrador has been definitely decided on, a great many speculators are looking with avaricious eyes on the possibilities of exploitation there, and I take it that it is our bounden duty to let nothing stand in our way, except our honour, in order to realise the utmost value of the areas of the Labrador territory we hold, for the betterment of Newfoundland. During the past few years various licenses have been granted to different people, and I claim that if the conditions under which those leases were given had not been carried out then we should strive to regain the territory over which those licenses apply. That is, of course, a legal matter, and, I take it, the Government of Newfoundland is not afraid to stand for any legal action in that matter. The Bill itself looks quite innocent and I do not say it is not; but before legislating on Labrador I think we should get a better idea than we have to-day of what value the Labrador is to us. In other words, before granting future licenses or giving extensions on present licenses, we should know what we are giving extensions for and we should know what is the value of the property. We have within the past decade spent a lot of time and money in upholding our rights on the Labrador, and it would be a thousand pities if all this time and money were to be wasted and if we did not show something for our investment. As far as I can see Newfoundlanders generally are wondering why we are bringing in any legislation about Labrador at this time, and they are looking with suspicion upon this legislation. I would suggest that before we proceed further with this Bill, and before issuing any more licenses we should have a Labrador programme defined and approved of. In brief, I would suggest to the Government the suspension of all privileges on the Labrador, other than the fisheries, until a proper Labrador policy is drawn up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in response to the observations of the last speaker, I may say

that what he has suggested is exactly what the Bill does. It prohibits any further privileges on the Labrador, except the fishery, without the sanction of the Legislature and until such time as a survey is properly made, and we know exactly what we own on the Labrador coast. As I stated in Committee yesterday, before I would be a party to taking action against those people who did not build mills I would resign my seat in the Government. Now suggestions have been thrown out that I was interested particularly in this measure because a relative of mine happened to hold some property in Lewis Bay and property which is generally conceded to be some of the most valuable on the Labrador. But I would like to point out that I never had a conversation or an interview with anybody on this matter nor did I make any suggestion as to legislation before the Executive Council. I never even bothered who owned the property. I simply viewed the matter as other members of the Government did, including Mr. Bradley, who sat on that Committee, and his views were the same as we had. The purport of these views were that when the Labrador Boundary question was settled that these people who held licenses were to go ahead with their pursuits and build mills and have surveys. Now I think this is a proof of the good faith of the Government that almost the moment after the Labrador Boundary question was settled the Government, through the Justice Department, began to take up the matter of conserving the Labrador for the country. Now we bring in a Bill and there is a suggestion of ulterior motives behind it. I would not like to suggest that there will be ulterior motives behind the Opposition members and that because they think they will soon be in power that they will be able to divide it up amongst themselves. This is a Bill that is in no other sense than to protect the Labrador and I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that it is good legislation and should be allowed to go through.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, ever since this Bill was introduced some weeks ago it has caused the greatest interest, as the subject—the value of the Labrador to Newfoundland—no doubt, has occupied the minds of the people in Newfoundland, that is, those who have any knowledge of anything that has transpired in connection with that country.

The question has been asked "What is the value of Labrador to Newfoundland? We were all enthusiastic in our expressions of congratulation to anyone who had any connection with the trial that was decided before the Privy Council in connection with the ownership of Labrador. We thought that we did come into undisputed right of territory millions of dollars in value, but I must say that those who have followed the debates in this House are very disappointed, and I find from the speeches made by the Prime Minister and legal men on the Government side, that it is very difficult for us as a country to reclaim the timber rights that have been granted in the past to certain people. Now it is not right for us who are supposed to be an intelligent people to be talking for the sake of argument about this very important question. The principle of the bill is important and no doubt all agree with it. But the second clause has given us an opportunity of discussing the timber lands of Labrador and all around it, the argument has centered it seems. As the debate proceeds we get more and more disgusted from day to day over the actions of the Newfoundland Government in relation to those who hold licenses. I really thought that the licensees had not conformed to the conditions of the lease. And that was the thought that was uppermost in my mind until yes-

terday evening when the Hon. Mr. Cramm who is a lawyer, stated that the Government took the position that the Crown Lands Act had been complied with, and therefore the amendment was without effect.

THE HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, my recollection as saying and what I intended to say was that these licensees had complied so far as possible.

MR. HALFYARD—Perhaps that is what you did say, but I took you down. Now it is questionable whether they have even complied with the terms of the licenses as far as they could. I cannot see why they could not have complied with some part of the agreement in connection with the survey. But they have not even blazed a trail or gone over the ground at all. I don't think that there has been any attempt made by the licensees to carry out the terms of the agreement.

Evidently a strong argument in favour of the Bona Fides of the claims of the licensees is, that if the Government should interfere with them and try to take away their licenses they would be subject to damage. Now I think that it would be in the interest of the country, and I suggest that we should have very definite opinions. This is a question which affects Newfoundland more than any other question that has been brought before this Legislature. If we cannot get in possession of the eleven or twelve thousand square milts of timber land on Labrador, then I think that there is something in the statement supposed to have been made by Premier Taschereau that "their victory is a fruitless one." Now with regard to turning that property into cash, I am afraid that some of us will not live long enough to participate in the fruits of the great possession that is ours. As to the idea of selling the Labrador, with one third of the best timber lands under license and owned by somebody else, we shall never make a sale of Labrador. The only hope now is of some one developing these timber lands down there, erecting mills and manufacturing pulp, and that is a far-fetched idea I think. But of course in the distant future if the timber will continue in demand for paper, and the areas that now produce timber for making paper become depleted ,then of course timber lands will become more valuable, and they won't mind the extra cost of getting it away from the Labrador.

It is a serious matter for us to have to contemplate or realise that we do not own the timber lands on the Labrador. The only object that the opposition had in mind when they suggested amendments to this bill was to get an expression of opinion as to whether it was possible for us to buy these timber lands back by compensating those who had paid rentals for them to the Newfoundland Government. I don't think that any member on either side of this House would after due consideration, attribute dishonest motives to anyone in this House for suggesting anything that was not in the interests of this country. We firmly believe that if the paying back of rentals which would mean anywhere from half a million to a million dollars, that that would be money well spent if we could get a clear title to those timber lands.

As far as I am concerned, and I think that I can speak for all those on the opposite side, the only object the opposition had in bringing in this amendment was that if this House thought that there was anything in that, and that a bill could be drawn along these lines, then we thought that it would be in the best interests of the country to do so. We have to approach this subject in the spirit of justice to ourselves. We may have reason to criticise the actions of the present Government, but criticism is

not much good unless you can offer suggestions to the remedy of the mistakes that you claim have been made. It is no good to blame the past Government for what they did. Since I have had the honour to have a seat in this House of Assembly certain things have been done, certain laws have been put on the Statute book. At the time it was thought to be in the best interests of the country, but time has shown, as we have had more experience in the operation of these laws, that perhaps mistakes have been made. Even the experience I have had, (and I have had a little) has been that anyone criticising a government always says "You shouldn't have done this or that," and would make it appear that they have intentionally been lacking. That is all trash. The Government of Sir Edward Morris was criticised for building the branch railways in the country, and I suppose that the party of Sir William Whiteway or whoever was connected with the main line, was criticised as foolish. During the years of depression, in 1920, 1921 and 1922 I feel sure that if there hadn't been Branch Railways to Bonavista Bay, Bay-de-Verde and other places, they would have been built then, instead of building roads to Badger and Deer Lake. What is the good of a country unless it is developed, and what was uppermost in the mind of Sir Edward Morris at the time, was to open up the timber and mineral resources. We find that perhaps it was a mistake, and that nothing has developed in our forests and mines thereby to any great extent. I suppose that in Sir Edward Morris' day, according to the date of the leases here, he was a sinner in this regard, in that leases were granted in his regime. They go back to 1922, then to 1912 and 1913, 1915 and 1916, during the administration of Sir Edward Morris, and in 1914. Possibly there were leases since then; I have been mixed up with Governments, but I don't remember if there were any new leases granted. I know that in some of the Governments I have been a member of, the attitude of the Attorney-General was to do nothing with the Labrador, and if he could cancel he would do it. I know one Minister of Justice I had the greatest respect for, who put his foot down on everything of that kind. So the personnel of the Opposition can't be accused of giving away the Labrador.

If I could be satisfied that nothing could be done; that the Government can do nothing to get back these leases in an honorable way, I wouldn't continue talking further on this subject, because I have no criticism to offer of the principle of the Bill that we are supposed to be talking about. The first clause of the Bill deals with the granting of timber limits of the Labrador by the Legislature and the Legislature only; I am told by those who ought to know that the second Clause is negative and better in that not, and I am satisfied. But the question of timber limits on the Labrador is so important that I hope the time I am spending on it is not in vain. To lighten my laborious efforts in talking to this serious and important measure regarding timber on Labrador, I would refer to a remark made by the Hon. Minister of Justice. I asked him what legal or other rights the Executive Government had to extend the period for carrying out the terms of these leases, and if I understood his reply, he said that they had the right to carry out the honest wishes of the country, that is to put in effect what the country would do. You felt that the country would like you to do what was right, and what was right was to give an extension of two years on the Labrador.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It wasn't extension.

MR. HALFYARD — It wasn't extension? But, Mr. Chairman, to

understand that it was not an extension, one must have the mind of the Hon. Minister of Justice or of the Hon. Prime Minister, who also says it wasn't an extension. But to the mind of an ordinary individual, the literal meaning given to it in the letters of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and the Deputy Colonial Secretary is acceptable, and they would say it was an extension.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have been talking about honesty and dishonesty, morality and immorality of the action of the Government in dealing with people who had timber limits on the Labrador. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the correspondence passed between the license holders and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Executive Government through the Colonial Secretary, have been interpreted by all the persons who have read the correspondence and by the people who received the replies themselves from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, that an extension had been granted—they believed that they had a bona fide extension for two years to carry out the terms of their leases. Is it honest to so mislead these licensees? Further, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, in reply to an interjection from this side, said that he gave them these letters because they, just like anyone else, would like to have them. Gave it to them just like we give candy to a baby—gave them an all-day sucker! While they have these letters which mean nothing they will be quiet. To please them and salve your conscience you gave them these letters, and to let them think they had something valuable. Now then, if you were honest, would you do these things? I think from the statements of the Minister of Justice, that it was merely something to show outsiders to lead them to believe they had something valuable. To deceive poor investors of money in England! That is to fleece the poor honest investor of money in England. Is there anything honest about such an action as that, to deceive the poor people who have money and want to invest it and who are told by a man who has received a letter from the Executive Government of Newfoundland that he has two years in which to erect a mill, his statement being proved by the letter. A man having that letter from the Executive may ask people in England, the United States or elsewhere to invest their money in a project, saying that he has a valuable property on the Labrador. If they ask does he own it he says he has a letter which he got when he asked the Executive Government to grant him an extension of time to allow him to make his title complete by erecting a mill and he produces the document showing that he has been given two years, to do so. But the Minister of Justice says it wasn't worth the paper it was written on.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I didn't say any such thing. I said no act of ours could change the law.

MR. HALFYARD—You are on the horns of a dilemma. To be a party to giving a document, signed, sealed and delivered, from the Executive Government of Newfoundland to the unsuspecting people of other countries so that they could invest their money! You say it wasn't an extension at all. You had no legal right to do that; no legal right to extend the license. Hon. Col. Sec't'y made a remark in connection with the amendment. I don't suppose the Colonial Secretary would say it on second thoughts. In the heat of debate in the interest of the cause we all sometimes unthinkingly make some remarks that on second thoughts would be withheld. It was said however by somebody that the Hon. Colonial Secretary thought that there was a dishonest motive behind the amendment brought in yesterday.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I don't think I said a dishonest motive. I am glad to be given this opportunity to explain myself. What I wanted to infer is that an action of that kind to go and cancel leases when the holders had lived up to their contracts I consider would be nothing more than dishonest. Mr. Grimes said that I said the thing was immoral. I didn't say it was immoral. I said it was morally wrong. I still consider it to be morally wrong. I don't suppose there is any immorality or dishonesty in the Opposition ranks, nor do I think that any such construction can be put on my words. I merely said that we would be acting dishonestly if we broke a contract when these people had lived up to their side of the agreement.

MR. HALFYARD — The Colonial Secretary has explained the matter very satisfactorily to me at any rate. There is nothing dishonest about our intentions, but I wish that the same could be said with regard to the actions of the present Government in granting extensions to license holders. These letters conveying the idea of extensions could be used to get money from unsuspecting people. I say this action was most dishonest. I don't know what about the motive behind it, but the outcome was most dishonest. As certain correspondence was referred to by the Hon. Member for Ferryland from the London-Labrador Corporation, Limited, addressed to Hon. W. J. Walsh, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, written 30th of May, 1927—so that clause "e" or "f" will not be left out I will read the whole lot:

(Reads)

One would gather that the London-Labrador Corporation, Limited, which is situated at St. James' St., London, would have expert legal opinion as to whether they could retain their licences or not without appealing to the Newfoundland Government.

(Reads)

That admits that there is a right to enforce certain clauses of the agreement. They want to know whether the Newfoundland Government is going to enforce them or not. When legal opinions differ in this country we go outside for expert opinion. I don't see why they should take the trouble if they were sure they had a right. That is why I think there is some legal right to carry out the spirit of the amendment that was presented by the Opposition yesterday—the spirit, not necessarily the letter of it.

There are two sides to every question. If it was a straight business proposition we might take the opinion of the Hon. introducer of the Bill, the Prime Minister. Two individuals may have entirely different views on almost any question. I beg to differ from the opinion of the Hon. Minister of Justice that in writing those letters and assuring them the granting of an extension on paper that you were putting into effect the honest opinion of the electorate of the country. I think it is absolutely contrary to the wishes of the people of the country. They have been hoping and praying and looking forward to the acquisition of the Labrador to help them in these hard times, and now they find it is all thrown away, and before the Labrador will be any use to us it will be years and years, and there is nothing left for them but to pack their bags and get out, for the years of depression are still with us.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received

and adopted and it was ordered that the Committe have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of this House until Monday, I wish to say that I do not want to detain the business of this House, but we have some matters of considerable importance to attend to in the next few days with the representatives of the International Pulp and Paper Company who are in the city now, in order to try to come to some sort of arrangement with them so that they might know whether they are going to stop here or not. While we have been in conference with them almost every night during the last week until 12 o'clock, we will be again for such extra time as will be necessary, and as Friday will be a whole holiday anyway, I thought that we might adjourn until Monday, when I hope to be able to bring in, in the early part of the week, some suggestions, if not the actual bills themselves, in connection with these larger matters.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, June 27th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 27th, 1927.

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

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURN—Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was before the House in Second Reading I went on record as being in full accord with the principle of the Bill. I hold in my hand a copy of a license issued to the London Corporation Limited in the year 1924 to cut timber on the Labrodar. In perusing this document I find that the London-Labrador Corporation Limited was given this license to cut timber, and, in consequence of being granted this license, there are certain conditions here which this Corporation is called upon to fulfill. One of them is that they have to pay to the Government an annual rental of $1,024.00 per year, that is, $2.00 for every square mile, of a total of 512 square miles. In addition they have to pay a royalty at the rate of 25c. per thousand feet, board measure, for all trees cut down for every year during the continuance of this license. Furthermore they are required to commence operations within one year and complete within three years from the first of August 1914 the erection of a saw mill which must have an output of not less than 51,000 feet of lumber every twenty four hours or to expend the sum of $26,000 00 in the erection of a pulp and paper factory or mill and the erection of which to begin within two years. Further down in the license I find that it is hereby further declared and agreed that this license is granted under and is subject to the provisions of the Crown Lands Act and the Acts in amendment thereof, and it stipulates that if the London-Labrador Corporation Limited should default in the performance of any of the conditions herein contained that this license shall be null and void and the timber licensed shall revert to the

Crown. I think that every member with.n hearing of my voice knows that the conditions under this license have not been fulfilled and it seems to me that, under that contract, this license is forfeited. It is true that the Government has continued to collect the annual rental from th.s Corporation and it is argued that on account of the payments of these rentals that this license still holds good. According to this document, it is expressly stated that if the conditions are not fulfilled the l cense becomes null and void, and it is a question in my mind as to the validity of the Government receiving rentals from any person or any corporation and whether or not it is legal for these people to hold that lease. If the Government cla m it is right, it is very strange to me and I cannot understand it. I would also like to point out to the Government that all those years while the Labrador Boundary question had been in abeyance the timber licenses held by those parties increased in value from year to year and I think .t is only right and proper to expect that if those people should be given a clear title to their lands and leases on the Labrador that the Government would be perfectly right in expecting this corporation to pay royalties which would have accrued if they had carried out the terms of their contract. The reason why these licenses are issued at all is in order that the forest on the Labrador might be utilized to provide employment and not simply to hold them for speculative purposes. In other words a man goes and appl es to the Governor-in-Council for a grant say of 500 square miles. He pays a certain sum and in addition a royalty of $2.00 per square mile per year. Besides that he is required to erect a mill and that mill is erected so that a certain quantity of timber, as laid down in the license, might be cut each year and on the amount of timber cut—the minimum output is laid down in the license—the Government collects a royalty. Now in the case of th.s license of the London-Labrador Corporation Limited I have figured out that the royalty which would be due to the Government if that mill had been erected and if they had cut the stipulated amount of 51,000 feet of lumber daily would be in the vicin ty of $3,800.00, as against the rentals of $1,024.00. By that it will be seen that the royalty is a far bigger amount than the rentals.

If it is argued that these people who hold licenses on the Labrador should hold those licenses then certainly it is only fair to expect that seeing that the timber areas have become more valuable each year, that they pay us at least the royalties which would have been due us if their contract had been carried out. I don't think there is anything illogical about that. The argument may be put forward that if these parties went down on the Labrador to operate that they would not be able to sell the timber that they sawed. I submit that that has nothing to do with this country. If a man enters into a contract by wh.ch he is supposed to erect a mill and cut so many feet of lumber per day and if he can't sell that timber then that is his affair and not ours. What we are looking for is the royalty on that. A few days ago when this Labrador question was up, I made the remark that if the Government enforced the Crown Lands Act that there wouldn't be any unemployment in Newfoundland. The Prime Minister asked me what I meant by enforcing the Crown Land's Act. I don't understand, and I fail to see why in Newfoundland as well as in Labrador the Crown Land's Act is not enforced. If these people hold valuable timber rights it is only right and proper for us to expect them to operate and to carry out their obligations of the contract as well as we should do so, but as has already been stated in the House, the majority of these areas

have been held for speculative purposes, and the person who goes and gets the lease just holds it until he can get somebody to come in and take it off his hands and then he makes a clean up. Surely these licenses should be cancelled, because the conditions have not been fulfilled. It says in the license itself that if the conditions are not fulfilled the license is null and void and of no effect. I have figured out the amount of money that would have to be paid by the Government to holders of areas on the Labrador who have paid their rentals in full, and I find that the amount would be roughly about three hundred thousand dollars. I have also figured up the value of the areas on the Labrador and I find that it approximated at least ten million dollars worth. Now Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Government that they take up this matter seriously as regards royalties and see whether or not we can claim the royalties which are accruing under these leases and licenses, but I fear very much that the Government has committed itself in that they have granted an extension, which we are told is not an extension, of two years to erect saw-mills etc. In that word etc., I see a loophold whereby those people who might have been forced to pay royalties on the timber which they should have sawn and which timber to-day is there on the Labrador and is more valuable year by year, because if not sawn it grows and increases and naturally is becoming more valuable on account of not being cut over. The Minister of Justice may tell me that it is stipulated in the licenses that they must erect a mill with the capacity of cutting fifty-one thousand feet of timber per twenty-four hours, but it is not obligatory on their part to cut this much. I know there is an option there that they can spend a certain amount of money on the area, and that may be another loophole. In my opinion there should be a minimum in all these contracts and licenses by which the holders of those licenses should be bound. Another point that has been brought out during the course of the debate is that there have been no surveys made on properties that have been held on the Labrador. As I understand it, the Act calls for surveys being made within one year, and I fail to see how the Government can claim that the parties to licenses have carried out the terms of their contract. I believe in the sanctity of contract, but I also believe that when a man is under an obligation to carry out certain things we should see that he carried out his side of the bargain just as well as we should carry out ours. I would suggest that the Government take steps immediately to enforce the Crown Lands Act, not only in Labrador but also here in Newfoundland and parties who hold leases here and licenses to cut timber either here or in Newfoundland and who don't carry out the terms and obligations of their licenses should have those licenses cancelled. The Attorney General said a few days ago that it looked as if in a few years we would have all these properties coming back on our hands again.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I said I feared so.

MR. ASHBOURNE—It may be so but I am very doubtful. However, I say that it is only right and proper that the Government should be firm in this matter because these areas on Labrador and licenses are granted under certain specific conditions which are mentioned in the license. We are told that no further areas will be given on Labrador for such a small rental as two dollars per square mile, and I agree with the Prime Minister in that remark that it is an absurd amount to pay for timber licenses. If on the other hand the holders of these areas find that the Government is weak and doesn't insist on their keep-

ing to their bargain then the chances are that they are going to apply to some other Governor-in-Council to grant further extensions of time to erect their mills. If that can be done I would like to know the authority by which any Governor-in-Council can extend the time and furthermore if it can be done I would suggest that a paragraph be inserted in the present Bill which would prohibit any Executive Government giving any further extensions as regards carrying out the Crown Lands Act. We are told that there may be a legal battle as far as the Labrador is concerned in relation to those whose applications had been approved pending the settlement of the Labrador award. To my mind, if the people who had paid their rentals have a claim those who have not paid any rentals have absolutely no claim whatever.

We have a railway here in Newfoundland and when we took it over from Reids', as I understand it, I speak subject to correction, no land was given with the railway then owned by the Reid-Newfoundland Company so that the cutting of railway ties could be provided for, for the railway, and the result is that we have the railway and the Reid-Newfoundland Company has timber limits which were given with the railway (for that purpose) and now to-day we have to go and buy from the Reid-Newfoundland Company, railway ties in order to use them for the railway.

The cost of winning the Labrador is no small item and I trust that the Government will see that those who hold areas on the Labrador carry out the terms of their contracts without any further extensions in order that the Colony may be able to recoup some of the money that she has spent in getting the Labrador award in her favour.

The Attorney General said a few days ago that "no act of the Government could change the law." When I sit down perhaps he will be good enough to explain how in view of the fact that these obligations that are incumbent upon the holders of areas in Labrador have not been fulfilled, how it is that these licenses are not null and void as is mentioned in these licenses. To my mind, (I am not a lawyer) but it seems to me very clear, that if it says in this license that should the terms and obligations and conditions mentioned here not be carried out and should the holder make default—then the license is void.

(Reads)

I don't intend to talk at greater length on this question at the present time but I would suggest that the Government take up this matter particularly as regards royalties because I fail to see why the Colony should not benefit considerably in that respect.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would just like one word of explanation. I know of nothing in the shape of royalties except the export duty that would be paid for wood going out of the country and if they didn't export from the timber limits on the Labrador they naturally wouldn't have to pay royalty. I don't know any other royalty that applies. As regards the other terms of the contract we have gone over that I think so many times that everybody thoroughly understands that it was a physical impossibility for them to carry out the terms of the lease and consequently they didn't do it.

Now it has come to my notice since we were in debate on this question last that in 1921 an Act was passed called "An Act respecting the exportation of timber." In that Act there is a clause which refers to the export of wood respecting Labrador.

(Reads: Sec. 3 Sub-sec. 2 of Act)

That was a clause put in I think deliberately for nothing else but to give rights to these people who had

rentals paid, even possibly who didn't have rentals paid; and without their erecting a mill.

MR. CASHIN—That Act is restricted to five years. I think it went out of operation in January 1927.

MR. HALFYARD—That was passed merely to help the situation in times of stress that then were.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is the opinion of an eminent lawyer that the clause was put in specifically for the purpose of protecting parties who were holders of licenses on the Labrador.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, just in amplification of the point the Prime Minister has just made I would like to add a few words to what he has said. In demonstration of the attitude taken by previous administrations with regard to licenses on the Labrador it was cited that in 1921 this Act with regard to Labrador permitted the export of wood from Labrador without a time limit because of the generally accepted position that people were not going to build with the dispute still on. A very clear line is drawn between the export of wood from Newfoundland which is limited to five years and from Labrador and that is the whole point. That shows that the Legislature in 1921 accepted the position that the only hope of getting any results from any limits on the Labrador was to abandon all thought of a power to compel people to put up mills in view of the dispute and allow them instead to export timber. That is the point of the Act and in that sense it is valuable in showing that the accepted position down the years was that these people because they were unable to comply with their agreements with regard to a mill were not considered liable to forfeiture on that account.

Mr. Ashbourne asked if I would give some explanation as to what I meant by the statement that the Executive Government could not change the law. I mean nothing more than just the exact words in it. The Executive Government can't change the law.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The point I want an explanation on was in connection with the license which reads that in default of the performance of the conditions therein it shall become null and void.

(Reads.)

How does the Government consider that these licenses are fully in effect?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —

I don't want to appear to be discourteous, and if the honorable member will not think me so since there are so many poins arising out of that, I would suggest that he put his question to-morrow, say, to some competent lawyer who will explain to him the difference between conditions in a lease which automatically entitles the lessor to cancel and conditions in a lease that do not carry that penalty. I do not know that there is much to be gained by discussing the technical situation in the House.

With regard to the discussion of these matters, in view of the fact that the Government is threatened by an action for having repudiated the licenses on which renals had not been paid, we do not want to do more than leave these people to their own recourses. It is rather interesting to remark that in connection with that situation that while statements have been made quite confidently and clearly that these people have no rights at all, that opinion is not accepted by all. I don't say they have any. I have advised the Government that the people who have not paid rentals have no rights, but it will be rather interesting to discover that very eminent lawyers in this city have accepted retainers and have announced their intention of taking legal steps to assert that these people have rights. I only mention that to show that other people are not as

clear on the position as we are. The contention of the Government is that these people have no rights, not having paid their rentals, but very competent legal advisers have apparently advised their clients the other way.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, before we pass on to further consideration of this matter, I desire to make some comment with reference to the Act quoted by the Prime Minister a few moments ago as a ground on upon which he bases the position which the Government takes with regard to the alleged rights of holders of Labrador limits at the present time. In the first place this Act in company with three or four others that appear on the immediately preceding and succeeding pages was passed, as the honourable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, has remarked, in time of stress, and not with a view to in any way alter any rights of individuals holding leases or limits on the Labrador and who had not carried out the terms of their contracts, but rather for the purpose of making it possible, if it could be made possible, to induce some person or persons to undertake the cutting and exportation of timber in Newfoundland in order that labour might be provided to relieve the stress of the times. The Act quoted is by no means the only Act on the subject at that time. There is an Act, immediately preceding, entitled "An Act to Amend the Crown Lands Act," which is technical in its character and not to the point just now; then there is the Act "Cap. 24: An Act respecting the cutting and exportation of timber for special purposes;" and then there is an Act "Further respecting the exportation of timber," and then the Act to which the Prime Minister referred, entitled "An Act respecting the exportation of timber;" then the next Act is "An Act respecting the exportation of codfish," and I submit if I were to go through the volume of Statutes I would find numerous Acts proposing to do something that might possibly induce persons to undertake operations that would give labour that was so badly needed in that year of grace 1921. Now, to come to this particular Act to which reference has been made, I feel that I will have to read a portion of it again in order to be clear on it.

(Reads.)

It does not say "Notwihtsanding anything in the Crown Lands Act, 1923, or the amendments thereof." It has nothing to do with the cutting of timber under the Crown Lands Act, or the making of pulpwood under the Crown Lands Act.

(Reads.)

Now that, I think, means this, that under the circumstances in Newfoundland (this has no reference to Labrador) conditions were such that the Government were willing to give concessions to holders of licenses who would not carry out the Crown Lands Act in order that labour be obtained. Section 2 says:

(Reads.)

In other words nothing in this Act shall in any way affect the rights of any timber holders under the Crown Lands Act, nor affect their obligations thereunder. That seems to me to be plain, sir, and I think that it does not require a lawyer at all to see the point that I was trying to make just now. Now as regards Subsection 2, Section 3:

(Reads.)

That is all very well, but have they cut it. If they had they would have applied to be permitted to export it, but they have neither exported it or cut it at all.

(Reads.)

Now did they cut it, that is the question. There would be no infringement of the Act if they had not cut. Surely the fact that you have failed to take advantage of the power that

was given you under this Act of 1921 does not surely involve the loss of any right that you may have had by reason of the failure of these people to carry out their obligations under the original license. Particularly in view of the preceding section which points out that this Act does not affect any rights or obligations under any contract, and this license is a contract. One would well understand that judging by the attitude that the Government have taken since these resolutions were brought before this House that a superficial observer would come to the conclusion that this persent administration was more than solicitous in their desire to see that everybody got fair play. The insistence with which they reiterate their attitude with respect of the payment of rentals by these people; the enthusiasm with which they referred to the fact that th people had paid their money in good faith, and that even if the Government was in a position at the present time which enabled them to take those rights from these people, such an action would be dishonourable, and would make it appear to anyone who did not delve very deeply into the question that this administration was prepared to do the straight thing by everybody. That is the reputation, sir, which the hon. gentlemen who compose the present administration endeavour to obtain for themselves at this moment, but to which they are not entitled in view of the fact that, while they are prepared to carry out what they deem to be the obligations of the Government, they are unwilling to enforce the country's rights against speculators. Now we have unfortunately to admit that during the past three years they have failed to carry out their promises to the people of this country. If obligations, whether moral or legal, were so binding upon the present administration as they would have us believe that these present obligations are, then why is it, sir, that during the past three years they have failed ignominiously, in fact never attempted, to carry out those things which they undertook with the electorate to do three years ago. The mere onlooker may mistakenly conclude that their attitude in the present connection is the nature of the repentance which the thief on the cross exhibited some two thousand years ago, but of one goes a little deeper, it is quite apparent upon the consideration of the persons, whose apparent rights the Government desires so earnestly to preserve, that their attitude is in line with their whole conduct of public affairs during the past three years, and their motive the preservation of the rights of capitalists of this and other countries at the expense of the rights of the people. It is not a moral attitude that they have adopted for the direct purpose of preserving the honourable name of Newfoundland. It is not even a deathbed repentance for the past sins of the Government and an endeavour to do right. It is a continuation of the policy that has characterised them since their birth.

Now, sir, even at the expense of wearying this House I do propose to go into this matter a little deeper this atfernoon. I want to say here that any right that the Newfoundland Government has to deal with Crown lands was received from this Legislature, when the Crown Lands Act was passed and amendments made thereto. This Act deals with every conceivable kind of land. Whether timber, bog, agricultural land, water power, or minerals, the whole subject of land grants is dealt with by the Crown Lands Act, and the powers of the Governor in Council are specified therein. And outside these powers he has no right to go. Now it would be interesting for a moment to consider what motives actuated our Legislature in introducing and pass-

ing this Act. We had at that time a very considerable amount of Crown lands upon which there was growing valuable timber and underneath the surface of which there would probably be found valuable minerals, and near the surface of which were valuable bog lands, and in various portions of which we have valuable water powers. All these assets which belonged to the people were lying dormant, entirely idle. Nobody was receiving a dollar of advantage therefrom. Wealth untold in the Colony and yet the people of the Colony were receiving no advantage from it. So our Legislature very properly undertook to remedy this so far as it could. The Crown Lands Act was drafted and presented to the Legislature and passed with this object in view. Be it noted that that Legislature was very careful to hedge in all people who wanted to obtain land under this Act with numerous conditions, and all those conditions had in view one thing and one thing only, and that was the exploiting of the wealth which was in the country. None would imagine for a moment that it was the intention of the Legislature to make it possible for speculators to get the rights of timber and hold them for twenty-five years in order to make large profits. On the contrary the intention was that this valuable asset should be immediately utilised and commercialised for the benefit of the people of this country. Consequently anyone who got any timber rights or other rights under this Act was obliged to take those rights subject to certain conditions directed to this end, as I have already pointed out. It was provided that the Governor in Council could issue licenses to cut timber and other licenses to applicants upon certain conditions and provided that certain mills were built within a certain time and that certain operations were carried on. All this shows, when viewed as a whole, that the intention was that these areas should be operated. Now I intend to draw attention to some of these clauses this afternoon which deal with this matter. It was provided under Section 25 of the Crown Lands Act

(Reads.)

An applicant then who had a bona fide intention of opening up some of the valuable Crown lands and of employing men thereon and of taking those raw materials which are the assets of the Colony and of applying to them a certain amount of local labour, and rendering them consequently more valuable, would be thereby increasing the wealth of the Colony by making it possible for more men to earn a livelihood here. In order that everything should be fair and above board the Legislature further provided that no such leases should be granted until the notice of the intention of the applicant should be published in the Gazette for four weeks. The very next section of the Act, which is the important section, goes on to point out the conditions under which the licenses may be issued. I am going to read this portion of the Act verbatim.

(Reads.)

Now let us take the case of an applicant for an area of 500 square miles. Under those conditions if that application is approved and the license is issued, the holder has to manufacture every twenty-four hours in his mill 50,000 feet of lumber. Now there is an alternative to that.

(Reads.)

In other words the Governor in Council could agree with this applicant that in the place of manufacturing 50,000 feet of timber every twenty-four hours he could manufacture something else that would be equivalent. In other words the intention was that he was not merely to manufacture timber, wheel barrows for instance, but that he should

give a certain amount of labour whether in the cutting of timber, or in the manufacturing into lumber, or the cutting of the timber and the manufacturing of it into bureaus and washstands. Now there is also another alternative. But before I go on I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to this point.

(Reads.)

Now if either of these alternatives is adopted or agreed upon by the Governor in Council, the applicant shall have that embodied in his license, and further, there shall be a time limit placed upon the erection of the mill or other manufactory. Then there is the other alternative.

(Reads.)

But that may be agreed upon, and there has been no information received from the Crown Lands Office that any application was made for a reduction or increase of the quantity to be manufactured. There never was an application made because there never was a mill built to manufacture the lumber.

Now in addition to that and in order to provide the means whereby the Government may be able to check up as to whether the holder of the license was carrying out the terms of the license, there is another subsection of this one which goes on to provide that returns are to be made of the timber cut whether for pulp or paper, and that these returns are to be made in November of each year. And this cutting is liable to a royalty which has to be paid. And the Minister of Agriculture can take action if it is not paid. And if the returns are not filed at the proper time he can take a further action and compel them to be filed. And there is the provision which says that if the rents are not paid the license shall be forfeited. Under this clause, as I have already said, the Monroe Administration is to be commended for having in some instances undertaken to carry out the law and cancel certain licenses the rentals of which have not been paid. But there are other conditions that have not been complied with also. I think that it is unquestionable that in a number of cases no attempt of any kind whatever has been made to carry out the terms of the lease. And that particular breach of the contract is provided for in the amendment of the Crown Lands Act in 1918. The original Act I think provided that any holder of a lease who had failed to carry out any of the terms or conditions of his lease shall be liable to a fine of $10,000, and a further imposition of one hundred dollars a day for the continuation of his neglect. Somebody evidently discovered in the Legislature that this was not working as well as it ought to work, and that the Governor in Council either could not or would not carry out the provisions of the Act. And the amendment Sub-section 8 of Section 25 reads as follows:

(Reads.)

Now I th nk that is about as strong as the Legislature could possible make it. Finding that the fine of $10,000 was not doing its work, and that the further fine of $100 a day was not doing its work, the Legislature amended the act, so that now the license can be forfeited for any breach whatever. Under these circumstances it strikes me that the Governor-in-Council probably has the legal right to apply to the Supreme Court for the cancellation of those licenses. I have already made the statement that the authority of the Governor-in-Council to deal with these Crown Lands is specified clearly in that Crown Lands Act. A few days ago we were informed here that the Government had undertaken to extend the term within which the present holders of timber lands on Labrador could comply with the terms of their licenses. I say here and now that the Government in my opinion

has no right or authority whatever to make any such extens ons. It is their duty to enforce that Crown Lands Act. And they are guilty, I say it plainly, they are guilty of the failure to do their duty if they fail to carry out the act as it stands, particularly when that act is aimed at the protecton of the assets of this Colony which are regarded as essential to our future to-day. Now there are certain contingencies in the Crown Lands Act itself under which an extension could be granted, or to put it in another way, the licensees are relieved from certain obligat ons which are contained in the Act. One of these is to the effect that where an individual holds a license he may get a further right to cut certain timber, for the manufacture of pulp without the payment of a royalty.

(Reads)

Now under subsect on 1 section 28 the very fact that the act sets forth certain conditions under which the Government-in-Council has the right to relieve him of some obligations, surely leads us to the conclusion that under the ord nary circumstances he has no such right. One of the obligations is to erect a saw-mill and properly operate it. Another is to make returns. And now we are told that the Governor-in-Council has extended the time limit for the erect on of saw-mills in favour of these gentlemen for another two years. They have no right to give them any such extension of this.

Now there is another point to which I want to refer, and that is the quest on of the obligation of the licensee with reference to the identification of the particular timber limits which has been assigned him. That is dealt w.th in section 37 of the Act which I propose to deal with in "extenso."

(Reads)

Now I directed a question to the Department of Agriculture and Mines a few days ago on this point. I asked for the dates when these various applications were approved and I got them, and I asked for the dates upon which the surveys were filed and I did not get them, for the simple reason that there is not a single one in existence. There are no records dealing with th:s matter in the Crown Lands office and we must conclude therefore that there never was a survey made. If that was not done within one year after the approval of the application then all the licensees rights were forfeited. And now I propose to read to the House the part of the act which relieves that stringency to some extent. In other words, if it is impossible to make the survey and file the same within 12 months, it may be extended for a further time not exceeding two years, on payment of an extra bonus of $2.00 per square mile within 30 days of granting the extension. Now note that! It is provided, in favour of the licensees that if it found impossible, reasonably impossible, for them to comply with the strict letter of the law and file the survey within 12 months from the time of the approval of the r applications, they can, by applying to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, by proving that it was so impossible, and by paying the bonus of $2.00, obtain an extension of time within which the survey may be made and filed, for two years and no longer. There exists in the Governor-in-Council the power to permit any such licensees to fail in that regard for a limited period. But there have been no surveys filed—I asked the Minister and he has told me that there were none—and apparently the bonus has never been paid. Two or three applied for extensions at varying times, but even after they got it they didn't make and file their survey. In other words they didn't carry out the terms of this particular section, and that being so I claim that they have forfeited their leases.

(Reads)

Now sir, we didn't need that amendment of 1918 for the purpose of forfeit ng these gentlemen's licenses. They had been forfeited years and years ago, and the Governor-in-Council of the day, and of day after day as Governments came and went, failed in their duty to the people of this country, and took no steps to see the conditions fulfilled. And that is the situat:on to-day. There are a number of licenses held by various persons on the Labrador to cut timber on varied areas of land, and far from the mills being erected there has not even been a survey of the limits. These licenses have been held for varying periods, some for nearly 30 years. They have at times and most irregularly paid their license rentals, but have not at any time attempted to survey the limits which it is claimed are theirs—they have totally ignored the Crown Lands Act in every particular, and yet the present administration comes in and asks us to believe that these people have r:ghts against the people of this Colony. What utter trash and nonsense! Now I have one of these licenses here and in order that we may be more specific I am going to read it. This is a license granted on the first day of August 1914 to a Corporation known as the London-Labrador Corporation, Ltd., of London. whereby, they acquire the right to cut t mber over an area of some 512 square miles, more or less. And that is as far as they have ever gotten with it! They have never made the survey in accordance with the Act; they have never filed the survey in the Crown Lands Office; they have never applied for an extension of time for making a survey; they have never paid the bonus they should have paid. They d d nothing except pay their rentals. Now here are some of the conditions contained in this license—this is an actual license; it s not a matter of law but a matter of fact.

(Reads)

That was in 1914, thirteen years ago Mr. Chairman, and that mill is not there yet. And yet we are asked to believe that these people have rights! Now in place of building the mill they might have done this.

(Reads)

Sir, that factory isn't there yet! And we are asked to believe that these people have rights!

(Reads)

And they are to keep correct books, so that the Minister or his duly authorized agents may be able to go over them. Further he has the right to go in the mill and examine it if he wants to. And there are two or three other clauses dealing with the right of the Governor-in-Council to make roads and bridges, and for ordinary citizens to cut timber for vessels and spars and so on. And then we come to the second last clause.

(Reads)

Now I am not going to deal with the question as to whether that is an absolute forfeiture or not—to be frank, I think it is somewhat doubtful. But the intention of the Governor-in-Council of that day was that in the event of the licensee failing to carry out the terms of his license it would mmediately cease. Whether the interpretation put on that by lawyers is that they have lost their rights or not, it is clear that the expressed intention was that if they didn't carry out the terms of their licenses they were to cease at once. That is how an ord nary man reads it, and that is how these licensees read it, and that was the spirit of the license, whatever the letter of the law may be. And yet this Corporation, having failed to put up their mill; having failed to put up a factory, hav.ng failed to make a survey; having failed to file a survey in the office of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines—having failed to do anything except pay rentals, claims that they have to-day an honest, bona fide, valid and equitable right to this

property which belongs to the people of the Colony. Perhaps my knowledge of moral rights is not so extensive as that possessed by some of the members of the Executive Council in this Colony; perhaps my moral vision is somewhat twisted, but I freely admit that in my opinion an individual who enters into a contract and fails to carry out a half dozen of its terms is from the other party. If I enter into an agreement with a gentleman from the other side to-morrow to operate a saw-mill continuously and to give returns each year, to make a survey and give me a copy and to pay a rental, and he did no more than pay a rental, would anyone conceive that he was carrying out the terms of the agreement, or that I would not be justified in putting an end to it. I contend that the Legislature has not only a legal but a moral right to cancel every license on the Labrador, the terms of which have not been complied with. It is argued that these gentlemen have paid their money and that, having accepted that money it would be dishonourable on our part to now say "We have your money, but now that you are in our power we are going to take your lands from you." Sir, we have never suggested that any such thing be done—my contention is that the Governments of ten and fifteen years ago have illegally accepted these rentals; they have illegally allowed these men to go on—they have failed in their duty by not cancelling these licenses. They knew their terms were not being carried out and accepted that in defiance of the law. And now, because they have failed in their duty, because they have allowed speculators to hold on when they ought not to have done so the Legislature is expected to back up illegal actions.

One may be forgiven Sir, if in reviewing the history of timber lands, the history of timber licenses and the story of licensees for the past 24 years, one is suspicious that individuals in governments of the past have been in collusion with these licensees. I say again that one may be forgiven if suspicions enter his mind that members of governments have been in collusion with licensees in connection with timber limits. I don't suppose there is one out of twenty who ever had the slightest intention of carrying out the terms of his license, and the story of these licenses during the past twenty-four years leads one to the conclusion that governments never expected them to carry them out. If that is true then clearly they were guilty of malfeasance; the transactions were wholly illegal, the acceptance of their money was illegal, and we as a Legislature are not bound to endorse it. If the Executive Government chooses to usurp powers which it does not possess then let them answer for it—it is not for the people of the Colony to do so. I say the Executive Government never had the right to permit these people to go on, as they have gone on, paying infinitesimal rentals upon large areas of timber limits—holding on with a view to going into foreign markets and hawking our property so that they might receive a big price for the natural assets of Newfoundland, instead of the people to whom they belong—a speculation; a game of poker, and we as a Legislature are expected to endorse the gamble of these adventurers. Asked to protect the rights of speculators in one of the few remaining assets of the country by giving those assets away for nothing. There was never a bona fide intention on the part of these men to carry out the Crown Lands Act or the terms of the licenses which they hold. They entered into an agreement which is here in writing, and under the Seals of His Excellency the Governor in Council, knowing at the time that they were not prepared to carry out their contract. One might say in the termino-

logy of lawyers that the parties were never ad idem, in other words that there never was a contract, or if there was one it was illegal, between an Executive Council acting beyond its powers and outside parties, prepared to take advantage of anything they might plunder. The Governor-in-Council had the Crown Lands Act before them, or if they didn't they ought to have had it—if not it is no use to plead ignorance. If, having that before them they issued these licenses and permitted the parties to carry on by paying rentals, sometimes letting these go in arrears for years,and never tried to make them carry out the terms, that is their own business. They acted entirely outside the law, and on their own heads be whatever may befall, but that has nothing to do with us. If these gentlemen had carried out their agreements I would be the last to come in here and suggest the lands be taken back and vested in the Crown. But I do say this, and without fear of contradiction, that these men who took these licenses never had the slightest intention of carrying out their terms or those of the Crown Lands Act—they accepted them under false pretences and with the intention of speculating for their own advantage. Not one of them intended to build a mill! I believe there was one who tried—Dockie, but no one else in Newfoundland or Labrador—not one intended to export pulpwood. We have heard too much during the last twenty years of the stipulations in the Crown Lands Act to have any doubt of that. Anyone here could name individuals who were veritable timber pirates, and who sold large areas of water as timber limits to unsuspecting individuals. And it is men of that type who accepted these licenses, and we are asked to regard the rights of these gentlemen who utterly neglected their agreements, and were permitted so to do by various Executive Governments who should have known better. It is time to put a stop to it! Very little profit has ever accrued to us because of licenes to cut timber; the whole object of the Act has been defeated, and no labor given; the natural assets of the Colony have never been exploited, in the sense of development—it was purely a case of holding on until they could get some one to buy it, at a price that enabled the seller to retire. They have paid thir rentals—that is one of the arguments which has been used to convince this Committee and the people of the country generally, I suppose, that these gentlemen ought not to be interferred with to-day. There is no attempt to take any of the profit which they may make of the timber lands they hold. They have paid their rentals—it is not advanced as an argument in their favour that they have carried out the terms of their agreements—that they did not receive them for the purpose of exploiting these limits, as the Act suggests.

The Government does not offer as a reason for considering what rights these people may have, that they failed in these matters upon which the framers of the Crown Lands Act intended their rights should depend. This Act was never framed and passed by the Legislature for the purpose of permitting these individuals with a few dollars to gamble in the assets of the country—the Act was passed for the purpose of opening up the internal resources of the country, and the framers were very careful (which is more than we are sometimes) to see that the rights of the Colony were protected. Having done their work, and framed an Act which if carried out would have been of great benefit, they left it to the Governor-in-Council to see that the details were carried out in each individual case. But the Governor in Council fell by the wayside, and in place of licenses being issued which were of advantage to the Colony,

which opened up and developed the internal resources, which gave labor to the people and revenue to the Government, a scandalous system of land grabbing has been going on for 24 years, which has been of advantage to no one but speculators. It is true that they lost sometimes, but a man can't go into a game of poker without losing occasionally. So much for the payment of rentals.

And then another argument is put forward in excuse for these gentlemen's failure to conform, namely that their title was doubtful. Didn't they know what title they were getting when they obtained these leases, and wasn't it their business to find out? If I sell a house to-morrow I don't lose time searching the title—I leave that to the buyer, and sell him whatever title I have. And if timber speculators take a lease to-morrow we don't guarantee him their title. If I am wrong the Attorney General can correct me—we are not bound to give any title. We say, "There it is—there is the land." If the title is bad that's the other fellow's business. If they know the title is doubtful, it is up to them to take it or leave it. Do you suggest for a moment that any firm or corporation with serious intentions of going on a large tract of timber land such as this one of 512 square miles and operating under the terms of the Crown Lands Act would take it unless they were sure of their title. If this London and Labrador Corporation honestly intended when they received the license to go on the Labrador and make the necessary survey, build the necessary mill and operate year after year, they would have taken very great care indeed to see that their title was a sound one. And if they did not take any care, then we can only assume that they did not intend to go to the Labrador and did not intend to operate at all and that their whole aim and object was to hold that timber until they could sell it at a handsome profit, and that is what they did. It is quite clear, sir, from all the facts that from the first day of August, 1914, down to the present day these people never had the slightest intention of operating a mill. If they had, they would have seen to it that the title was good, and if it was not good they would not pay their rentals, unless they had an ulterior motive and that ulterior motive was to hold the land, if the title holds out to be good, until they could sell it at a huge profit. There has also been advanced a further reason why they had not complied with the terms of their license, namely, because the Canadians stopped them from doing it. I am surprised to hear such an argument put forward. What have we to do with the Canadians? Supposing the Australians or the New Zealanders or some Hottentots from the middle of Africa came over and attempted to stop them. What have they got to do with us? We gave these people a license under the conditions that they were to build and operate a mill and if some outsider comes in and begins to kick up a dust over it, what business is that of ours? We are told of one instance in which the Canadian Government did send a man to the Labrador some years ago and interfered with some one who was going to operate a mill there. In all probability that man who was interfered with has a claim against the Canadian Government to-day. That man's rights were illegally interfered with and it is up to him to take action against the Canadian Government and not against us. We simply gave him the license to operate. If Canada interfered and had no right to interfere, then this man must look to Canada for compensation, but we have nothing to do with it. We gave him a license and under the terms of that license he failed entirely to

carry out his agreement. It has also been suggested here that we led this corporation to believe that they would be safe enough if we won the dispute with Canada and that as a consequence they risked their money. Who led them to believe that? I suppose that must have been the Executive Council I do not know who else there is to do it. Well I want to tell the Executive Council that they had no right whatever to lead them to believe such. The Executive Council were stepping entirely outside the Crown Lands Act when they did it. I repeat the Executive Council have no powers outside the Crown Lands Act, and when they assured these gentlemen, if they did so, that they could pay their rentals and forget the conditions of the license, the Governor in Council went entirely outside its powers. It was the act of ten men who failed in their duty under the Crown Lands Act and we are not responsible. Next we come to the correspondence that was tabled in this House a few days ago showing that three sets of parties applied for an extension of time within which to erect saw mills and comply with the other terms of their licenses. There is the estate of J. J. Tobin, C. P. Eagan and Alderdice who hold 2434 square miles of timber; the London Labrador Corporation, Limited, with 512 square miles and the Labrador Pulp and Paper Company, Limited with 2158 on the Labrador. Now if my information is correct all those areas are on the southern portion of the Labrador, that portion nearest to the River St. Lawrence and the most valuable portion from the standpoint of timber in the Labrador. In fact I have been talking to fishermen who have been going to the Labrador all their lives and they tell me that if the licenses which are at present in existence cover timber limits southern of Hamilton Inlet then you can forget the rest of the Labrador so far as timber is concerned. In other words, if these licenses are going to stand the rest of the Labrador is not worth a snap of my finger, despite the $200,000.00 spent on winning it. These gentlemen speculators have got all the benefit out of it and all we got is the experience.

It is interesting to know the attitude of these gentlemen. Here is a copy of a letter to the Executive Government from the estate of J. J. Tobin and C. P. Eagan:

(Reads Letter)

Note how carefully these gentlemen stress the fact that they paid rentals; but they are not so specific about erecting saw mills. These people have not carried out the initial terms of the Crown Lands Act, namely, the survey. A survey should have been made within twelve months after the license was issued, but two years have now elapsed and no survey made. Now, Sir, that letter is a request to the Executive Council to do an illegal act, a request to the Executive Council to do something that has no warrant under the Crown Lands Act and the Government assents to the proposition. In my opinion, Sir, the assent of the Governor-in-Council is not worth the paper it is written on because it is outside the provisions of the Crown Lands Act entirely and the Governor-in-Council had no business to place itself in such a position as that in which it now stands with reference to these matters, and, may I be pardoned for saying, Sir, that doubts, as to the lofty motives of the Government, are entertained by those of us on this side of the House. The letter I have just read is signed by C. P. Eagan and John Tobin as Executor of the estate of the late James Tobin. Now we come to the London-Labrador Corporation Limited whose license I read here this afternoon. Be it noted that none of those

gentlemen got very busy about this license until after the decision of the Labrador Boundary question, as the following letter to the Governor-in-Council shows:

(Reads Letter)

Well that is interesting if true but we have no proof of it whatever.

(Reads)

That may or may not be true. I have grave doubts of it myself.

(Reads)

They wake up after eighteen or twenty years to discover that there are some terms in the license wh:ch ought to have been complied with.

(Reads)

That law suit is thirty years old. They have held the license for twenty years and in 1927 they finally discover there has been a law suit.

(Reads)

I presume they hope it has happ:ly terminated. They won't regard it as happy unless we let them get away with what they want.

(Reads)

If they read the Hansard of this House which will be published about twelve months time they will find that there was three years from the date of the license and the date of the license in 1924.

(Reads)

Evidently these investors are aware of the fact that the Newfoundland Government has a right to forfeit their licenses and they want the Newfoundland Government to waive their rights under their failure to perform their conditions of the license.

(Reads)

So if they will read the Hansard they can take the information from me that the Governor-in-Council has no right to waive the performance of these conditions.

(Reads)

The Newfoundland Government ought not to have accepted these rentals.

(Reads)

May I be pardoned for saying so but I believe that to be absolutely untrue. I don't believe they ever had the slightest intention of developing the property. Their idea was to float a company which might or might not afterwards develop the property but only

(Reads)

In other words if you have the power to revoke this license we want you to waive this right, if you haven't the powers then beat the law in another way by giving us a new license, so we can start all over again. The dishonesty of that document is apparent on the face of it.

Then there is another one. This is the14thof June after the present Bill was tabled in this House.

(Reads)

They have expended a large sum of money in acquiring these licenses. I wonder where it was expended. I wonder if this colony received it and if not who did and if after this letter in itself is not the best evidence we have that they are speculators. They didn't pay this Colony a large sum of money. We got a miserable two dollars a square mile for it, but somebody got a large sum of money for it.

(Reads)

Sir, I cannot understand how any sane, sensible man can take a document of that character seriously. Nine or ten years ago these people go to the Government of Newfoundland and make an application for a timber license to cut timber on the Labrador. They make that application with a knowledge of the Crown Lands Act; w:th a knowledge of its provisions. If they don't they are fools. We must assume that they knew the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. They make application to the Governor-in-Council for the grant of a license to cut timber on the Labrador under the conditions of the license and under the terms of the Crown Lands Act and the license is granted. I am entitled to assume

that when that license was granted it was the intention of the Governor-in-Council that that Crown Lands Act should be carried out and that the terms and conditions of that lease should be fulfilled. At the time I probably would have assumed that the Executive Council intended this should be done and I would be compelled to assume on the grounds I suppose that every man is innocent until he is proved otherwise, that the licensee intended to carry out the terms and conditions of the license. But from 1914 to 1927 no attempt whatever has been made by the licensee to fulfil those conditions which are essential to the retention of his license and Governments from time to time, in spite of the fact that they and a Minister of Agriculture and Mines presumably familiar with these matters, whose duty it was to watch these various holders of timber limits, apparently took no action whatever, made no attempt to bring these licensees to book, accepted the payment of rentals from time to time without making any inquiry as to whether the other terms and conditions of the licenses had been fulfilled or not and in that way were guilty of a prostitution of the Crown Lands Act. They used the powers given them under that Act to grant away areas of timber lands to persons who had no intention whatever of carrying out the terms of their agreements and whose objects were entirely foreign to what was intended by the Act. They got that land as a private speculation buying at two dollars a square mile in the hope that some one would come along and pay them a hundred, and some of them, sir, got away with that, some of them after holding on to these areas did sell some of them to people who really intended to operate and thereby became rich. The subject is one sir, that is distressing to anyone that has the interests of this country at heart, and who contemplates the manner in which our natural resources have been made ducks and drakes of during the past twenty or thirty years. Some individuals have got rich because the Governor-in-Council permitted them to acquire licenses to cut timber, and sell them to some outside investors, and as I have already pointed out to some investors at least they sold large well watered lakes.

Now sir, to me and I feel that to many of the members of this House the position is quite clear. Ever since the passing of the Crown Lands Act, it has been prostituted for the purposes of speculation, by people who had no interest whatever in this country, and whose only object was to make all the money they could out of it. And the people guilty of this conduct sir, have been permitted to do so by the connivance or the neglect of the various executive councils from time to time. There has been very little effort made, we find, by Governments in the past to see that those who acquired timber lands under the Crown Lands Act kept their lawful contracts. As regards those contracts I do not think that it would be going too far to say that the various Executive Councils from time to time, accepted these rentals from these speculators knowing that they were not carrying out the provisions of their licenses or the Act, and they did not care whether they carried them out or not. And under such circumstances the Governor-in-Council was acting entirely outside its rights. It was permitting something to be done that it had no right to permit. And those who were sacrificing the interests and the rights of the people of this Colony were doing it with eyes open. With the Crown Lands Act before them they permitted these people to get away with this kind of jockeying. They held up timber rights and water powers for the purpose of speculation in order that they may make fortunes. They saw that prostitution of the Act

going on, not for a day nor for a month, but for 20 years, and never on a single occasion as far as I am aware has any Government stepped in and attempted to do its obvious duty. In many instances the action of the Government in connection with these matters was illegal as I tell the Government this afternoon their extensions are. If at any future time I happen to be a member of that party which has a majority in this House and this question comes up before this House, I know what attitude that I shall take in the matter. And I am satisfied that every hon. member on this side of the House would take exactly the same position. I say sir, that this thing has been permitted to go on illegally. It has been permitted to go on immorally. No attempt has been made by the Government of the day from time to time to call a halt and preserve the rights of the people of this country to their natural resources. One would think from the attitude of some of the members in this House that Newfoundland possesses timber lands for no other purposes than to give these gentlemen a chance to make money, and that the people had no rights at all. This country has carried out its obligations under these licenses and these gentlemen have carried out none of theirs, except as to the payment of rentals, and yet to-day they are the persons who must be shown courtesy by this House, and we must forget entirely the people whom we represent. I want to tell the members of this House that we are not here representing any speculative interests. We represent the people of this country and we are here to preserve the rights of the people of this country against those who hold them improperly. Those, I say, who have timber property on Labrador to-day hold that property improperly. In no single instance whatever save in the payment of rentals have they made any attempt whatever to carry out the conditions under which they received their grants, not even as regards the surveying of the limit itself. If you went down there to-day or any time within the past twenty years it would be impossible to locate the particular areas which any of these gentlemen holds. They have got a sort of inchoate claim to the timber on Labrador. Just where that timber is has never been defined. Admittedly there has never been any survey, and yet we are asked to-day to endorse their licenses the terms of which have never been carried out. And we are regarded as the type of men that deprive others of their rights because we are opposed to the retention of these areas by these people.

I want to refer for a moment to the value of that Labrador. I don't suppose that there is a single Hon. Member in this House this afternoon who has any real knowledge of the value of that territory. I must quite frankly say that I have not. But we have seen statements made in the newspapers and by various persons at different times, since the settlement of the dispute to the effect that it is worth to the ancient colony, $200,000,000 $250,000,000, and so on. I have not got the faintest idea as to whether either of these statements is even aproximately correct. But it is quite apparent that there are a number of people, there are some I know, who have some idea of the value of that territory and who believe it is a valuable one. If it is valuable then we must remember that it is the last asset in the nature of timber of any appreciable value which this country possesses. We have no timber in Newfoundland. At least I understand that we have very little. What we have is not worth talking about. So insignificant is it in fact that the Government to-day does not consider it worth while to include Newfoundland in the operation of the Labrador Bill which is before the House now. If then we have any as-

set in the nature of timber at all today it is this Labrador, which the Privy Council finally decided belongs to us. If then it is worth half or quarter of that $250,000,000 it is of essential importance to this country that it should be conserved. It is a notorious fact that the national debt of Newfoundland today is over $70,000,000, and according to a statement made by the Prime Minister it is possible that even in the very near future we may be saddled with another $10,000,000 on account of the Humber industry. In other words it is likely to approximate another $80,000,000. When one adds to that the fact that the present Government admits that there is a deficit of something over $2,000,000 on current and railway account, we can confidently anticipate the necessity of a further loan of $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 which will bring the national debt up to $85,000,000. Under existing suggestions I say that unless we can conserve every possible asset that Newfoundland has it will be hardly possible to meet our obligations in any shape or form. Less than twenty years ago the debt of this country was less than $23,000,000. Now it is nearly four times that. I forbear at the present moment to comment upon the causes of that terrific inincrease in our national debt, but it is there and it must be faced. And if this Labrador is an asset and is of value to its owner, is it not our duty as the representatives of the people of this country to do all in our power to see that it is conserved for the people. Why should we lie down because these speculators claim that they own it, and let them take it? Must we take the atitude suggested by the present administration, and say, "They paid their rentals and therefore let them take it." Must we forget the fact that they have not carried out the terms of their agreement? Must we as the representatives of the people deprive this country and the people of the only remaining asset we have of value in the nature of timber?

I say, sir, that if this Labrador is of value, for the purpose of lifting this Newfoundland of ours out of the slough of despond into which it is plunged, then it would be to the undying shame of this Legislature if it passed a measure that failed to preserve that territory intact. Generations yet unborn will live to curse us.

As I have already pointed out here this afternoon, the most valuable part of this territory is the Southern portion. I am informed by fishermen who have spent their life time on the Labrador that this is the case. I am further informed that most of the licenses which exist cover areas on this portion, and if these individuals are permitted to retain them, the best of Labrador will be lost to the Colony. And further than that, assuming for the sake of argument that a large quantity of that portion is not covered by these licenses, I suggest this for the consideration of the House, that the Labrador intact is worth more than twice as much as half of it would be. We will not command half price of the whole for half of the territory; in other words, as the quantity shrinks, so proportionately will the price shrink also, and our duty, as I see it, is not to speculators but to the Colony. If these gentlemen had any moral rights I would be prepared to consider them, but I do sincerely contend that they have no moral rights, and that payments of rentals have been dragged out of them by Governments which ought not to have dragged them out. They only pay because they want to retain the lands, so that as soon as conveniently may be they can sell to speculators for huge sums. The agreements under which they have held have been entirely ignored—there has been no effort to carry them out, and no intention to make an effort, and they come in with an effrontery that is almost unbelieveable and ask the Gov-

ernment to give them an extension, and the Government meekly falls for it. I trust, sir, that the present administration will take this matter into serious consideration; I trust they will see that to continue on such a line of conduct is detrimental to the interests of the people of the Colony, and a giving away of the birthright of the people—the only thing in my opinion which can save us unless miraculous good fortune intervenes. This is one of the means whereby the present stress can possibly be relieved. There are other reforms which I don't intend to labour now, but to which I have referred before, and which the present administration promised and failed to carry out. These have to be coupled with this. One of the necessary courses which the Government must adopt if they are to pull the Colony through is the preservation of whatever is in the Labrador for the people of the Colony. The deaf ear must be turned to the whinings and demands of speculators whose only desire is to gamble with the assets of the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent speech made by the honourable member for Port de Grave. There is just one point that strikes me, and that is that I came in to take charge of the Government as a very ordinary layman, and I endeavoured to get all the best legal advice I could in my Executive to keep me straight on questions of this kind. Now this matter came up while Mr. Bradley was a member of the Executive, and Mr. Bradley, to my knowledge, never raised the point at any time of the cancellation of the leases of those who had paid rentals to date, and neither did any other legal or other member of the Council. The question of cancellation of those leases which were paid up was never mooted, and the position is not a bit different to-day than when Mr. Bradley sat in the Council—it is not changed in one iota. The position is that if they didn't have rights then they haven't got them now, and if they did then, they have them now. If we were to take them by the throat and attempt to compel them to give up these properties, they would claim that they have a right to them —if we were to take legal action it would surely have been a great deal more reasonable to have taken it two years ago. The more money paid in by these people, the less right we have to cancellation—that is a view anyone would take I am sure. That is why I am so astonished that the honourable member for Port de Grave who is able to tell us how absolutely wrong this is was sitting in the Council and did not raise this point even though we were discussing cancellations of leases on which rentals were not paid up. Surely if anyone had thought when that was before us that even those who had paid up to date should be cancelled, that was the time to say so, and I want to say before the House that from no one have I had the suggestion that these should be cancelled. When this matter came up the Minister of Agriculture and Mines asked the position and the Minister of Justice said: "Of course they must have another two years." As to any question of legality, that has never occurred to me. There was no ulterior motive before the Government in connection with extensions of these conditions; there is not a single member interested. I am nearer to having an interest than any other member, inasmuch as a relative of mine is connected with the Lewis property. He has never spoken to me, nor has anyone else, and I did not know there was anything being looked for that might be regarded as a concession.

Now we have time to finish the Bill to-night unless some other member

wishes to speak. The Bill has one object only, to prevent the Labrador from being given out to speculators. I do not think any member of the Opposition opposes the principle.

MR. HICKMAN—May I ask the honourable introducer if he intends to reject in toto the amendment brought in by the Opposition.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman: The Hon. the Prime Minister has suggested that it is rather late in the day for me to bring this matter up, and that when I was a member of the Executive Council I said nothing about it. That is true in part. But I was not one of the law officers of the Crown, and was not called upon to investigate licenses or examine as to who performed their conditions. There was the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, in the person of Mr. Walsh, who knew the facts, and the Hon. Attorney-General, who was a member of the Council, and if he was satisfied I wasn't going to take up the question. Even if I was a lawyer, if he didn't raise the question naturally I wouldn't do so. But I want to say that if anyone was a kicker to have licenses cancelled I was the one, and I was kicking for 12 months before I could get any action. And furthermore, since I am forced to say it now, I want to make the statement that although for 2 years I was a member in the Council, I was never of it, sir.

DR. MOSDELL—I was not present in the House when the Bill regarding the Labrador reached its second reading and, up to now, I have had no opportunity of making a pronouncement on it. I have been given to understand, from statements published by the Government press, and from pronouncements made in the House by members and supporters of the Government, particularly by the gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, that the intention of this legislation is to ensure the exploitation of the Labrador territory to its fullest value for the especial advantage of the people of Newfoundland generally. With any such intention, decision or undertaking I entirely agree. The principle of protection and advancement of popular rights is one of major importance; it is also, Mr. Chairman, one to which scant respect is usually shown when public undertakings are being dealt with. Now, if I were persuaded in my own mind that this Labrador Bill did, in deed and truth, represent a departure from the old order; if I were convinced that the principle proclaimed as inspiring this measure is being entrenched and protected by the provisions of the Bill and if I felt tolerably sure that this legislation would, in effect, conserve and advance the material interests of the ordinary people of this country in the highest possible degree, then I for one would not occupy the time of this Committee discussing this matter to any great extent. I would simply voice my approval of the Bill, would give it my support and my vote and would help all I could to hurry it along its due course towards the Statute Book of Newfoundland.

During the considerable number of days I have sat here in Committee, I have listened carefully to the pronouncements of various members of the Opposition in criticism of this Labrador legislation, and I have to admit that there has been ground for extended debate of the measure, for stern fault-finding and for outspoken expression of the suspicion and the claim that this Bill will not safeguard the exploitation and disposition of Labrador territory in accordance with the principle enunciated by the Government when the measure was brought into the House.

The bare susicion that this proposed legislation will leave popular rights without adequate protection is calculated to disturb any representative of a district who takes his duties and his responsibilities seriously. The consideration that, in enacting this measure, he may be entrenching those who encroach or seek to encroach on popular rights on the Labrador is sufficient to bring such a member of the House of Assembly to his feet in indignant protest. It is for that reason, and that reason only, and to give outspoken expression of my own firm convictions in that connection, that I am addressing this Committee of the House this afternoon. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I have absolutely no intention, that I have no idea whatever in mind of attempting to cause delay in these proceedings and that obstruction of public business is far from my thoughts. I would,I assure this Committee, be the first to frown on any ill-timed attemt to prevent the Government from enacting legislation indubitably calculated to advance the interests of the common people of the country. I call your attention, sir, to the fact that member after member of His Majesty's Oposition has addressed himself to the terms and effects of this Bill. Member after member from this side of the House has spoken in critical, in uncomplimentary and in hostile terms of the measure. Every Opposition member has given good and sufficient reason for the denunciations they have hurled at this legislation, so bright in promise, but so utterly disappointing in its actual terms and provisions.

Reviewing in thought the course of this Bill since its introduction here, sir, I am persuaded in my own mind that it might have gone through Committee with a great deal more of ease than has actually been the case, or is likely to be the case, had it not been for the disquieting announcement made, just after the debate started, that certain extensions of rights in respect to large and very valuable areas on Labrador had been granted by the Governor-in-Council, without reference to this House or to this Legislature. This announcement, in effect, informed us casually and for the first time that a number of leases of Labrador territory, including a total of close on twelve thousand square miles of the best and most accessible timberland, worth in terms of money many millions of dollars, had been extended for a further period of two years. The effect of this official action of the Government is to alienate forever from the possession and the profit of the ordinary citizen of Newfoundland the whole of this vast and valuable area and to confirm in their title those who, in the opinion of members on this side of the House, have not consistently lived up to the terms set forth in their leases. The circumstances under which that announcement was made, the nature of that announcement and its obvious effects, were so astonishing to the members of His Majesty's Opposition that it led them to examine with more than usual care the bona fides of Government claims based on the provisions of this Bill. It suggested more careful calculations of the probable effects of the Bill in operation. It inspired persistent and searching questions as to the motives and intentions of the Government. In fact, that development itself, and not any intention or any desire of the Opposition to be unduly or unreasonably pugnacious or obstructive in such a connection, has led to the extent to which this debate has been initiated and sustained by members on this side of the House.

With respect to the legal effects of the Bill I do not pretend to be qualified to pronounce. I have listened

with considerable attention to the eloquent and reasoned pronouncement made to the Committee by my friend, the honourable member for Port de Grave. His legal training has enabled him to analyse the provisions of the measure from a professional standpoint. One important result of this phase of the debate is the extent to which lay members of the House have been made familiar with the provisions of the Crown Lands Act and the effects and significance thereof. Even though we have lawyers on opposing sides of the House who disagree as to the effects of this Statute in practice, we have learned some new points about the provisions of timber licenses in effect in this country and on Labrador. It is something worth while to be educated as to the significance, the conditions involved and the line of conduct laid down by the enactments of this Legislature.

My honourable friend, Mr. Bradley, who preceded me, wound up his eloquent and effective speech with a reference to the wealth of this Labrador territory and its prospective value to Newfoundland. He did it very well, but even so I propose, as a layman, to address myself particularly, to this aspect of the discussion and trust I will be able to so treat it that I will succeed in advancing some fresh points of significance to both sides of this House. It is true that the Bill now before us has been traversed and re-traversed. Its provisions have been considered and examined and discussed from numerous points of view. It may be contended that the discussion has been both exhaustive and exhausting. I hold, however, that the extent to which the discussion has been continued is proof positive of the desire of honourable members to proceed with the utmost care and caution with the enactment of legislation so far-reaching in its effects on the general welfare of this country. The opposition have offered much more than destructive criticism of the measure now before us. Not only have they subjected it to critical analysis and not only have they condemned what they regarded as the certain effects of some of its sections, but they have brought in a constructive amendment and have given the Leader of the Government a full and definite idea of the lines on which they considered a measure of this sort, embodying the principles declared to be associated with it, would be constructed. Members opposite saw fit to discard that amendment in toto. It is true that, from a technical constitutional standpoint, they were correct in their attitude. The amendment contained a provision that the Opposition were not competent to offer, one for the payment of money to re-imburse leaseholders who had paid in certain moneys to the Crown by way of rentals for their timberlands. But, that amendment was offered at the invitation of the Leader of the Government and in the best of faith. It was constructed with the most careful deliberation. Had it been admitted by the Government, even in modified form, it would, in my opinion, have been most effective in protecting the underlying principle of the Bill.

Frequently, in a discussion like the present, it is very necessary to hark back to first causes. We have been debating, day after day, the provisions of a Bill in relation to the disposition of territory on Labrador. We have heard the ordinary laymen and we have listened to the lawyers air their views. There is always a danger, in a connection like this, of allowing a discussion of something that is secondary to the subject attract our attention from the big point at issue. I, therefore, urge upon this Committee contemplation of the fact that we are now engaged in debate

on a matter which, dependent on how we decide to act in connection with it, will make for the future weal or woe of our country. Very, very often a multitude of words will submerge a consideration of this nature. We must carefully avoid allowing the sound and fury of debate to deafen our ears to the insistent calls of public necessity and public duty. I do think, therefore, that at this stage of the debate it would profit the country and the Committee, if we were to consider, if for a few minutes only, the vastness of the territory on Labrador with which this Bill is concerned, the importance of that territory to Newfoundland now and the value of that territory to Newfoundland in the future, should we reach a time when it can be disposed of to financial advantage. Later on, we can go ahead and thresh out the meaning and significance of the various clauses of the measure.

Geographically and territorially, our definite acquisition of Labrador puts Newfoundland prominently on the map. Until the recent momentous decision of the Privy Council in our favor, we were only a small island, a tiny speck of creation. Now, we have not only our own Newfoundland lands in our undisputed possession but have, in addition, Labrador lands aggregating the vast area of one hundred thousand square miles. Newfoundland, then, in the outside world, both in geographical position and in territorial extent, is a vastly different and more important country than it was before the Privy Council handed down the decision which assured us the ownership of Labrador beyond all question, dispute and preadventure. As a result of that decision we are here considering a measure intended to govern our future methods of disposing of that territory. Our victory in the fight for Labrador has engaged our attention and has constituted a drain on our efforts and our finances for the last quarter of a century. The conduct of our case has occupied the cleverest legal minds of the country, including the present Attorney-General, down through these many years. Having, therefore, given so much of money to bring our case to its recent victorious issue, it is the obvious duty of every member of this Chamber to make as certain as is humanly possible in this life of uncertainties that our time and efforts, and brains and any measure we enact as a law to govern the disposition of this territory benefits, first, last and always, the people of Newfoundland to whom this matter is so vitally, so supremely important at the present time. Let us not forget, either, that when we have stated the vast area of our Labrador possession, we have not stated the chief reason for its outstanding importance to our country and our fellowcountrymen. I say, sir, that the possession of that territory, to have and to hold and to dispose of, represents to the average Newfoundlander a chance of the realisation of the hope that, through its proper and profitable disposition, this country can be saved from some of the grave menaces it now faces as a result of some of the terrible tribulations through which it has passed of recent years. This measure is designed to effect such a proper and profitable disposition. It is incumbent on us, therefore, to make as sure as we can that nothing we enact here will dash the hopes of those we represent or will spoil the future of our own country.

The total area of Labrador has been stated as exceeding one hundred thousand square miles. The figures are staggering enough, but mean little unless we have some knowledge of the contents of the territory represented thereby. What does our Labrador area contain that is of commercial value, that we can realise upon in the near or remote future and in terms of dollars and cents? Of this feature of our

Labrador territory we cannot speak definitely, except in one or two respects. We do know something of its wealth of timberlands and of its potentialities in waterpower resources. Of its minerals we cannot affirm anything certain. However, nature is usually very kind to lands so situated. She usually provides some compensation for the bleakness and the remoteness of their surroundings and their situation. We are hoping that we will discover this to be the case in respect to the Labrador.

Mr. Chairman, it is now half past six, and as I have not time to finish my remarks this afternoon, I now move the adjournment of the debate for to-day.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council asking that body to make the following amendment in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Ratification of a Contract for the St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail service," namely, that the following Section be added to the said Bill:

5. Section 14 of the Agreement forming the Schedule marked A. hereto shall be read as if the words "the last four years" there were substituated for the words "the last three years."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, June 28th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 28th, 1927.

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

A petition was presented by:

Mr. Brophy, from Portugal Cove Road, re roads.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until a later hour.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think, Mr. Chairman, that Dr. Mosdell was addressing the House when we adjourned the debate.

DR. MOSDELL—This Labrador legislation is of extreme national importance because of the great interests involved, of the time at which it is introduced and of circumstances existing to-day in this country. As I remarked in the course of yesterday's debate, the Labrador territory is of outstanding importance to Newfoundland, because of what was involved in our legal fight and because of what it cost us to win and I now propose, Mr. Chairman, with your permission, to spend some little time endeavouring to arrive at an approximately correct estimate of the value of that territory to our country and our fellow-countrymen. Though a great deal of that territory is of no known commercial value, as far as natural resources

are concerned, we are fully aware that a considerable portion is of the utmost potential value. Scores of thousands of square miles contain natural resources ot outstanding wealth. We know that if that wealth of resource can be secured to our people and insured to use to their general advantage, some of the most depressing days in our financial history are behind us; that we can hope, by the proper exploitation of this wealthy possession of ours, out of the maze of financial trouble in which we now find ourselves and into a broader, more prosperous and altogether more advantageous future.

It is generally accepted as correct that, of the whole Labrador area of upwards of one hundred thousand square miles are sufficiently wooded to permit of operations on a commercially profitable scale. If we regard that total area of timber lands as calculated to produce only four cords to the acre, we have a total prospective output of almost seventy-seven million cords. It is perfectly safe to assume that the production would be at least an average of 2600 cords per square mile, giving the total production just estimated by me. Now, such a total production of seventy-seven million cords of pulpwood at even a value of one dollar per cord represents a total valuation of pulpwood on this area of thirty thousand square miles of timbered Labrador land amounting to the enormous total of Seventy-seven Million Dollars. I have, of course, taken as the basis of my estimate a ridiculously low rate of production per acre and an even more ridiculously low rate of valuation per cord. Still, the totals arrived at are impressive enough to induce the feeling that this Labrador territory, properly exploited in the popular interests, can do all expected of it, indeed a great deal more, in the way of relief of the financial burdens of the country.

In a previous reference to this subject, I mentioned the fact that the Province of Quebec adopts a radically different and a much more profitable policy than do we in dealing with the timberlands. Where, for leasing purposes, we set a nominal rate of two dollars per square mile per year. Quebec demands an initial royalty of four hundred dollars per square mile and gets besides additional royalties in respect to stumpage and other charges totalling another five dollars per square mile. Lest it be concluded that these charges aply only to more favorably situated territory than that owned by us on Labrador, allow me to point out that this is the Quebec assessment at Clark City, situated in immediate proximity to the southern end of our Labrador territory. There are, of course, various and sundry reasons why Newfoundland has not up to now been able to collect royalties on her timberlands at the same rates as has Quebec. With these reasons I propose to deal later on in the course of my remarks. Let us now assume, for argument's sake and to arrive at a true estimate, or one approximately correct, of the value of this Labrador territory to Newfoundland, that we are in a position to charge only half the initial royalities collected by Quebec. Then, these 30,000 square miles of wooded territory on the Labrador, at $2.00 per square mile, are calculated to bring us in a revenue of $6,000,000 for the first year. Thereafter, charging at the Quebec rate of five dollars per square mile, we would receive an annual revenue of $150,000 in respect to royalties for the whole area, always assuming, of course, that the Government of Newfoundland has entire control of this territory. The application of our own present rates would bring us in a total of one hundred and twenty thousand dollars for the first year, and a total of half of that amount annually. Now, $76,000,000, the total conservative estimate of this Labrador

timber area is a huge sum of money. Six million dollars is a large amount to receive by way of royalty. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars would be a handsome addition to the annual revenues of the country. The whole aim and object of the Legislature should be to ensure the early and profitable disposition of Labrador territory; to make certain that the returns secured for such disposal are more nearly in accord with their real values than would be the case of a sale or of leases under our present Crown Lands Act and, above all, to so handle the whole matter that whatever the financial returns may be the benefit and the enjoyment thereof are assured to the bulk of the people of Newfoundland beyond all preadventure.

I must now point out to this Committee, Mr. Chairman, that the rates I have adopted are not only those prevailing in Quebec Province, but they are rates which prevail under present timber supply circumstances. But the fact must not be overlooked that the value of the available and accessible pulpwood supply of the North American continent is steadily, increasing in value and that the present day valuation of these timbered areas represents nothing like the much-increased value that will most certainly attach to these same areas in, say, five or ten years time. To emphasise what I say in this connection and to prove the official recognition of this tendency elsewhere, I beg to point out that the Canadian Government is completely shutting down on the export of raw materials from Dominion crown lands. That Government, aware of the increasing value of pulpwood as a natural resource and as a source of large revenues to the Dominion, is conserving these resources and is promoting their use for local manufactures exclusively. In this connection I was much interested to read, in a balance sheet recently issued by the International Paper Company, representatives of which are now in this country conducting certain negotiations, a statement that the Dominion of Canada has become the centre of the newsprint producing industry of the world. That is not because Canada possesses the preponderating number of mills. It is purely and simply because Canada possesses the greatest supply of raw material for feeding those mills. Canada has so protected those raw materials of hers that those who desire to exploit them are forced to go to that country and establish their manufactories there. The result is that, as the International Paper Company observes, Canada has advanced to the position of centre of the newsprint manufacturing industry of the whole world.

We have, then, Mr. Chairman, this significant fact to note in connection with the manufacture of pulpwood into newsprint—that that industry for the last few years has been marching steadily northward. Where, formerly, the centre of that industry was in the United States, it has crossed the border into Canada. It, of course, moves ever forward to keep in closest possible touch with the source of greatest supply and, naturally, to those localities where such a supply can be utilised to the greatest advantage and at the least possible cost. Invested millions cannot keep the industry in any country because the mills are located there. The position of the United States in relation to this particular industry is evidence enough of the truth of that statement. In that country there are almost twelve hundred pulp and paper mills. Some of these manufacture pulp, but the majority of them were constructed and equipped for the making of newsprint paper. The latest statistics to which I could make reference show that, of the 840 paper mills and 315 pulp mills—1155 in all—in the United States,

over five hundred, or almost fifty per cent. have absolutely no local supply of wood, either privately owned or located in their own country, from which to draw supplies of raw material. So pressing is this manufacturing situation that American pulp and paper manufacturers last year had to import almost a million and a half tons of sulphite and sulphite pulp, an equal quantity of groundwood pulp, a tremendous quantity of unmanufactured pulpwood and, in addition to these items, two million tons of manufactured paper of various grades.

The last official figures available show that the quantity of pulpwood that went over the border of Canada, exported to mills in the United States that are either without supplies of their own or which have not a sufficiency of such supplies, is one and a half million cords. The export value set on this pulpwood was at the rate of ten dollars per cord, which, I am assured is a low estimate. Still, on that basis, Canada's exports of that raw material in the year referred to reached the large total valuation of fifteen million dollars. You will note here, and in passing, that in reckoning up the value of the wood on the timbered areas of Labrador, I adopted the relatively very small valuation of one dollar per cord.

The position, then, of the pulp and paper manufacturing industry in the United States being such as I have described, and the tendencies in respect to the industry and the supplies for that industry being such as I have just outlined, I regard it as of the utmost significance that representatives of the International Paper Company of New York are now here negotiating for the plant at Corner Brook, proposing the creating of a new and similar industry in the Gander Valley and making tentative proposals in regard to the pulpwood supply on the Labrador. It is true that their negotiations are at present mainly concerned with properties in Newfoundland, but it is certain, indeed it is absolutely inevitable that they must eventually reach out after the supplies of raw material available on our Labrador territory. And, by the way, a further reference to the balance sheet of that concern from which I have already quoted, shows that the International Paper Company place an average general value on their woodland areas of two dollars per acre. Reckoned at even that low valuation, our thirty thousand square miles of Labrador timberlands would figure out at a cash sale price of forty million dollars. Looking, then, at these figures, considering the persistent trend of the newsprint industry and taking into account the obvious fact that as woodland supplies are rapidly becoming exhausted those industries are moving further northward, I think this Committee will agree with my contention that we have in our timberlands on Labrador a magnificent possession of almost unlimited potential value, resources worthy of the highest estimation we can place on them, resources such as demand the exercise of the greatest care and highest judgment and protection, resources that call for the most careful planning to ensure their due exploitation to the highest possible profit to Newfoundland and Newfoundlers generally.

Reference should next be made to another outstanding natural advantage of our Labrador territory. It consists in the waterpowers of Labrador, a resource that is bound to become of great and increasing importance as the pulpwood possibilities in connection with such a natural resource. I am informed that there is possible, in connection with the timbered areas of the Labrador territory, a total development of at

least ten million horsepower, development that can be made from the streams that traverse these lands. The Province of Quebec makes a royalty charge on such developments ranging from one dollar to three and a half dollars per horsepower. For purposes of our estimate of Labrador waterpower values, let us adopt the lowest Quebec rate of one dollar per horsepower. Ten million horsepower, at that royalty, figures out at ten million dollars per year. Such an annual income represents, at five per cent., a capitalised value for the potential waterpower development on Labrador, of the huge sum of two hundred million dollars. Some of the best waterpowers of Labrador are conveniently placed in relation to timbered areas that promise commercial profits from their exploitation. Such a waterpower is that of the Hamilton River which along its course of two hundred miles provides a possibility of developing a million horsepower. Here are located the Muskrat Falls, capable of a development of half a million horsepower. At the wonderful Grand Falls alone are capabilities of the huge development of a million and a half horsepower. There may be displayed an inclination to scoff at the declared possibilities of values or revenue derivative from such a source; it is quite possible that a considerable number of people of average intelligence will sneer at the idea of approximating, even, a small percentage of such possibilities from Labrador waterpower developments. But there is really a foundation for the declared estimates and there is good and sufficient reason for the faith that ultimately they will be developed and realized on to some considerable portion of their estimated value. It is indisputable that the nearest and most accessible timber areas are almost entirely depleted; it is a matter of common knowledge that the search for new supplies had led the papermaking industry to Canada; it is also obvious that the scene of the next invasion must be the Labrador. That is an inevitable development of the near future. Accepting these premises as correct, there can be no disputing the fact that the inevitable exploitation of the pulpwoods of Labrador inevitably involves the development of Labrador waterpowers. In proportion as Labrador pulpwood and paper industries are promoted, so must Labrador waterpowers be developed in order to keep the wheels of such industries turning.

Just as I have emphasised the significance and the importance of Labrador waterpowers in relation to the pulpwood areas in that territory, so I must now ask your consideration of their equally great significance and importance in connection with other potential resources of that great country, its mineral areas. I must, at the outset, admit that the mineral possibilities of Labrador are far more of the remote future than are its pulpwood potentialities. At present these mineral resources are pretty much of an unknown quantity. Very little has been done in the way of the mineral exploration of our great northern dependency. A great iron ore deposit is known to be situated in the neighborhood of Grand Falls, but that is of little potential value at present. It is too remote from manufacturing centres which for many years to come can continue to draw ample supplies from mines that are nearer home and that are more readily and more cheaply accessible. But the fact that other mineral areas of different classes, of more restricted general supply and of higher value than iron ore are not known to exist on Labrador does not prove their absence from the country. Systematic search may prove their presence. Nature appears almost always ready to provide coun-

tries of the geographical situation and climatic characteristics of Labrador with ample compensations for the inconvenience of situation and for the drawbacks of general conditions. It is really not too much to expect that when it is properly explored the Labrador will prove, from a mineral standpoint, of as much value to Newfoundland as Alaska, for instance, has proven to the United States of America. In 1869 the American Government negotiated the purchase of that territory from Russia for seven million dollars. The Secretary of State who put through the deal was reviled by his fellowcountrymen for having squandered public moneys on such a remote, inaccessible and valueless territory. It was commonly referred to as "Seward's ice chest." Since those days of misrepresentation and misapprehension Alaska has amply proven its value as a mineral, fur and fish producing country. As an American territory it has taken in a few years one hundred and fifty million dollars' worth of U. S. products, manufactured by plants in the United States. The revenue of Alaska totals nine million dollars annually. There is absolutely no reason why we should not have confidence that our experience in connection with our Labrador territory will be equally as profitable to us as has been that of the United States in connection with its Alaskan acquisition. We should maintain that much faith in our great dependency and its future possibilities, if only to maintain and improve the morale of our people generally during the times of great stress through which they are now passing. We should also manifest a disposition to protect the interests of the people during Labrador exploitation, present and prospective, in order that their confidence in the administration of public affairs may be increased.

So far, Mr. Chairman, we have emphasised the outstanding importance of this Labrador territory of ours from a number of viewpoints, and I consider it well worthwhile to recount them here, briefly, of course. We have considered what it has cost us to establish our undisputed and indisputable title to that territory; its absolute and its potential value in timberlands, in water powers and in mineral lands; its importance in relation to the pulp and paper industries of today in respect to adequate present and future supplies therefor, and, finally, from the standpoint of the ever-increasing values of these pulpwood resources. We must now consider our Labrador acquisition in connection with our present economic position and future outlook. We have won our legal victory at a time when such a triumph, with all it signifies, is nothing less than the accomplishment of public salvation. The Labrador territory has been confirmed to us by legal decision of the Privy Council, when the effects of such a judgment are nothing less than providential to this Dominion of Newfoundland. That territory has become unquestionably ours, ours to exploit to our own general advantage and ours to manipulate to the utmost of economic and financial benefit at a time when Newfoundland stands sorely in need of such a boost in the general regard of the outside world and in its credit rating in the international money market. It was because I held such ideas in my mind; it was because I had such a conception of the present value of the Labrador territory to us at this juncture and it was because I cherished high ideals as to the degree and the manner in which this opportunity could and should be developed, that I have listened with approbation to the manner and the extent to which the members of His Majesty's Opposition have debated the measure now under consideration in this Committee. There is every justification for

the care with which my colleagues on this side of the House have examined and analysed the Bill to Govern the Granting of Rights and Lands in Labrador, have debated it and have offered amendments to it. After all, we are not considering so many trees or so much of an area of wooded lands; we are not concerned merely with so many water powers or so many horsepower of certain or possible development; we are not alone bothered about the question as to whether or not Labrador is rich in gold, silver, copper or some other mineral that offers prospects of commercially profitable development. We are, as a matter of fact, a fact which must be treated as the most outstanding one in connection with this whole discussion, dealing with the people's heritage, a heritage won by and for the people after great expenditure of time, effort and money, and as such to be guarded jealously and exploited solely in the popular interests.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this Bill was brought into this Legislature by the present Government with the declared purpose of applying to the granting of lands and rights in Labrador the principle of ensuring all the financial and other advantages thereof to the enjoyment and the benefit of our general population. The Opposition have carefully applied the acid test of that principle to the measure during the last few days of debate. Members of the Opposition have examined and analysed that Bill purely and simply from such a standpoint. It is solely with the idea of forming a settled opinion as to how the provisions of the Bill in practice will or will not ensure the strictes possible adherence to such a principle, the principle enunciated when the Bill was introduced, that I am now taking part in the present debate. Does this Bill really ensure to Newfoundlanders generally the utmost possible protection and advantage in respect to the leasing of Labrador areas under consideration? Any amount of analytic debate and constructive criticism is just fiable on the part of the Opposition, seeing that it 's vitally necessary to satisfy the House on such a point and to reassure the country as a whole. The Government of the day must remember that it has lost the confidence of the electorate and that there is a great deal of suspicion and anxiety abroad generally regarding the manner of disposition of this great and valuable territorial acquisition of ours, popularly regarded as the ultimate and effective remedy for our major economic and financial ills.

With reference to Section One of the present Bill several pronouncements have been made from the Government side of the House. I was particularly interested in one made by the Hon. the Colonial Secretary on the day on which the Opposition brought in the Amendment that received such scant consideration and that had such a short lease of life. The honorable gentleman contended that in Section One was to be found embodied an action of the present Executive Council without precedent in the history of Governments in this country. He proceeded to set up the further contention that the present Executive Council had, of its own volition, decided to forego outstanding powers and privileges in connection with the disposition of Labrador territories and to delegate those powers and privileges to the Legislature. I am prepared to admit that that action of the Executive Government did represent something of a step in advance in this connection and that there is a great deal commendable about the spirit so displayed. I am not, however, prepared to admit the sweeping contention of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary that as a result of this radical policy very sweeping benefits are bound to accrue to the people of this country. I cannot concede, even, that the step of the

Executive Council here referred to represents anything worth while from the standpoint of Government self-sacrifice. Further, I hold that that step by no means represents the highest poss.ble degree of protection of popular rights on Labrador, though that is the contention I understood the honorable gentleman to make in this connection.

Now it is possible, just as it is preferable to analyse the present position from an entirely impersonal point of view. This is my impression as to the change that has actually been made, or will be made, through the enforcement of the provisions of Section One of this Bill to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador. Formerly, the nine or ten politicians composing the personnel of the Executive Council issued licenses in respect to timberlands on Labrador, as elsewhere. To these are now to be added a further number of politicians to the extent sufficient to form the ruling majority in the House of Assembly who will now do, through legislative debate, what was formerly done by the Executive Council off its own bat. It may be said by way of rejoinder that that is what happens any measure in the Legislature. That is true, but it must also be admitted that legislation passed here is not always just the sort of legislation that is advisable in the best interests of the majority of Newfoundlanders. Aforetime, the Executive Council granted timber licenses without reference to the Legislature, but was in a position to argue its action in this connection would be endorsed were it submitted to the Legislature just as all other actions are endorsed by the party majority when they are so submitted to the Legislature. The specific effect of this Bill is to force the Executive of the day to obtain such endorsation. There has thus been created by this measure a distinction much stressed by the Government but without the differences from the former system so strenuously claimed by advocates of the Bill.

Then, too, sir, I beg to point out to those who express such delight that this Bill takes the disposition of Labrador lands from the hands of the Executive Council alone and places that power in the hands of the Legislature, that the measure also removes those Labrador lands from the scope of the rules and regulations whereunder these lands shall alone be granted. Not even a minimum rate of rental or royalty is stipulated for. There is another obvious objection to such a broad latitude of procedure and I will deal with it specifically later on in this debate. The position to-day, as I see it, is that a partisan political majority in the House of Assembly can, under this Bill, deal with the issuing of grants or licenses on the Labrador in absolutely unrestricted fashion, utterly untrammelled by rules or regulations such as are usually regarded as protecting the rights of the country generally. It stands to reason, sir, that the Executive Council of the day will still continue to recommend to the Government Party in respect to such licenses. It is unthinkable that the Leader of any Government Party will fail to exercise in such a connection a supervision with benevolent effects on the followers of his own party, in the Legislature or outside it. Obviously, then, party interests, under the new order, will as now continue to dictate the policy and the undertakings of any government in this connection. At any rate, it can be said the door is left wide open to such partisian exploitation of this portion of the domain of the people of Newfoundland. I apprehend, indeed, with the wider knowledge of available lands and grants made of timber lands, which will now be in the possession of every politician there is bound to be a greater scramble than ever for shares in the spoils of office.

Conversely, of course, the general public will suffer more than ever.

The contention, Mr. Chairman, has also been made that the decision to make grants of timberlands on Labrador only through the medium of the Legislature will ensure wide publicity in respect to such transactions. Even were that actually the case, I would not regard such a development as ensuring any additional protection to the general public. Honorable members on both sides of this House know that measures embodying provisions that are anything but in the public interest sometimes reach this House, are fully debated and are given the widest adverse publicity. But they are passed just the same, unamended, because party exigencies of the moment demand that their objectionable features shall not be removed. The administration of the day finds itself up against some particular difficulty, the Leader of the Government represents to his party that a way of escape is to be found only through adoption of the measure and its enactment as law and, given a fair majority in the Legislature, such a measure gets by, despite the most strenuous criticism of its opponents in this House or in the public press. But, I do not see how you are to get any such extra publicity as is anticipated by the Government from the enactment of this measure. Applications for licenses do not have to be brought in here over the actual signatures of those who are after Labrador lands. The trend of the times in this connection is very noticeable in the pages of the Newfoundland Gazette, where one notes that, instead of notices of applications for Labrador lands being made in the names of the parties concerned, solicitors are now being employed and are advertising Statutory form on behalf of their clients. I take it that gentlemen who adopt this manner of giving notice of their intention to apply for timberlands on Labrador are trying to avoid as much publicity as possible.

I regard the departure of the present Government from the old time rule of issuance of timber grants or licenses by the Executive as a retrograde and an exceedingly dangerous step. In delegating these powers to the party as a whole and to the varied units that go to make up such a party serious dangers are created. The Executive Council is generally regarded as composed of the best and most reliable elements of any administration. For the most part, they are conscientious, anxious to perform their duty to the country as a whole, and usually act as a buffer between party demands and popular interests. This relationship is now altered and this public safeguard is now removed. There come times in the experiences of Government when it is found necessary to take extraordinary steps either to maintain a slim administrative majority or to secure accession of strength from the opposing party. Left in its present form, this measure can easily be used to exploit Labrador lands for the maintenance of adherence to the ruling Government party or to induce new adherents thereto. In a few words it leaves that Labrador territory wide open to the fullest possible advantage to selfseeking politicians. Under the Crown Lands Act there was set a minimum rate of two dollars per square mile. As the Minister of Justice has observed, what was intended as a minimum has through custom of years been accepted as a maximum rate. It is, of course, a ridiculously low rate. Inadequate though it is, it is better than none at all. The present Bill should embody such a minimum rate, more in keeping though with the scale of Quebec charges, defined as neither more nor less than a minimum rate, and above this should be a scale of charges graduated in ac-

cordance with the situation, resources and exploitable value of various areas.

Another shortcoming of Section One, in my opinion, is its failure to ensure special attention to the mineral areas on Labrador. No pretense, even, is made of ensuring special protection to this feature of the natural resources of this territory. I am, of course, taking a layman's view of the matter and I am anticipating some practical troubles and difficulties that may be created. Let us suppose, for instance, that an area of timberland is applied for on Labrador and that, after a fast and furious debate in this House, the Government make such a grant, but are forced to charge something like an adequate rental. The grantee can then proceed to recoup himself for the financial loss he has sustained through having to pay more dearly than he expected for his privilege. The Minister of Agriculture and Mines, even under the Crown Lands Act to-day, has the right to reserve mineral areas from exploitation by the general public. Under this Bill the Labrador Mineral areas are still retained in the jurisdiction of the Crown Lands Act. What, then, is there to prevent the owner of a timber area on Labrador, who has discovered the presence or signs of the presence of valuable mineral deposits on his timberland, from having his political friend, any Minister of Agriculture and Mines, declare such an area a reservation from the public within the meaning of the Act?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Minister has no such power. Lands can only be reserved conditionally, and they are open to the public.

DR. MOSDELL—Lands cannot be reserved from the public and open to the public at the same time. I quite see, however, the point that the honourable the Minister of Justice attempts to make. I was not claiming that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines could or would make reservations of mineral areas on Labrador specifically for the benefit of any owner of timberlands on that territory. I think, though, that the honourable gentleman will admit that such an owner, having his lumbermen working there, can easily and quietly bring in his prospectors and use them on such reserved areas until he satisfies himself as to the value or otherwise of his mineral prospects.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—But that does not stop me from going over his timber limits to look for minerals.

DR. MOSDELL—Surely it would, if the area were reserved. Then too, the honourable gentleman must understand that we are now talking about remote timber areas, that if the owner happens on signs of minerals he can readily pull the wires, have a reservation made and the public debarred, prove his property and proceed to take up as much of it as he desires under the old and inadequate provisions of the Crown Lands Act.

I have endeavored, Mr. Chairman, to point out what I regard a certain grave menace to public interests under the working provisions of this Bill. My conscientious opinion is that it leaves wide open, that, indeed, it throws wider open than ever before these areas on Labrador as the objects of party political exploitation. The Leader of the Government has been frank enough, on several occasions in the course of the present session, even, to admit that it is not always possible for the politician in office to carry out his pre-election promises. The ideals embodied in a pre-election programme cannot always be realized after that party has assumed control of the administration of public affairs. That is the

Prime Minister's declared attitude and, I presume, he speaks from personal experience. I am prepared to admit my belief that the present Prime Minister did assume office with the highest motives and with his heart set on realising certain high ideals. Now, according to his own admission, he is in the position in which other leaders of governments in this country have aforetime found themselves, that because of party interests and political pressure of one sort and another, he cannot make administrative undertakings coincide exactly with electioneering programs. He is not the first prime minister to discover that, while he may not permit party influences to take his feet from the straight and narrow path, still those same influences are persistent and powerful enough to delay his progress along that pathway. Heretofore, he appears to have been so trammelled by party considerations that he has failed to justify the high hopes his fellow-countrymen entertained of his term in office. Still, making allowances for all the obstructive and trammelling influences that have hitherto been held insurmountable by him, I claim that it is high time he set his face resolutely towards his electioneering ideals and henceforth refused to be turned aside from his efforts to realise them. Three years ago, he announced a programme and a policy for his Government. He has abandoned that programme and he has departed from that policy. Small wonder, then, Mr. Chairman that there should be created a position such as the present, whereunder the administration rules without the confidence of the people, in spite, in fact, of repeated declarations of loss of trust by the electorate in the Government of the day. His Majesty's Opposition have by recent, repeated and major developments been proven to have taken the place that was vouchsafed the Government in the general election of 1924. In other words, the position of three years ago has been reversed, because of the sheer disgust of the electorate with the breach of faith of which the Prime Minister has been guilty. The country looks confidently to members of the present Opposition to advocate public rights and to attend to the protection of public interests. Realising my duty as an associate of that Opposition I am now warning the Leader of the Government, the Minister of Justice and other honorable members opposite of what I regard and what the people of the country generally regard as the loopholes in this measure through which may come destruction to the very popular interests which this Bill professes to safeguard.

I have referred to a general menace which I regard as created by the provisions of this measure, permit me now, Mr. Chairman, to make some reference to what I regard as nothing less than an outrage perpetrated by a recent action of the Government in the same general connection. Of recent days we have heard a great deal about this matter, the extension of the terms of the leases held by certain gentlemen in respect to timber lands on the Labrador. Bear in mind the fact that the public generally, the electorate of this country, no longer regard the Government as they did three years ago. Bear in mind the fact that the Leader of that Government, as a politician at any rate, no longer occupies the position of influence and of trust that was his at that time. Then, even his strongest opponents, including myself, expected him to stick to the letter of his undertakings to the electorate of the country. Our expectations have been disappointed and our confidence has not been respected. Bearing all these considerations in mind, contemplate what must be the effect on the electorate of the announcement of the circumstances and the effects of these extensions of terms

of leases on Labrador timberlands. Some of these leases are held by strong political supporters of the present Prime M.nister, even by relatives of his. Surely, there can be but one effect of such a public announcement; it must be an effect still further destructive of whatever bit of trust in the Prime Minister may still persist :n the minds of a portion of the electorate. Everybody may not possess the high regard for the Prime Minister's personal character that some of us admit. Most people, indeed, will contend it is safest to argue back to examples in recent years to when outstanding politic!ans, because of close political identity of interest, or family identity of interest, have given away large port!ons of the public domain in order to make sure of standin well with their family connections of their political supporters. I have no intention of making charges of any such corrupt pract ces aginst the Prime Minister. I would be the very last to point the finger of scorn at him. I must, however, point out to the honorable gentleman the position of jeopardy in which he is placed through an action of his own Government, and, presumably, w.th his own consent. If he does not take immediate opportunity of disavowing all connection with and any approbation for the Executive Council decision that gave these extensions of Labrador leases, the general publ!c suspicion as to his personal as well as his political integrity must inevitably be aroused, and all the bad odors created by this transaction must most certainly cling to his reputation. I don't care how jealous the Pr.me Minister may in fact !e of public interests; it matters not in how conscientious a spirit he may have shared in the transaction to which I refer, there is bound to be the worst sort of constructoin placed upon h!s connection therewith.

That which explains, more than anything else, the protracted nature of the debate on this Bill, Mr. Chairman, was the announcement of the extension of some of these leases and the declared intention of the Govrnment to grant similar extensions to those who make application therefor. As far as I am concerned, I must admit that, to me, that announcement came as a bolt from the blue. Certainly, it was not the sort of thing I expected. Had it been predicted to me, I could not have regarded such a development as possible. Just as certainly, it does not appeal to me as playing the game by the public and I regard it as be.ng anything but in keeping with the declared general policy and intentions of the Government in connection with the reservation of timberlands on the Labrador and their ultimate exploitation in the sole interest of the general public of Newfoundland.

There are some features of outstanding importance in connection with these announced extensions of Labrador licenses. The first, which strikes me very forcibly, as it must strike all those who have given the subject the slightest consideration, is the location, the extent and the value of the lands on Labrador covered by the grants in respect to which the Government has made extensions of license terms and which, to all intents and purposes, are now alienated from the public domain forever. In my opening remarks this afternoon, I referred to the total potential value of Labrador timberlands. I also pointed out that there was not much hope of these timberlands being exploited for manufactur!ng purposes in the immediate future, because of their remoteness from manufacturing centres and because, at present, many of them were, relatively speaking, inaccessible. Now, we are here concerned with the nearest and the most accessible of these lands. We are dealing with the first timber areas to be tapped when circumstances force the pulp and pa-

per manufacturing interests to resort to Labrador for supplies of raw material. Twelve thousand square miles of the most accessible and the best wooded lands on Labrador; twelve thousand square miles of woodland situated in proximity to the best Labrador waterpower; twelve thousand square miles of the most valuable of all the Labrador timber areas are represented by grants to parties who have paid up their rentals only, and who, despite their complete disregard of the other terms of the Crown Lands Act, are, this House has been informed, to have a couple of years more in which to speculate on these immensely valuable properties and to endeavor to turn them to personal profit. Some of the Labrador licenses have already been extended, others will get similar extensions on application therefor to the Governor-in-Council. It is but reasonable to expect that all such licenseholders will hasten to obtain an extension, so that we may consider the whole of these twelve thousand square miles of territory as definitely lost to the people of this country. The total number of square miles of wooded territory on Labrador is 30,000. So that the recently announced decision of the Government to confirm to the possession of the present licensees these twelve thousand square miles of the best of all the Labrador timberlands means that over one-third of all that Labrador woodland that is of any commercial value has been absolutely and definitely taken from the people of this country.

One honorable gentleman, in speaking to this measure on yesterday, expressed the opinion that the area so alienated from the public domain by this extraordinary act of the present Executive Government is worth about seven million dollars. It is worth more than four times that amount, even considering it on the basis of a production of four cords per acre and at a valuation of one dollar per cord. Thirty million dollars would be a very low estimate of the total value of the area comprised in the extended grants. Small wonder, then, that the effect of the announcement of the extension by the Government was to redouble Opposition criticism of the Bill that was supposed to prevent just such outrageous exploitation of the public domain, or that the Opposition has protracted the debate in the hope of inducing the Government to rescind such an unpopular decision. The value of the land affected is so great; the amount at stake is so large and that money would be so nearly in the public treasury even now were the lands retained as portion of the public domain, that the cause of retention merits the strongest championship from every member of this House who is ready to do his duty as representative of the people who sent him here. The Government does not appear to have made any outstanding effort to discover whether they were legally bound to grant any such concession to these holders of grants. They appear, quite casually, in an almost irresponsible manner, indeed, to have decided that the extensions should be made. They surely could not have been quite oblivious to the value of the lands they were thus alienating from public possession. They must have known that these lands represented a huge total valuation that merited a legal fight to a finish for their reversion to possession of the Crown. If they were aware of these factors, they have given no evidence of having been duly impressed by their importance.

Mr. Chairman, there is another peculiar aspect of this decision of the Executive Council to extend the term of grants covering Labrador timberlands for two years more. The Government brought in here a Bill declared to be framed for the general protection of the public interests in this territory. It was loudly proclaimed throughout the country that the

purpose behind the Bill was to ensure the public interest in Labrador the full protection of the Legislature, composed of elected representatives of the people. This Bill had been under discussion for some days before, quite casually, almost accidentally, in fact, the Opposition learned that the Labrador territory had been shorn of its wealthiest areas even while the measure was being debated. The cream of value has been taken from the total area; the Legislature is now to be vouchsafed the privilege of guarding the skimmed milk. I contend, Mr. Chairman, as other honorable members who have preceded me in speaking to this measure have contended, that if the Government were sincere in their declaration of deep and abiding interest in the public weal, they would have taken the Legislature into their confidence in this connection, they would have consulted this House on such an important matter and they would have put up as strenuous a fight for the reversion of these areas to the possession of the Crown as they did to secure the decision of the Privy Council that the whole Labrador area is indisputable territory belonging to Newfoundland and its people.

That is the policy for which the Opposition are fighting; it should be the policy of the Government, too, were they really anxious to do the general public the highest possible material service. The Opposition affirm that the action of the Government in granting these extensions is unjustifiable and the Opposition demand that these licenses be cancelled because their provisions have not been kept. The policy that commends itself to the general public of Newfoundland is one that assures the loosening of the tentacles of the timber speculators from Labrador lands, that public heritage that has cost us so much to secure to our own undisputed jurisdiction. That is the policy for which the Opposition stands and the policy which it endorses. It is the policy that I champion because by its observance alone can the real, outstanding interests of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders be advanced.

The Opposition amendment to this Bill provided for the cancellation of all Labrador timber grants, the holders of which had in any respect failed to comply with the terms of the Crown Lands Act. Permit me, Mr. Chairman, to pay some little attention to the objections which were raised by honorable gentlemen opposite. I am satisfied in my own mind that cancellation should have been decided on, rather than extension of these licenses. I am persuaded that nothing less would satisfy this House and the country generally. What is the case as presented against such cancellation?

The Prime Minister, when the amendment was offered him, demurred against the cancellation clause, urging that the licensees had some claim on our moral consideration, because previous Governments had accepted rentals in respect to these Labrador holdings. It is apparent to me, though I am not a Philadelphia lawyer, even, that the circumstances under which these payments were made and accepted must be taken into account. Were those moneys accepted under conditions that were regular and legal and do the circumstances of such transactions constitute a legal and binding obligation on us?

This aspect of the situation appeals to me somewhat in this way, Mr. Chairman. If a Minister of the Crown has in his office an official who is guilty of defalcation or other offence, the Minister being ignorant of the dishonesty, one does not hold the Minister responsible. If a Minister of the Crown be negligent in the discharge of the duties of his office and does not adhere strictly to the legal

aspect of the administration of his department, the Government, surely, does not admit itself bound by his conduct or obligated to fulfil his undertakings. I am now, of course, arguing in the abstract and am not concern ng myself with considerations of the exigencies of practical pary politics which may lead a Government into all sorts of peculiar commitments. If, therefore, any present or former Min;ster of the Crown, or official in a certain department of the Civil Se·-vice, has at any time or over a period of time, accepted rental moneys in respect to lands on Labrador, under irregular or illegal circumstances or conditions, that does not bind the Government, that does not obligate the Government to a line of policy that entails a huge loss to the taxpayers of this country. That is my sincere contention.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — You are assuming that the Government of the day had not any knowledge of what the Minister was doing?

DR. MOSDELL—I am taking it for granted that the Executive Council assumed the departmental head referred to was in all respects performing his duty conscientiously and in strict accordance with the Statutes that govern the discharge of h:s office.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — You are aware that the Executive of that day distinctly knew that the conditions of the erection of a mill had not been complied with?

DR. MOSDELL—I cannot see how any Executive Government could deliberately consent to a breach of Statutes passed by this Legislature, or condone any such breach if, as the honorable gentleman intimates, it became known to them. Such illegal conduct could not stand. It would constitute illegality perpetrated by individuals and not by the Executive Government itself. Granting that the Minister of Just.ce is correct in his charge that members of an Executive Government did either act illegally or condone such illegality, that is no reason why this Leg:slature, the source of the laws so broken, should now consent to an act of indemnity. Former Executives, we are told, ignored the law; the present Executive condones the offence and shoulders a responsibility illegally imposed on the country. And the present Executive now asks the Legislature to condone its offence as well as the offences of former Governments. That, obviously, is the conclusion to be drawn from the prems es the Minister of Justice has just set up.

The Honorable the Colonial Secretary also made some remarks in criticism of the Amendment introduced by the Opposition. He stated that the provis.on whereunder the Opposition proposed the cancellation of Labrador licenses appealed to him as a dishonest suggestion. The Minister of Just ce was a little more cautious in his statement, saying that he thought that the taking back of such lands by the Crown would constitute the essence of dishonest action. I am prepared to accept the dictum of both of these honorable gentlemen as to the honesty or dishonesty of he motives of the Opposition, if either will show me where and when the gentlemen whose interests are now being protected in connection with those 12,000 square miles of Labrador timberlands, made one single honest effort to carry out the general provisions of the Crown Lands Act in respect thereto. Of course, some honorable gentleman opposite is, I know, tempted to retort that these licensees paid their rentals. However, any member of this House who faces the issue squarely and fairly, will in duty bound admit that, after all, the regular payment of annual rentals was the least onerous of the obligations imposed on these timber

speculators by the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. If they could get away with a simple payment of two dollars per square mile per year; if they could obtain official toleration of their disregard of the condition that calls for mill construction and operation and general development of their properties—very expensive undertakings, indeed—it is not at all surprising that they chose the more economical way of holding on to their limits. By total annual payments of $60,000, spread over a number of years representing total payments that are comparatively small, they have succeeded in holding on these valuable areas and are subjects of a Government benefaction that confirms them in holdings worth thirty million dollars or more.

Some of the statements made by honorable gentlemen opposite in the course of this debate have been quite mystifying to me, and none more so than that made by, I think, the Honorable the Colonial Secretary. Relating a coversation he had with a Labrador timber speculator during the period before the dispute was settled by the Privy Council, the honorable gentleman asserted he had stated definitely to his interviewer that the Government of Newfoundland did not then admit and had at no time admitted that there was the slightest doubt as to its title to Labrador lands. If the Government took up such an absolutely definite position from the beginning and maintained it all through the dispute, why was not there a consistent insistence on observation of the condtions under which timberlands in the Labrador area were granted? Why was not specific compliance with the terms of the leases demanded? Or, if it was felt inadvisable to subject the lessees to hardship and inconvenience why were not these conditions, excepting the payment of annual rentals, specifically waived? Neither course was pursued. Licensees were not authorised to ignore any of the terms of the Crown Lands Act; they did ignore these terms; they broke the law and, therefore, they have no legal title to the lands.

From remarks made by the Honorable Mr. Cramm and the Honorable the Colonial Secretary in the course of the debate, I gather that both these honorable gentlemen set a great deal of store by what they are pleased to term "the good faith" of these license holders on Labrador. The Honorable the Colonial Secretary's asesrtion was to the effect that these people paid their money for rentals in perfectly good faith. The Hon. Mr. Cramm's statement was that there was perfectly good faith displayed on the part of license holders. There are a good many aspects of this subject very puzzling to the average layman, but there is one that I find the most puzzling of them all. It has been shown through information tabled in this House by the Honorable the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that the majority of the leases to Labrador timber lands were issued after the Dickie controversy at Hamilton Inlet precipitated the dispute between Newfoundland and Quebec as to the ownership of Labrador. Now, how could gentlemen who took out licenses any time after the commencement of that dispute and before its settlement by the Privy Council, intend or expect to carry out the terms of these licenses? These gentlemen made aplication to the Government of Newfoundland and they obtained their licenses; they specifically undertook to carry out all the provisions of the Crown Lands Act involved, because no alteration was made in the license forms or in the engrossed conditions; they knew they could not keep the law and they must have hoped to keep their lands illegally. They gambled; they took a chance on developments and on the attitude of whatever Gov-

ernment happened to be in power if and when setlement of the dispute in favor of Newfoundland occurred. The point is that they undertook to observe the provisions of the Crown Lands Act when they knew they couldn't live up to any such undertaking. As a matter of fact, they made no such attempt. How, then, can it be argued that they took out their licenses and paid the r rentals in good faith or that they displayed good faith all through the proceedings? I fail to see where the alleged good faith comes in at all, and I suspect that only those prejudiced in favor of the license holders could find or imagine he had found the slightest trace of it.

When the Opposition presented their Amendment to the Committee it provoked from the Honorable the Colonial Secretary the indignant declaration that he "wasn't pirate enough to enter and take from these people their lands by an act of piracy," an act that, he asserted, was suggested by members on this side of the House. Being rather curious as to the proper interpretation of the word 'piracy," I resorted to that ever-present help, the dictionary, and found a pirate defined there as "one guilty of the offence under Comman Law or having committed those acts of robbery and depredation on the high seas which, if committed upon land, would have amounted to felony there." Now, the Opposition were not aiming at or suggesting acts of robbery or depredation; they were not inciting felonious undertakings, nor were they suggesting the invasion of the rights of any private party or parties whatsoever. They considered that certain parties were being confirmed in possession of lands to which they had no legal right or title. They demanded that the rights of the people to these lands should be declared and enforced. Under all the circumstances, they held, and still hold, that they were justified, both morally and legally, in demanding the reassumption by the Government of Newfoundland of the title to lands on Labrador that are of the utmost financial importance and value to the people of this country. The epithets "pirate," or "piracy," are scarcely, by any stretch of the imagination, justified in such a connection.

The Honorable Mr. Cramm claims that, for all practical purposes, these license holders have carried out the terms of their leases. Such an assertion, in view of the act of extension undertaken by the Government, is another cause of puzzlement to me. If, to all intents and purposes, these people have fulfilled the provisions of the Crown Lands Act, why on earth have the Government butted in on their affairs at all? If they were in undisputed possession, why this amazing intrusion of the Government on matters with which the Government had and could have no concern? What inspired the extraordinary intervention of the Executive? Surely, there can be but one satisfactory or really comprehensive explanation. These license holders did not have a clear title to these Labrador areas; they recognised the fact; they could not dispose of the lands until the Government granted them such a clear title, so they applied to the Government and were accommodated at the expense of Newfoundlanders generally.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to be permitted to reiterate my contention that, instead of pursuing the course they did, the Government should have tested the legal hold of these parties on those extremely valuable Labrador lands. That was their undoubted duty, their obvious duty, and they failed to perform it. What appeals to us here on the Opposition side of the House is the fact that the Government without making a strenuous and determined effort to oust these

timber speculators, without making any effort at all, has calmly acquiesced in the complete and permanent alienation of these areas from possession of their rightful owners, the common people of Newfoundland. The preponderance of public opinion supports me in thinking that there is something mysterious about the displayed anxiety of the Government for the interests of these people, and something most peculiar about the action of the Government in preferring the profit of these people above that of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders generally. After all, if we had taken this milk-and-water, namby-pamby attitude during the course of our years of dispute with Quebec we would have fared badly indeed in our attempts to be confirmed in ownership of the whole of Labrador. Yet, having won a generally great and glorious victory in our battle for the ownership of the whole Labrador territory, we not only calmly agree to the best portion of that territory being wrested from possession and ownership of the people who sacrificed and strove for it, but aid and abet private interests to deprive us of the chief portion of the fruits of our victory. It is an astounding position in which the present Government has not only acquiesced but which it has indeed made possible of creation.

My claim, Sir, is that the Opposition Amendment offered a chance to retrieve some of the lost territory, if not all of it. I regard it as extremely unfortunate that the Government should have decided to throw out that Amendment, purely on the technicality that the Opposition is constitutionally incompetent to introduce money bills in this House. The Opposition drew up that Amendment in good faith and with the utmost care, endeavoring not to be tyrannical or oppressive in respect to license holders, the while they sought to effect the restoration of the timberlands held by them to the people of Newfoundland. Hence the provision for the return to these people of the total amount of rentals paid, together with interest thereon. The Gov't could have accepted the rest of the Amendment, if only for purposes of debate, but saw fit to reject the whole, because of the inclusion of a clause which could have been omitted without destroying the general principle or effect of the suite of resolutions.

There is just one other reference which I would like to make to a statement made by an honorable gentleman from the other side of this House. When the Opposition Amendment was brought in the Honorable Mr. Cramm spoke in contradiction of the preamble which stated "it is desirable in the interests of the country" to cancel licenses the terms of which were not fully carried out, and contended it would be "to the eternal detriment of Newfoundland" to adopt any such course. Now, to make such a statement and to prove it are two radically different things. The proof submitted by the Goernment in respect to ownership of the lands affected is anything but conclusively in favor of those whose licenses are extended or will be extended on application. I contend that, until that has been done and until the Government has shown its good faith in the transaction in which it is now implicated; until, in fact, it has established any moral and legal obligation whereunder it should confer the great favor it has just done private interests on Labrador, it must stand discredited. The Government have established no such position; the Government have not proven the utmost was done to protect popular interests, and it is to the eternal detriment of that Government that the common people have sustained such a great territorial and financial loss on Labrador.

It strikes me as peculiar, Mr. Chairman, that although Labrador has been

confirmed in our legal possession for some months, no arrangement or tentative arrangement has been made by the present Government for a complete and accurate survey of that territory. Until such an undertaking is completed we can, obviously, have no exact knowledge of the natural resources of that area. Until we are in possession of that data we cannot, of course, proceed to fix prices or rates on the territory, either as a whole or in part. If we are to follow the example of Quebec and rate our timberlands to the utmost of their value to the taxpayers of the country, then we must have exact knowledge of what we have to offer and what we ought to charge therefor. This knowledge should be in our possession at latest by next session of the Legislature when the first applications for timberlands and waterpowers will be made under the provisions of this Bill. We have no such knowledge now and we have not taken even the preliminary steps necessary to securing it. The first thing to be done, and that without delay, is to have a survey of Labrador. The factor of cost is not so great as is commonly imagined, nor need the undertaking occupy a very great period of time. Survey methods have been greatly modified and expedited of recent years by the employment of airplanes. Where, formerly and by the old ground method, only about fifty square miles could be sureyed per year, aviators make complete and satisfactory surveys of as much as forty thousand square miles per year, which was the record established by the Canadian aerial survey force in 1926. The cost to the Canadian authorities averaged three dollars per square mile. Evidently, then, aviators could survey the whole of the commercially valuable woodlands of Labrador in twelve months and at a total cost of not more than a quarter of a million dollars.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I beg to insist on my contention that the Government should take up the cudgels more aggressively on behalf of the people and against timber speculators on Labrador, who have asked for and are being granted extensions of the period of their licenses. I urge that mineral areas should be surrounded with as ample protection of the public interest therein as is being provided for the timberlands and the waterpowers; that there should be no further delay in making arrangements for an aerial survey so that we may speedily arrive at a proper conception of the extent of our holdings in square miles and the value thereof, either on a basis of outright sale of the territory or of annual rentals and royalties for portions thereof.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman: I have already given expression to my convictions with regard to the question before the chair, but I would like to add a few words more this afternoon. Before proceeding, however, I would ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines when I may expect answers to various questions in connection with these Labrador licenses which I asked a few days ago. I would be in a much better position to discuss certain phases of this question which I have in mind if the answers of these questions were before me. The Opposition through the amendment which we are now discussing has given the Government an opportunity to get out of a very bad mess, but judging from the tenor of the Prime Minister's remarks the Government has no intention of even considering the amendment and are evidently determined to pursue their unexplainable policy with respect to our interest on the Labrador Peninsula. To sum up the attitude of the Government briefly, it has been decided to stand by and protect the interests of a handful of greedy land grabbers and timber sharks, as against the

people of Newfoundland whom they are supposed to represent. I challenge any person living to-day to produce a more glaring case of rabid class favouritism than that which the Monroe Government are pursuing. In those strenuous days through which the country is passing, when thousands of unemployed cannot see the way to provide the wherewithall to keep the wolf from the door, with our staple industry rapidly becoming abandoned, and faced as we are with a tremenduous deficit of two and a half million dollars in our current revenue, while a national debt of practically eighty million dollars to which will be added another five millions this year, represents a heartbreaking burden . The picture one is compelled to draw of this country's future is anything but encouraging. On March 1st the clouds seemed to break and a ray of light and hope seemed to penetrate the gloom, when the intelligence that t he Labrador Peninsula had been awawred to Newfoundland was announced. Our claim to that very valuable territory comprising roughly 120,000 square miles containing valuable water power, timber and mineral wealth, had been substantiated. The question uppermost in the minds of us all was how can Newfoundland best exploit our Labrador dependency to the greatest advantage of this country. The proclamation of our victory however, was but a signal for activity on the part of a bunch of speculators, who have secured real or imaginary claims on Labrador for the purpose of exploiting the wealth of that peninsula to their own personal advantage. From a list before me I note that over 11,000 square miles of the very best timber lands in sections that lend itself most conveniently to development, are in the hands of 10 or 12 persons whose only object in trying to hold this valuable property is for the purpose of speculation, and not for any intention or desire of development. The amendment moved by the Opposition provides that these lands be immediately reclaimed on behalf of Newfoundland, and taken out of the hands of these land grabbers so that the country may possess the Labrador free from any incumberance, and therefore be in a position to negotiate, if necessary, a sale, the proceeds of which would wipe out the crucifying national debt which the people to-day are staggering under, and give this country an opportunity to secure her place in the sun. But sir, the Prime Minister has exhibited a very paternal attraction for these timber sharks, it would not be fair to them he says, for Newfoundland to take back these lands despite the fact that they have openly violated the terms of their licenses. Every licensee is bound within a prescribed time to erect a saw mill capable of manufacturing so much lumber per every square mile of territory held under the license, or in lieu of that to erect a pulp mill, and we find sir, that out of over 12,000 square miles of timber land tied up by these gentry, only the licensees of about 600 square miles have attempted to conform with the regulations under which the licenses were granted, in view of this fact then their claims on Labrador are invalidated and in consideration of the great necessity of Newfoundland securing an untrammelled title to Labrador so as to be able to exploit it in the best interests of the people of the country whose heritage it is, it is difficult for any honest-minded Newfoundlander to understand the attitude of Mr. Monroe and the gentlemen who comprise his Government, with regard to this great question.

When Walter S. Monroe and the gentlemen who hold seats on the Government side of the House, went to the Country in 1924 they did not appeal to a handful of greedy, sel-

fish speculators to elect them, they appealed to the people of Newfoundland, and to them they pledged a clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all policy.

Now at the very moment when they have a glorious opportunity of redeeming this pledge, in this respect at any rate, they have decided to betray the best interest of this country in order to give Tom, Dick and Harry of the land grabbing fraternity an opportunity to become millionaires at the expense of Newfoundland.

Mr. Monroe appears to be so interested in the licensees of the Labrador territory that he stated here yesterday that if the Minister of Justice were to advise him that the Government could recover those timber limits and have same revert back to the Crown without the slightest difficulty that he would not be a party to it, and rather than that his Government should restore to Newfoundland the areas in question, that he would resign as leader of the administration.

This situation, Mr. Chairman, is not unexpected, when one considers the course which the Government has pursued with respect to our Labrador dependency, at the very beginning of its term it will be remembered that in 1924 the Prime Minister accompanied by the Colonial Secretary and the Minister of Justice, proceeded to Quebec and Ottawa, and while there tried to negotiate a sale of this vast and wealthy territory practically three times as large as Newfoundland itself and containing untold wealth, for the paltry sum of fifteen million dollars. The Prime Minister while I was speaking on the Address in Reply some time ago endeavoured to deny that he had made such an offer, and I was at that time obliged to produce the Hansary of 1926 which contained copies of correspondence between the Prime Minister, Mr. Monroe, and Mr. Taschereau the Premier of Quebec, to whom he made the offer in black and white to barter away our total interest on Labrador for the above sum.

I go further now, sir, and state I challenge contradiction of the statement that we were not even to receive the ridiculously small sum mentioned, but that Newfoundland was not to receive more than ten million dollars, the other five million under the arrangement was to be divided amongst the gang of speculators to whom I have referred. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that our interest in Labrador is safe in the hands of the Monroe Government.

Since this award has been made to Newfoundland by the Privy Council, a great deal of space has been given to the discussion of the probable wealth of Labrador by American and Canadian newspapers, having regard to the fact that pulpwood areas throughout the United States is fast becoming depleted, a fact which is equally true of Canada. The value of Labrador has been variously estimated at from one hundred and fifty million to two hundred and fifty million dollars. It is therefore not only possible but very probable that if Newfoundland has a free and unincumbered title to the whole peninsula, that we could realize one hundred million dollars for its sale without in any way affecting the interests and activities of our fishermen along the seaboard.

The sale of Labrador for say one hundred million dollars would represent all the difference between a practically bankrupt country, populated by a discouraged and despairing people, and a Newfoundland free from the strangling incumberance of an eighty million dollar national debt, with a sufficient surplus with which to carry out an industrial development policy. That would make this

country one of the richest in the world, a country that could offer sufficient inducement to retain and support the flower of its manhood and womanhood who have been for years emigrating abroad as if to escape a deluge.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that if the Monroe Government will play a fair game by the people of Newfoundland and not by a handful of get-rich-quick fortune seekers, that Newfoundland can become the brightest gem in the British crown, and be within a very short time transformed into a land where a happy, prosperous and contented people will be privileged to work out their destiny in a manner worthy of their industry, courage and perseverance. If the Government persist as they appear determined in protecting the interests of a handful of the classes at the cost of sacrificing the masses of Newfoundland, then the people themselves will have to rise to the occasion as they have never done before ,and place the present Tory administration in the position in which it can do no harm.

One of the first acts of the Liberal Government when it is once again placed in charge of the destiny of Newfoundland will be to pass an Act reclaiming for the country the valuable areas of which the country has been despoiled, and to take steps to see that the people of Newfoundland will reap the benefit of this rich heritage, which has been handed down to us, and our true legal title to which has recently been confirmed.

One of the outstanding traits and characteristics of the Monroe administration has been deception and political hypocrisy, and in no case has this quality been exemplified more than in the bill which is now before the Committee. It is a proverbial case of "locking the stable door after the horse has been stolen." The Government pretends to be safeguarding the Labrador from further exploitation by land grabbers; they are going to make it more difficult for the speculators to obtain licenses and they are going to save Labrador for Newfoundland, when they know right well there is nothing left to save, and have by their very act confirmed the speculators' right to the substance, while they tell us in effect that they are preserving the shadow for Newfoundland.

The eleven thousand square miles of timber land now under license which the Government refuses to confiscate, despite the fact that these licenses which are illegally held, covers the most strategical positions, bordering as they do the most important rivers and waterways and rendering the successful development of other areas a very difficult proposition.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any hope for Newfoundland disposing by sale, or in any other way developing Labrador to the advantage of this country while these people maintain their stranglehold upon her timber resources. Mr. Monroe says that these people have paid considerable rentals and holds up his hands in horror at the idea of the Country attempting to reclaim the territory held by them; he conveniently winks out of sight the fact they have violated the terms of their license by their failure to erect either a saw mill or pulp mill as provided by law. He overlooks the fact that their venture was a purely speculative one, as the territory which the licensees held was a matter of dispute between Newfoundland and Conada, and they were merely taking a gambler's chance with no idea of the development of Labrador in the interest of Newfoundland and its people.

Since the Prime Minister displays such conscientious objections to re-

claiming these lands on the score that some rentals were paid, why not pay back those rentals so that the gentlemen will not be anything out of pocket, and even if it cost Newfoundland a quarter of a million dollars to make these refunds, we would be recovering at least twenty-five million dollars worth of property, and Mr. Monroe would have the conscientiousness of having done his duty by the country whose chief trustee he is at the present moment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has not tabled the answers to my questions regarding the payment of rentals during recent years, as I feel sure that when that information is secured it will reveal a condition of affairs that will not add much to the stabilization of the claims of those people which the Government are at present endeavouring to shield and support.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: I just want to say one word; more particularly in reply to Dr. Mosdell, this afternoon, who gave an extremely eloquent and I would go so far as to say an extremely illogical pronouncement on the Act at present before the Legislature. To begin with he pointed out to us that as far as this Act was concerned that the reference of any future legislation in regard to Labrador to the Legislature was practically useless. He anticipated that behind the Government, whatever Government it might be, there would be a strong party, and that party would have to vote for whatever was brought in and consequently it had the same effect as if the Executive itself had to decide. That, in my opinion, is an extremely illogical position for the honourable member to have taken; and I say it the more particularly because we know how difficult it is to put such a Bill as this through the House. We have been a fortnight or three weeks debating for several hours each day the question of whether this legislation should go through. We have explained from this side of the House that it is a piece of legislation to defend the country against us and against all future government inasmuch as lands cannot be given away without the consent of the Legislature, and then the honourable member tell us in respect of it that the Legislature is no better than the Executive inasmuch as a party measure would put it through. I think, from my experience, that I find it very much easier to put a matter through the Executive than through the House. That is my experience up to date, and I think it is going to be my experience in the future as far as I can judge because we have not got through very much legislation so far this session. Another point that the honourable member for Fortune mentioned was that the $2 per square mile rental payable under existing leases is done away with in connection with the Labrador and the Legislature has to fix the amount of revenue in the future. Now, I disagree entirely with the honourable member that the keeping on of $2 rental is better than leaving the matter open, because I think possibly that various properties on the Labrador are going to be of various values; some properties will be much more valuable than others. It was pointed out by the honourable member for Ferryland that in connection with this Lewis's Bay property that he understood and, as a matter of fact, had very fair evidence of the fact that it had been optioned for sale at a price of £400,000 and £5,000 had been paid. I don't know whether that is correct or not. I have heard the rumour and it may be true that they have paid over £5,000. I mentioned it to a gentleman here in connection with the International Paper Company in order to impress him with

the valuable limits on the Labrador and he pooh-poohed the idea of any such price possibly being paid on the Labrador. It amounted to $950 per square mile, and there is not a territory in Quebec that has been sold at anything over $400 to $500 a square mile. In opening negotiations with the International Paper Company we mentioned a price of $500 a square mile and they said there was no use discussing the matter any further. They said their ideas were down somewhere between two dollars and three hundred but much nearer the two dollars than the three hundred.

The other arguments the honourable member for Fortune made is that we should cancel leases and indemnify the holders is one that we have gone over and over again, and I have taken the position right along that to try and force these people who have paid their rentals up to date to give up their rights and tell them we are going to take away their lands would be an act of highway robbery. That is my view of it, and I have made the statement that even if the Justice Department thought we might get them back by fighting for them on a question of law, I, for one, would not be a party to it. Attention has been drawn to a relative of mine having interests on the Labrador, but a man can't help having relatives, and I suppose, like everybody else, I have got a few that have got interests in some place. The fact that some relative of mine has interests in the Lewis's Bay property is no interest of mine. I have no interest in it; neither does it affect me in any way in my attitude on this matter.

The fact that any relative of mine got any interest in that Lewis Bay property is not influencing me whatever. In the position I take we had four lawyers in our Executive to advise us, including Mr. Bradley, who made such a long speech here yesterday afternoon and who was prepared to confirm my statement, that during all the time we were discussing the cancellation of the licenses of those people who had paid their rentals there was never a suggestion that we had any claim against them. These people kept on paying their rentals, and, according to the advice of Hon. Mr. Morine, Hon. Mr. Higgins and Hon. Mr. Cramm they had a specific title when the Labrador Boundary dispute was decided upon. The matter came to me first in the Executive Council when it came from the Agriculture and Mines Department and it was referred to the Justice Department. Then the Justice Department gave an opinion on it and the matter went through the Executive without a dissenting voice. With regard to the time limit, I do not know whether it is right now. I think it is questionable whether or not we should give those three years instead of two in which to complete their mills, because their leases give them three years, and it may be they will have a come-back on us. With regard to the Bill itself, I want to say that we would make it stronger if we could, but the amendment submitted by the Opposition would be unavailing, as the Opposition have made up their minds to a proposition that is impossible—a proposition for us to forcibly take back the lands from the people who paid their rentals—and a proposition that was against the opinion of every legal man in our Party, and, consequently, I do not see, with such able opinions behind us, that we would be justified in taking the matter into Court and having an opinion on it. As I view it, it would be an iniquitous thing to take it before a Court of Justice and further it would lower the prestige of the Government not alone in the

minds of the people of the country but in the minds of the world generally.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the honourable introducer of the Bill if it is the intention to grant further extensions to people who have not already had the extension for two years?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: In response to the honourable member I might say I suggested to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that he notify all those who had paid their rentals up to date and had complied the same as the others to have their mills built within two years, so that they would not be looking for further extensions.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman: The answer of the Prime Minister raises another point. According to the argument put forth by the member for Part de Grave yesterday, the Government has no right to instruct the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to notify license holders that they have any extension of time. This is a most important question and one that should be decided by the law officers of the Crown. Now that question has been lucidly, clearly and forcibly dealt with by a professional member of this House, we should have the matter decided right away if it is absolutely contrary to statuary law for the Executive Government to interfere or retard any matter of the Crown Lands Act dealing with licenses. I contend it is illegal for the Government to intimate to license holders in any way. I would like to hear the ruling of the Minister of Justice on this point so as we can know where we stand in the matter. The Minister of Justice has always stated it is not worth the paper it is written on and it would be a criminal act on our part to cancel the licenses of those men who have paid up their rentals. If the license holders did not ask for an extension, why notify them?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: I want to repeat to the member for Trinity what I intimated to the member for Fortune Bay. So far as Section two of the Bill is concerned it has absolutely nothing whatever to do with any act of extension, suspension or ignoring of leases. There is no powers that I know of by which any person can arrive at the conclusion that Section two has any connection with say so-called action of the Executive as regards those who have paid their rentals, because Section two only provides that nothing in this Bill contained affects any rights that people have got. Rights mean rights, not moral or equitable rights, but rights simply construed as what persons are legally entitled to. I repeat here now what I advised the Government on numerous occasions before that no other course was open to the Government, in view of the conduct down through the years of waiving a compliance of the terms of the leases in other respects than paying of rentals, but to give those people who had paid their rentals an opportunity of complying with the terms of their licenses and erect mills, and to fully accept the responsibility.

I state that now and I state it with all respect to any opinion any honourable member in this House or outside of it may have. It is all very well, and quite easy for people to get up here and say: "Why not try it out in law." This country has suffered enough from the attempts of people, who for political motives or from the standpoint of catering to public sentiment have started the violation of contractural obligations. And it has been in Newfoundland ever since. Two-thirds of our miseries to-day are due to these. But

I will go further and suggest to-day to the Premier that as to Section 2, if there is any doubt as to the meaning of it the Bill would not be altered a bit as regards its legal rights if we put in "or anything lawfully done." I suggested in consultation with Mr. Dunfield, to cut out Section 2, and that Section could go in; but it will not alter the force of the Bill a bit, although I admit that it will look nicer, and read better. May I have the permission of the Prime Minister and the House to have that suggestion carried out. Now we are doing the Opposition the credit of assuming that they are honest. We are taking that as the premises in this case. And of course arguing from these premises if the main fact is false then our deduction is absolutely wrong. But we will assume that they are interested in doing the right thing by the people of this country as far as they are concerned. Now in Section 1:

(Reads)

We are just anticipating the objection that the honourable member for Fortune made to-day, although it is neither an objection in point of fact or law, but just a possible construction, and the honourable gentleman himself is well aware that so far as ·ving out that section or putting it in it will have no effect whatever in the sense of the intention of the Bill. But leaving it out the first section reads like this:

(Reads)

Section 2 then reads:

(Reads)

Insert the word "lawfully." It will not be a bit different but it makes it clearer. Although if the action of the Executive Government is unlawful then this bill is no good. It gives no claim, or support or protection to these people who for ulterior purposes we are trying to protect. It clearly cannot protect because as I say any action of the Executive Government has no legal effect. Any rights they may have are neither taken from, or added to by the action of the Executive Government.

(Reads)

I desire to say that I made that suggestion to the Prime Minister only to give a clearer idea as to what was the ojbect of the Bill. It may be asked as to what is the reason for that expression that I have suggested.

(Reads)

-I just desire to state that it is an erpression put in to guard against the possible position that may be made by the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company, in the nature of the suspension of certain water power rights on the Labrador. They claim that they have fulfilled them up to a point; they made a survey of the location, they are not entitled to the Water power rights, without the expenditure of $10,000,000 on Labrador, but the time has not expired within which that expenditure has to be made.

I do say therefore so far as the present measure is concerned if it be the desire of the House to have conditions continue, as they have been in this country of old, then the only recommendation that I could make to the Prime Minister would be to withdraw the bill. But the honourable member for Fortune does not want that done. But I must say that the amendment that was introduced the other day would have that effect. As the honourable member for Bay de Verde pointed out if that amendment had been accepted in the act, whether intentionally or otherwise it would leave the situation thus, that all that had to be done at any future session was to wipe out the Act, and you would be back to the old conditions. The amendment would have the effect that nothing could have been done anyway.

Now I want to say here, that it is just as well to make up our minds to one of two courses. Is it the idea of the House here to do nothing about this Labrador territory. The Government comes in here and says that it thinks that this territory ought to be taken out of the present method of administration. The honourable member for Fortune says that if you do that, you are really just in the same position as ever you were. In other words the honourable member is complimentary enough to say that those who compose Executive Councils from time to time, are just as good people to enact measures as this Legislature. Probably very much better. The present Executive is much better than the present Legislature. But I do think that the honourable member himself will admit the absurdity of suggesting that all laws and everything else ought to be done by the Executive Council. If that is the position there is no point at all in paying any attention, or set any value on the decisions of the Legislature, because that does not contain all the Executive only, or all the Government party or all the Opposition but you have got the advantage for what it is worth of the fact that you have the benefit of its opinion on the different questions which appear. I do not think that it is a fair thing to say that grants for territory on Labrador are more likely to be assessed at the best possible value for the country if they have to run the gauntlet of the Legislative ranks, then if we were to go down to-day and with the Crown Lands Act as it stands to-day, leave it to the descretion of the Executive as to what rate is to be charged. The honourable member was not serious when he suggested that, and the best proof of that is that when I asked him just now whether he wished us to withdraw this Bill and leave the matter stand as it was, he says "No," that he thinks that something ought to be done with the territory. The only way to control it is to take it out of the operation of the present methods as regards the Crown Lands Act under Executive authority. The situation to-day is that if this measure does not go through and after all it seems that honourable members do not want it to go through, then the Prime Minister is ready to let the whole matter stand, and if we want to protect our friends as honourable members have suggested, there would be no trouble to have the Gazette tomorrow filled up with applications for Land on Labrador, and we could grant it out for two dollars a mile. None of us would regard that as good business. Well now what ought to be done is the passing of this Bill. The honourable member for Fortune Bay made a most eloquent speech this afternoon, as of course he always does, but if ever I heard a man say nothing, in a speech he certainly did it to-day. It was as clever a covering up of an address as ever I heard, that in actual facts contained not one single objection to this Bill. There was no reason in any position that the honourable member took. He took the position that it was no improvement to have matters submitted to the Legislature than to the Executive Government. Surely that is not right. He comes forward and suggests that we ought to apply the situation as regards Quebec in valuing lands on Labrador, knowing as he does, and everyone in this House does, that we know nothing about Newfoundland let alone Labrador. The first attempt that was made by anyone to make a charge for timber rights in Newfoundland was when this administration came into power. Rentals being paid for land on Labrador, were based on the two dollars a square mile as the value of the land down there, just because that was put down as the minimum. None

knew or at least did not attempt to put a value on the land down there, and we don't know ourselves, and so far as the transactions referred to last year are concerned, we do not suggest that we were going upon real knowledge of the value of the land on Labrador. But the first time that any real money was got for that territory was when this Government made the decision to fix a price for the land down there. Of course we should know the value of the land but to have that we must get information, and the only way to get information is by a survey, and is not that all the greater reason why we should have a Legislature that ensures that the advantage is not going to be taken from the Government as it is under the Crown Lands Act. I would like to believe the honourable gentleman that we can get the Labrador surveyed as cheaply and as quickly as he suggests.

The information that they get even by airplane method does not indicate as cheap or quick a return as stated, nor do I think an airplane survey would be sufficient, especially for timber. It is a quick method to get a pretty general idea of a territory in which timber prevails. But it cannot be suggested that an aerial survey is sufficient on Labrador to get an estimated value of the timber.

In conclusion I wish to repeat to the honourable member for Trinity that insofar as we stand to-day, the passage of this measure, either in the form in which it was printed or in the suggested form I have indicated to the Premier, in no ways affects the rights of those who have or have not leases on the Labrador. That is number one. My second is that the attitude of the Executive is simply to interpret to the people what position it is going to take as an administration regarding those who paid their rentals up to date. In other words if they have a title they have it, and if that is not sound in law I think it will be found that we have an application in the Legislature to pass an Act to rectify the title. I don't think the opinion is sound that recourse to any Court of Law would go in our favour where governments have accepted rentals for years. I repeat that I don't see anything in the action of the Executive that interferes with or takes away the rights of these people. I don't see how the Executive affects that.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am sure we have been very much interested in the learned address just delivered by the Minister of Justice, and I am very much obliged to him for coming around for two or three mintes to my question as to the connection of the Government in granting extensions to these license holders. I take it now that the Executive Government, on its own authority have performed an act that they had no real authority to do, and to make that legal and worth while they would have to come to the Legislature to have it ratified. It is like a great many things that have been done by Executive Governments.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I didn't say that. I said if the title was not good these people would still have to come to the Legislature.

MR. HALFYARD—That is, if the letters sent by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, upon the recommendation of the Governor-in-Council, are worth nothing. Possibly that would be well ventilated in the world, and the people in England, and that company in England who asked the Executive Council whether their rights would be covered, would question the validity of that piece of paper given them, and no dobut some English investors will have the knowledge even now that this is worthless, and the present Legislature or a succeeding one may after all pass a law cancelling these licenses. That is a terrible

position for the Government of Nfld. to assume—to be issuing letters, signed, sealed and delivered by the Executive Government, and still to be worthless. Talk about giving us a black eye! The question will be what kind of a Government have these people of Nfld. got. I think what we should do is to seriously consider putting an amendment in the Bill indemnifying the Executive Government in the interests of Nfld., because it is a terrible thing to be committing such a dishonest and dishonourable action—and we are parties to it by not trying to rectify it at the earliest possible moment, and I suggest to the Hon. Minister of Justice that he put three or four lines in this Bill to indemnify the Government and make their action legal. The Hon. Minister must know that there is some truth in what I am saying—I I don't think it can be termed illogical. It is a very interesting thing that we have given these licensees a letter extending their terms for two years from the date of the settlement of the Boundary question to carry out the terms of their agreements. Some of these license holders stated that it was useless for them to appeal to the investing public unless they could be quite sure that the Nfld. Government would not compel them to carry out the terms. It is a pity that the people of the community who have had dealings with this Government haven't got the same opinion of it as the Minister of Justice, but they are not blessed with the same knowledge as he, and would not interpret things in the same way. I have no great knowledge of legal phraseology, and have to take my opinion from those who are supposed to know something about it. But there it is as far as I can see it, done by the Executive Government. The Min. of Justice now tells us that by some transmission of thought these people will know that everything is safe as long as they are in power, bui "God help them" when this Government gets out. I don't think we have come to transmission of thought yet, but have to get things in the written or the spoken word to convey meanings or indicate intentions. And I still contend that the Executive Government has performed an action that they admit is worthless—that the Legislature may revoke the agreement altogether—and they are going on in this way. There is nothing in this Bill or any action of yours to make things different, and it must have been quite awkward for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines knowing what he knew at the time. I sympathize with Mr. Walsh; a person asks for an extension and he gets authority from the Executive Government, knowing that it is worthless, and so becomes party to an illegal action. Why can't we get over that by giving them one year from the date of the settlement of the Labrador? Absolutely no rentals at the end of one year, and if they don't carry out the terms of their agreement, they will be cancelled, then we will be in a good position and everyone will understand it. By act of the Legislature is the only way that we can act now as far as I can see. These people can go on according to interpretation put on Statutes asking for extension as long as the present Government is in power, but God help them if anyone else comes in. I believe, as the Minister of Justice says, that nothing will be done on the Labrador.

And people are not going to attempt to ask people to buy shares in a company down there under these conditions. So they are tying it up; the Government is tying up these limits, preventing the development of these valuable timber lands down there. We can neither sell nor can we develop. That is the condition at the present time.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to address a question to the

Hon. Minister o f Justice. Having given permission to the licenseholders to have an extension of two years to comply with the terms of the lease, when the two years are up, if the terms are not complied with, what is the pos.tion then?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The position then, I take it, is that the administration of the day can pursue its remedy.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—What is the remedy?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The remedy by action. As I view it, we undertake that if they get a mill up within two years, we are not going to take any action. That is all it means. At the end of two years we proceed.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the most important debates taking place in the House or that will take place during the session, and as there is some information that has been requested from the Department of Agriculture and Mines in questions asked by Mr. Hibbs, member for Fogo, that we have not yet got I would suggest to the honourable introducer of the Bill that the Committee rise. I am not doing this with any intention of delaying the House. There are other matters on the Order Paper and Supply has been deferred every day for the last two weeks, and there is no necessity to continue on the Labrador Bill alone. There are other things that can be gone ahead with, but I would like to have the information asked for before the Bill is passed.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Justice alleges my unwillingness to see this Labrador Bill go into the discard. He is quite right in his estimate of my opinion. I find fault with the measure more on account of what it omits rather than for what it contains. I am prepared to pay the Government the compliment of saying that the Bill represents a distinct step forward in the direction of protection of public interests. I do contend, though, that the stride taken is not long enough. I welcome the measure as evidence of growing interest in the general public, but I contend that the glowing claims made on behalf of the Bill and its future effects are by no means fully justified.

I have tried to point out the defects and the shortcomings of the Bill and I have endeavored to show how, in my opinion, it could be greatly improved. It does not give all the protection I would like to see thrown round the method of disposition of Labrador lands. One matter to which I have persistently called attention is the omission of mineral lands from the scope of what is represented as the protective section of the Bill, Clause 1.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It was deliberately done.

DR. MOSDELL—I am not clear as to the reason. I don't see why careful protection is attempted to be given to Labrador timberlands and water powers and yet mineral areas are not included in the scope of that section, especially as it is generally admitted that the Crown Lands Act does not provide adequate protection for these mineral areas.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —In the original draft of the Bill minerals were included. The matter was debated a good deal and it was felt that minerals ought to be taken out. It was felt that it would discourage people going down there to go prospecting. It was thought that people ought to be encouraged to go prospecting on the Labrador without having to come before the Legislature. People are not going to go down prospecting unless they know that it is going to be worth their while and so they would have to come to the Legislature before going or any discoveries might be useless to them and in that sense it was thought better to leave it open and if anybody goes ahead and

strikes anything and wants to look for any unusual concessions he would probably come to the Legislature anyhow.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I have to take exception to the remarks just made by the Minister of Justice. There has been no recantation of opinion expressed by honorable members on this side of the House. We have spoken in favor of the principle enunciated in connection with the Bill to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador. We have demanded that the provisions of that Bill embody the fullest possible recognition and the fullest possible protection for that principle. We approved of Clause 1, except for its omission of mineral areas from its scope. We attacked Clause 2, because we feared that in practice it would be injurious to popular interests. The position I now take is that if the Government refuse to accept the Opposition Amendment as already brought in and will not consider any other radical alteration of the measure, then it is better to pass this Bill than none at all.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the Bill be read?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— In the original draft of the Bill minerals were included. The matter was debated a good deal and it was felt that it would discourage people going down there to go prospecting. It was thought that people ought to be encouraged to go prospecting on the Labrador without having to come be- the Legislature. People are not going to do down prospecting unless they know that it is going to be worth their while and so they would have to come to the Legislature before going or any discoveries might be useless to them and in that sense it was thought better to leave it open and if anybody goes ahead and strikes anything and wants to look for any unusual concessions he would probably come to the Legislature anyhow.

DR. MOSDELL—There was another remark in connection with those letters in connection with extension. Did I understand the honourable gentleman to say that they had no legal effect?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— No; no legal effect.

DR. MOSDELL—And we have no liability under these letters except as a matter of good faith?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— That is really the position. We only undertake that we are not going to call into question their position as to not having erected a mill. We can't alter the law; it merely says we are not going to do it. Naturally I assume if another administration came int opower they are going to honour that.

DR. MOSDELL—That was the point I was trying to make. Why has it no legal effect?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Because the Executive Government can't alter the law. If a man violated the conditions of his lease, and I repeat he has not violated them, but if he had, we had no power to permit it. We can't alter the law.

DR. MOSDELL—But if the writing of letters, so, be an act apart from the law, surely the payment of rentals in respect of areas, in the failure to keep other conditions will also be an act apart from the law?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— No, the payment of rentals cannot be considered an act apart from the law as you say. That is entirely different.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: The Leader of the Opposition has asked me to ask the postponement of the reading of this Bill. I can't follow his arguments. I know that these questions that have been addressed to the Department of Agriculture and Mines are asking

the amount of rentals paid in by some people at the present time. I can't see what bearing they have on the Bill whatever. The Bill is simply and solely for the purpose of preventing governments in the future from giving away the Labrador. However as I say, I don't want to refuse to have the Committee rise; at the same time I may say we are all pretty tired of it and I feel very much inclined myself to withdraw it. We have nothing to gain by this except by the country's interests in having the Labrador tied up for we think it better to have the Labrador tied up, but if the Opposition are going to persist in keeping this thing going from day to day I think we will probably withdraw it. I don't throw that out as a threat, but merely as a suggestion, that there is not much object in persisting if that is the attitude of the House. The Leader of the Opposition made a statement to the effect that we have been postponing the Estimates from day to day. Well, we felt that we would like to get a matter of this kind through with and get on with the Estimates. We are ready with the Estimates and can go on with them as soon as the House is ready. I might say in connection with legislation, before I ask the Committee to rise that we are still in negotiations with the International Paper Company and we have had very difficult legislation to enact. We are meeting difficulties in very many respects; and if you talk about this as being important as a piece of legislation I am going to say it is not important at all as compared with the legislation we have got to bring in in connection with the Gander and in connection with Corner Brook. The two bills in connection with those in my estimation are the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Legislature since this administration came into power and will very largely affect the future of this country. We want to give as much time naturally to the consideration of these matters as we can and we have been giving almost every night and every spare morning and it would be very much better in many respects if we were giving our afternoons as well instead of what we have been giving them to.

However in deference to the wishes of the Leader of the Opposition I move that the Committee rise.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee rises I would like to say that I don't think any member on this side of the House who spoke has objected to the Bill going through to protect the properties on the Labrador. What we always contended for was additional protection. We want what property is there which we claim is illegally held to revert back to the Government so that the property can be some value to us. I still maintain that the argument and discussion in connection with the Bill has been very important and has been important in bringing out certain matters which the House should know and which the House perhaps will benefit by in the future. There is no intention to obstruct the procedure of the Bill. The information asked by the honourable member for Fogo is important although it doesn't bear on the Bill inasmuch as it is important to the subject under discussion and I think we should have the information.

MR. K. BROWN—Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee rises might I be permitted to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been drawn to a message sent from St. John's to the Montreal Daily Star, concerning the buying out of Corner Brook. With your permission I would like to read it.

(Reads)

This message is dated June 22nd. I

would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has met or has been in correspondence with as mentioned here?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the honourable member my attention has not been called to the message he mentions but in the main the statements contained in it are correct. There is a gentleman connected with one of the largest trust companies in Canada whom I asked as a personal favour, a great friend of mine, to help us in the consideration of our important problems and difficulties. I felt that he could be of great benefit, rather I felt that he could be possibly a good competitor in the business and I say that he has been of very great assistance to the Government in that respect. I can't say very much more about it at the present moment except that negotiations have been going on with the International Paper Company and at the same time with other parties and that the two parties have met together in New York to discuss the situation, the Canadian interests acting largely in a friendly way on behalf of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Wednesday, June 29th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 29th, 1927.

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

Mr. Halfyard presented a petition from the residents of New Harbor re roads.

Mr. Halfyard presented a petition from the Fishermen's Industrial Organization re fishery matters.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Fishermen's Industrial Organization, which has its office at Catalina. The officers of the Organization are George Dalton, President; J. Blackmore, Vice-President; Thomas Perry, Secretary. Being a representative of Trinity district a part of which is the headquarters of the Organization, I have been honoured by the Secretary to present this petition. This Industrial Organization has also attached to the petition a copy of their constitutional rules. I presume the Organization has been duly registered and carried out all that was necessary in connection with statutary law for such Organization. With your permission, Sir, I will ask the clerk to read the petition to the House.

(Reads Petition)

Mr. Speaker, I have here the signatures of numerous people praying that this petition be granted. I can only give the House and idea of the number of signatures to this petition by measuring it off in fathoms: one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. Mr. Perry who gave me this said there were thirteen yards of signatures.

Mr. Speaker, the presentation of this petition from this organization will show the great interest being taken in the fisheries especially the codfishery. It is a well known fact that the prosecution of the codfishery during the last year particularly has been unremunerative. All interested in industrial conditions have given great thought to this and no doubt this organization before starting in to get this signed and circularising people throughout the country gave the matter the great consideration, therefore we should not treat this petition light-

ly. It is not the ordinary petition we receive during the legislative session. They refer to the method of culling known as the tal qual and say it is an unfa r method of culling. They refer to the stabilization of the fishing industry and they also refer to the encouragement of the fisherment to prosecute the fishery and turn out a better grade and higher standard of our fish. In short the petition refers particularly to the curing and marketing of codfish. That no doubt is agitat ng the minds of all those who have anything to do with the fish business, in prosecuting the fisheries and in marketing our codfish. In the opinion of the petitioners they have reached a conclusion no doubt that it can hardly be expected that any measure will be adopted by the trade, those who have to do with the marketing with regard to the standardization of fish. They have come to the conclusion for any measure to be enforced beneficial to the fish ng industry that the matter will have to be dealt with by the Legislature; that laws must be enacted governing the standardizing and marketing of fish and that is the gist of the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Speaker, it would be unkind on my part, perhaps unfair, if I was to say that everybody interested in the welfare of Newfoundland has given great thought, serious thought, to this question of the standardization and marketing of codfish, except the Government. Now, I say it would be unfair, perhaps unkind. Anyhow it is up to the Government and now the matter is put up to us as a Legislature it is up to this House to give serious consideration to this all important matter and if the trade cannot agree in coming to a decision as to what some people think should be done then it is up to us to legislate in the best interests of Newfoundland. The fishery is our staple industry. All other industries are supplementary to it or secondary. If we are to exist in the country something must be done to induce our young men to remain in the country and prosecute the fisheries. We cannot do it at the present time. The cost of prosecuting the fisheries is too high to make it possible for them at the present time. The price they receive at the present time would be fairly remunerative if it did not cost so much to prosecute the fisheries, but with the cost away up and the price only moderate or out of all proportion to the cost of catching it can't be done. I suppose it would not be extravagant for me to say that ten thousand of our best men are leaving the country because they can't see any future in the fisheries.

On the question of a bonus I will say nothing. It is a question of which the working out is too much for me. My small mind cannot grasp all necessary facts to properly work that out so I will say nothing. That is a matter for the Govt. to consider. They did talk about a bonus I think once upon a time. I don't know whether they will consider that now or not.

I beg to support the prayer of the petition with regard to standardization and stabilising of the fishery industry. If there is anything that can be done under heaven to stabilise our fishing industry, I hope that the Prime Minister and the Executive Government will discover it after giving earnest thought to this petition and from that make a start to do something tangible to enable the fishing industry of Newfoundland to carry on. I beg to ask that the petition be referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: I rise to support the prayer of the petition presented by Mr. Halfyard, in the main, that is to say, insofar as it refers to standardization, and insofar as it refers to the necessity of some steps being taken to do away with the tal qual system of purchasing fish. I do not propose now to

subscribe myself to the idea of a bonus. If I were a member of a Government to-day and the matter was brought seriously home to me as in this I might be prepared to give it some very serious consideration in connection with my colleagues, but at present I am not prepared to make any pronouncement. I would like to take this opportunity to explain that a petition being prepared by the F.P.U. has a good deal in common with this one but has nothing in common with regard to its origin. We have a series of petitions originating from the activities of the F.P.U. dealing chiefly with this subject. This is a distinct organization; it is not entirely a rival organization. It will be found that the signatures to our petitions and the one just presented are in many cases the same. I agree with Mr. Halfyard's statement that after all, all these things go to show that fishermen are taking a real interest in these problems and really want the Legislature or the Government or someone with authority to get down to serious business and try to remedy some existing evils. In the main I say I subscribe to the prayer of the petition and I trust the Government will see fit to give serious consideration to it along with the other petitions proposed to be presented as I have mentioned later in the session.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker: I think if I say say one word I would like to point out the great difficulties that the present administration has to face to recommend Government enforcement of any step in connection with standardization. Although quite desirous of having standardization that would be suitable the difficulties are almost insurmountable. I know that last year six firms, in order to test the possibilities, labelled various fish with a private label and had the culler describe those fish as No. 1 Spanish, No. 1 Italian, No. 1 Jamaica, or whatever might be the particular market to which those fish might be shipped. These fish being labelled by the various firms were exchanged between the various firms and perhaps one firm, the Monroe Export Company culled over Bowring's fish and Job's culled over Harvey's and so in various cases, and the culler employed in each particular firm made an absolutely different cull and put it in a different market altogether from where it was put where originally sent out. To get somebody that can create a system in connection with standardizing of fish for the various markets to which it is to go is no easy task and the value of such a system would be largely determined by the market to which it would go. As far as I can see the difficulties are almost insurmountable and if these gentlemen who are petitioning have given a good deal of thought to the matter and think that something can be done along those lines and can present something more than a petition a proposition by which this can be done I would very much like to hear from them. It seems to me we would require a super-man here to train cullers all over again. I don't think we could take the cullers we have got in this country today and train them in a very short time; that is the reason that I remarked in my reply to the honourable member for St. Barbe when speaking on this subject that it wasn't so ridiculous as he might imagine to suggest a plaster cast of a model or standard to go by. It is really not so ridiculous because there is no other way that I can see that we can make a standard by which the culler can pick out the exact qualities required.

I just want to point out the grave difficulties the Government is up against. The reason we don't do anything is solely and simply because of

these grave difficulties. The matter has being given a great deal of consideration. It has given me a great deal of thought and worry and that test made last year has proved conclusively in my mind that under our present cullers no system can be made out until some way of training can be determined.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker: I would like to say a few words on this petition because of the importance and the history of petitions here. I remember when I occupied a seat on the Opposition I ridiculed the idea of Government Ministers getting up and presenting petitions and supporting petitions on various subjects and immediately the petition passed through the hands of the presenter it found its way to the waste paper basket at least so far as we were concerned we heard no more about it. I suggested when on the other side of the House that in the early days of the session there should be a committee appointed to deal with petitions. Surely members of the House can forget party politics sufficiently long to give the various petitions that come before the House consideration. This is a petition according to its substance originating from a body absolutely nonpolitical. I notice in reading the main clause of the constitution:

(Reads)

What I suggest is because of the importance of the subject a Select Committee be appointed to consider the petition instead of referring it in the ordinary way to the Department to which it relates, and that it refer back to the House. We have time before the House will close, and I suggest that five or six men be appointed. Surely five or six men can be found to forget politics and give a subject so important the consideration it deserves.

Mr. K. Brown presented a petition from Three Arms re roads.

Mr. K. M. Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: I do not intend to deal at any great length with the Estimates this afternoon. I just intend to go over the increases or decreases practically without any explanation whatever, and to ask the Committee then to rise so as to give the members of the Opposition an opportunity of going over the Estimates to-morrow, and then as each vote comes along I will be prepared to fully explain it. It would seem that for the year 1927-1928 there is an increase of $277,528.83 over the Estimates for the year 1926-1927. This is all practically made up because of the increase in the public debt. In the Finance Department there was a decrease of $12,388.49 and in the Colonial Secretary's Department a decrease of $600.00, whilst in the Justice Department the decrease was $3,504.50. In the Education Department there is an increase of $51,-050.50 which is made up chiefly in augmentation grants. In the Public Charities there is an increase of $23,922.15, and when this vote was taken up I felt there would be an agreement as to the justification for this amount. It was mostly for sick poor. The Agriculture and Mines Department showed no decrease or increase and the Public Works Department showed a decrease of $139,543,-91. The Marine and Fisheries Department showed a decrease of $895.-00. The Posts and Telegraphs De-

partment shows a decrease of $7,-742.75 whilst the Customs Department shows an increase of $136,-465.00. This amount is due to refund for duties, etc., paid in. It is only an estimate and if the duty is not paid in the amount will not be necessary. Last year a vote of 50,-000 was not sufficient and the Deputy Minister suggested that this year there should be a vote of $140,000 for this purpose as in the past large Supplementary Supply had to be taken. Another increase in this department was due to the cost of operating the S.S. Daisy. Usually the sum of $20,-000 is voted for this purpose, but it costs $40,000 to operate the ship. I had gone into the matter carefully and did not see how the cost could be reduced. I thought it was better to vote the full sum for the boat now than have to come back into Supplementary Supply later and ask for another amount as was done last year.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the ill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I am hoping that members on the Opposition side are now satisfied that this Legislature has brought in amendments that will cover all the points that we can see can be granted in connection with the assurance to the country that Labrador will be held intact for disposition by this House of Assembly rather than by Executive Governments in the future.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: The attitude of the Prime Minister that the Opposition ought to be satisfied that this legislation after all is directed towards the protection of our interests on the Labrador is one which, as far as this particular legislation is concerned, I for one do not concur. I fail to see how the legislation which we are now considering, and which we have been debating here for the last fortnight, is in any measure whatever protecting or conserving our interests on the Labrador. Nevertheless the position we have arrived at to-day is this, that for two weeks we have been debating this legislation, and as far as the Opposition is concerned, we have entered in to this debate with the hope, and with the view in mind that we would be able to exercise some influence on the Government in order to see if it was not possible for this legislation to secure for the people of Newfoundland all the lands on Labrador intact. It is now apparent, I think, to everyone who has followed the trend of this debate that as far as that idea is concerned we have gained nothing. When this legislation was introduced, and after the preliminary discussion took place upon it, the Prime Minister, and he must have been very well aware as to what the position was, asked the Opposition if they would be good enough to draft an amendment, or suggest amendments as they chose to, the present Bill. We accepted the invitation of the Prime Minister and devoted some considerable time to the whole matter, and subsequently brought in an amendment here, at least an amendment from our point of view by which we hoped to arouse the opinion of the members of this Legislature along lines as to whe-

ther or not we could secure and protect for the benefit of Newfoundlanders not only in this generation but for all generations to come, the fruits of the victory that we won as a result of the Privy Council decision. The House has never had strictly speaking, an opportunity of dealing with that amendment, or of considering the principles that underlie it, and the Government have made up its mind, that come what may, its chief interest is that nothing shall harm or endanger the titles of those speculators who already hold timber limits on the Labrador. Mr. Chairman, I am not afraid to have it said that in view of what has happened I at least was one of the men who held up this Legislation on this Bill. I am not afraid to go to this country, sir, and let this country know that this Opposition fought a strenuous fight on the floors of this House in order to secure and hold intact for Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders the fruits of the victory that was won as a result of the Privy Council decision. And I will go further and say that I am satisfied for it to be known to this country as it is known to-day throughout this country that through the whole tenor of the debate on this bill it has been not the people of Newfoundland but the interests and the welfare of the speculators owning timber lands on the Labrador. When the Privy Council decision as to the rights of Newfoundland on Labrador, was handed down in the Spring of this year there was general rejoicing throughout the country, because of the fact that after the wrangle of twenty years with the Canadian Government over that disputed territory, we had won it, a period of twenty years in which the people of this country, this generation must have expended a sum of money in expenses and legal fees, aggregating not less than a quarter of a million dollars, I make bold to say that there was general satisfaction throughout the country that the award was given us in the favourable manner that it was. While not merely from the matter of fact that it was the termination of a long fought out struggle, not merely because we feel that we had got some returns for the money that was spent in fighting that case, but because the people of Newfoundland hoped and believed that through the Labrador we had got something which we were going to be able to exploit in order to ease the present burden of taxation under which we are groaning at the present time. Now one thing has emerged very plainly from the discussion that has taken place in this Legislature on this Bill. I think the position the Leader of the Opposition took yesterday afternoon when he said that, even though we could not get the House down to the point of considering our amendment or proposal, still a great deal had been learnt and a lot of good had come out of the discussion. Yes, we have learnt a great deal and through this discussion on the Labrador Bill there has emerged one aspect, one definite situation to my mind and that is that if the people of Newfoundland rejoiced when the decision of the Privy Council was known, in their hope that because we had won and we would now have some opportunity of manipulating the territory down there, either by developing it or selling it to lessen the burden of debt and taxation, then I say that hope is dead. That is the sinister aspect that has emerged from out this discussion. Twelve thousand square miles of timber lands on Labrador, the best timber-lands are already gone. By the time we have the various surveys that the Prime Minister referred to here on opening day for one thing, and by the time we have the geographical survey there would not be much left of Labrador as far as the timber-lands are concerned, that would be of very much benefit to this country. The Prime Minister stated here in the

remarks that he made on opening day in reference to Buchan's Mine, that he regarded it as being of superior value, superior as far as the interests of the Company are concerned, than Labrador. He spoke knowing whereof he spoke, because he knew that the most valuable portion of Labrador has been gone, and it was going to be his job to make secure for those holding lands on Labrador, their titles and rights. I charge that the Government broke faith with the people of this country throughout the whole matter. When the decision on the Labrador question was made known, we were told that the Government was going to see to it, that everything possible was going to be done to protect the peoples rights on Labrador. From out this discussion, we have discovered that the very reverse has been the case. It is correct that the Government may not have since the decision awarded any new licenses for grants on Labrador but the fact remains that the people holding timber-lands on Labrador have no title to these lands, and the Government instead of endeavoring to get back these timber-lands for the people started to work and serve notice on these people in order that they might be forewarned and have an opportunity to take steps to make their titles secure. If that is not breaking faith with the people of Newfoundland, then I would like to know what the Government called breaking faith. The whine, and I cannot call it anything else, the whine that has been heard throughout all these debates has not been the interests of the people of Newfoundland, but the interest of the speculator and the land-grabber on Labrador. Well did Mr. Tachereau know when he threw out the taunt in the despatch from Toronto on June the 14th that "we were taking it like good sports"

Mr Taschereau spoke truly. It is a fruitless victory for Newfoundland in view of the facts disclosed since debate on this measure has started. One newspaper forsooth asked if Newfoundland was prepared to take up the challenge. If the men who were responsible had done their duty, when they had the cards in their hands, they would have been in a position to take up the challenge, for the reasons that I have outlined and which have been so well discussed since this debate opened. You have not conserved the interests of the people in the Labrador. There is no hope for us that the Labrador is going to mean anything of the nature of importance that we expected when the decision was made in our favor.

Now Mr. Chairman, as regards the Bill which we are now discussing, I can only say that I see no necessity for it in any case. The Prime Minister intimated yesterday that if the Opposition was not satisfied with the Bill he was prepared to discharge it. As far as I am concerned he can go ahead—I see no necessity whatever for it. I might possibly agree with the first clause, and I can very well understand why the Government should be in such haste to bring this in. No sooner was the decision laid down than speculators got busy, and the Government had a rough time. For instance, during the Spring I scanned the pages of the Royal Gazette and made a list of the people applying for timber-lands since the Labrador question was decided. It is very interesting. They filled up the Gazette week after week with requests totalling over twelve thousand square miles. A gentleman named William Pearcey wanted 1950 square miles—he didn't want much. Robert Walsh asked for 250; a man called Burke 140; Fox and Phelan, acting for an unknown client, asked for 750; Mr. Crane at Joi's wanted nearly the whole Labrador—he asked for 6000 square miles; M E. Martin 200, the Hudson's Bay Company 1400, Donald Moore of St. Anthoney, a young man I know very

well, wanted 750—he is easily satisfied for a young man; a gentleman called W. C. Goodyear had no mean idea of his own abilities when he asked for something like 2180 square miles. So the story went on, and I make no wonder that the Government rushed down with the proposition that in future the decision on applications of this sort should be by the Legislature. But isn't it time to shift the responsibility, and doesn't it amount to this, that even if this Legislation becomes law of the land, wouldn't it be a fact that the Executive Council would be the parties that would have to pass on these applications and submit them to their party. No one imagines that when an application comes up, if it is objected to by the Council or against the wishes of the majority of the party, that it will come before this House. So that the position put by my friend Mr. Halfyard is absolutely correct. However as far as the first clause is concerned I am prepared to let it go through, but see no reason why anything after clause one should. Now we have, or had, in the Labrador a very valuable territory. I notice that when Sir Patrick McGrath returned from London he delivered a lecture in the Pitts Memorial Hall, and it was very interesting to me to note that the Chairman of the meeting was Mr. J. C. Hepburn, a gentleman whom the Government has since May 27th confirmed in the possession of something like five thousand square miles on the Labrador. I make no wonder that he acted as Chairman, and that he expressed himself as being keenly interested in everything Sir Patrick McGrath said.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I do not feel like bandying words further on this subject. The legal aspect of this matter in connection with the Crown Lands Act has been well and ably gone into by Mr. Bradley. From the standpoint of the possible value to Newfoundland as compared with Quebec, Dr. Mosdell has given us an interesting and informative address, and it is not my intention to go into these matters. I merely rise this afternoon, in the final stages of this Bill to state frankly that the Government has broken faith with the people. The thought and activity of the Government since the Boundary decision has been in the interests of these speculators and not in the people of Newfoundland.

Again I want to protest against the manner in which the Government has treated the amendment of the Opposition. There wasn't an hon. gentleman on that side who was man enough to say "While you are not entitled on Constitutional lines to bring in a Bill in the nature of a money bill, we are prepared to come in and have this debated, and give it a chance." There wasn't an hon. member with spirit enough for that. As far as the Opposition is concerned we have done our duty. We have tried to impress upon you the enormity of the crime—there have been strong words used during this debate, such as "honesty" and "dishonesty" and I am going to introduce another strong word and that is "crime," and I say that the Government has been guilty of a crime in the manner in which they have dealt with this affair. The Opposition has done its duty—we have not tried to obstruct, but have tried to impress upon hon. members opposite that the proper course is to get back every mile that we can get back and hold it intact. What are we to do—I for one wouldn't worry about the man who has held lands on the Labrador—he didn't live up to his terms—he was merely waiting for time to make absolutely sure of his title. It is outrageous! Again I say the Government has broken faith and the responsibility must be on their own heads.

There is one thing here Mr. Chairman, that I have never been able to understand, and that is that is the list

of existing leases as of May 12th we find the Grand River Pulp and Lumber Co. I understand these have a right to hold their property, as they lived up to their obligations. That to my mind recommends the course to us of leaving this stand and holding up on the others, an example that gives us a ground for cancelling. In other words we have placed no premium on the people who have made a real effort to carry their terms out. I find that difficult to understand—to me it seems a good and sufficient reason for clearing the others out because they failed to live up to their contract. It is nonsense to quibble about the $500,000 that we would have to pay back. At a conservative estimate we would probably save twelve thousand square miles, worth thirty millions. And you balk at attempting to secure that staggering sum for the people of Newfoundland because you would be called upon to pay back $500,000. There have been all sorts of things said in this discussion—we don't seem to be sure of anything. The Minister of Justice admitted yesterday that the conduct of the Executive Government was illegal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Pardon me, I said it was neither legal nor illegal. They couldn't do anything.

MR. SCAMMELL—They did something. They instructed the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to grant an extension. What kind of a position would you be in if these people come back and told you they took these statements in good faith? That would amount to something. In the final analysis it amounted to something.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't propose to engage in a legal conversation with the Hon. Minister of Justice, but with all respect to his abilities, his explanation of yesterday was by no means as clear and lucid as we would like it to have been. But the position remains that throughout all these things you have not kept faith with the people of the country. The victory has been lost sight of. We on this side have done our duty as we have seen it, and I have but one more remark. As far as I am concerned the Prime Minister can withdraw the Bill and I challenge him to do so right now. If the Bill goes through I shall support the first section, but I am unalterably opposed to the remaining sections.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, there has been much said about this Bill, and I don't propose to have much to say. I have heard the legal side and the other side—In the Spring when it became generally known that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had awarded us the Labrador territory there was general rejoicing through the Island. Everyone thought that having the Labrador added greatly to us, and that there would be a chance of at least selling it and paying off our National debt. The Labrador Boundary has cost this country thousands upon thousands, and when it was put to the test and Newfoundland won out everybody thought it would be a great benefit to the country. But now we find that no less than approximately twelve thousand square miles is held by timber grants. Mr. Chairman, that is not good enough; if the Government decided to cancel one of these grants they should have cancelled them all. Supposing these people did come back at the Government and we had to pay a half million, it is better to pay half a million than lose twenty millions on the sale of the Labrador—and this will cut twenty millions off the value of the Labrador, because these who hold these leases have the prime places. These people can make millions out of timber grants we ought to have. I am in favour of cancelling all the leases—let them then come back at the Government, but when we go to sell the Labrador we will be selling it as it is. and not half of it and the other half

be in the hands of speculators. By doing that we will be doing something for the country and in the interests of the people.

Some time ago when the Bill came before the House I asked the Prime Minister if he could tell me who were the men directly or indirectly interested in the Labrador, and he said he could assure me that he had no interest, but yesterday afternoon the Prime Minister said a relative of his was an owner of timber limits on the Labrador. Neither the Prime Minister nor anybody else in the country can convince the average man that he is not fighting for the interest of that relative—and these are the people who talk—the people on the outside. The Prime Minister in my opinion ought not try to fight this Bill or try to put it through this Assembly. The Opposition is against it, the country is against it, and in my opinion it should be withdrawn. The first clause should go through but section two and the rest should be cut out and withdrawn. I am not, as a member of the Opposition, in favour of these people holding their licenses any longer.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Well, Mr. Chairman, I should like to say right here and now, without having any authority from the Prime Minister who is not here, that unless some other member desires to add any remarks, I am prepared to rise the Committee and give the Government the opportunity to withdraw it. The Prime Minister is in charge of the Bill, but for myself I should certainly say that this being the request of the Opposition the Government would be very glad to withdraw it. If any hon. member has anything else to say now he can do so, otherwise I am prepared to rise the Committee and see about withdrawal. We have not the slightest desire to force this legislation.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I might say in reply to the Hon. Minister of Justice who is taking the place of the Prime Minister, that it is not the unanimous desire of the Opposition that this Bill should be withdrawn. We hoped to improve conditions through the amendment, and the discussion that has taken place on the subject of the Labrador has been and will be very valuable.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned, speaking for myself personally and not for the Opposition, the Prime Minister can withdraw the Bill. I notice the Minister of Justice uses the word "request." I don't request it—I merely say that as far as I am concerned you can withdraw it.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I think the Hon. the Minister of Justice is taking an unreasonable and an unfair position. This legislation was declared by the Government to be brought in here to recognize a principle. I have viewed it solely from the standpoint of that principle and have so debated it. Having done so conscientiously and having enunciated my conscientious objections to the provisions of the Bill and not to the principle declared to be behind it, I think it unjustifiable for the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, or anybody else, to make a threat of withdrawal, I, personally, don't share in any request than may have been made for withdrawal, I am absolutely in favor of any legislation designed and calculated to protect popular rights on Labrador and to ensure the exploitation of that territory for the sole benefit of the people of this country. I am not persuaded that this Bill will be as effective to that end as it might have been when brought in here or as it might be made as a result of the debate in this Committee, but I certainly will not endeavor to obstruct or to destroy even a measure that appeals to me as giving the minimum rather than the maximum of protection to popular interests.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr.

Chairman, this may not be in the nature of a request. I know what I would do if I were in charge of this Bill, but I am not, and for that reason it would be improper for me to do more than rise the Committee at this stage. I wish to say flatly and decidedly that the attitude of the Opposition, in the sense of their conduct regarding this Bill, has not been altogether easy to bring one to a definite conclusion as to what they want. Hon. members have indicated that they don't want this withdrawn; hon. members indicate that they want the first section passed. The suggestion therefore appears to me that they put some meaning on the second section and that all the debate amounts to a discussion of that section, which as I see it means nothing. It never meant more than a protection of the Legislature of the Colony from being put in a wrong position—it couldn't mean anything else. The Government brought this down with a view to giving the Colony the utmost security in the future, regarding the Labrador, in that any grants had to be got through legislation, and if that policy is not regarded as a wise one, surely the simplest thing to do is to continue as we are going. All sorts of suggestions have been made, even by the hon. member for Fortune who as he says believes in getting as much out of a measure as possible, that legislation may not be so far in advance in actual practice, of the present situation. The Government thinks it will be far in advance, and that it will be a protection. The hon. member for St. Barbe, who has just sat down, quoted a whole list of applications in the Gazette for territory on the Labrador. We all know the present position—the Executive doesn't have to come into the Legislature, but can look after its friends, as has been the suggestion. All they have to do is parcel it out. If I do have to say it, the conduct of this administration is a little more in line with a desire to do something more than previous administrations, who howled a lot about what they were going to do but did nothing, but allow unpaid licensees to go on, until these licenses were cancelled by us. I remember distinctly long announcements as to what ought to be done on the Labrador, but it was never done, and I think you ought to be fair enough to admit that this is a real step in advance, when these people had their licenses cancelled—that had been threatened.

Files in the Department will show that repeatedly threats of cancellation had been made but had never been put into effect, and I want to repeat here now that in so far as actual right of cancellation is concerned that it only exists in so far as non-rentals are concerned. I know that instruction were sent to the Department of Agriculture and Mines to have notification given to all people who had not paid their rentals or if not paid would have them cancelled. That was the first act done all down through the years and that was the first act this Government did do.

The second act of this Bill under the circumstances is that the Opposition do not appear to favor the measure. There is nothing in it to arouse a wrong impression in the community. For that reason and because of the deductions of what the Prime Minister said there appears to be a feeling that the Bill ought to be dropped.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: Yesterday I was at a loss to understand the Prime Minister's argument. Because the Opposition have taken an opportunity to make some remarks about the Labrador, I do not see why the Government should withdraw the Bill. I think the Opposition have gone on record as being in accord with the principle of the Bill. Cannot we as representatives of the people voice our sentiments here? Or what are we to do, come in here and

keep our mouths shut and have the Government tell us how short or how long we have got to speak? It is now being construed, as if we wanted the Bill withdrawn, a most unreasonable deduction on the part of the Prime Minister to my mind. Now if the Government was fully in accord with the principle of the Bill, why not stand by it?

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: I quite agree with the position taken by my colleague. The Opposition have done all they could in making their criticism as constructive as possible. Perhaps, they were wrong to some extent, but I think that the Minister of Justice will agree that the Opposition have played the game fair. The Opposition expressed themselves as being in favor of the principle of the Bill. I thought that in order to conserve the Labrador territory and have it remain intact was outlined in the amendment submitted, but was not accepted, by the Opposition. That has been the attitude of the Opposition and nobody on the other side of the House can say the Opposition opposed the principle of the Bill. Every Bill presented here is open to criticism. What was said was said in the interests of the country, and I think that discussion on the Bill ought to proceed.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman: So far as this suggested amendment of the Opposition is concerned, there is no good beating the air about it. The Government has taken a stand as regards people who have paid their rentals, whether it meets with the approval of the Opposition or not. Now we have been ever since discussing the propriety of that stand. I simply say to members that the Government have decided that they are not going to break faith with those people who have paid their rentals and having so decided the Government will not entertain a proposal to depart from that position. Surely the Opposition can see that position.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: During the debate on the Labrador Bill yesterday, the Minister of Justice was good enough to fling some bouquets across the floor but, unfortunately, quite absent-mindedly, of course, he included a few brickbats and flung them at the same time. The bright idea of the honourable gentleman, obviously, is to endeavour to turn the tables on the Opposition, to put critics of the Government on the defensive. In political, as in military warfare, it is a generally dependable axiom which states that the best defensive tactics are those which constitute an offensive against the enemy. So, the honourable gentleman proceeds to attack members of the Opposition because they have attacked the Bill under consideration by this Committee. The measure originated with the Government and it is for the Government to show the bona fides of the intentions with which they introduced it here and, moreover, to prove to us that its provisions will actually conserve the principles on which they are alleged to be based. The Opposition have debated the Bill at length because we do not think that it has gone as far as it should have gone with protection for the interests of the people. We have commended the principle enunciated by the Government in connection with the Bill, because we believe it to be right and we are prepared to presume that the Government brought in the Bill because they approved of the principle enunciated in connection with it. I see no season at all why the Government should be refused credit for that much of sincerity. The Government, on its part, must be equally generous in its estimate of the displayed attitude of the Opposition. A Bill that means so much to the people of the country and that has such an important

bearing on the disposition of Labrador territory, should be carefully and persistently debated by honourable members on both sides of this House until the best measure possible is framed before it is enacted as law and as such is placed on the Statute Book. But, because the Opposition have fully availed of their undoubted right and privilege of analytic and critical discussion, have really merely performed their public duties in that connection, the honourable gentleman in charge of the Bill intimates that the Government are contemplating withdrawing it from Committee and from the House. Either the Government are not enough interested in the people of the country to give their Labrador holdings the protection that is generally conceded to be necessary, or else the Government is frankly admitting that a piece of legislation of the utmost importance and the utmost value is to be abandoned because that Government is powerless to enact it. The Government, I gather from the pronouncement of the honourable the Minister of Justice, are not going to insist on the passage of this measure, are not going to push the Bill to the limit and put it through its legislative paces because the Government is too weak to do so. The honourable gentleman misunderstands the Opposition attitude towards this Bill. That attitude is not one of destruction. We have debated the measure at length only because we were anxious to offer all the constructive criticism possible. Because of the length of the discussion the gentleman in charge of the Bill intimates the Government is justified in withdrawing the measure or in contemplating such action. I do not appreciate the attitude of the honourable gentleman. It is not a reasonable one for him to take. If the Government follow that policy logically and consistently during the present session, then they must be prepared to declare that they will not, because they cannot, pass any legislation except such as is virtually unopposed by honourable members on this side of the House. Surely that is not the position of the Government. If it be, then it were just as well for the Government to resign at once, for the Opposition certainly do not intend to permit any measure of such general and vital public importance as this to pass the Committee or the House before it has been analysed and criticised and discussed in the most careful and painstaking manner. The attitude of the Government, if the honourable gentleman has presented it to us correctly, is that it cannot enact legislation of which the Opposition disapproves or which the Opposition decides to debate to any great length.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman: If it be felt that honourable members desire to go on with the Bill, it is quite alright. The statement was made merely in view of the suggestion first that this was being enacted for the protection of private interests and for a few interests. That certainly is opposed to the principle of the Bill. That is not the purpose at all. The purpose is exactly the opposite. Then it was suggested that the second section might have an ill effect. With regard to the first section as intimated yesterday so that it might be absolutely clear it might be amended as follows:

(Reads)

That should make that section more clear. As said, we were merely taking note of the fact that the Bill and that section in particular were apparently regarded as for the protection of private interests.

DR. MOSDELL—Before we get away from that clause would the honourable gentleman in charge of the Bill tell us if the Government

have absolutely decided not to accept the suggestion made that minerals be included.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No; I might say on that point, and I don't know that there is any objection to its being considered. As a matter of fact, as I have already stated, in the first draft of the Bill minerals were included, but it was merely felt to be a mistaken policy. I am quite prepared to entertain the idea of considering that.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Just what was the objection?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—It was felt that if we included minerals that it would mean that every individual who might be inclined to go off and do a little exploring down there on his own would have to come before the Legislture to get any rights by reason of any mineral discoveries. If he did not come before the Legislature he would have to go down exploring with the uncertainty that if he made a find he might not get the benefit of it, and the opinion of members of the Council generally was that it would tend to discourage prospecting and development on the Labrador.

DR. MOSDELL. — Could not the Governor in Council make regulations to safeguard such a man?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If we left out the application of the Crown Lands Act to Labrador as to minerals the same as to timber, then of course we have no power to make regulations. I don't know that there was anything particular beyond that. It was just simply the honest feeling that it was a mistake to have minerals in. As I say it actually was in, and it was thought advisable to remove it.

The second matter was in section 2. It is required to have it made clearer, we might insert the words as follows:—

(Reads)

That certainly makes it clear that it does not apply to shadowy claims. The main idea is, as I explained yesterday to the Committee, so far as I know that will apply only to the situation in connection with the Corner Brook proposal. That is the only thing I know of. There may be others. I don't think there is any other right existant under Act of the Legislature except that, and, I as I say, as to that ten million dollars still has to be spent on the Labrador inside of two years.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Is section 2 applicable to Newfoundland as well as Labrador?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE. — No; the Bill only applies to Labrador. The amendment is suggested that we insert on the second line and on the third line the following words:—and make the section read as follows:—

(Reads)

Section 2 only applies to anything that is done. If any man has a right on the Labradwor this merely undertakes that this doesn't interfere with that. With regard to minerals, I merely say that we think it is a mistake to put it in. I think myself it is a mistake.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Would not the Minister of Justice view it this way, that possibly it might be found that a- prospector's chances would be much better. He might be given better protection by this than under the Crown Lands Act.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—It would seem that the time to make that iprovement would be in an amendment of the provisions of the Crown Lands Act with respect to minerals. That particular section of the Crown Lands Act is hopelessly behind the times. It requires very complete revision, and I don't quite agree with the wisdom of putting in minerals now.

MR. MOORE.—What is the objection?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE. — Well, the idea was that we ought to encourage men to go down and look for minerals there. With regard to the Crown Lands Act now, if a man makes a discovery, he goes down to the Agriculture and Mines office and files his application for a claim and others then are laid off in blocks from that. That is wrong, because strictly speaking we should have in this country what they have everywhere else, that every man ought to make his own stake. I think I could go so far as to say, though I speak subject to correction, that not only do all these others get the benefit of the first man's staking, but if somebody had an application in before him, that would go first; of course, there has to be an original stake. In Ontario to-day and in other places the mineral legislation provides that in all cases there should be a stake, that a claim is not granted unless it is staked. Our law in that respect is badly in need of revision, and it seems to me that when that is done the matter could be dealt with properly and will be much better than under the present Bill. If we included minerals and suspended the provisions of the Crown Lands Act it would be no use to a man to stake a claim, and if he made a discovery he would have no status of any kind. The Crown Lands Act being suspended, there would be no legal control.

DR. MOSDELL.—Would it be possible to make an amendment with regard to minerals Later on in the session bring in a short measure covering the principal here?

MR. HALFYARD—The answer of the Minister raises another point. According to the argument put forth by the member for Port de Grave yesterday, the Government has no right to instruct the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to notify license holders that they have any extension of time. This is a most important question and one that should be decided by the law officer of the Crown. Now that the question has been lucidly, clearly and forcibly dealt with by a professional member of this House, we should have the matter decided right away if it is absolutely contrary to statutary law for the Executive Government to interfere or retard any matter of the Crown Lands Act dealing with licenses. I contend it is illegal for the Government to intimate to license holders in any way. I would like to hear the ruling of the Minister of Justice on this point so as we can know where we stand in the matter. The Minister of Justice has already stated it is not worth the paper it is written on and it would be a criminal act on our part to cancel the licenses of those men who had paid up their rentals. If the license holders did not ask for an extension, why notify them?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE. — It is really to-day quite different, as regards the handling of that Crown Lands Act that refers to minerals from what refers to timber and lands. I was always in hope that I might be able to bring in an amendment to that Crown Lands Act this year but I would not like to promise it. We have given a little thought to it. As to the inclusion of minerals here, I would be very glad to have the opinion of some of the members of the House as to how they feel about it. We are not definitely committed to it.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman. With regard to this matter, it is definitely understood that this Act did not contemplate minerals at all. Now with regard to this matter of the mineral laws, both in Newfoundland and Labrador I think that it is assuming

a very important position. Now within the last few days there has been a gentleman in St. John's, a man who is the advance agent of the Metalurgical Congress that is to be held at Montreal during the fall. And I had the privilege of listening to an address made by him a few days ago, and he emphatically pointed out the desirability of having mineral laws formed in this way that will give every possible encouragement to outside prospectors and capitalists coming into this country. He cited as an instance of how far reaching that would be, by referring to the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada. In the case of Ontario which some years ago had a remodelling of the mineral laws, and made them very atractive for investors to go there, with the result that investors have and are very readily investing there. At the same time the Province of Quebec with its more conservative temperament allowed the mineral laws of that Province to remain with out the necessary adjustment, with the result that there was very little development in the Province of Quebec. And as Ontario was advancing Quebec was standing still. Eventually that Province woke up to the fact that there was something wrong, they discovered what was wrong, and amended their mineral laws, and at once Quebec took on a new lease of life by the development of its mineral resources. I am not competent to give an opinion as to how the mineral laws stand here in this country, in this respect but I do recognise the necessity of giving our earnest attention to any information that can be acquired on this point. Because I think that the signs of the times are evident of a new era dawning in this country, in the way of mineral development. As I pointed out during this session that I always had very great hope, and a very enthusiastic idea for the future development of Newfoundland as a mineral country. I believe that it will be a greater mineral country than a fishing country. But time alone will prove that. We have had mines developed but where did these mines exist. They are all on the fringe of the coast, because that was the only part of the country that was accessible in the past. But what about the vast territory that lies in the interior of the country; is not the possibility in every act of that as great as it is on the coast. Therefore I say that it is a very important point at this juncture particularly when we have a series of developments in the interior of the country of a magnitude that is probably little dreamed of.

As regards the Bill under discussion I may say that I was not enthusiastic about the introduction of this Bill at all. It is a negative bill. No policy is involved as far as the country is concerned. We merely thought that now that Labrador has been acquired and proven to be a heritage of the people of this country, that it is our duty as an Executive to conserve that heritage, and in bringing in this Bill we have done it in the best of faith. As I said the other day it is an unprecedented thing for the Executive Government to take the powers out of its own hands and hand them back to the Legislature for them to govern. And I will be honest enough to say that we did not trust ourselves, and we thought it better to put a safeguard around Labrador, and to preserve it for the people of Newfoundland. That is our only object in bringing it in.

With regard to the second clause, I consider that if you take rentals from people year after year right up to the time of the settlement of the case goes in your favour, then it would not be the right thing to turn around and say "we have kept faith with you up to this point, and now we are going to turn you down." In 1925 we served notice on these per-

sons interested in Labrador that they must pay their rentals. A large number did not pay their rentals. As far as this administration is concerned it is the only administration that took the bull by the horns and cancelled licenses without fear or favour.

With regard to the second section of the Bill, if the House wants to let the matter stand, and let the Executive Government continue the granting of licenses as they have done in the past, alright. Of course if you say that these people who are paid up in their rentals are not entitled to the lands, they have recourse to the courts for the substantiation of their claims, and as regards any ulterior motive acutating any member of the Government I think that is unworthy of members to insinuate any such thing. I don't think that Mr. Monroe as one of the gentlemen who is alleged to have some interest is the class of man that would sacrifice his principles even if there was a large amount of money at stake. I think that his reputation is such that we can readily clear him of any influence of that kind. And I don't know any other member of the Executive, concerning whom this insinuation could have any foundation. As far as I am concerned it does not matter to me whether these grants are cancelled or not. But I do like to see a square deal given to those who have acted square with us. I don't think that it would be fair on our part to take advantage of a technicality. For that is all that it can be construed to be. Everyone knew that it was impossible to erect mills there before the settlement of the Labrador question because of the attitude of the Quebec Government, who felt that if they allowed Newfoundland to erect mills it would mean the loss of prestige in their case. The Labrador boundary question was settled in March and if these people now do not erect mills within two years from the second day of March, then of course their license is cancelled, unless of course some future Government will give them a further extension of time. But this Government has only given them two years in which to fulfill the conditions of their leases. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I want to say this that I think that the Government have this much to their credit, that they have come down in all good faith with this measure, in the first place from a political standpoint, and secondly because they intend to keep faith with those who have kept faith with them in the past.

MR. SCAMMELL—Regarding that question asked as to minerals. I don't favor the inclusion of minerals in this Act, but I should like to know if you contemplate mineral legislation, making provision for royalties.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, as regards that we hope to provide for it by modern mining legislation. I am hoping to be able to bring it in this session. But it is not easy to deal with minerals in the same way as land and timber. The late Mr. Turner had gone a good deal into the questions of timber and lands, but the mineral end had not been touched by him. I hope to bring in a Bill this session if we make some progress.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I want to make a few remarks before the honourable introducer asks the Committee to rise. But first I am going to sit down while the Hon. Colonial Secretary or someone else explains what a negative Bill is.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—It is a negative Bill where the Government is taking the power out of its hands and putting it in the Legislature. Where it says "You mustn't do this—Thou shalt not."

MR. HICKMAN—If that is your explanation of a negative Bill, then we can do nothing else than accept it. However there has been a good deal

of discussion, and it has really been on the subject of the bill and not the bill. The Hon. Minister of Justice, who is taking the place of the introducer seems to be annoyed over the way the Bill is being discussed by members of the Opposition, but I repeat now what I said before, that I regard this as the most important piece of legislation that is going to come before us during this session. The Prime Minister told us yesterday that he had some very important legislation regarding the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company and the Gander, but I cannot think that will be anything as compared with the interests of Newfoundland in the Labrador, in importance, at the present time. Now the Hon. Minister of Justice told us this afternoon that the conduct of this administration was far ahead of any other in trying to improve conditions on the Labrador. Now if that is the case I cannot understand why they did not go a little further and have these properties revert to the Crown. Every license holder on Labrador has not carried out the terms of this agreement, and the ones that have been cancelled have been those who have broken every condition; now there are several conditions in a license, and only those who have broken every condition have been cancelled. Now these licenses were granted on the Labrador, according to the Crown Lands Act for the purpose of cutting timber, and every application to the Government expressed that purpose —that was how it appeared in the Gazette. I claim that not one of the Companies who hold licenses had any intention of cutting timber—that did not make any difference to the Government when the licenses were granted, but when they had not erected a mill to show their bona fides, it was the duty of the Government to see that the licenses were cancelled and the property revert to the Crown. The Hon. Colonial Secretary in his speech this afternoon told us that they gave notice to these people who had timber licenses to pay up their back rentals. I claim that no such request should have been made. When these license holders were in arrears then certainly they had broken every condition of their license. Now I have before me the answers to questions asked by the honourable member for Fogo as to the dates on which rentals were paid up by the different license holders on the Labrador, and I find that there was only about one in the lot who paid up in full each year since the license was granted. The first one is to the Labrador Pulp and Lumber Company, and dates from 1915 — in 1921 there is no amount credited for rentals; in 1925 there is no amount credited for rentals—each payment afterwards was the same as the first one, and if this information received is correct that Company did not pay their rentals in 1921 or 1923 and it is still due and owing to the Government. I am dealing with the information given and presume it is correct. That is one. The Estate of J. J. Tobin and C. P. Eagan—according to this statement there was no amount paid for rentals in 1919 and in 1920—as I said before, the Company still owes the Government two years' rentals. George J. Jardine paid no rentals from 1920 to 1925, and in 1925 paid up for these years. But my contention is that instead of accepting this in 1925 the Government should have cancelled the license. The Sandwich Bay Pulp and Lumber Company, according to the statement owes the Government $3,-296.00 since 1918. J. J. Galway, 1916, and nothing credited for rentals in the years 1920 to 1925, when arrears for the five years were paid up, but arrears for 1916. A property here in the name of J. P. Blackwood, which I presume is held as Solicitor for

timber people—in 1919 there is nothing credited for rentals. A property in the name of W. J. Ellis—nothing paid from 1919 to 1925; rentals for the six years was accepted in 1925 and the license continued. The Grand River Pulp and Lumber Company—nothing credited for 1919, and according to the statement they still owe for 1919. Messrs. McCauley, Smith and Crabtree, some outside speculators who got timber limits on Labrador in 1914—paid in 1923, skipped in 1924, and the Government accepted the back rentals for that year in 1925. So there is yet, I might tell the Hon. Minister of Justice, room and reason for cancelling some of these timber licenses and having them revert back to the Crown.

Our aim in discussing this subject is to try and improve conditions for Newfoundland, and the Prime Minister in introducting the Bill, and the Speech from the Throne told us that the Labrador would be protected, and these who spoke at that time were all in favor of it.

But when the Bill was introduced we thought the Government could go still further and protect the whole interests for the benefit of the people of the country. No doubt the Labrador contains great assets—the future of Newfoundland is bound up in it, and if there are in Labrador thirty thousand square miles of timber, that is nineteen millions, two hundred thousand acres. If there are only five cords to the acre that is ninety six million cords, and if that cut and put on the bank is worth $5.00 a cord, the total is $480,000,000.

Paper is being used to day to a larger extent than ever as is also pulp and it is realised that these commodities are getting scarcer, and there are many people in the world to-day who are looking with longing eyes on the Labrador and they would like to get an opportunity to get what is on that territory. We understand there are 10 million horsepower on the Labrador in the waterfalls and 10 million h.p. at $10 a h.p. is one hundred million dollars. Electricity has been carried through wires a distance of eight hundred miles. It is used largely for commercial purposes and is being carried through the air without any other means of conveyance and there is no doubt but that the water power on the Labrador some day will be worth an immense amount of money.

Now the Labrador territory is abounding in minerals because lots of minerals of various kinds have been discovered there, and I understand that a representative of a mining syndicate in the United States is going to the Labrador at the first opportunity with the object of surveying a certain property on which minerals have been located. It is difficult to find minerals but there is no doubt that according to the geological position of Newfoundland there is an abundance of minerals there. I can remember when Bell Island mines were on the market for sale and I can remember that those who had charge of it spent a number of years trying to get people interested. It was very difficult to get people to take shares and I believe at the time that the mines could be bought for ten thousand dollars. Then there is the St. George's Coal Fields. If the reports of the past few days operations are true, it contains an abundance of coal. Look at all the years this property was disregarded. During last session of the House the Opposition supported the Government in giving a substantial amount for the purpost of boring operations in that region. Still nothing was done by the Government until an outside company were brought in to do the boring operations. Then the Government was willing to assist, but if the promoters of the St. George's Coal Fields had been dependent on the present Gov-

ernment to investigate their property their coal fields would be lying dormant to day. I have no doubt that if all the timber property on the Labrador reverted back to the Crown and if all the timber areas, water powers and mineral property on the Labrador were free there would be no trouble to get a walthy corporation in the United States to come in and operate the resources on the Labrador at a price that would not alone pay off the National Debt of Newfoundland, but would give us a good reserve as well. I have not the least doubt but that one hundred million dollars could be secured in return for the use of our timber lands, water powers and mineral lands on the Labrador. Ten thousand dollars is a lot of money for us to talk about in Newfoundland, but it would be easy to get a corporation that would buy our Labrador resources for a hundre dmillion dollars. By holding the territory intact the Government will find it easier to have it exploited by big corporations than to have the best of it go to private speculators. To get the best out of it has been the Opposition's object all through this discussion. It had been intimated that the Bill was likely to be withdrawn, which is an admission of defeat for the Government just as they were defeated last year on their own Bill and by their own Party in connection with the Besco agreement.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Prime Minister the attitude of the Opposition was construed to be against the principle of the Bill. Since then there has been unanimous expression of approval in the House and in the light of the Opposition having recanted the Prime Minister goes on with his Bill this afternoon as usual.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to take exception to the remarks just made by the Minister of Justice. There has been no recantation from this side of the House. We have spoken in favor of the principle of the Bill and we demanded the fullest protection for that principle. We approved o f Clause one of the Bill, but we attacked Clause two because we thought it was against that principle.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the Bill be read.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, I feel that the discussion on this important measure should not end without my having something to say in connection therewith. If the debate has brought out nothing else, it has brought out a lot of information that will be of lasting benefit to many members on both sides of this House, because if the members of the Opposition had not debated the question of the Labrador in the manner they have a lot of valuable information regarding the Crown Lands Act and its application to Newfoundland and the Labrador would never have been obtained. I think the Prime Minister must feel grateful to the Opposition for the vast amount of information he has obtained free gratis from those who are not even members of the Executive Government. The debate has not only circled around the principle of the Bill, but it has principally dealt with the extension of time that persons are supposed to hold timber limits on the Labrador. The speeches delivered during the past couple of weeks have covered the ground so fully that I, as an "apprentice," hardly know scarcely where to begin or end.

I regard the question of Labrador as the most important piece of legislation that has been brought before this House this session or is likely to be brought before this House. As I understand it the Government stands for the protection of the rights of the timber property holders on Labrador, even though those people have not and

probably never intended to carry out the terms of their lease. We on this side, I take it, have stood for the cancellation of these leases wherever possible and the return of these rights and lands to the Crown. As it is now 6.30 I move that the Committee rise.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this debate be continued until 7 o'clock, and unless the Opposition is determined to keep this debate going, I don't see why it cannot be finished this evening. We have not been discussing this Bill at all. We have been talking about Labrador for days. One would suppose that this Bill was introduced to give away Labrador. What is the use of talking about the value of Labrador when we are only trying to protect it, and there is no suggestion of giving anything away. If any member of the Opposition was to start in and take this Bill word by word, and suggest some alteration in the word that would better protect the interests of the country, there would not be much objection, but I cannot listen for hours to a debate that is nothing less than eulogising the value of Labrador without feeling that it is obstruction. For that reason I suggest that Mr. Russel finish his speech.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, most of the remarks coming from the speakers on this side of the House, have arisen I think from the criticism produced from the Government ranks and the Department of Agriculture & Mines with regard to the extension of time given to these individuals who had leases of land on Labrador.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to call your attention to the time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, if it is the desire of the House I have no objection in raising the Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I want to take exception to the remark of the Minister of Justice. We were getting along quite nicely and then without rhyme or reason, as far as anything that was said on this side of the House is concerned, he said that there has been a general recantation of the remarks made by the Opposition. I for one have nothing to take back in connection with what I said on this matter. I would reiterate again anything that I said. We are in favour of the principle of the Bill but anything that I have said in connection with the grants of leases I do not take back. Therefore I have no intention of delaying the passing of the principle of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to to-morrow, Thursday, June 30th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, June 30th, 1927.

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

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred to be taken up presently.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, I have not taken up the time of the House very much this session, but I felt yesterday afternoon that I should have a word or two to say upon the Bill now before the Committee. I had only said a few words when I noticed it was 6.30 and moved the adjournment of the debate, but the Prime Minister, as usual, made an effort to curtail the debate by suggesting obstruction. Now, as I said before, I have said very little in this House this session, and I don't propose, on this side of the House at least, to be a dumbell. The Prime Minister knows when it comes to a question of obstruction probably not in the sense of speaking, but from the standpoint of the late opening of the House, he himself is the greatest obstructionist of all, and I would also say that members on the other side of the House have taken an active part in the discussion concerning this Bill. Even the Minister of Justice, when in charge of the Bill yesterday afternoon in the absence of the Prime Minister, asked the Colonial Secretary to have a few words to say in connection with the Bill. So, all the speaking, and if by speaking you mean obstruction, hasn't been altogether on this side of the House.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I merely asked him to confirm a statement when information was asked about mineral rights.

MR. RUSSELL—Everybody must be aware that this debate has brought out for the information of all concerned a lot of things that we didn't know before, and my thought is this that it ought to have a good effect in the shaking up of those provisions of the Crown Lands Act because if there is any act in this country that needs a shaking up and needs looking into and needs enforcement more than any other, it is the Crown Lands Act.

It has been stated before in the House that if the Crown Lands Act were enforced and there is no earthly reason why it should not be, we have practically settled the employment problems of this country and not only that but it would go a long way to meeting the general expenses of running the affairs of the country. But what do we find to-day? That numbers of people have been granted licenses and the Crown Lands Act governs these licenses and if the Act had been enforced mills would have been in operation all over the country giving employment to a large number of people. Instead of that there has been no enforcement of the Act and mills have not been erected and timber has not been cut; and therefore there has been little or no employment. The timber that is being cut to-day is really being cut from the three mile limit. I suppose that 95 per cent. of the timber that is cut in this country every year is cut from the three mile limit and there is only about 5 per cent. cut from Crown Lands. Whatever the Act specifies as far as I can learn no timber of any kind cut from Crown Lands can be exported from the country, and that is a great drawback to certain forms of employment; forms of cutting which we could export the timber of to the Old Country and other countries. I think England imports to-day about 125,000 (pounds) worth of raw material in the shape of lumber including hard wood that is being used for boxes, barrels, bobbins, spools and for various other things. Now, in connection with this Labrador Bill, it is a well known fact that when any matter of importance is brought before this House, those particularly interested have some one to espouse their cause and speak for them and fight for them either in the House or out of it. We are the representatives and the watchmen for the people of this country. We are not sent here by any private individuals or private interests. We are sent here by the people who are looking to us to conserve their rights and to conserve

their interests, and if we fail to do our duty, then the people are bound to suffer, and the country is bound to suffer with them.

I sometimes fear that after the members of this House are elected, after the strenuous campaign is over and the strenuous fight in order to obtain the goodwill and support of the people, that their interests are too often forgotten, and other things are allowed to interfere with the attention to duty that the people are entitled to. I know that sometimes some politicians are accused of taking political matters too seriously. I know that we are supposed to regard a great many matters, especially politics, as a game, and to go to our constituents, get their votes, and after getting their votes and support, say to yourself, not to them, "To Hong Kong with them." Now, that is politics, as it is understood by some people, but we are here to protect the people whether we are members of the Government or the Opposition. The people and the people alone the country and the country alone; the country's interests and the country's interests alone, should be our first and last consideration. The people as such have no spokesman but the 36 men that they elect; they have no lawyer, no financial man, no man conversant with very many important matters broght before the Hose. The people as such have nothing of that nature; they absolutely have to reply on the honesty and integrity of the men that they send to the House of Assembly of the Legislature to make laws and look after their interests generally.

Coming back to the Labrador Boundary question particularly, it is a well known fact that after the case was won and the announcement was made about March 1st or 2nd, that the newspapers of the world, particularly England and Canada and the United States published column after column concerning the great victory won by this country, and the value of the territory on the Labrador. The Daily News, for instance, estimated the value of the Labrador as £50,000,000. It was pointed out too, that out of 110,000 square miles that there was at least 60,000 rich in timber. I don't know whether that was stretched or not but there must be on the Labrador several thousand square miles of valuable lands especially timber of a kind required for the production of newsprint. I have seen some timber cut on Labrador and brought to this country and it compared very favourably with any timber I have seen cut and manufactured in this country.

Again, Mr. Chairman the people of this country have been heavily taxed during the past few years to fight this case and to win this case and they alone to-day should reap the benefit, if there is any benefit to be reaped from our winning of the Labrador. My own opinion is that Labrador will never provide much employment for our own people. It is not part and parcel of this land as it is part and parcel of Canada or Quebec, and Quebec it appears to me has the chief interest in acquiring that territory and what it contains in the way of timber, minerals, and water powers. Therefore, I think, Mr. Chairman, the best thing for this country to-day is to negotiate a sale of the entire territory with a reservation for the fishermen of this country and others on the coastline. If this were done it would rid us of the burden of our public debt and the heavy interest charges on that public debt which to-day amount to nearly four million dollars. That public debt to-day is a regular mill-stone round the necks of the people of Newfoundland. Out of that interest, to-day, of nearly four million I am given to understand only about half remains in this country. The rest is sent out of the country; and it is a perfect drain on the resources of the people of the coun-

try. If I understand correctly out of 11,431 square miles covered by licenses only 587 square miles is covered by licenses the owners of which have attempted to comply with the law. If that statement is not correct I would like somebody to correct it. Therefore about 10,844 square miles is held by speculators as has been pointed out in this House before, who never dreamed of complying with the law. Therefore, I ask, Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, are the rights of the speculators to be held sacred, while the people's rights, which should be given the first consideration, have to be sacrificed? I think, sir, it is high time for all Governments in this country to quit throwing away the people's territory. The Prime Minister, I think, made a statement that the Government had given away no timber land. I question whether the Government has any timber lands to give away. I think this country is pretty well covered. I think all the timber lands are taken up so that there are no timber lands worth while to be sold or given away to anybody. From information tabled by the Colonial Secretary the other day some idea was given of conditions under which certain leases of land were made. I have a copy here of the Labrador Pulp and Lumber Company leases with two limits on the Labrador, one at Sounders Bay and one at Ca———— River. The Sounders Bay one was originally issued in 1915.

(Reads)

These were some of the conditions and the same thing applies to the license or timber lease for Ca———— River, only they weren't expected to cut out so much and wern't expected to expend so much money. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Government should have made it a condition when they were asking for an extension of time, for these parties holding timber lands on the Labrador, they should have it made a condition that these people should be required to contribut a proportion of the expense that this country was put to in winning the case not only for Newfoundland but for these men. If Newfoundland had not won the case these men I take it would have lost all. Newfoundland was in possession. They applied to the Newoundland Government for these timberlands and the Newfoundland Government granted these timber lands; and it is not because Dickie was prevented by the Canadian or Quebec Governments from carrying out the terms of his lease that they should affect anybody else. Newfoundland at that time claimed Labrador and claimed it was ours. Quebec it was true, disputed that, but I take it that these timber land holders on the Labrador were given even before the dispute was settled a clear title to the properties that they held. Therefore I say Mr. Chairman, that the Government should have made it a condition when these timber land holders applied for an extension of time, for it wasn't the Government's fault that they didn't go ahead and carry out the terms of their licenses, that they contribute to the expenses with regard to the dispute; but that wasn't suggested. The Government could very easily have said to them that in consideration of the cost to the people of the country the timber land holders should have been prepared to stand some of the cost. But that was not done.

The demand for pulp wood is on the increase and the operation of mills is on the increase. It may be that at the present time there may be a temporary slump in connection with the newsprint industry, but it is very much like the tide, it recedes and comes back, and there is no doubt about it that the demand is going to creep up while the supply is going to decrease. Canada today re-

quires six million cords a year. The supply is exhaustible. Canada exported to the United States in March of this year 215 cords of raw pulp wood. It shows that the American mills will be looking in the future for a supply of raw material in the shape of pulp wood. While I am in accord with the principle of the Bill so far as it relates to timber land grants being brought before the Legislature, the chief discussion has been around the question of the extension of time to those holding timber limits on the Labrador. I think that, as has already been suggested by the Opposition, the Government might well take back the lands without the interference on the part of anybody. It is only to-day that I heard that American interests were prepared to pay us a hundred million dollars for that Labrador territory. If that is so, and I understand it is so, the matter surely is well worthy of serious thought and serious consideration. The question is do the Government stand for the protection of timber holders or not? Personally I would advocate that all licenses be cancelled so that all timber limits should revert back to the Crown and when we could stand in a more favorable position than we do to-day with regard to the sale of that valuable territory. I would recommend the opening up of negotiations for the sale of that property to the Province of Quebec, because the territory would not be a field for employment for our people and next it is favorably situated for Quebec. I do not know if there is anything further I can add on this important subject except to say to the Government even now not to be too conscientious in considering the interests of those people here who hold timber licenses and who are asking for extensions on the promise that they will erect a couple of mills. This is putting money into the pockets of the few at the expense of the many and such a practice is not calculated in any shape or form to be in the best interests of the people of the country God knows that things are not so rosy just now and this country wants everything she can put her hands on. In fact the outlook at present is very gloomy, and if something is not done along the lines I have suggested, I fear for the future.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition I feel it incmbent on behalf of my associates to offer a word at this stage of the Bill in reference to the amendment proposed by this side of the House. In the drafting of this amendment the Opposition were actuated by the highest motive. It is passing strange that the the only bona fide license holders on the Labrador were those given licenses by the Bond administration and that those license holders are granted extensions to carry out the terms of their licenses and all others are ignored, except those who have paid their rentals. I think the time spent in debating this Bill has been well spent because it shows how blind and how foolish and how incompetent the Morris Government of 1912 was in granting licenses for half the marketable timber area on the Labrador. We had hoped by presenting this amendment to the Bill now under discussion that those timber limits would be reclaimed by the Crown and it was to show the good intentions of the Opposition that we put in a money clause in the amendment. However, it seems that it is no good for us to debate this Bill, although we are better informed on the Crown Lands Act than before this debate started. It is very evident that our birthright has been sold for a mess of pottage and that we are now trying to redeem ourselves. We on this side of the House have been treating this subject according to what we considered to be in the best inter-

ests of the country and for the welfare of the people of Newfoundland, but we do not want to be told that our motives are dishonest in any respect. We are opposed to the attitude of the Government for not making any attempt to get back those valuable assets for Newfoundland and its people, but what is the good of us asking for divisions of the House, or making any amendments, as the Government have made up their minds and all we can do it to go on record as opposed to the Government for what they have done. We are not opposed, however, to the principle of the Bill.

We have a duty to perform on behalf of the people we represent and we have to satisfy our own consciences in opposing the Government for the position they have taken, but the Government says that it is no good to interfere now, that they are not going to cancel timber licenses of those who have paid their rentals, license holders are to be granted extensions and we are told to leave things alone.

MR. RUSSELL.—I want to reiterate what I said the other day when speaking to the same subject that the Bill itself is better than nothing at all. But if we want to legislate for Labrador at all and do it sanely as I have previously said, we should ascertain what is really the value of the Labrador teritory, and then when we have done that we can go ahead and grant leases on that basis. Under this bill we can still have the power to grant leases. Now for the license we get two dollars a square mile of rental. It may be worth double that or not that much. But surely the sane thing is to know what it is worth to us.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—We cannot grant leases once this bill is pased.

MR. RUSSELL.—Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that there be a suspension of all privileges on Labrador until we ascertain the value of the Labrador and what it is worth to Newfoundland.

MR. BROPHY.—Mr. Chairman, my reason in geting up here this afternoon is not to criticise this Bill. As far as the principle of the bill is concerned I am in favour of it. But I certainly join with the remarks made by each member on this side of the House as to the conservation of the timber rights on Labrador for the people of Newfoundland. When I was on the outside looking in, so to speak, before being a member of this Legislature, I was always of the opinion, along with many thousands of Newfoundlanders, that the only salutary thing in sight for Newfoundland to reduce its national debt was the winning of Labrador. Apparently the results will be different. To my mind the passing of this bill will be to those who are going to continue in public life, like Clementine in the song of old, "Lost and gone forever.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and by unanimous consent it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and was ordered to be sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking for the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD.— Mr. Chairman, we have now come to the estimates after three or four weeks, and we are

asked to vote about $10,000,000, and that no doubt does not cover all our liabilities. We will have Supplemental Supply, and no doubt the Finance Minister knows what that is going to be. I suppose it will be another $100,000.00.

I think that we are proceeding the wrong way. We are voting here over ten mililon dollars for the administration of Government and we don't know how we are going to get it. I think that it would be wise on the part of this House to bring down the Budget so that we should consider both at the same time. We should have ways and means to know how we are going to pay these bills, before we commit oureselves to voting away ten million dollars.

It was not my intention, Mr. Chairman, when I came here this afternoon to make a set speech on the financial conditions of the country, but if it is the intention of the House to consider the estimates this afternoon there is nothing left for me to do but to put in the time until half past six. Without giving any serious thought to the subject now before the chair the question that comes to one on the spur of the moment is: "Why has not some attempt been made by the Government to reduce expenditure." We are asked now to vote a greater amount of money than last year. And every year that we come in here we are committing ourselves to greater liabilities. And it is only natural for anyone in this House to ask this question: "What are the prospects of meeting our liabilities?" The Finance Minister must know that he cannot find ways and means of getting revenue during the next financial year to meet between ten and eleven mil-mililon dollars expenditure.

I notice in these estimates that there is no vote for roads and bridges. Last year it was $150,000, and that is an essential vote.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We feel that we have not got that money to pay out of current account.

MR. HALFYARD—That reply, Mr. Chairman, just shows us what a terrible condition we are in at the present time, when we canont fix our roads and bridges without borrowing money upon capital account. We canont repair a hole in the road to make it safe to travel over without going to the money markets of the world and borrowing money.

(Reads)

Now the actual vote in the estimates this year was twenty thousand dollars for dredging. Will the operation of dredging improve the quantity of fish caught this year, and give the fishermen greater remuneration for the fish caught. What is the good of dredging harbours when there are no men to man the ships to enter the harbours I say sir, that these things are dishonest. We are voting monies that we cannot afford to pay, without going to the money markets and borrowing. Next year three millions will have to be found to meet the deficit of 1927-1928. Two and a half millions will have to be found to meet the deficit of the fiscal year that expires to-day. And still we come in here like a crowd of idiots, and propose to vote away $11,-000,000, and we don't know where we are going to find it, and when I say that I defy successful contradiction. Come day, go day, God give us power to borrow more money, is the policy of the present Government. These are the most dishonest estimates that were ever presented to this Legislature. We showed a deficit for 1926 of $112,000 but if the legitimate expenditure had been charged to cur rent account we should have shown on ordinary expenditure, which should come out of current revenue, a deficit of $400,000. But we did not show that

because we borrowed the money from Loan account to pay for the ordinary expenditure.

The Auditor General reports as follows:—

"The sum of $318,194.28, balance of votes not required, was surrendered to the Treasury. This large drop balance is accounted for for the most part by the transfer of certain current expenditures, which had been voted in the 1925-26 Supply Act, to the 1926 Loan Account. The following are the principal items of this transfer:—

Roads and Marine Works ..	$122,867.06
Telegraph Construction and Capital Repairs	25,166.27
Telephone and Wireless Installation	12,723.36
Marine Works	20,000.00
Bounty on Ships Built	43,504.08
Dredging	12,000.00

In addition to these the sum of $100,000.00 expended under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act and properly charged to Current account was transferred to the debit of Loan 1926 Account."

These are deplorable conditions that we are faced with at the present time, Mr. Chairman, and it is not a very pleasant thing for me to have to remind you of it, that the business of the Government cannot be carried on for 1927-1928 unless we go to the money markets and get a loan of approximately $6,000,000 to pay for the deficit of last year, and the deficit that we will have to face this year.

We are not possessed with the financial ability of the ordinary politician, when we make no attempt to keep expenses within revenue. If we were borrowing on capital account for labor giving industries, for the creation of revenue producing industries, then we would be employed, more money earned and more goods sold, and we would get indirect returns from it. But there is nothing like that! You can't point to one undertaking of the present Government that can be regarded as revenue producing. Fixing roads, building bridges, building docks and repairing the railway will not give extra revenue in the future. To give example:—If a man spends money to build a new schooner in place of an old one to prosecute the fisheries, he is no better off, but he has to spend it. It is supposed that you have to put the railway in a safe condition but that doesn't increase the revenue producing power of the people. It is a utility to which we were committed by past Governments who thought they were acting in the best interests of the country. But two millions on the highroads, with a hope of getting revenue from outsiders who come in and travel over the roads in their motor cars—we will not live long enough, even if we live another 20 years, to see any direct benefit from that expenditure. One thought leads to another, and that brings me to the bill passed the other day authorizing certain individuals to collect monies from people travelling first class going out of the country. For what? To give a salary of $2,000 to the Secretary of the Tourist Bureau to look after tourists coming into the country and preserve our historic spots. Mr. Chairman, those who have had any experience with the Tourist Publicity Bureau and its activities know that what it will bring to the country is worthless. The men who come in here are not to be regarded as tourists, but round trippers; poor people who are jaded to death, like we are here the last few weeks and want to get away from the scene of their activities, and they do it in the cheapest possible way by travelling on the Furness Line or Red Cross Line boats. They come down and ask "Where they can go? and the Secretary of the Bureau will say "Go to Torbay at Liddy's, the scenery is bautiful." They ask what it will cost. $4.00. They can't afford that—they are just waiting for the dinner bell on the

boat to get their dinner. That is the kind of 90 per cent. of the Tourists we get here. There may be a few wealthy men, but they go to the West Coast fishing and we don't see them here at all. I heard there was one at Placentia, but he must have lost his way, or had been told that it was a fine place to go. Well, we have wasted two and a quarter millions on that fool policy, and can't get $150,000 per year to keep the roads in repair where the people live. Mr. Chairman, there is a bridge at Shoal Harbour that has to be flagged off and people can't go over it. The Minister of Public Works, if he was in his seat, would confirm what I say. And they have to wait, the Minister of Public Works has to wait until there is money voted to fix this bridge, and still we spend two and a quarter millions on roads to get people to come to the country. I may say it is a fool policy. Still we come down here to-day and are asked to vote a further ten or eleven millions to carry on government—by a government that was elected for the sole purpose of reducing expenditure and possibly reducing taxation.

Mr. Chairman, I reiterate what I have said since we have been in the House this Session. We should not be here. The Hon. Prime Minister will agree with me that we should not be here acting as we do—acting as a crowd of irresponsibles; voting away monies when we can't possibly see any way of paying the bills we contract. It is time for us to call a halt to our silly actions as supposed legislators. It is time for us to close this House as a House and get out and give place to men who will try to do something to put the country on an even keel. We are drifting—no! not altogether drifting—steering, for we are giving an impetus to a forward movement to bankruptcy and ruin. If we do put any legislation on the Statute Books it is not in the nature of reduction, but more expenditure all the time, with no possible chance of getting any return for it. Mr. Chairman, I make an appeal, seriously and sincerely to the Prime Minister—when this House opened we had a pronouncement from him to the effect, if I remember his words, correctly, that as a Legislature we could not bring in necessary legislation—I think he spoke of drastic legislation. What he meant by "drastic" he did not explain, but I interpret it as legislation that will effect a saving in expenditure; that would be in the interests of the laboring classes of the country, by lessening their load as much as possible, and to cheapen, as far as it is in the power of the Government, necessary articles that have to be used by people of the country. The only possible effect that this Government has on the price of articles is in connection with the tariff—we have nothing whatever to do with the invoice cost in other countries. But the amount of duty which increases the price of articles fifty and sixty per cent. we have everything to do with, and I presume that is what the Prime Minister meant when he said there was need of drastic legislation, but that his numbers were so depleted that he didn't see his way clear to bring it in. That is only a lame excuse for not doing the right thing! I wish to Heaven, with the experience I have had in government matters that I was as independent as regards money and men, as the Hon. Prime Minister, and if I couldn't bring in drastic legislation which I knew to be in the interest of the country, I would tell my supporters that I was no longer their leader, and that every man could leave and go to the Opposition and I would be free from the responsibility of leading them. I wouldn't be made a goat of by any crowd of men! No cajolery or flattery would influence me in any way. The country's interests would take first place and men and individuals second. That is not the position

the Prime Minister has taken. He has the idea that he must stick by the crowd. And for what? So that those in positions of emolument can sit down and enjoy their salaries. That is all the Prime Minister is doing—he is doing nothing for the country but helping the members of his party to draw salaries from the Government. If the Prime Minister had introduced drastic legislation after the House opened instead of spending three weeks on the Labrador Bill talking about timber licenses, we would have had to consider it, and if it was all in the best interests of the country how dare the opposition oppose it. Could we go back to our constituents and be faced by the statement that the Monroe administration introduced legislation in the interests of the country, and we turned it down? If we had the interests of the country at heart, they are our interests. Individuals made up a country, not its physical features, but its like-blood we are driving away as fast as we can. We are voting away ten million dollars without a possibility of getting revenue to meet more than eight million dollars, and making the burden heavier still for honest men.

But to get back to the actual doings of the Government during the last fiscal year 1925-26, as reported by the Auditor General, there is nothing commendatory, but rather condemnatory about it as regards handling public money. I wonder why the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs left out last year the amount of $30,-719.55, and charged it up to 1926-27. I suppose it was a typographical error, but the Auditor General referred to it last year, and it looks as if it might have been intentionally done. I am not judging the Finance Minister by any opinion of my own, but by that of a man who is supposed to know what he is talking about, and who is trying to keep the Finance Minister in his place, but can't do so. We expected better things of this financial wizard. I am telling the truth now and want to make it as interesting as I can because we have to do something on a hot day like this to keep up some interest.

(Reads)

We never expected supplementary supply to be brought in by the present Finance Minister. He always came in here and said that it was penny wise and pound foolish if we didn't put in the Estimates everything we were going to spend. Good intentions, but he never carried them out, and he comes in now with another half million overdrawn. Is that sane, sensible financing? Mr. Chairman, it is nothing different from what I have been accustomed to since 1913, when I first sat in this House. We expected something different now, but we got an increase every year. Compare 1924-25 with 1926-27 and you get an increased expenditure of over a million dollars —it is here in black and white. This Government is guilty of, voting away in the Estimates over one million dollars more; according to the Estimates it is $1,300,000 more than in 1924-25, and in that year they came in and took the estimates prepared for them. Mr Chairman, this is a Government that was elected for one purpose and one only ,and that was to Clean Up and Keep Clean and give a Square Deal to all. And that did not mean cleaning up the Post Office and painting it, but cleaning up of graft and unnecessary expenditure, that was what the people thought they meant, but these Estimates have nothing that will prove that any attempt whatever has been made to keep their promise to the electorate. Mr. Chairman, it doesn't make much difference to me whether there is anyone to listen to me or not, but I would ask if there is a quorum in the House.

To get back to that statement made by the Auditor General in his report. To make it interesting for the Minis-

ter of Finance and Customs, I will quicken his mind over that typegraphical error made in 1924-25.

(Reads)

Mr. Chairman, during the by-election in St. John's East, a financial statement was published in one of the St. John's daily papers, which showed that the deficit in 1925-26 was about $81,000. As business was preceeded with since the House opened, the Finance Minister was asked certain questions as to expenditure and revenue for that year, and gave a different statement, showing the deficit to be $112,000. He did that because he anticipated just what I referred to, and added on this $30,000. We will call it a typographical error if that will ease his conscience and make things better for him. I am satisfied to accept his statement. The Auditor General, poor man, is in a very awkward position; he will make recommendations and deal with matters of overdrafts and votes on Executive responsibility; he will disallow them, and will not give a letter of credit, and says, "You will have to go to the Legislature and be indemnified." That is the position of the Auditor General, and Governments are not honest enought to be guided by his admonitions and honest instructions. He protests against irregular expenditures, but you spend the money and get supplementary supply, or use a drop balance from some other vote. What troubles me is that the Government is going on in the same old way—in fact your Government is worse in this respect than any Government that I have any knowledge of.

I asked a question Mr. Chairman, and I took it from page 9, section 11 of the Auditor General's Report, but could not get a satisfactory reply:—

(Reads)

Now I don't suppose the Treasury Board ever considered any letter that was sent by the Auditor General.

I quote this from the Auditor General's Report to show that the Auditor General not only wrote his report and recommendations but asked the Government of the day whether they will comply with his wishes and carry out his intentions or not and he finds fault with the Government for not carrying out his wishes in this respect He says:— ". . . ." Sec. 1 page 9.

(Reads)

Has that been your policy during the last year with regard to free entries?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Free entries? Yes.

MR. HALFYARD—To carry on a Government has to collect duties. Now with regard to this free entry business. I understand that according to the Revenue Act certain articles for different purposes can be imported into this country without paying any duty. I am also informed that as a result of those concessions to churches, societies, charitable organizations, and all the rest, there is a great temptation to evade the spirit of that Act. We have a Bill on the Order Paper to-day in connection with Buchan's Mine. Corporations connected with enterprises like this have also free entry concessions and it is questional whether there is not a lot of goods imported under the heading of free entry articles on which duty should be paid in connection with them. I think serious consideration should be given to the matter of free entries. Even if we allow free entries we should not allow the condition to stand as to-day. Everything imported into this country should pay duty; everything for every purpose; but if you want to assist any corporation or any society let them bring their personal guarantee, certificates, or invoices duly certified, as to how these articles have been used, and get a rebate. It may mean an additional accountant in the Customs Office; perhaps one man more would be required but you would have more accurate

knowledge of the value of imports and I believe there would be thousands of dollars go to the revenue that are now lost by admission of duty free articles. I just mention that as a suggestion: The question of free entries, anyhow, should get full consideration, and possibly some plan can be devised so that while certain concessions are given with regard to free admission it should be seen that articles admitted duty free are used for the purpose intended and not any other.I have been told that a motor car was entered duty free by a certain corporation. It might be alright under concessions for equipment to enter trucks that would be used in a business but I don't suppose the Act ever intended to admit motor cars and rolls of cloth free of duty.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—What corporation got in a motor car?

MR. HALFYARD—I would not like to say, it is your business to know such things.

Mr. Chairman, to get back to the consideration of the condition of the country which is really the subject before the Chair; dealing with free entries of course is relevant to the subject; because hand in hand with Estimates must come Revenue. As I have already said we have no right to vote away money unless we know how we are going to pay for the same and that is why I suggest to the Minister of Finance that it would be a wise policy if we had the Budget to go hand in hand with the Estimates and then we could more intelligently and honestly consider what we are doing and the condition at the present time with regard to expenditure and the general condition of the country. I am honest and sincere in my statements in every respect. I am honest in saying and honest in believing that it is not acting in the best interests of the country to be putting in time in this Legislaure considering secondary matters and neglecting the fundamental interests of the country. The matter effects everybody; how we can live in the country under the present system of tariff and expenditure. If you admit that you can't do any better; well the least you can do is to resign the job and let somebody else see if they can do any better. The Auditor General refers in his report, to expenditure by Orders in Council. We were told that we were great sinners in that respect. We were "a Minute of Council Government." I agree with that charge made against the outgoing government to a certain extent, but an Executive Government must carry on business when the Legislature is not in session and certain matters will arise where it has to govern by minute, but the present administration are the greater sinners.

MR. GODDEN—I beg to draw your attention, Mr. Chairman to the fact that there is no quorum in the House.

* * *

MR. HALFYARD—That shows just the interest we have in the affairs of the country We really don't know or don't care whether the country is solvent or insolvent, whether we are participating in wise legislation or unwise. There are a few thoughtful peoin this House, a few, there are more who do not appreciate the responsibilities of being members of the Legislature; they are too indifferent to make themselves acquainted with the actual management of the affairs of the country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is rather hard lines on your colleagues.

MR. HALFYARD—My colleagues are in a position that they cannot put into effect any legislation that would make anything different.

I am trying to state that we are asked here to vote away ten or eleven millions of dollars and we do not know how we are going to meet our

bills. If we had the Budget tabled it would be alright, otherwise how are we going to know the true financial position of the country, and how are we to know what our revenue is going to be for the year 1927-28. Is it the intention of the Government to borrow more money to pay the interest on our public debt? If we go on borrowing we are only lessening the earning power of the people, and increasing their expenditure. There are various votes here which will show, as we deal with the different departments of the public service, that no attempt has been made to properly control expenditure. For instance, there is a vote here in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department of twenty thousand dollars for the Dredge Priestman. Then again we have a difference in the vote asked for by the Finance Minister last year of $3,329,339.00, while the interest on the public debt that we have to be met this year is $4,201,232.22. I presume these outstanding amounts will be met by loans so as to put the country further in debt. Since the advent of the present Government to power if there is one thing more than another they are remarkable for, it is for raising loans, and yet we have no new facilities for the carrying on of the public service, there is no extra money voted for the encouragement of agriculture; roads and bridges all over the country are impassable for the most part and people are getting out of the country as quickly as they can. In every Government Department the votes are over-expended on the authority of the Governor-in-Council and irrespective of this Legislature, and then we are told that we have good Government You know, Sir, you cannot have good Government as this House is at present constituted. There are too many guns, literary speaking, put to peoples' heads in your Government for you to have good Government. There are members of the Executive Govt. this evening who know that what I am saying is the truth. I hate to be saying certain things in this House, but my duty demands me to say them, irrespective of who may take exception to them, but when you have members of a Government making all sorts of demands and having these demands acceded to in order to keep the Party together how can you have good Government in the country. Under the Pre-Audit system, contrary to anticipations, conditions have not improved any. District representatives and their friends get favours done over the heads of Departments and order things to be done through their influence with Executive members. The Auditor General makes a strong commentary against such malpractice and here is what he says in his report. Page 14.

(Reads)

The representatives for Government Districts go over the heads of the Departments and order things to be done. They say that you must pay and if you have not the money, jade the Executive Government for it.

Referring to the matter of relief, it has been thought that it would be very unfair if the names of all those receiving able-bodied relief were published, but that is no reason why we cannot get a detailed account under the heading of "Able Bodied Relief." I think that the Government should give consideration to that matter and give authority to the Poor Commissioner to publish the names of those who are receiving relief. It has been brought to my notice that certain business men, who are Relieving Officers, are dishonest. Some I know are under suspension now, for putting names on their reports to be submitted to the Poor Commissioner at headquarters, the names of people who were dead for many years. That is known to the members o f the Government no doubt. I say sir, that dishonesty is rampant. Dishonesty

is everywhere. Not only in the Government Departments but all over the country. And we should try to protect the people from their own weakness. And if you cannot prevent dishonesty in this way get the accounts published.

(Reads)

I notice here in the Auditor General's report quite a large amount here for extras. All this was going to be cut out when this Government assumed office. People would have to live on their salary and no more. But we find it still going on from year to year. In the Marine and Fisheries Department $2,580 was voted to 12 individuals, ranging from ten dollars to eight hundred, for extra services.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—That is not correct.

MR. HALFYARD — Well then I think we will have to get the Auditor General to the Bar of this House because that is in his report.

(Reads)

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—That is not extra services, that is extra jobs.

MR. HALFYARD—That is something like "When is an extension not an extension?"

Mr. Chairman, that refers to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Let us turn to the Department of the Colonial Secretary, and we find some amounts paid for exra services—Arthur Mews, $370.00; F. M. Stirling, Assistant-Deputy, $230.00; W. Halfyard, $205.00. Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Finance and Customs are so small minded as to refer to cigars and to the name Halfyard, I will give the Minister all he wants to know about Halfyards, and I will tell him how Halfyards have been treated. Mr. Chairman I would refer to the Department of Public Works, page 92. I notice that here in the Estimates the salary of the carpenter at the Sanatorium and Sudbury has been reduced from $1200.00 to $1140.00 and the salary of the laundryman has been reduceed from $1248.00 to $1140.00. Now I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs to these two votes. The expenditure in the Estimates this year is $377,000.00 greater than last year, but this Government is going to effect economies, and plans to do it by reducing the salaries of a poor carpenter and a laundryman at the Sanatorium—cutting $60.00 off the carpenter and $100.00 off the laundryman; I would like to know the reason why that is done. After the House closed last year, as a result of some question as to changes made and salaries paid, it was brought to my attention that the carpenter at the Sanatorium was receiving $60.00 less than the Estimates provided, and the laundryman $100.00 less. It so happened that the carpenter is a brother of mine, and I rang up Wallace, in the Colonial Secretary's Department and asked him to come and see me. He came and I asked him "Do you know anything about that vote for the carpenter and laundryman?" He said "Yes, sir." I asked "What does your father get—does he get less than the vote?" and he answered that he did. I wanted to know why he hadn't told me, and he said he thought I would know about it, and that he didn't want to bother me with it anyway. Now it is not because he is my brother, but this is a matter of principle. I am just as much interested in the laundryman as in the carpenter. Mr. Chairman, in 1924-1925 $1200.00 was voted by this House for that position, and $1348.00 for the laundryman. In 1925-1926 the votes were the same in the Estimates, and still these two poor individuals were receiving in one case $5.00 a month less and in the other $7.00 a month less. And what did they do with it? They gave it to the

storekeeper, and increased his salary to that amount, and took it off the other two. Is that honest? It is not constitutional. If the vote for the Sanatorium was in globo it would be alright because they could pass it out as they liked, but when $1200.00 is voted for a man he is entitled to it and should get it.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: I should like a word of explanation. Mr. Halfyard knows as well as I do that we have been quite just. He knows that there is a Board of Governors in the Hospital and Sanatorium, and we acted on their suggestion. It is not because the man is a brother of Mr. Halfyard that he is cut, but it seems to me that it is a recommendation from the Governors of the Hospital. I can positively assure him that the Government has no intention of cutting him because he is Mr. Halfyard's brother. It is absolutely a matter of a recommendation of the Governors.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: Has the Board of Governors authority to override the vote of the Legislature? I never was party to anything like that—never a party to reducing salaries in that way. Salaries are voted and some men, for reasons best known to themselbes, try to get an increase for the storekeeper, not through the Executive Government, and without their consideration. I think the honourable member for Burin is a member of that Board, and I feel sure that he never intended to be a party to that sort of thing. What is the good of voting salaries in the Legislature if a sub-department of the Government can override us? It is the principle of the thing — it is constitutionally wrong. The Executive Government has no more power to do it than I have. It is an illegal action and one that can only be indemnified by this Legislature.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think the honourable member will admit that if the Hospital Board makes a recommendation regarding adjustment of salaries, the honourable member, if a member of the Executive would be inclined to follow it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: That amount was voted by the Legislature in 1924-25, and again in 1925-26, and it is only because I took the matter up with the Finance Minister and the Colonial Secretary, and some correspondence passed between the Colonial Secretary, and the Minister of Public Works that now you are putting down what these men are actually getting. Don't you think it dishonest for these men to suffer this loss? I don't conform to that ruling that any department can override the House. As I said before, if the vote for the Sanatorium was ten or twenty thousand in blobo, subject to distribution, it would be alright, but it is an individual vote and that makes all the difference. And I think that now this has been brought to the attention of this House that justice should be done, but I question the honesty of so reducing the salaries of these people. I don't think any delinquency or dishonest attributes can be attached to them—they are not boozers, but decent individuals and their work is satisfactory, and why should the carpenter at the Sanatorium get less than at other institutions? If the storekeeper does not get enough why not vote him more? I don't find fault with his getting more—give him enough to find something to eat and drink and some clothes to wear, but don't give him what belongs to other people.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I should like to express an opinion about this matter. as I think after the House closed last year the honourable member saw me. The position is this—that under the Hospital Act the Board of Governors

of the General Hospital had supervision over that Hospital, and afterwards that was extended to the Sanatorium. The Board visited the Sanatorium, and made a recommendation to the Minister of Public Works that salaries be re-arranged along the lines they are to-day.

The Board of Governors claimed they had the right under the Act to adjust salaries, but it is not a good principle. I think that the principle of maintaining salaries voted by this House should not be changed and I think it would be a most unfortunate condition to have the system of having salaries fixed by the Legislature upset, and I can quite see the justification for having the matter complained of by the honourable member for Trinity readjusted.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I think the Colonial Secretary and the Government will appreciate the circumstances referred to. The reason I brought this matter to the attention of the Finance Minister is because I really thought I had good and sufficient grounds for it, and, furthermore the carpenter is one of the constitutents of the Finance Minister in St. John's West and you know we are all supposed to look after our constituents. After all, this Legislature, I think, is supposed to indemnify the actions of the Department of Public Works. I must thank the Colonial Secretary for his remarks and I trust that the Finance Minister will give this matter his personal attention when we come to the vote for the Department of Public Works.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee rises I would like to point out that there is no vote in the Estimates for a General Election the coming fall and I would like to hear from the Prime Minister if there is going to be any vote taken to provide for an election in the fall. The people all over this country are crying out for a General Election, and it is only fair and proper that their demands should be acceded to by this House. In my opinion, there should be an amount in these Estimates that we are now considering earmarked for a fall election this year, as I have no doubt honourable members would like to get through the present session of the Legislature before the salmon starts running up the rivers. Personally, I have a strong idea that it is the intention of the Government to hold a general election in the fall, but I would like to hear a definite pronouncement from the Prime Minister on the subject.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTEH—I have an idea that I have already answered that question definitely and my answer now is the same as it was when last I answered the question.

MR. BROWN—Well, then, we will be here until September next.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTEH—We are quite prepared to remain here until September.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker: With your permission I would now like to call the attention of the honourable the Prime Minister to the contents of some articles appearing in foreign newspapers and having to do with the pulp and paper proposition now before the Government. I do so not only because of the serious nature of the main statements made in these articles, but because they are so written as to give the general im-

pression that they are authoritative pronouncements on this subject. The Evening Telegram of to-day's date reprints from an outside paper an article with a St. John's date line and professing to describe the attitude of the Government of Newfoundland towards the British Treasury. Frankly, these articles appeal to me as inspired from inside official sources; it is difficult to form any other opinion. They appear to have been written by somebody with rather free access to inside information of negotiations between the Government and the International and of events that preceded the negotiations in this country. If these statements be as authentic as is generally presumed, then they give honourable members and the country generally a great deal more detailed and definite information than the Government has hitherto vouchsafed this House. For instance, one of the articles to which I am now referring and one which was also reproduced in a local paper of yesterday's date, makes the specific statement that certain Canadian financial interests are negotiating with the Government for the property in which we have hitherto supposed only the International Paper Company was directly interested. Information of this nature, I respectfully claim, Mr. Speaker, should be the property of this House before it is passed on to local correspondents of foreign newspapers It should be given to the local press before being broadcasted to the outside world generally. This apparent leakage of information from inside sources appear to me as likely to embarass the Government not only in its negotiations with the International, but also in its future relations with the British Treasury. I would like to have a pronouncement from the Prime Minister as to these statements, if they are authorized and if they have any basis in fact. They should, I think, be emphatically denied if the contrary be the case. Left uncontradicted they are certain to increase the very reasonable irritation of this Legislature and of the local press over a preference that appears to have been given to representatives of the foreign press in this connection.

MR. PUDDESTER—Mr. Speaker: Before the Honourable Prime Minister rises to say anything on this matter I want to associate myself with what has been said by the honourable member on the other side who has just sat down, from a local newspaper standpoint. Local newspapers have agreed with the promotors that they will say nothing whatever about these matters until final settlement, and until there is something ready to come before the House. Day after day we have to publish matters and articles that we clip from Canadian and United States newspapers, emanating from Newfoundland. There is more information contained in these articles than I have reason to believe is possessed by members on this side of the House. I don't think it is fair that our papers have to copy local news of this nature from Canadian and United States papers; there is a leakage somewhere for which I do not think the Prime Minister or his Executive is responsible, and shall be glad to have him say so.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: Now that the matter is brought up it gives me an opportunity to make an explanation. Personally I don't know where these reports come from; I haven't read many of the articles. I saw one that was published in a Toronto paper and repeated in the News this morning, but as to the article that the honourable member for Fortune refers to I can only say that there is at least one grave misstatement, and that is that a member of a Canadian finan-

cial firm is here negotiating with the Government. There is nobody here nor have we any knowledge of anyone coming. I think I stated yesterday that so far as I could explain we are still treating with the International Paper Company, and hope to make a deal that will be satisfactory to the country generally. We have, as I said, received some assistance from a Canadian financial firm, and there has also been an intimation from Lord Beaverbrook and a large house in Canada that they are interested, but nothing in the shape of negotiations have taken place, and at present the Canadian Trust Company is merely of assistance to me and the Government, so that we may by that means be better able to make arrangements with the people whom we think are the most reliable concern that the Government can do business with. The International Paper Company is world famous, and there is no doubt that if they acquire interests here they can provide a ready market, just as the A. N. D. Company have a market on the other side; for that reason we naturally prefer them.

There has been a good deal of criticism in the British and even the Canadian press over the fact that Americans are coming in and trying to take charge of the forests of a British Dominion, but I want to say that the British interests woke up rather late in the day, because the International Paper came here strongly recommended by the British Government, who seemed to feel that there was no hope of getting anybody else interested, and they thought that the only thing for us to do was to deal with the International. That was almost a recommendation. I shall bring down the correspondence later, but in the meantime I want the House to understand that we are not trying to hold anything back from them. We hope to make some arrangement, and if these people come here I want them to feel that we are partners for all time to help the country, and that we are not going to be antagonistic once the deal is consummated, and once the House passes it. I want the International Paper to feel that they are going to receive hospitality, and not that they are foreigners coming in here. I have nothing more to say.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker: Permit me to thank the honourable the Prime Minister for his explanation and his assurance. I am certain that the members of the House have confidence in his fairness and his frankness, and I want to go on record in that respect. The honourable gentleman will, I am sure, admit that the tenor of some of the paragraphs of the articles referred to is very grave and is calculated to create unpleasantness as between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Great Britain. Ordinarily, the authorities in the two countries would pay no attention to such newspaper comments or statements, but in this case the correspondent speaks as if with the imprimature of the Government of Newfoundland, as if he had official or semi-official authority and inspiration for his remarks.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, July 4th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 4th, 1927

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

Pet'tions were presented by:

Mr. K. M. Brown, from Harry's Hr. and Jackson's Cove, re Roads.

Dr. Mosdell, from Belleoram, re Public Building.

Mr. Scammell, from Raleigh, re Telephone.

Mr. K. M. Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House went into Comm.ttee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, I have not yet had an opportunity to examine at length the contents of that pink colored pamphlet that was handed around to members of the House, and, consequently, I am not in a position this afternoon to enter into the deta ls of it, but there are a few general observations which I think I should make at this stage of the proceedings. I think it will be admitted on all sides that the subject now under discussion is really the most important one which will come before this Legislature during the present session, particularly because of the deplorable financial situation in which this Colony finds itself at the present day. At the outset I desire to draw attention to an observation made here the other day by the Finance Minister when a request was made that the Budget should be presented as soon as possible to be considered by the House in connection with the Estimates. The Finance Minister, I understand, said—and he can correct me if I am wrong—that there was no precedent for the bringing down of his Budget with Supply. If he wants any precedent for that course, I am prepared to give it to him this afternoon. I can point him to, at least, three instances where the Budget was brought down before Supply and I can point him to another instance where it was brought down a hundred years ago in connection with the Exchequer Bill. I can point to two other instances where it was brought in at the same time with Supply. I can point to an instance where it was brought in with the Customs Act and I can quote another instance where it was brought in with the Defence of the Realms Act, and I can quote an instance where it was brought down in our own Legislature five days after Supply was tabled. If that is not good enough for him and if he is not satisfied to take my word, I am prepared to produce the proof for him. It is to be found in that world renowned authority—Mays Parliamentary Practice. As a precedent in our own Legislature, I will refer him to the records of this House for the year 1922. It is clear that the attitude of the Finance Minister is an incorrect one. He is quite justified, should he so decide, in bringing in his Budget before his Supply Bill had he so decided and ordinarily speaking there would have been no objection to it. Presumably any man who desires to issue a cheque upon his bank account takes the trouble of ascertaining whether there are any funds there, and this Committee this afternoon would be quite justified, before it votes away any sum whatever, to demand of the Finance Minister a statement in the nature of an assurance to members sitting here that there would be funds to meet those cheques when they were drawn. Instead of that he comes in here and asks us to vote moneys, moneys which we at present have not got, moneys which may or may not be available and moneys which, if we are to judge by the history of the present administration for the past three years, are not likely to be available. These Estimates that we have before us show that there has not been any attempt towards reduction in expenditure. It is apparent that the Government intends to continue without making the slightest attempt to make reduction in the public expenditure and without the slightest effort to in any way lighten

the burdens upon the people, and, apparently without any regard whatever for the source from which they are to obtain the money which they propose to expend. The question of reduction of expenditure has been usually brought here by the Opposition, in fact, I may say has been always brought up by the Opposition during the past three years. And these efforts on the part of Opposition members to try and get the Government to adopt the policy of reduction of expenditure were wholly due to the attitude which the present administration took prior to the election of 1924 and which attitude they immediately dropped after the election had resulted in their favor when they pursued an entirely opposite policy. In other words, whereas these gentlemen, according to their own statements, were honestly of the opinion that the expenditures of the Colony could be reduced and should be reduced in May 1924, thereafter they were of a contrary opinion, at least, if we are to accord them any degree of honesty at all. We were told prior to the election that the country was going to the dogs and that if the present methods of conducting public affairs was to be continued there was no future for the country or its people, except bankruptcy. That prospect was held up to the public eye, pictured in words of the strongest type and painted in the most lurid colours. We were led to believe that this administration at that time intended to make drastic reforms in the matter of expenditure. We were told that the country was only a cat that carried the trappings of an elephant and that it was a simple matter to reduce the expenditures so materially that the burdens upon the people of the Colonly would be considerably lightened. The people believed it could be done, they believed that these gentlemen believed it could be done, and these gentlemen told us they believed that it could be done. But what a strange volte face. Within a few months after the election it was quite apparent to the ordinary observer that the present administration had no intention of doing anything other than plunging the country further in debt. From June 2nd, 1924, until this 4th day of July, 1927, the present administration have totally disregarded the promises they made to the electorate prior to the former date. If at that time the affairs of the Colony were in such a deplorable condition and that drastic reduction in the public expenditure was necessary, I ask can anyone doubt that such a reduction is even more necessary and that it should be more drastic to-day.

Yet the Estimates which have been tabled in this Committee instead of showing a reduction show clearly that an increase is intended. Can it be argued for a moment that that attitude contrasted with their attitude of three years ago is either honest or justifiable. If in 1924 a reduction of expenditure and taxation was essential to the well being of this Colony surely it is even more essential to that well being in 1927. I don't know of a single instance at the moment in which there has been a reduction. Yes, I recall one to mind now. I refer to the fact that the Prime Minister himself, out of the generosity of his heart, I suppose, undertook the office of Minister of Education without pay. We thereby saved $4,000 in a salary but I am very very doubtful whether it was wise economy or not. I know that the Prime Minister of this Colony is an extremely busy man. I feel sure he has very little time for attending to matters in connection with education only; and I feel that if the Prime Minister had been Minister of Education only during the past three years we would have had much better service from that Department, but as he also had the burden of the office of Prime Minister upon his shoulders it necessarily followed that the greater portion of his time was

devoted to that office and the Department of Education suffered accordingly. With all respects to the Prime Minister I do say to-day that I feel sure that he has not 5 per cent. of the information which he would have about that department had he not been Prime Minister. I do not say that in derogation of him at all, because after all he is only human like the rest of us and no man can serve two masters. The chair of the Prime Minister is large enough for any one man to fill and if he tries in addition to fill the chair of the Minister of Education, one chair must be vacant all the time and consequently that department must suffer. So that economy, that reduction in expenditure of $4,000 in all probability left us poorer far than if we had a full time man sitting in that office. Now Sir, there has been no reduction in expenditure in spite of the fact that the Government believed such a reduction essential, and they believe that to-day if they continued in that belief during the past three years. If so then we are led to one conclusion and one only that they have dishonorably, I repeat my statement, handled the affairs of this Colony in a way in which they did not believe to be proper. In other words they did not do that which they believed ought to be done and that can be characterised in no other way except as being dishonest and dishonorable.

If on the other hand their opinions changed and they have been since that fatal day, I use that word advisedly, June 2, 1924, been of an altogether different opinion I would like to ask the reason for the sudden revulsion of opinion. If their opinion I say during the past three years has been that a reduction in expenditure and taxation was not in the best interests of the Colony I would be pleased, sir, to have them justify it here from the floors of the House. It is an undoubted fact that since that advent of this ministry to office we have been faced year after year with deficits, increasing deficits, sir, until the Prime Minister announced some two months ago from his place in this House that the deficit this year on current account would approximate something over two millions. Two millions of a deficit on an expenditure of ten millions,—a twenty per cent. deficit; if that is not serious, if that does not demand a reduction in expenditure, I don't know what does; but here this afternoon we are faced with another estimate of expenditure higher than that of last year; and, sir, before we proceed to the detailed consideration of the Estimates we want to know where that money is coming from. The record of this Government during the past three years shows that they are not able to meet our bills, that they are not capable of so organizing the affairs of the Colony as to be able to square accounts each year without a loan, and if we are going to continue in that way to live upon the vitals of the Colony, then I submit that administration is of such a character that not alone this Opposition, but no citizen in Newfoundland can have possibly any confidence whatever in them. Their record is that they have not on any occasion been able to pay their bills. Now, before we give them any authority to incur further liability we want to know where we are going to get the money. We are asked to vote ten millions of dollars this year for the purposes of this Government, practically the same vote as last year, with a slight increase, and if these Estimates of expenditures are justified no member on this side of the House is prepared to oppose the grant, but first we have to be assured that they are justified and even having got to that point we must then know before we give them authority to incur there liabilities where we are going to get the cash. I have

no desire, sir, and I take it, no member of this committee has any desire, that this Colony should be faced next June with another deficit of two millions or more, and to be then compelled to go with out hats in our hands into the money markets "cadging" for a further loan. This kind of thing can't go on; it has got to stop somewhere, and I want it to stop now. Every member of this Committee who has the interest of the country at heart wants it to stop now. Where is it going to end? When are we going to come finally to a stop? If we go on as in the past, if we incur liability after liability as we have been doing during the past three years, which liability we are not able to meet without borrowing money from the foreign market, then that can only continue for a limited time and finally is going to stop and this Colony is going to default. If there were no means by which expenditure could be reduced I think the Government would find itself in a rather difficult position but that I do not admit. On the contrary, I am satisfied that in various directions the Estimates introduced here a few days ago can be reduced; reduced materially; reduced so as to at least make it possible for this Colony to come nearer to squaring her accounts. No effort during the past three years has been made that I am aware of to in any way foster that industry upon which we mainly depend for our revenue. No effort whatever has been made to provide those funds which were necessary to meet the increasing estimates of the same period. On the contrary it seems to me that a determined effort has been made to muzzle that industry. Burdens have been taken off the shoulders of others and placed upon the shoulders of those who prosecute that fishery, thereby lessening their ability to earn and so their ability to contribute to the revenue. Deficits have been made by the giving of concessions to corporations involving an increase of burdens of others. During this session already measures have been introduced which tend to throw the burdens still further upon that industry. There are Resolutions before this House now, sir, the effect of which is to reduce taxation or remove taxation entirely from a corporation which has according to its own statement one of the most valuable properties in Newfoundland. I refer to this Buchan's Mine affair. With regard to that I shall have more to say when the discussion is in order; but just now I do want to say that that corporation having, as it has, a most valuable asset which constitutes one of the resources of this Colony should at least be compelled to bear its share of the burden of carrying on the affairs of the Colony. Why should the poor fisherman in his little fishing boat be taxed fifteen per cent. on his lines and twines while this corporation gets away without any taxation whatever. That, sir, shows evidence of a policy on the part of the present Government which is anything but in the interests of the people of the country, or the country itself. On the contrary, it shows clear and undisputed evidence, if any further is needed, to prove beyond a doubt that this is a Government for the classes and not for the masses, and sir, so long as this House of Assembly permits that administration to continue I do say this of it, that instead of being a control for the people it has degenerated into a control of the people. No further evidence is needed then. These Estimates show that the Government has absolutely no honest intention whatever of trying to do anything for the Colony. I hear a lot of talk about labour, about bringing in new industries in order to give labour, but I haven't heard a word from any of these gentlemen

who have introduced these present measures from the other side of the House about giving labour a reward for that labour. They are left to the tender mercies of these companies to say to them whatever they please. Twenty-five cents an hour, I suppose. No working man in this country to-day can bring up his family on twenty-five cents an hour. It is impossible, and yet in these Resolutions in connection with Buchan's Mine introduced into this House a few days ago, no reference whatever is made to securing a decent wage for the working man. He is to have his twenty-five cents an hour, a good percentage of which will be squeezed out of him by the present administration to pay the bills which ought to be paid out of taxes upon this company and other corporations that are wealthy and pay big dividends.

The Main purpose of my rising this afternoon, was in connection with this Budget. I have said before that during the past three years the present administration has shown an increasing incapacity to meet their bills until to-day we have over two million of dollars of a shortage on a ten millions expenditure which is twenty per cent. and if that deficit is going to increase in like ratio we will be four millions short next year, and I for one am not satisfied to proceed to the detailed discussion of these Estimates unless I know where the money is coming from. I am not satisfied to give a blank cheque to an administration in which the people of this Colony have lost confidence and I want to see that the money is in bank or that there is a reasonable likelihood of its being there before I join in the giving of the cheque. In other words tell me where you are going to get the money before I am prepared to vote that money to you. That is a most reasonable position. I tell you quite frankly that the people in this country to-day have no confidence in you and are justified in that attitude by your own record. If you decide to carry on you must show us how you are going to do it. If you want ten million dollars we want to know where it is coming from because we don't want any more two, three, or four million deficits in this Colony. I ask the Minister of Finance and Customs to be good enough to lay his cards on the table and let us see whether he is a big enough man for the financial situation as it exists to-day. If he can properly cope with it we are quite prepared to give him the money; if he cannot, I for one intend to oppose the grant. I have pointed out the reason. If he wants any precedents for bringing down of the Budget at this stage I will give him enough to bury him and if he say there is no precedent I say he is wrong and if he will step down in the Opposition room I will show him.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, before we go any further in connection with these Estimates and as a matter of fact we are not very far yet, I have just a few preliminary remarks to make in connection with the votes before the House. I think it is evident to members on both sides of the House that it is getting late in the season. I feel that the Government have been and will continue to attempt to get the public to believe that the fact of the House of Assembly being opened at this period of the year is mainly due to the fact that the Opposition are obstructing legislation and that the Opposition are determined so to speak to obstruct any legislation, be it constructive or otherwise, brought in by the present Government. Before going any further I would like to disallusion the minds of those who may be thinking that way by pointing out to them the fact that the proper period for the opening of this Legislature, no matter what Government is in power in my

opinion, and in the opinion of members of both sides of the House would probably be the last part of January or the first week in February. That, this Government has not attempted to do. Let us go back to that period this year, what do we find? We find in January and February months when members on both sides of this House find it most convenient to attend the Legislature, we find the Government postponing from month to month the opening of the House for the despatch of business. At that time they were not in a position to carry on the affairs of the country. Then we find ourselves at the end of February or the first week in March faced with a bye-election in St. John's East. There are monies in these Estimates to-day that have been stolen from the road grants of St. John's East by the Government in an attempt to win the election at that time. They were stolen so to speak because they were taken from this year's grants and given to people to shovel snow in St. John's East to try and elect the Government Candidate in St. John's East, and still we are asked to come in here into this Legislature and allow these estimates in the interests of the country to go through. I defy contradiction when I say that if I were representing St. John's East I could go down and allocate from the Board of Works one cent for the maintenance of roads provided for the District of St. John's East. I defy the Prime minister, Minister of Justice or any of those who are directly responsible for the throwing away of that money to contradict the statement which I have just made. Now early in the session I made certain statements regarding the financial position of Newfoundland, statements based on facts and figures given in answer to questions which I asked in this Legislature and which afterwards turned out to be inaccurate. Well now to-day I propose to make more statements and to prove that whilst at that time I might have accused the Minister of Finance and Customs for giving me wrong information that he was not the only one that gave wrong information to this House. The Prime Minister the other day in reply to a question asked by me told this House that there were no monies taken from loan account to purchase coal for the Railway. That is absolutely false. Consequently the accounts from the Railway here are padded to the tune of one hundred thousand dollars, and the Prime Minister knows it. That is, this administration, this Government or joke of a Government think that in the best interests of the country our duty is to give them a blank cheque so to speak and to go out and draw on the bank for any money that we may consider necessary to pay the debt of this country, without first telling us where we are going to get it. Last year according to the Auditor General's Report there was a deficit of $740,000. On top of that there was $100,000.00 taken from Loan Account to pay for coal for the Railway. The Prime Minister the other day in reply to a question asked by me said there was no such thing. Now, who is right, I have a statement here of Loan Account which says that $100,000.00 was taken out of Loan Account to lend to the Railway to buy coal. Just imagine lending money to an outfit that is losing three quarters of a million dollars a year, and expecting to get it back again. What a ridiculous statement to have the gall to shove down the throats of people, intelligent or otherwise. It is absolutely in accord with every action of the Government from the head down. You cannot depend on anything given in this House. Now I understand that the Honourable the Minister of Finance made the statement the other day that there was no precedent for bringing in the Budget with the Estimates. I

would like to call the attention of the House and the members of the Government especially to the year 1922. Here is an Order Paper dated May the 11th, where the Budget was brought down the same day as the Estimates, and they themselves insisted that the Budget be tabled the same day as the Estimates before they voted. I wonder if any of them will attempt to contradict that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will cotnradict it. I was not here.

MR. CASHIN—Well, the others were. The Minister of Justice was, the Colonial Secretary and Mr. Sullivan.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — You will find Supply was tabled before the Budget was brought down.

MR. CASHIN—About seven or eight days before.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Longer than that.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, with your permission I will read the procedure of the House on that date.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The statement I made the other day was that I knew of no precedent in this country.

MR. CASHIN—What is the position to-day? I think that some months ago I made certain statements regarding deficits in this country. While I do not intend at the present time to deal at any length with this matter, as I am deferring more detailed remarks until the Budget is brought in, but I would like to point out a few things to the Minister of Finance. And in this first place I want to tell him that his deficit instead of being $112,000 should be one and a half million. Here are the figures:

(Reads.)

Here is the crux of the situation. This is why we should insist on every detail being explained in this House. Last year taught us a lesson. We voted a loan bill last year of approximately five million dollars. We voted that money to be spent specifically.

(Reads.)

That is the most ridiculous clause in the loan bill. A bluff from start to finish. Because last year after this House closed a meeting of the Fishery Board took place, and I want to point out to what extent politics is carried in this country. That Fishery Board, constituted as it is with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries at its head, recommended certain things to be done, and amongst other things that a depot be erected at Bay Bulls. Mr. Outerbridge wrote a letetr to the Prime Minister suggesting that no such thing should be done, and no depot was erected. But if it had to be erected in Bonavista Bay for instance it would have been done. But because it was recommended to be built in Ferryland District, and because that district is opposed to the Government and will be, they would not erect it there. Why, because they wanted to put an outfit up in Bay Bulls controlled by the merchants of Water Street, called the Hawes group, consequently Ferryland had to be without a depot. Other places also, because the idea was to experiment with a cheap one at Bay Bulls before putting them up in other portions of the country. And then we are asked to come in here and vote money for the Prime Minister and his associates on Water Street to play with.

(Reads.)

I asked the Minister of Public Works one day where the balance of that $200,000 that was left out of the one million dollars was. And a Minister of the Crown told me that he did not know. Well, I know then, and if he will only come in here now I will tell him a few things from memory. But when the Budget comes in I will give it to him in detail. There was a vote of one million dol-

lars last year for public works, roads and bridges, etc. What happened? The whole thing was robbed from the Public Works Department and spent. How? It was spent on the Labrador Boundary, $100,000 plus $75,000 voted for it. It was spent on everyth.ng. $15,000 or $20,000 of it helped to elect Mr. Chambers in Burgeo and LaPoile. I agree with him that that district was entitled to it, but other districts are also entitled to it. Furhermore, $150,000 wh.ch is cut out of the estimates this year was voted here last year for public works, and it was never spent for public works, and consequently it should not be in there to-day. It is a drop balance so to speak. You took it from the Loan Account and put it into Exchequer Account and never spent it out of it at all. And then the Minister of F.nance attempts to tell us that he only had a deficit last year of $112,000. Very well, he knows, and every member of the Executive knows, that the deficit of last year was huge. Any member of the Executive that you meet in private conversation will admit that it was huge. And the Budget and the Estimates had been padded in order to make matters look as good as possible. Now, sir, are we right or wrong in the point in insisting that the Finance Minister introduce his Budget showing us from where he is going to get ten millions to run this country for the next twelve months. I think that it is unnecessary for me to speak at any length whatever in order to convince members on both sides of this House that it is a mere business proposition, because if I were to go down to the Minister of Finance and Customs' office to-morrow with a business proposition as a business man he would want me to show him where I am getting my revenue from. Is it not natural then that members of the Opposition should demand from the Government to-day a statement showing us where the money is to come from to balance this expenditure. Probably in a short time the Government will be introducing :nto this Legisltaure a bill known as the Income Tax, wherewith they will point out that they are anticipating $300,000 from that source. They will probably show us that Buchan's Mine, which is now being exploited by a large Amer.can corporation, is going to give labour to 1700 men, and that this mine will probably contribute enormously to the revenue of the country. But I want to be emphatic that moneys which were voted for, be they on one side or the other, members should ins.st that these moneys be distributed in the identical manner as voted. The Auditor General's Report here before us this afternoon if read in detail to this House is conclus.ve proof beyond the shadow of a doubt that the moneys which were voted in this House last year were never spent as they were voted. And there is no doubt that if we passed these Estimates in globo, and allowed the present Government to go out, and the Estimates were voted from this evening, they would not be spent as they were voted for. Furthermore, I feel, and I know that the Min.ster of Finance will agree with me, that a loan bill of five or six millions shall be introduced within a short period, and no doubt it will be introduced in a similar form to this one, but it will never be spent in the form in which it is voted. Therefore do you not think that it is reasonable that we should insist on the Finance Minister producing his Budget and showing the House, because I feel that there are members on the Government side of this House who do not know the true state of affairs, to show this House how they propose to raise the ten mill.on dollars that they ask us to vote for in these Estimates. I should not be so insistent, Mr. Chairman, if the infor-

mation that was tabled in this House was accurate, but I say that this information was deliberately inaccurate. There are no expenditures for the by-election in St. John's East in these Estimates, but no doubt they will appear in Supplemental Supply, or additional estimates which will be brought in at the last hours of the session in order to rush them through quickly. But I want to make the statement here that that election cost this country in the viciniy of $50,000. And this is the purist Government. And I want to make the statement that the candidate for the Government in St. John's East was paid out of the moneys voted by this Legislature last year, out of the one million dollar portion of the loan, the sum of $6,200 for a job that he was never intended to have, according to the bill that went through this House last year. He was put in there for political expediency. He was imported here as you would import a barrel of tar. He was brought down here and paid a hundred dollars a week out of the taxpayers' money—for what? Clerical work in the Newfoundland Hotel. Absolutely a deliberate steal. Because in my opinion that man had no more to do with the building of the Newfoundland Hotel than I had. He was put down there as a camouflage.

(Reads.)

I think that we passed a vote for twenty-five thousand dollars last year for dredging, if my memory serves me correct. And in addition to that we take this amount out of Loan Account. And then the Executive Government have the gall to come in here and try to tell any man in this House that the deficit was only $112,000. You can't believe one word that comes from their lips. Here is the deficit in globo.

(Reads.)

The Prime Minister on opening day said that the deficit would be in the vicinity of two and a half millions. And he acknowledged that he would have a deficit on the current year 1925-1926; but, Mr. Chairman, if we were more frank with each other we would get on much better in the interests of this country. I say in my opinion that this country is bankrupt. We have had the Government basking in their praise about what great results were going to accrue to this country from the settlement of the Labrador question. Have we had them tell us in their press or from the platform of the settlement of that dispute is going to add in any way to our paying abilities. No, but we find the other day the introducer of this bill in this House, the principle of which I quite agree with, saying that in the future no lands shall be granted on Labrador and no leases passed except thru this Legislature. But to show the deceit of the present administration they have been extending secretly licenses to what may be termed the favoured few. Because when that bill was tabled and during the time that it was under discussion, they had been extending these leases without having the common decency to come into this House and tell the members that they were doing it. Now I suppose that it will be advertised in the local press that the Opposition are hampering business in this House. Why we have not one constructive piece of legislation brought before the House this session. Preposterous was one of the words used by the Prime Minister in an expression referring to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. I claim that this is the most preposterous thing that has been introduced into this House with the exception of the Revenue Bill of 1925. I refer now to Buchan's Mine or the agreement that is to be entered into with the International Power and Paper Company. I say that it is preposterous, and why? Because they

come in here and ask us for concessions for twenty years, during which time they shall be free from duty on practically everything, instead of the Government living up to the Customs Act and allowing things absolutely essential for the construction of that mine. That mine, fortunately for the country, is a good one, but I wonder if the Government knows that they have abandoned their original vein and followed a new one known as the "Lucky Strike". They want everything duty free, and I regret to have to state that members in my opinion have treated this thing lightly so far, but I hope when it comes before the Committee that we will have men on the Government side as well as on the Opposition who will try to do their best for the future of the country.

Mr. Chairman, it is our duty—it is my duty, if I were the only member in Opposition and every man on this side was in Government, it would be my job to insist under the present circumstances that the Finance Minister introduce the Budget, Supplementary Supply and the Additional Estimates before we allow one thing to pass. If the Govt. declines to bring them down we should adopt the famous words of Marshal Joffre—"Ils ne passeront pas," and take as our motto "They shall not pass," unless they bring in the Budget and show us where they are going to get the money to pay the bills of the country. We have been in here over two months—going on three months, and we have done nothing for the fisheries of the country. I regret that the Prime Minister was absent a few moments ago when I referred to an item in the Loan Bill of last year of $290,000 to be spent in promoting the fisheries and developing that industry by establishing Bait Depots. I want to ask the Prime Minister if a bait depot has been erected in Newfoundland and paid for out of that money? Isn't it a fact that one was recommended at Bay Bulls and the present administration ignored it on the recommendation of Mr. Leonard Outerbridge. I asked that to be tabled, but evidently it was like a good many more—"personal and private." Regarding the $1,000,000 in that Loan Bill, I want to go on record as a representative of a district which last year got $350.00 pauper relief, that the roads in that district are in a despicable condition, and I blame it on the Government. Why, they spent $62,000 last year on a highroad between St. John's and Bay Bulls, 18 miles of road. Consequently we have 18 miles of road laughing at the rest, that is not fit to drive over. I have been over it in the past few days, and I am ashamed to have ever been associated with a Government that has stooped to such low tactics as this Government has done. I recommended to the Government through the Minister of Public Works, that a bridge at Mobile and another at Gallows Cove, Witless Bay, needed repair, and that an inspector be sent. He was sent, and stated that they were in need of repair, but the Minister advises me there is no money to spend on them. He took good care last year when the bye election was on in Burgeo and La Poile that the district he represented was looked after. And probably if I resigned today and there was a bye election in my district, money would be frittered away in the same way as in that bye lection and in the one this spring.

There are no Estimates here for the Liquor Control Department. Three men control that department, and no member of the Executive, and no Government can dictate to them. That is a beautiful position' But there is one thing we can do—we have to vote their salaries. Three of them, and the rest of the favoured few! Mr. Mifflin's favoured few get their salaries increased and bonuses at the end of the year provided they

stand in well with the Liquor Control Board. They were going to have nothing to do with politics, and were to have no part in it—to be non-partisan. I want to state that they took a prominent part in the recent bye election, and did more than they should, telling their employees in St. John's east not to vote for the Opposition candidate. Not taking any part in politics? I would like a rigorous inquiry in that department, and it wouldn't stand rigorous enquiry if I got at them. There have been questions asked in this House and false information given by the Board—I don't blame the Minister of Finance. They said that they never mixed smuggled rum with imported. I make the charge in this House and demand an enquiry, that there has been smuggled rum mixed. We remember last year that some rye whisky was brought in the House. It was nothing compared to the whisky sold this year—it was champagne to it. And I understand that there was some bad campagne sold, and the buyers rang up and sent it back. This high mucky-muck who never saw the inside of a rum shop till he came up here to run the liquor department! I understand that Mr. Duff stated that when he left this party he saved the country $300,000. I wish he would explain that. I can tell him what happened—he never had the pluck to leave—he sneaked across. He didn't cross like a man—if he did I would have admired him. He left without even notifying Mr. Hickman, the Leader of the Opposition—and we are supposed to be under a Government known as an honourable government. Mr. Chairman, there is no honour among thieves in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the financial affairs of the country, I am going to state, and I know the Government agrees with me, although they will not get up and say so, that it is time to forget politics, and to bring in what is the true state of affairs. And I wouldn't trust the Auditor General to do it either. The Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, made the statement, when I said that some financial statements were cooked, that they were the Auditor General's figures, and if he was wrong he should be dismissed. He hasn't explained the situation regarding the Savings Bank yet, how he was going in there month after month and money was being taken through that period for the past seven years. I don't think he has been fired yet. I notice too that he gets his share, and collects $1000 from the Railway; also that the Deputy Minister of Justice, whoever he may be, got $1000.00. An absolute bonanza.

When I look back at that manifesto and think what an idiot I must have been to swallow it in globo in 1924, and to think that my political opponents were such rascals as they were painted by the Prime Minister, and I come in here and look back over the past three years government by the Monroe administration, and try to draw a line between the honest men and the rogues! I think if a man is dishonest in politics he is dishonest in his business. If you can't trust him in one you can't trust him in the other, and surely we haven't heard any honourable member on the Government side get up and in a frank way tell the House the exact position in which the finances of the country are at the present time. Last year I had a few remarks to make on the Budget of the Minister of Finance, and the Prime Minister took occasion to give me the nickname of the "'financial wizard," because poor little me attempted to give an opinion. I would like to hear the Prime Minister to-day on the same subject —he had the opportunity to deal with it, but he wasn't man enough. I feel that he would be rather inclined to

praise me than to belittle me, because he has found out that my statements were correct. Things have happened to confirm every statement I made. The Government spent its time luring and seducing members to cross the floors, and the one that crossed wouldn't do it in the open, but waited and sneaked across. If I wouldn't go with the Government openly I wouldn't go in the night-time. Good gracious! Haven't you got a member on that side man enough to express himself in that respect?

Do you want to know how to cut down expenditure? People say it is alright to tear down, but can you build up? Well, I will build up, even if I risk my political future. You have telegraph lines travelling parallel to other lines—cut them out. You haven't got pluck enough. You have five or six millions of dollars worth of goods coming in duty free —stick five or ten per cent. on it— you haven't got pluck enough. There are too many axes to grind, and your own axes are sharpened already. But you will do what you can to protect big industries, ropewalks, butterine factories, tobacco factories and clothing houses and everything else —but you haven't got pluck enough to put it on where it will not be felt. I was speaking to a fisherman the other day as to what it cost him for his trawls, and he told me in the vicinity of $80.00 in lines and twines to operate his trawls. And you weren't satisfied, but put fifteen per cent on that to make it harder to operate, and you are now finding the error of your ways.

You are into-day with Additional Estimates to the amount of $250,000, next year you can come in with a less amount of $90,000, unless you over spend. How are you going to come in with that amount over? There is a loan coming due in 1928 of six million dollars which you have to borrow for to pay up, and you should be able to borrow at five per cent., saving one and a half points; if you borrow right you should get it for 4¾, and you would save over $100,000. This year you have to come in with this loan for five or six million, and you are going to borrow at five per cent. because I have grave doubts that the present Government would allow it to go at 4¾ because they would be afraid it was not going to sell and no wonder why, because they have hushed up everything. Another thing in my own district I am going to bring to the attention of the Minister of Finance and Customs. In the Customs at Cape Broyle you seem to have found that one man was not enough and have put in another. One man has been working there for 30 years for $800.00, and you put on another at $1,200.00; a party heeler who has performed some services for you and had to be fixed up, and there was nothing to do but to put him in Ferryland District—a nuisance. I may never be in a Government, but if I ever am I will fire him quick— and I make that statement now so that he will know where he stands. I have a statement here regarding a question of mine about Customs Officers; I don't think it would be amiss for the House to hear it.

(Reads)

I understand that one of the gentlemen working in the Customs Office in Grand Falls is also in receipt of salary from the A.N.D. Company. No wonder you find it necessary to pass legislation to make sure that the Customs Law is being carried out by large industries.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Do you make that charge seriously?

MR. CASHIN—I understand it is so. I learned it coming in the other day.

(Reads)

There are hardly as many officers in New York as in Port aux Basques.

I didn't know how many additional ones there will be in view of the fact that we have won the Labrador case. Half of them—I don't care whether they be friends or foes of mine—should be dismissed, but this Government, and possibly other previous and future Governments haven't got pluck enough to heave them out.

Another thing I insisted on last year but did not get and it is a thing I am going to insist on again this year, even though I do not get it. I refer to the running expenses of the Railway. Here is the largest Government department in Newfoundland under the control and operation of the Government to-day. Of course, it is a political tool just the same as other departments of the Government. It has a revenue of a couple of million dollars, but it had an expenditure of a million dollars more than it earned for the past year and members on both sides of this House cannot tell the salaries or the running expenses of that department. There are over two thousand employees in connection with the railway and their salaries range from eight thousand dollars a year to ten dollars a month. Still this sort of thing is allowed to go on and the country is expected to survive under such circumstances. Some one will have to put a check on that huge expenditure every year and it has got to come sooner or later. Up to June 1st, 1927, we had down in the Bany of Montreal $1,386,000.00 to the credit of last year's loan and possibly a considerable amount of that sum has been spent since. We owe that and more for deficits. Now does the Government think that we are asking for anything out of the ordinary when we ask that the Finance Minister to be frank and introduce his Budget and let us know the actual financial standing of this country. What is the use of hiding the true facts? It is like the story of the wolf. The wolf has to come some day and when that happens we will not be in the Legislature to stop the wolf from taking it away. Now the railway department should not cost more than a quarter of a million dollars a year to run. To-day it is costing over a million, exclusive of money spent on Capital Account. Last year money was spent on Capital Account that should have been spent out of the ordinary operation of the road, but the Finance Minister will table a statement here in order to show that the loss on the railway last year was smaller than what it really was. Imagine the idea of putting a window in a railway station and charging such an item up to Capital Account. Then again the steamers operating now are not being operated properly either. The Finance Minister has had considerable experience in that line and he will agree with me that this is absolutely a department for dumping political heelers in. There is more men working to-day per mile than there is working on any railway in the world. We got 900 miles of railroad and there is no other railroad who would have so many employees and at such big salaries as this one, particularly when you consider the size of the country, the size of the revenue and the amount of work done by this railway. Let us take the railway as a whole. You got a General Manager named Russell who sits in his office in St. John's and makes an occasional trip to Port aux Basques. Then you got two other separate departments passenger and freight. Now, if the railway was conducted on business principles, all this would be one department. Then you got a locomotive department, which is a joke. Why? Because the maintenance of the locomotives all over this road are not properly looked after. In some places you got competent men and in other places you got incompetent men and the incompetent ones have suffi-

cient pull to hold down their jobs. Then you have the dry dock that cost two million dollars. I made a statement here before that if you put a six thousand-ton ship on that dock and left it there the whole year round you would not get enough revenue for it to pay the interest on your loan. I was a member of the Railway Commission while the dock was under construction, but I was not a member of the Executive Government. When the Government decided to build and purchase the new steamer Caribou that decision was reached by the Executive Government. The Railway Commission had nothing to do with it but the money was taken from the railway department to pay for the ship. Mr. Sullivan was sent across to purchase that ship and the Government did not have the decency to say they were doing it. Still the Government will say they are decent. It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that you will want some sort of disinfectant on that table in order to keep the obnoxious stench from coming across from that side of the House, and maybe one may need a gas helmet. I have already stated here about that $100,000.00 that the Government gave the railway out of a loan with which to buy coal. The Prime Minister told me such was not the case. Now I would like to hear from the Prime Minister if it is true that the Government is giving the railway money in $100,000.00 lots or does the Prime Minister know at all what happened? The Government has been continually lending money to a losing concern. I wonder would the Prime Minister lend me money if he knew that the business I was running was constantly dropping money heavily. When you purchased your coal for the railway, sir, you should have purchased it out of the current expenditure and not out of your loan account, which, in my opinion now, is going to show a bigger shortage than $750,000,00, owing to the way railway operations were handled the past year. I would like to know also if it is the intention of the Government to cut out $150,000.00 which were voted in the Estimates last year for Public Works and allow roads and bridges to fall down. Surely goodness the $100,000.00 that was given out for able-bodied relief last year could have been worked out. I know the reply the Prime Minister will make to this assertion is that St. John's got $90,000.00 of it to meet the unemployment situation. Well, I contend that St. John's should get it, because out of that million dollar loan St. John's share would be well over $100,000.00 instead of $90,000.00. Consequently, the Government owes St. John's another $50,000.00 of that loan. You gave the district of Ferryland $22,000.00 out of that loan, as their proportionate share of it, and we had almost to wade to our knees in blood to get that share. If I were a member or even the last link of the present Government to-day, all I would have to do is to go with hat in hand and demand of the Executive anything I would like and I would be sure to get it; or if I were a Minister of the Crown I would be allowed to dish out orders indiscriminately with pen or pencil and they would be honoured by the present administration. I asked a question here the other day of the Minister of Public Works as to what became of the $867,000.00 that was spent out of the million dollar loan last year. In other words, I asked him for the returns of the money spent. He gave me details of $150,000.00, but he never stated yet what happened the rest or where it got. I suppose he must have considered me a bit dense. I got a similar evasive answer to a question from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in relation to a $30,000.00 expenditure. Surely the Government

does not want to tell me that their deficit is only $112,000.00. Why that is not half the deficit.

The comparison with the original Estimates given in the Budget Speech shows:—

(Reads)

One would imagine on the first loan raised that they were after getting a surplus of $300,000 and they were giving it back to the Treasury.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it would be an interesting little story to me, though I never occupied a seat in an Executive Government, and probably never will, and don't care whether I do or not, to give an idea of the Minister of Finance and Customs one night having to go to a meeting and tell the Executive Council that there was going to be a shortage in the revenue. He would ask how it was going to be fixed up and they would asy, "Well, we will have to fix you up somehow." Then the program is laid out and the matter is discussed. It is arranged then to fix up the Budget Speech and fix the shortage by changing votes and dropping balances. Now that $300,000. If we add that $300,000 to $112,000 we get over $400,000. Then $800,000 on the railway. There you are, over a million and a quarter. It would be interesting to give a comparison with the figures I used here last year. Here are the figures I used last year. I kept them just to see how it would work out. Let us see how far I am out from a million and a quarter.

(Reads)

I estimated a quarter million on current account and a million on railway. A million and a quarter is here. I want to point out that although I didn't have access to the various figures of some departments I am not far out; I am rather under.

Now, I would like a pronouncement from the Government through the Minister of Finance and Customs who is acting for the Government while this is going through, as to what their intention is this year regarding better construction of roads; if any; with regard to the repair of roads which are absolutely dilapidated at the present time owing to their fault. I can hear the reply now that they haven't got the mony. But you had the money to heave into the Highroads Commission, out of the 1927 loan,, which was never voted by this House, and which they never should have received. A pet scheme devised by a gentleman who is now ill; consequently I will say nothing about him. I visited a certain settlement in the district of St. John's East during the past twelve months, that section known as the Battery, composed principally of fishermen, and it just goes to show the interest the present administration has in the fishermen. It would be interesting for the Prime Minister to do down to the Battery and take a walk round the roads down there to find out what it is actually like.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Battery is under the Municipal Council.

MR. CASHIN—I understand that no taxes are received from the Battery, and if no taxes are received I don't suppose the Council are going to do anything for them. I understand that the Government is in charge of the situation and if the Council are not to blame the Government must be to blame. I was on Bell Island a while ago. We will go right in to your own district. I was on Pitts' Hill . I don't know where it got its name. It certainly didn't look as if it had any aristocratic connections or associations such as perhaps go with that name. There is a public wharf there, and you can hardly bring a dory in without running some danger. Construction stopped on it some two or three years ago and no effort has been made by the Government to construct it. Many

roads of the district are in a dilapidated condition. Now, I am not talking politics because I am never going to run for Bell Island. You talk about clean government and the money you threw away on snow shovelling down in that district is shameful. Somebody said that the snow cost a dollar a shovelful. There is a lot I would like to talk about in connection with the St. John's East election, but it appears to me that my tongue has been curbed and I don't know if I will get an opportunity unless we can stage another Bell Island act where the people are the judges. I have yet to hear in this House since we came a pronouncement from the Government as to why the law is right one time and not another. I have yet to hear why it is constitutional to open St. John's East one time and not another. Well; I hope they got their medicine and they are poor sports at that. I may go out of this House to-morrow and never come back again, but one thing about it, they can't take my decency from me or my independence under any conditions whatever. Mr. Chairman: If I can do it those Estimates shall never pass until the Budget and Extra Estimates are brought in here. Talking about salaries, here in the Auditor General's report is a list of extra salaries dished out by Order in Council. It will be interesting to read it and see who stands in well with the Government. I understand there was a Finance Committee appointed and the Finance Minister was absolutely snubbed, so to speak, by the Government, and they brought in three individuals who knew no more about finances than the Man in the Moon. Their first action was to send around two or three policemen to try and cut down pensions, and took a war pension from an old woman of seventy-five.

MR. SULLIVAN—Not the Finance Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Well, the Pensions Committee did it through the report of some sneak who discovered some old woman of about seventy-five in receipt of a war pension. That woman lost two sons in the war and the pension was taken away because she was supposed to be supported by a son who has been in the States for years. That individual is the second Customs Officer at Cape Broyle, and I may live long enough to get in a government some day, and if I do, that fellow will fly so quick he won't know what happened to him. We have yet to see a report tabled by the Finance Committee. The main thing they did was to try and investigate every poor old man or woman. I understood that the hon. member was one of the wiping up party, so to speak, the night previous to the election in St. John's East. I did not meet him in the trenches anywhere, but I understood that he was in a section of the district somewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I was just looking for the extra salaries that have been paid out to the various fellows who stand in well with the Government.

(Reads.)

Now if you want to pay a man a good salary pay it to him. Surely the Hon. Mr. Duff, who says that he saved the country $300,000 by crossing the floors of this House, was not a party to voting these extra salaries that now appear in the Auditor General's Report. I have yet to hear the hon. gentleman detail to us the avenues by which he saved this country $300,000.

Now I would like to read out for the hon. gentleman what he once said about me in this House.

(Reads.)

I would tell the hon. gentleman, sir, that as far as I am personally concerned that I have done nothing in this House since I came in here that I am ashamed of. He was here the night I left them. I was never asked

to go with the Government since I left them, nor would I. It was intimated one time that a Coalition Government would be a good thing for this country, and I was asked for my support, which I absolutely refused. I did not wait until this House closed to leave the Government. Nor do I intend to carry out such actions as running away in the dark, because that is what it means. The man who has not pluck enough to move openly from one side to the other is not fit to be a member of this House. No wonder he now lacks the confidence that his constituents placed in him a few years ago.

MR. DUFF—My constituents are satisfied.

MR. CASHIN—So are mine. The position is that the Government, and Mr. Duff is a part of that Government, should consent to have a general election. And there are members in the Government ranks to-day who if they had pluck enough as I feel that I have would get up here and say it. As far as I am concerned men of that calibre can steer clear of me. I want nothing from any member of this House, one side or the other. But I am going to be independent here. I am not going to pledge to-night and stab them in the back to-morrow night. Now I would like very much for the hon. gentleman to tell us where he saved this country $300,000. The hon. member says that his constituents are glad that he left the Opposition. The hon. gentleman can make no such statement. The constituents, in the Prime Minister's own words, have not had an opportunity of saying whether or not they agree with his attitude. The hon. member's own friends no doubt are glad. Some of the large trust companies in St. John's are proud. Some of the various ones that he bawled about in 1925 are proud. I don't know whether the hon. gentleman feels as I felt—whether he felt as proud as I felt when I received a letter from the Prime Minister asking me to join his party. I do not know whether he received one also.

I say that anything personal that interests the affairs of this country is public. Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member had the interests of the country at heart, as he should have —not that it affects me one way or another—he is an independent man, and he would never have gone with the Monroe administration, especially when he did and in the manner he did. We have often heard of the Ghurkas during the war, and the manner in which they attacked the enemy, and the hon. member for Carbonear reminds me of a political Ghurka crawling through the bushes. As to my part in the war, politically, at any rate I never got on my hands and knees and crawled across —I walked across like a man, and would walk back the same way if I wanted to, and nobody could stop me. I will take the hon. member at his word and I will go across to the Government if he moves over. He hasn't pluck enough—we wouldn't expect it from a man who sneaks across in the night.

Coming to another man, and I regret to have to do it because he is a friend of mine—Mr. Sullivan. There is nothing personal in it, but in connection with Buchan's Mine he crossed swords with Mr. Lake regarding his position in the A. N. D. Company. I want to ask him one question: If I was his agent and was over in London, and acting on his behalf in selling goods, and didn't carry out some instructions, what would he do? Fire me! He has brains enough and pluck enough to do it. And that is his position with the A. N. D. Company—if he doesn't perform his instructions they will get another agent, and he has to cater to them; that is why I say it isn't right for him to vote on that question, and when the time ar-

rives I am going to make that motion, or whatever way it is done, that he should not vote. I know Mr. Sullivan will know there is nothing personal in this, but I hate to hear of anyone getting anything put over on them. Do you mean to tell me that if my agent or lawyer has the opportunity that it is more than natural for him to do everything possible for his employer or client? That is his duty. But I want to say that as far as I am concerned the Buchan's Mine Bill as it is at present constituted shall not pass. If I am overpowered I have to take my medicine, but I am perfectly able to do that. I am just the same in defeat as in victory.

But let us get back to the Estimates. The Estimates now before the House, instead of being $270,000 over last year are really $600,000 over last year. There was an amount of $150,000 shown in the Estimates last year voted to be spent on roads that was not spent, but is shown in the Estimates. Add to that the $277,000 shown here and where do you get off at?—$420,000. There are various salaries, according to the Auditor General's Report, which are not in the Estimates that should be in, and about which we were told when the present administration came in that they were going to put in, and that all salaries should be voted. From $500,000 to $600,00 extra—$250,000 of it on the loan raised last year, and while I am on this business I might express an opinion about that loan. Last year the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister and Executive Government were prepared to put certain amounts on the local market. The Honourable Minister of Finance has stated in answer to a question that the raising of money locally has not been successful. Mr. Chairman, while I was not in the country when loans were raised locally, I have information enough to know that in 1918 or 1919, or whenever they were raised, it was without difficulty. Certainly the war was on at that time, and I suppose people had money. But there is twenty-seven millions in the Savings Bank, and I want to tell the House and the country that their money is safer in bonds of the Government of Newfoundland than it is in the Savings Bank, and that is proven by the Auditor's report. It is dangerous to put your money in the Savings Bank, in case you have it stolen—and the Auditor General is a joke. Is twenty thousand all that was taken—it is a pity he didn't take it all. It is better to put their money in bonds at five per cent. than in the Bank at three per cent or three and a half per cent., with the chance of having it robbed.

It is interesting to know that in the shape of increases to salaries, pensions, etc., there is another $280,000 which should be in the Estimates and is not. That should have been added to the deficit of $112,000 of last year which is not here. $280,220.01.

(Reads)

There is $280,000 Supplementary Supply in salaries alone, and Suppletary Supply this year will not be less than $500,000 or $600.00, which should be added to that because it is spent in the fiscal year. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister and his whole aggregation look on me as one who has no interest in the country, as one who doesn't care what happens tomorrow or the next day, and as one whose sole ambition is to obstruct the Government in its legislation—I know they have expressed themselves privately in that manner, and that that is their attitude. As far as I am concerned personally I don't care what they feel or do, but I want to tell them that the day of reckoning must come sooner or later. Let us figure out for a moment what government was costing the country in 1924, and what it is costing at the present time. There was a deficit of

$1,600,000 from the previous administrations, which was hailed from the house-tops. But what has happened? If correct accounts had been shown, I believe the Government would have shown a deficit for every year from June 1924, to June 1927. But monies have been taken from loans, in various forms and showed in the Exchequer account. I don't care what the Auditor-General says—his word can't be taken, as far as I am concerned. The Government showed a surplus in 1925 when there was really a deficit; there was a deficit in 1926. In 1927 it will reach two millions, and the present Government is composed of business men! And what happened to bring this about ? When they came in in 1924 the country was fairly prosperous—there was a good fishery, a better one in 1925 and a rotten one in 1926 as far as prices went. When they put on extra taxation in 1925 they forced people to cut expenditure. Because the necessaries of life increased, the man who bought two pairs of boots last year bought one this year, consequently the revenue from the extra paid was not forthcoming to the Custom House, and the same applies all around. We have heard a lot from Government speakers, particularly in the bye elections about the fall in textile goods, but we heard nothing about the fall in the price of fish. I don't want to be one of those who contends that the Government is absolutely responsible for the price of fish, but I claim that the Government in every country is responsible to some extent for the manner in which its products are handled, why to-day right in this city the people who control the fish of the country have driven up the price of salt through mishandling. After all, the fishermen who produce the fish have to pay the piper; if the merchant loses, he is going to make it up some other way, and the same applies to the fisheries of this country, and they have to be fostered in some way or other. This government promised a bounty on fish; it is questionable whether they could not bring that about, but my point is that they have not carried out their promise. Assuming for argument sake that they could not, what else could have been done? Surely some form of regulation could have been brought about as regards exportation. Surely the fisheries of the country should not be left in the hands of the few to manipulate to their own advantage. Possibly some of these have lost money in handling fish, but I maintain that it is through their own fault because they are not men enough to get together and devise a scheme whereby everyone would work together and be satisfied with a decent margin of profit. If they wont foster the industry, then I say without fear of contradiction that the country will be bankrupt to-morrow. Buchan's Mine won't save it; the Gander won't save it, neither will the Humber or Grand Falls. The lot of them together don't amount to more than 15,000 people. It is said that Buchans Mine has in sight in the vicinity of 200,000,000 tons of ore, and they have the gall to ask this Legislature to give them twenty years freedom from duty on practically everything they are going to import. If the Prime Minister had risen in his seat to say that this was a most preposterous piece of legislation ever introduced in here, he would have said something correct. He would have said something that was absolutely correct. But instead of bringing this House together and talking to us over here in a friendly kind of manner when we make a suggestion it is ignored and treated as if we were dogs. But when the Manufacturers' Association does you can't rush quick enough to meet it. But the representatives of the common people are ignored. That's what we

are up against with Buchan's Mine and everp piece of legislation brought in by the present Government. I want to make a statement which I believ if it were carried out to-morrow would have a great effect on the future of the country I f.eel it is a point worth consideration by the Opposition that every one on the Opposition should come in and one after another make a small speech, and say that we are withdrawing from this Chamber until a decent Government is in power. They are blaming the Opposition to-day for holding up the Estimates holding up legislation, and they didn't think it worth while to open this House until May 11th. Why? Because as I said it wasn't politically expedient at that time. You talk about bribery and corruption. Insinuations were thrown across here during the Speech from the Throne about the actions of some of the Opposition. You threw away money down in St. John's East and now further we are going to be asked to vote fifty or sixty thousand dollars in additional estimates or Supplementary Supply to pay for the squandering. Then you have members in your Government with gall enough to get up and try and tell us we used dispicable methods. If every man of the Opposition is of my mind those estimates shall not pass unless the Government bring in the Budget, Supplementary Supply, and Additional Estimates and tell us the facts as to where this country stands at the present time. I can tell you offhand that this country is responsible for $80,000,000. For more if an arrangement cannot be entered into with the International Paper Company or some other outfit, for another ten million on the Humber. This Government should be ashamed of itself in connection with the Humber. We are supposed to have a Government director on the Humber. He was so weak he couldn't demand a report from that outfit. If he could not make them the Government should; and the Government were just as weak. Do you mean to tell me that the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister would not make a company come across with a financial statement. On the Humber matter a liability of ten million is facing us unless somebody comes along and lifts the liability. Nobody is more anxious that somebody does come along than this man Cashin right here now. The legislation regarding industry of that nature especially one to lift liabilities from the shoulders of the people, if any legislation of that kind comes up I am the last man I think to play politics with it, because I feel that when a subject concerns the general benefit of the community we owe it to ourselves and to our children to treat that matter with the utmost impartiality. I want to tell the House that whilst legislation brought here to do that might need amendment in small matters as will be the case in all matters I want to say that any legislation to reduce our liabilities and help industry that is brought in I am going to give it my very earnest consideration . But I hope that with a corporation such a one as we are dealing with now in the person of the A.N.D. Company with regard to the Buchan's Mine property I hope that when that Bill comes before the committee again for discussion it shall be greatly improved because I feel it is an absolute piece of thievery on the part of the A.N.D. Company and I intend that as the Bill is at the present time to oppose it as vigorously as I can. Not for political reasons because I don't have to talk politics to be elected a member of this House, but whilst I am here I consider it is my job to work in the interests of the people. And so far I have done the best I could and have received from the present adminis-

tration nothing but contempt. I would not mind if every one received alike but in that Loan Bill last year of five millions there was one million for construction of public works and the Government deliberately goes down and take that million from these various districts. I consider it is an insult to every member of the House from the Executive Government. True one or two got their share. True I think Carbonear got a little share in the form of a concrete bridge or something at Victoria. And my poor unfortunate district? I must call it unfortunate in the sense of the Government, is left to suffer. Why they knocked down the public wharf and haven't even decency enough to rebuild it and put it back where it was. A Government boat knocked it down and that boat is legally responsible for the wharf and it is not back yet. Mobile bridge has got to be built or some one is going to be killed. Gallow's Cove bridge has got to be built. All we want is our share we ask you for nothing. If I was in the Government it would be very easy for me to get the necessary funds to keep up the public works, but I happen to represent a district politically opposed to the Government and so it is entirely different; actually not politically opposed to the Government because that district stood by the Monroe administration; gave them two members and they don't deserve to be treated as they have treated them. Mr. Chairman I feel like doing business in this House and when I ask a certain thing about a certain matter I feel like getting an answer at once. Now with regard to no new public works I want to know if the Government intends to repair the bridge at Mobile. It is not safe. That bridge is dangerous. I have examined the bridge and I know what I am talking about Plank has had to be put over it to try and keep it together. I ask that that bridge be repaired immediately and I am not talking for my own personal aims. I am talking because it must be done or lives may be lost and I have got to try and get something done in the interests of the people.

I am no use to my district unless I can get something done. And I want to tell you right here now that every day whilst we are in Committee on Supply I am going to get after the Government concerning that bridge. And so you can forget about doing anything until I get the assurance that these bridges will be repaired. And I am doing that not for my own interests but in the interests of the people and their lives in that settlement. And I would like to know from the Prime Minister before this House closes this afternoon whether something is going to be done about that.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker: It is not my intention to hold up this House but in reply to an answer from the Minister of Public Works I would like to ask him if there is not a rock crusher down in Grand Falls belonging to the Government. It was bought in 1923 out of a sum of $4-000, and it was sent out there to repair the roads.

Also with your permission, Mr. Speaker, since I have not had the opportunity this afternoon before, I would like to ask the Prime Minister, now that the Prospero has left Port Union on its way south, may I ask

him if he has given any consideration to its making Springfield a port of call.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: We have made the statement in this House that as soon as there was sufficient freight to make it worth her while that she would call there, sufficient freight or number of passengers to make it worth her while to go that much out of her way.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker: I want to tell the Prime Minister that unless it is advertised that you are going to make Springfield a port of call there will be no freight offering. But as soon as you do there will be lots of freight and passengers. I just want to say that I am determined to fight that point to a finish.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker: In rising to support the motion for adjournment, with your permission I would ask the Minister of Justice, for it is causing a lot of talk around town, whether there is any Acting Deputy Minister of Justice.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker: In reply to that question I may say that there is not any Acting Deputy. Mr. Dunfield has been retained to assist the Department in the ordinary routine matters. There is no other Deputy or Acting Deputy. And without meaning any disrespect to Mr. Dunfield I may say that he has no authority to sign a letter or a check.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, July 5th at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 5th, 1927.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, closing my remarks yesterday afternoon regarding various public works, I drew the attention of the House, the Prime Minister and the Government to the fact that Mobile bridge was in a very dilapidated condition and unsafe for traffic at the present time. This evening, Mr. Chairman, in a very few moments I propose to deal with a matter which I do not feel proud to bring before the House. This morning a number of constituents of mine from the Goulds called at my office regarding work asking me to take the matter up with the authorities with a view to trying to get them some kind of remunerative employment. I would like to point out Mr. Chairman to the Government that the part of Ferryland known as the Goulds consists principally of men who during the past few years have been engaged in other avocations than the fishery. A few having been engaged at first still go to Petty Harbor from the Goulds but at the present time are not able to better matters at that work. Last year they were employed principally on the highroads and the construction of the new flume at Petty Harbor. This year none of that work is going on and these men, Mr. Chairman, I feel have a very good case. I feel personally that these people are up against it and I can't feel otherwise than say it is the duty of us as members on both sides of the House that when people are on the verge of starvation so to speak, we see that steps be taken at once to try and remedy it. I understand accompanying those who interviewed me this morning there was also a deputation from the adjoining district of St. John's West

which I understand interviewed one of their representatives, Mr. Browne, as member for St. John's West, and I take it from what my constituents told me that Mr. Brown assured these men that they would get employment.

MR. BROWNE—I rise to a point of order. I don't know whether the matter is in order for discussion just now, but I want to state that I didn't say anything of the sort. I said that I didn't know that there was necessity in that part of the district, and that the people there were in need of employment. I said that the proper course for them was to come to one of the representatives of the district and put the case before him. As a matter of fact I was told they were part of a deputation going to Government House this afternoon. I said I would discuss the matter with my colleagues; I hadn't known of necessity there; and I would endeavour to do all I could.

MR. CASHIN—If the discussion is out of order I would like to ask permission to make a few remarks in connection with the matter. I would like to point out to the Government that these people to whom I refer look to me as their representative to try and do something for them in the way of finding employment and I look upon it as part of my job to try and find them some kind of employment and I would suggest at the present moment to the Prime Minister or the Government that in order to fix matters up and try to get some constructive work for these people I am quite prepared this afternoon if necessary to meet the Government or the Prime Minister to discuss ways and means to get some kind of constructive labor and I feel that after discussing the matter we will come to an arrangement whereby these people may be relieved. After all these people are human and it is absolutely essential that we get something for them to do in order that they don't starve, not alone themselves but their wives and children who are absolutely in distress. If I could do it myself I would not come to the Government and ask it, but it is obviously beyond the hiring of all those men what anybody could expect of me and I contend that it is the duty of the Government to see that employment of a constructive and remunerative nature is forthcoming immediately or otherwise things are going to be very difficult, and that not alone in the Goulds but in every section of the country. This is the first time since I have been a member that I have had occasion to bring a matter such as this before the House, and I am not bringing it up as a political dodge, but to try and do my duty in the interests of these people. After I sit down if the Prime Minister feels like it I would like to meet him in order to discuss ways and means, if you like, to help out in this matter. Yesterday in connection with the affairs of the district I called to the notice of the Government that at the present time the bridge at Mobile was in a most delapidated condition. I feel that I owe it to my constituents to do everything possible to get that bridge mended. That bridge is in a very unsafe condition, and a danger to those who pass over it. If it is not repaired it may cost somebody's life. I would like to ask the Government in all fairness and decency to see to it at once that that bridge be made safe for traffic. I don't know but it might be myself going to my home in Cape Broyle who might come to disaster on it. The Government might not feel the loss, but personally I don't want to go to my death in Mobile River. It may be any member of the Government. It may be some poor man down there. I feel that you owe it to the country; you owe it to the district that elected two representatives for the Monroe administration to see to it that these bridges are repaired and repaired immediately. The Prime Minister mentioned that there was various requests

from his own district in various sections, but he will agree with me when I say that this certainly is so situated in the Island that it carries more traffic than a lot of sections in his own district, and heavier traffic. And again, funds were sent to the Prime Minister's district which, if spent to better effect, these bridges would not have been broken down, and now, without further comment, I ask that we get together and do something to find ways and means to find employment that I have been referring to, and I ask that something be done that these bridges be made safe immediately, or otherwise we may live to come in here to mourn the loss of someone's life, and then, as often happens, I suppose, steps will be taken to prevent damage after it is done.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, yesterday on the motion to adjourn I rose to speak in connection with the "Prospero" not making Springdale a port of call. I intended to speak for a few minutes and then have finished, but the Speaker ruled me out of order and asked me to bring the matter up in Committee to-day and I am now taking the opportunity of doing it and to bring the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister and the Railway Commission. Now the Prime Minister informed me yesterday that at any time there was any freight offering for Springdale the "Prospero" would call there. How can the people of Springdale know or how will they know the steamer is going to call there unless it is advertised in the papers in order to give the people a chance to order their freight and have it come by the "Prospero"? I stated here yesterday that this sort of thing is a discriminatory practice and I repeat here now that it is and if I am called upon to prove it I will do so. Here's a settlement in the district of Twillingate and every man who lives in that settlement is a producer in this country and there are scores of men who go from there to the Treaty Shore prosecuting the fishery and they are now compelled to go down to Little Bay or elsewhere to await the arrival of the "Prospero" to get down to the fishing grounds, owing to the fact that that steamer does not call at Springdale. I ask, Sir, is this fair treatment to these people or is this the kind of a square deal that the Prime Minister promised the people of this country three years ago? The people who belong to the important district of Twillingate are producers in this country and as such are entitled to have the "Prospero" call regularly at Springdale. They have as much right to have that steamer call there as the peeople in any other district have. The "Prospero" is the outside boat north and is supposed to touch the outside ports, as it is well known the people of Springdale have no railway facilities and the people got to get back and forth to the fishery just as well as the people in Bonavista Bay or any other Bay have. I spoke last week of the "Prospero" calling at Wesleyville on the north side of Bonavista Bay. Now Wesleyville is in the Prime Minister's district and it is rather significant that every steamer running north calls there, namely, the "Malakoff," the "Home," the "Prospero," the Labrador boat and three or four ferries ply between there and Gambo. The Prime Minister may come back and say that he is not using discrimination. Well I want to tell the Prime Minister that he is wrong and that he and his colleagues are grossly discriminating to the disadvantage of the people of Twillingate district. Twillingate district has been discriminated against ever since the Monroe Government came into power, and, as a representative for that district, I will not stand for it any longer. Does the Prime Minister think that the three representatives for that district are three fools? If he thinks so he has another guess

coming to him. If you had given out pauper relief in that district as you have given it out in other districts then I would not have as much to say; but because we sit in Opposition and you are there as a Government you discrimate against us and then say that it does not pay to have the "Prospero" call at Springdale. Does it pay her to call at other places on the northern coast? There are ports north where that steamer has been calling for several years and it has never paid her to call there and yet we are told that it costs too much for her to call at Springdale. The Prime Minister said that it costs $60.00 to have the steamer call at Springdale. That is absolutely wrong. When the Prime Minister talks on what it costs to run a steamer between ports he will find, perhaps, that I know more about that subject than he does; and I say here right now that if that ship does not call at Springdale that she will lose hundreds of dollars. I propose to see this thing carried right through, and, furthermore, I assure the Prime Minister that I will be a thorn in his flesh as long as he is in this House until he arranges to have the "Prospero" call at Springdale. Now why does not the Prime Minister make this a general thing and if the "Prospero" is not allowed to call at Springdale why have her call at Wesleyville where every ship on the north coast calls? Then he has the audacity to get up here and say he is not discriminating. Why it's discrimination of the worst kind and the Prime Minister knows it too well. That is some of the square deal that he promised. It is a raw deal I would call it and it is a sore that will never be healed until this administration goes out of power and I hope that time will not be far distant. Last year there was a million dollar loan allocated for public works throughout the Island. Of that amount the district of Twillingate got $7,000.00, whereas we should have got, according to our population, $100,000.00, and then because we ask here for the rights of these people we are called obstructionists and we are told that we are holding up the business of the House. If we are doing any holding up, we are doing it in the defence and the interests of the men who sent us here. Where is the money gone that belongs to the district of Twillingate? This is a district which for years was the premier district in the Colony and it is an independent district where the men work for their living and are not fed on pauper relief and I am glad this evening to have the honour to be one of the representatives of such a district. I wonder will the Prime Minister explain what happened to all of that one million dollars that was voted in this House last year for public works? Why did not and why should not the district of Twillingate get its proportional share of that money? Certainly goodness the people of that district have not been so terribly bad. Is it because they did not return three members for the Monroe Party that the whole district must suffer and be discriminated against? Surely there must be a serious reason for this kind of treatment meted out to my constituents. Out of the million dollar loan of 1926 I notice here by the Public Charities Accounts that over eight hundred thousand dollars was given out for able-bodied pauper relief. Out of that the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, the district that Mr. Sullivan represents, got $20,000.00 while the district of Twillingate with a much larger population got only $7,000.00. I do not blame the Minister of Agriculture and Mines for that. I respect him and I am glad to have the opportunity of telling him here now that I believe that if he had his way that no district would be discriminated against. Now Mr. Sullivan, who is a Railway Commissioner, told me that the reason the "Prospero" did not call at Springdale was to cut down expenses; but Mr.

Sullivan forgets the fact that he and others robbed the district of Twillingate in connection with old age pensions.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE —S.nce I have been in the Department no district could steal a pension from another. Every application for pensions last year went through to my knowledge.

MR. BROWN—But the district of Twillingate with a population of 26,-000 people got only 15 pensions last year while the district of Placentia and St. Mary's got over 80. However, it appears that most of the public moneys that are given out for public works or pensions go to Placenia and other southern districts while the northern districts do not get their just quota or anything near it per capita. In other words, the principal producing districts of the country, particularly Twillingate district, are discriminated against. I notice here also in the public accounts that the district of St. George's did well last year and I suppose the member for there was also fixed well. Out of road commission account that district got $13,842.00, and out of the same account the General Hospital X-Ray Department got $2260.00. Now I hate to say anything against an Hospital or anything that is done for it, but why was it paid money out of this account? I notice also that $5,000.00 was spent on a road from Carbonear to Heart's Content and that $5,000.00 more was spent on a concrete bridge at Victoria, Carbonear. I was thinking if this is the reason why Mr. Duff is on the Government side. Fortune Bay also did well last year, according to population. The sum of $5,000.00 was spent on roads between Fortune Bay and Burgeo and that, I presume, helped to elect the Minister of Public Works Well I would be ashamed to go to Twillingate and say I had to spend so much money to be elected.

MR. BROWNE—How were you elected?

MR. BROWN—I am not talking to you, "Mr. Buttinsky". I will handle you later, and I am prepared to handle you at any time, either with gloves or without gloves. Mr. Chairman, I was dealing with the expenditure of public moneys that was responsible for electing the member for Burgeo and LaPoile when I was interrupted. I find here two more amounts of $5,000.00 each, money which was spent on marine works, and still another amount of $5,000.00 for blasting a rock in Burgeo harbour. Now this is money that should have been spent in Twillingate. Last year a big rock came down in a part of Twillingate District and cut off the water supply from the people. I wired to St. John's for $60.00 from the Government to have the rock removed. No money was granted and the people started in and removed that rock themselves, but they are not yet paid for their work. Now is not that discrimination again, I ask? The Prime Minister is now gone out of the House. I wish he would come back because I have a copy of his famous Manifesto which I intend to read, and I know he would like to hear it. Next we have the expenditure of $16,608.39 for the S. S. Earl of Devon, which operated on the lower Labrador in 1925. That money was taken and paid out of last year's loan account. Now just imagine that boat being paid such an amount out of loan account and the district of Twillingate could not get $60.00 to remove a rock that cut off the water supply from the people. Then again we have here another thousand dollars that was given out in the district of Burgeo as per Mr. Chambers' election. It does not state here what the money was for, but presumably it was given out in tips. I see the district of Hr. Grace got $20,000.00 out of the loan last year. I wonder how the

men of Island Cove are getting on this year in the way of pauper relief. The trail from Sop's Arm to Twin Lakes in our district got the munificent sum of $400 whilst Fortune Bay got $1,900.00 for marine works, and Fortune got $500 towards a breakwater. The Labrador Boundary lawyers got two payments of $40,000.00 each, and this is aonther way our district moneys went. I would be ashamed to sit on the other side of the House and know this thing went on. Why not let every district get the same treatment regardless of their political affiliations. The clerk at the Newfoundland Hotel got $5,500.00 last year. I say this is disgraceful and it is a statement that the Government ought to be ashamed to table in this House. In the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention to have those information collectors engaged again this season

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I don't think.

MR. BROWN—Well I know of one who is engaged and I say that it is a crying shame for this country to be called upon to pay men who work three or four days in the year supposed to collect information regarding the amount of fish that is caught and they to draw monthly salaries and expenses. They do not go in a fisherman's stage and find out what fish he has caught. They depend on someone else to get the information for them. They do not get accurate information because they do not look for accurate information, and yet they cost this country $20,000.00 last year. It would serve the purpose much better if the Government paid the mail officers on the coastal steamers an extra $100 each or pay a little extra to a few customs officials in the various important outports. I cannot speak too strongly on this point and of the Prime Minister, a man who promised to "clean up, keep clean and give a square deal to all." I have my own opinion if he allows such conditions to continue. Very soon this House will be going into Committee of the Whole to deal with the Buchan's Mine Resolutions and I propose to fight them as long as I am able to stand on this floor. I am not going to vote for the A. N. D. Company or any other company to get such concessions asked for in these Resolutions. I am going to oppose them, and I think I am right in doing so. This company should not get, nor should be allowed to get, everything they want in duty free for twenty years. I am against this because I do not want my children to curse me in the future. Another thing I am against and that is a company having a closed town and having men to work for the smallest kind of wages and forced to pay the highest prices for the common necessaries of life. Later when the Bill comes up, if I am here, I am going to ask, if not demand, that the men working at Buchan's Mine will be paid for the work they perform. There is no labouring man to-day in this country, at least a man that works in the paper mills or the lumber woods, that is being paid for his labour. And I want to tell the Prime Minister that he ought to be ashamed of that Manifesto which says of giving a square deal to all. And he has never lifted his voice or his hand on behalf of the labouring man of this country since he sat in the Prime Minister's chair. You don't care what becomes of the labouring man of this country. You have no interest in them, anyway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — More than you have, anyway.

MR. BROWN—In what way. The man in the lumber woods. I have been a fighter for the working man. That is more than you have. And I am a working man myself. I have

often got down to manual labour, but I am very doubtful if the Prime Minister has ever done that. If he did he would have more regard for the working man of this country to-day. "The man who works at Buchan's Mine must receive a minimum wage of thirty-three cents an hour." That must be inserted in this Bill. It is no good going back and saying what past governments have done. That has got nothing to do with it. It is not past governments now it is this one. Here is the Minister of Agriculture and Mines who knows what it is to get down in the bowels of the earth to seek minerals, etc. And I am sure that he will agree with me to-day in what I am saying that the working men of this country are not being paid for their labour. Men at the Humber and in Grand Falls receive twenty-five cents an hour for their labour. Now I will ask the question here, with the present conditions of living can any man in this country exist on twenty-five cents an hour? You know he cannot do it, and if you are wise now you will have a clause put in that bill saying that "we will give you certain concessions provided that you give the working man at least thirty-three cents an hour." And not only the labouring man but the skillled working man. He should not receive less than sixty-five cents an hour for his labour. If we allow this thing to continue as it has been going on, working men to be allowed to receive no more than twenty-five cents an hour, where are we going to get off? You give the A. N. D. Company twenty-five years free duty and what do we get for it? They have been encouraged in this country to-day and have been given great privileges, and all that we get out of that is the starvation wage of twenty-five cents an hour for the working man. Is the country going to stand for it? No, sir, you will see a revolution here before very long, and the quicker it comes the better. I hate to speak of revolution. I am a British subject—there is nothing of the Bolshevik in me. I like fair play, but as a working man and a man who has stood up for the rights of the working man I demand fair play for them. Now, sir, I have heard much said in this House about the way things were managed in the Squires Government, and how the Budget was padded, the Estimates fixed up and everything else. I have heard much said about the Squires Government and what they did, but I want to tell this House now that Squires is out of this House and his equals never sat in the Prime Minister's chair in this House, and I doubt if ever will again, and the Prime Minister knows that. There has been a lot said about past governments and what they did with the Humber and the Bill that was drafted. There has been a lot said about Squires personally, but no matter what was said about him and his Government he is still Squires to-day, and you cannot put him down. Now, sir, if you knock me on one point I will bring up another, and I want to tell you and the House now that I have listened to a lot that has been done by the Government of 1923 and previous governments presided over by Squires, and a lot has been said that has been untrue, and the Prime Minister went to this country with a manifesto that knocked Squires in every one particular way, and he came back as the Prime Minister and made the worst mess that ever a Prime Minister made in this House. Now we have been called obstructionists in this House. Why have we been called obstructionists? Why are we obstructionists? You did not open the Legislature until the 11th day of May, when it should have been opened in February and closed in May. You kept the House closed for reasons best known to yourself,

then you opened the House and blamed us for being obstructionists, at the same time that there was no legislation ready to be brought into this House, but you said it because you thought the people in the outports would say that we have no right to oppose the Government because we are holding up the House. This House will be held up, and I am going to help hold it up suppo- ing I have to mortgage my future. I will stay here and keep this House open whilst there are other members who will do the same and until you give us the square deal that you promised us. That is what you cannot do, you never intended to do it, and you don't intend to do it now.

(Reads.)

Would to goodness we had Coaker in this House to-day, things would be different from what they are. He was the only man that did anything in this country as far as the fisheries are concerned. The Prime Minister was going to do everything for the fisheries and give as a paradise. We have it, haven't we? We have a paradise here with very few souls resting in it.

(Reads)

Mr. Prime Minister, was there ever a Government came into power that made the awful mess of things that you made. Our forefathers would turn over in their graves if they knew it, or if there was any way in communicating with them. Why sir, when you came back as Prime Minister you were too conceited almost to speak to the members on this side of the House. What can you expect, why sir if a man goes to look for master of a ship he does not go into Kilbride and put a man from one of the farms in it. He looks for a man with experience. The same thing applies to the Prime Minister in this country. He had no experience in politics, he came from his office on Water Street and was placed in the Prime Minister's chair. The people of this country fell for it. They thought everything was going to be sunshine now, but to-day they don't fall for it, they know the difference to-day sir. You cannot go and face your district to-day, and you know it.

(Reads)

If Coaker came into this House naked to-day he would be a better man than the Prime Minister in the chair.

(Reads)

It was a sorry day for this House when Coaker went out of it, but he is coming back here again, and some of your men will be glad to join him, but you won't. In 1924 you refused to go to the country with the F.P.U. crowd, you would not have anything to do with them, but that F. P. U. crowd think themselves just as good as the Prime Minister or any man of his party and I would like to tell him right here now.

(Reads)

I went to the country under the name of Hickman, and I am not ashamed of Hickman or myself, but I am an F. P. U. candidate. I would like to have been near you when that was inserted in that Manifesto, you would find then that I am not the tool of Coaker or you either, but I prefer to be his tool than yours.

(Reads)

God knows that it is time for a change now, and the opportunity should be given us this fall.

(Reads)

If the Prime Minister and his colleagues have not corrupted the electorate of this country, well I cannot say anything. It is all gone now. There is nothing but corruption all over the Island.

(Reads)

Well you have carried it out sir, there is no question about that. You have gone the limit, you will not get

much more chance to carry it out any further, because the people of this country are fed up on you and your Government.

(Reads)

What did Hollis Walker do for this country? He cost this country thousands of dollars and he did nothing. He did not crucify Squires after all. He is still alive. You have not killed him politically or any other way, he is one of the finest men in this country to-day, and also one of the smartest if not the smartest.

(Reads)

If you believe in that why not give it, why not give the people of this country to-day who are cursing you sir for not giving them a bounty on fish. You went to the country with a Manifesto written by somebody else, placed in your hands and signed by you, and I doubt if you knew ten words in it.

(Reads)

If you had the fish regulations to-day sir, and if they had been kept any further this country would be in a more prosperous condition than it is to-day.

(Reads)

Which he did, and he will come back again just as sure as we are here to-day. If Coaker does not put through some Legislation in the interests of the fishermen of this country nobody else will try to do it, and we have to give him credit for being sincere, and that is more than you and your Government tried to do sir.

(Reads)

It is reduced, is it not? When you take scores of men on in the public service.

(Reads)

Mr. Chairman, I cannot for the life of me see how you can hold your seat and listen to this being read out, in the face of the fact that this Legislature was closed till the 11th day of May. Deceit.

(Reads)

If the Advocate promised it they could give it, but you came in promising economy and you borrowed millions of dollars and you threw it away on roads and every other kind of visionary thing, and the country has got no returns for it. There are thousands starving in the country to-day who should not be holding up their hands and asking for help in any way. You are a failure Mr. Prime Minister. I shall have something more to say on the Bill that will come before this House known as the Gander Legislation, concerning the Interantional Paper Company. When this Bill comes up, sir, I can say something in connection with that Company. I know a little about that Company. I led the Grand Falls strike in 1921. And if there was any official here from the International Paper Company, I would ask him who is the first that gave a cut in wages in the United States, that caused the A. N. D. Co. Bill to go flat. Watch that company. While there were strikes in Canada and the United States I was there attending conventions of the International Paper Company in both these countries and I know a whole lot about them. When that bill comes up before this House I shall have a lot to say about the matter.

There is one other matter. I notice in these estimates that the salaries of officials at the sanatorium have been cut. Salaries that have been voted by this legislature. The salary of the carpenter of that department and the laundry man have been cut. Now why was that done. The salaries of these men have been voted by this House. They have been cut one hundred dollars to ninety-five dollars. Is that lawful. I would like to ask the advice of the legal men of this House. These salaries have been cut and put on the store keeper's wages. And with all due respect to the store keeper and he should get paid for his work, but instead of cutting these men, you

should have increased the store keeper's wages if he was not being paid enough. But to cut a man's wages has never been known before has it. On whose recommendation was that done I would like to know.

In conclusion let me tell the Prime Minister and his Government that the best thing for him to do is to go away after this House adjourns, is to pack up your bag and get out because this country is finished with you. They want to have no more to do with you.

MR. SCAMMELL—We have not made much progress with these estimates since they were tabled in this House, and considering the fact that the Prime Minister thought it expedient to delay the introduction of the estimates into this Chamber for such a long time and taking into consideration further that the Government was under the impression that when a certain motion was made to bring in supply, I see no reason why we should be in any particular haste to discuss the estimates that are now before the Chair. Before proceeding further I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if he has the answer to the question that I asked some time ago regarding expenditure in the district of St. Barbe. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me to be a puzzle to find out how we are to get answers to our questions. The Minister was not here yesterday afternoon, and I was under the impression that it would be tabled to-day. While he is trying to find out what happened to the answer I will proceed with my remarks. I don't propose this afternoon to enter into any particular detailed discussion of the Estimates, but it is my intention to refer to the Estimates and to Supply in a general way. I rise this afternoon to suport the position taken by my colleagues who preceded me to the effect that I believe that contemporaneously with the Estimates we should have laid on the table the Budget, Supplementary Supply, and Additional Estimates. You are down here asking the House to vote you $10,000,000 and the Finance Minister hasn't in the back of his mind the least idea as to how we are going to raise within two millions of that. I think I took the position here last year on the Estimates that before we are called upon to incur a bill, we ought to know the source from which the money is coming so that we might be competent to deal with it. You are down here today asking us to vote $10,000,000 on current account, and you can't get up in the House and show any rhyme or reason how you are going to be able to raise that revenue and be sure even of $8,000,000. On your own admission you are short on the revenue $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1927, and if you are short 2,000,000 for that year I submit that the Finance Minister is not in a position to-day to show how he is going to be better off in the fiscal year just begun. Therefore, I submit that it is nonsensical and farsical in the extreme to ask the Legislature on current account alone to be prepared to consider an expenditure of $10,000,000 without being able to come in and show us how you expect to raise this amount you propose to incur. Now, I have taken the trouble to examine the journal of the House and compile some figures regarding the Estimates, and after all, something can be learned from an examination of the figures, not merely from a political, but from a practical view as to where we are and whither tending. I didn't want to be unfair to the Government, and I didn't seek to discover whether the Government is doing any better than its predecessors whom they so stringently condemned in 1924, but I took the Estimates for 1923-24—that was the year of a Government of which I was a member, although not in the Executive —and I find that we voted $9,626,560,58 for the Estimates. Very good! Our

record was bad, and you published it to the country as being very bad, and showed us up as a shining example of squandermania and recklessness and all that kind of thing. Then about the close of the fiscal year 1923-24 you came in power, and you took the accounts as you found them, and you were in a very good position to make a statement as to what you would do for the first financial year and your Estimates were $8,516,619, but I think that the Estimates that the Finance Minister submitted were those of the Government that went out of office immediately preceding that election. The Government led by Mr. Warren had prepared these Estimates. If there was any credit it was due to the men who preceded you in office. You were satisfied to take a chance on them. Very good! But come along from that, you came in in 1924-25 and you voted $500,000 Supplementary Supply on that year's account which brought it practically up to the expenditure of the Squires administration the year before you came in and took office. Now, let us proceed. In 1925-26 you brought in Estimates totalling $9,605,-000; certainly a tremendous increase over the Estimates on which you worked the year before and neither you nor anyone else has any idea what Supplementary Supply you are going to ask for the financial year ending June 30th, 1926. We are now in the position that we have in our minds two financial years to think about. If the Legislature had opened when it should have, we would have been considering the financial year 1925-26, but we can't get out of our minds 1926-27, which has now come to a close, and if this is involved we should be pardoned. We voted last year on current account $9,605,000 and some odd dollars, and I think the honourable member for Ferryland, when he stated yesterday, that you were likely to ask Supplementary Supply of at least $500,000 this year, was very correct. According to the Auditor General's report the increases in salaries alone will necessitate a quarter of a million in Supplementary Supply on last year's account, and no doubt there are other items that we are not cognizant of, which leads me to think that you are likely to ask for half a million. I recollect that last year, when talking on the Budget, I said that Supplementary Supply would be likely to be a quarter of a million. The Finance Minister smiled, but he smiled because I was too conservative. I don't intend to err on the side of conservatism, and I have every reason to believe that you are not going to ask for a dollar less than half a million dollars. Now, the reason I am reciting these figures at the outset is to discover whether we can get a correct statement of the financial affairs of the country. I can't see what the Minister of Finance has to fear in standing up and saying "Here are the actual figures; here is the revenue for 1925-26, and here is the expense actually incurred—that the $318,000 the Auditor General has written down as drop balances has been taken from loans for Exchequer account." The Hon. Minister of Finance is the last man in the country who wants wild statements to be broadcast. There was a time when the Hon. Minister sat in Opposition and made statements that in sane moments and not in the heat of debate he would not have said; he has written things that he would not have written except in the heat of debate. But I sincerely believe that if the Minister is conscientiously anxious to do his best for the country, he could do no better than take us into his confidence, and tell the true story. Why should we be denied it? If there is a true story, and we have every good and sufficient reason to doubt the statements we have, particularly from the Auditor General. If you feel that you have an actual grasp of the facts, and I can't believe but that you have—

no man knows the financial condiiton of affairs better than Sir John Crosbie (I am not criticizing the Minister of Finance as a fool, but as a smart man). If the financial position is causing you worry, and you believe certain things should be done, you should take the Legislature in your confidence, and tell the Auditor General and others to go to Hong Kong. If you fire the Auditor General, it won't be the first man you ever fired. Conduct the business of the country in the same way you would your private business; if a man was not giving you correct figures about your business, and you discovered it, he would not be long in your employ, and I don't believe that you are satisfied that the figures submitted through you are absolutely reliable. What the country wants to-day is the correct financial position; I and every member of the Opposition would like to know it, and there is no member on that side who does; the Prime Minister doesn't know it, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries doesn't know it, Mr. Power who is sitting there doesn't know it, and Mr. Woodford doesn't know it. Sir John Crosbie is the only man who knows what the financial position is. If the crowd wants money, they ask the Executive, and Sir John says he doesn't know where the money is coming from; he doesn't tell them what is the correct position, but the Legislature should know what is the real financial condition, and, Sir John, I want to tell you through the Chairman that you are charged with the greatest responsibility of any man in the House. I don't suppose there was ever a time when the affairs of the country required such consideration as at the present time, and when the people wanted to know them. Tell us the truth, we are not afraid to know it, and knowing it we will be prepared to do the honourable and right thing. Don't come and say you want a loan of eight million dollars, when you are not prepared to tell us just why you want it. You know we are feeling very sore about the loan you put through last year; the fundamental amount in that loan was a million dollars to be spent on public works throughout the country. We believed that that would be spent proportionately, and in a fair and proper manner in each district. We allowed it to go through because we thought that it would be spent throughout the country, and each district would benefit and get its share of the money distributed in that way. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is reason in the request of the Opposition that we should have the Budget Speech, Supplementary Supply and additional estimates brought down contemporaneously. Is there anything unreasonable in that position? I am talking in the public interest and forgetting party politics, and I believe that it is only right and proper that before we are called upon to come here and vote an expenditure of ten million, we ought to be shown as to how and where you are going to get it. The Finance Minister doesn't know where he is going to get it; the only new avenue of taxation within your purview to-day is the idea of putting back the Income Tax which was repealed in 1924, and the Business Profits' Tax, and you are encountering no end of difficulty in doing that. You raised a hornet's nest politically when you repealed that, and you are raising another hornet's nest in putting it back, and I reiterate that you can't put back an Act as stringent as the one you repealed when you came in in 1924.

You can't raise a revenue of ten millions to-day even if you put back the Income Tax Act. Tax Incomes and Business Profits if you can get away with it, and you will find that at the outside you can't get more than $500,000 revenue from it. That is not going to save you. Even admitting

the additional $500,000 from that source, you will have a deficit of $1,500,000. So you will not be a bit better next year than last year, and why do you try to show it? I pointed out in the course of my remarks on the Address in Reply that your revenue was not short because of slacking off of the importation of goods in which cotton was an element; the revenue was short because the earning power of the people was depleted. And why? Because the price of fish was low, and can you stand up and give an assurance that the price next Fall is going to be a bit better? You can't do it. There is nothing to lead you to think that the price of fish is going to be better; the outlook at present is very black. Last year this time there were encouraging reports from the Straits of Bell Isle, while there has been nothing this year—and the Straits fishery last year was not good. You can't at the outside, at the price of $6.50 for Shore and $4.50 for Labrador fish, realize more than seven and a half million dollars this year—what does that amount to? To this, that if every quintal of fish caught in Newfoundland this year was placed in bulk at the Custom's House as a present, you would have to thank the fishermen and tell them that you wanted three millions more to meet expenditure on current account. How can you expect in these circumstances that you are going to raise a revenue on current account of ten millions? It is not honest! I sat in the seat that Captain Winsor occupies now and heard you discuss the financial affairs of the country and talk in exactly the same way that I am talking now, and you were talking reasonably, and I put to you the pertinent question—why don't you be reasonable this afternoon? Why don't you, if you want to be known as a big man, say, "Yes, you are perfectly right—it is only nonsense to ask the House to vote ten millions on current account without being able to show how we propose to raise the revenue. That ten millions is only one thing—you must admit that you have additional Estimates. And in spite of the fact that you have juggled the accounts by getting loans and putting them in Exchequer account you will have to come in and ask for supplementary supply for half a million.

The estimate of $112,000 of a deficit on last year's account is all wrong; you know it is. Your real deficit last year if the truth were known, if you had not dropped balances and put money into exchequer from loan account, and supplementary supply, to say nothing of the railway deficit, your deficit was a half million, and on top of that you will have to come in and ask us for supplementary supply for a half million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with these few preliminary remarks I propose to proceed to the discussion of the subject before the chair. We are told here now, and I think this is the fourth occasion, that the Monroe Government has come to ask this House to pass votes for expenditure on public accounts, and we are told here to-day for the fourth time, by a government pledged to drastically reduce expenditure in this country, that they ask us to vote estimates on current account which make for an increase in expenditure. I was going this afternoon to refer to the Prime Minister with regard to his manifesto because after all the Prime Minister was the man the country looked to. Sir John Crosbie was regarded as a politician. Whatever Sir John Crosbie did nobody was going to take seriously. But the Prime Minister was out as the purist. He was regarded as the man who was to take charge of all the divergent elements and put them into shape: he was going to take Woodford and Crosbie and Higgins and all the boys and bring them together and make good boys out of the lot. I was going to

read this manifesto. Here was what we were told by the Prime Minister. What is the reason that hon. members facing me are on that side of the House and we are here? It is because it was considered that we had done wrong, that we had not managed the affairs of this country right, and the people of the country having the power to make a change said we will place those men under Monroe in power and we will give them a chance or an opportunity to see if they can improve conditions. And what was the cause? What reason was there for believing something better could be done.

The reason was this: This document:

(Reads)

Why haven't you done it? You were able to do it. You have missed your golden opportunity. Mr. Monroe had a mandate from the people in 1924 to reduce expenditure and put the country on the map in that way, and Mr. Monroe personally stood high in the country in 1924, and he was in a position to say to every man in his party when they returned from the polls, that he proposed to carry out the policy of his Manifesto as regards expenditure and taxation, and he could have done it. If he had only remained in politics three months and had done that he would have much greatter honour than for the three years. We were told last year that we were going to have an Economy Commission appointed, to investigate expenditure in Newfoundland and to try and find means and methods whereby expenditure could be reduced. Mr. Chairman I think two years ago in this Legislature I suggested to the Prime Minister that he ought to appoint this Commission. I referred, if I mistake not, at that time to the Geddes Commission which one of the Governments, I don't know whether it was the Conservative or Liberal, in the Old Country, appointed. That was not a political commission; to my mind it was an outside Commission, given authority to go around the country and discover where substantial reductions could be executed in public expenditure. Last year the Prime Minister got up and moved the appointment of an Economy Commission. It was appointed and consisted of members of his own Government—it was as a matter of fact a party commission and could not be considered as a Government Commission; it was not at all a parallel case to that of the Geddes Commission. It was not the kind of a Commission that we could expect any sincere results from. I don't quite remember who composed the Commission—I think, Mr. Morine, Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Cramm, and perhaps others. What happened? What happened to the report of that Commission? I want to ask some questions too as to the result of the Fishery Commission. Even when the Leader of the Opposition and myself did not decide to act, it is no reason why the Fishery Commission ought not to consider the problem of the fishery. At any rate it can't be thrown back at us as regards the Economy Commission that nothing came of it because we didn't act. Where is the Economy Commission? What was their report? What suggestions did they make? And is the Finance Minister prepared to get up and tell us the history of the farce-comedy enacted when that Economy Commission tried to bring some pressure to bear? I believe they did discover certain practical means whereby expenditure could be reduced. I wonder does the hon. member for Burgeo know anything about that report? Why was it never reported on? What came of it? That is one of the questions he is going to be asked when he goes back to Burgeo.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I don't know anything about the Economy Commission.

MR. SCAMMELL—I don't believe you do. Do you know anything about the row they had over it? After all it was a good move on the part of the Government to try and start an Economy Commission. I ridiculed it at the time, knowing the make-up of your crowd, and the way you are all after money, and want to hold on to politics and your districts, and that you could never bring down a practical Commission with regard to economy. If you had brought down a practical Commission, I would have been one of the first to support practical reductions, provided they bore evenly on the districts, and did not make a sacrifice of one district against another; provided they bore proportionately whatever way it might be figured out. If that was done I would be quite satisfied, but it never came to anything. In effect you were told by your party that it was a dangerous thing on which to embark. You have a report—I daresay you did some work on it. I daresay you started in to do something, but we haven't heard anything of the Economy Commission, and there is no reduction in expenditure as a consequence.

(Reads)

The thing that makes me sick about all this is this position—that down in the District of Bonavista Bay, which Captain Winsor represents, when our party was in power, you know, Captain Winsor, that the United Fishermen had a movement down there, whether you had anything to do with them or not doesn't matter, but you know that you owe a lot to them politically and that a crowd of them paraded here to St. John's to the Advocate office with a red flag to Government House and everywhere else. Their object was to force our Government into a reduction of expenditure. Too much money was being spent and therefore people were being taxed too much. It was they that placed Captain Winsor in power to improve matters politically. At the time they were mad; they were even going to take a schooner and go to Port Union to take Sir William Coaker out of his home. The crowd were so crazed on a reduction in expenditure that a man wasn't safe in his own home.

Now if there is any man in this House to-day who I believe to be sincere in trying to do the best he can for the common people of the country it is the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. He got up here the other day, after a petition had been presented by Mr. Halfyard, and suggested that this petition be referred to a Select Committee for consideration. I know of certain theatrical movements that happened amongst certain members on the other side of the House, but nobody noted the suggestion of the Ministre of Agriculture and Mines that the petition should be given serious consideration. Why? Because people on the Government side do not want to give serious consideration to anything that any crowd of fishermen brings in. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have got up and fought for that petition and should go to his Government to-day and say that he was sick of this game of politics and that he wanted some kind of an effort made for the good of his country. He knows very well Messrs. Dalton, Johnson and all that crowd that brought up that petition and he knew the men who started it and he knew that this thing was of a non-political character. In my district where the people are nearly all Liberals they signed the petition without any regard for politics and they signed it with the belief that it was going to be seriously considered by both sides of this House; but Captain Winsor did not think it worth his while to say a word of encouragement for that petition, which was signed by the northern people and supported by Mr. Walsh, the member for Placentia. Personally, I have lost

all faith in Captain Winsor and I do not think that he will be any longer regarded as the champion of the interests of the fishermen.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I am glad you lost your good opinion of me.

MR. SCAMMELL — Whilst I am sorry you have lost mine, there are thousands of others you lost also. But why not try to help the fishermen in this particular instance, they are not asking for poor relief.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I rise to a point of order, as I consider this matter of a personal nature.

MR. SCAMMELL—I disagree with the honourable member, as I am addressing my remarks to the Government and to members of the Government. I think the best way to help the fishermen is to find ways and means whereby they can earn their livelihood and do something that will enhance the price of fish for them and then it will not be necessary for Captain Winsor or Mr. Scammell or any other member to go into his district and have to give out Government relief. Of course the present Government is not serious. Now Mr. Woodford, who is called the father of the House, went to the country in 1924 believing that he was going to do something for Newfoundland and believing that the Monroe manifesto was a serious effort to put into effect a good policy; but now having won his seat and won his department and won a seat in the Executive Council he assumes an attitude what I might term political indolence and he no longer cares as to whether the country is going to wreck or not. In his early political career he must have been somewhat sincere or else he would not have held the confidence of the people so long, but now he appears not to want to do anything for the common people of the country, rather does he want to hold on to his political spurs.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman: The member who has just sat down, like his colleagues who preceded him, has been only joking since he started talking about the financial affairs of the Colony. You know very well the financial position of the country is sound just as well as I do. Now none of us knows very much about finance and all of us cannot expect to be financiers; but we are living in hopes as past Governments did that something will turn up sooner or later to help us out of our difficulties, and now that we have that magnificent territory on the Labrador there is no doubt that we will be able to raise all the money we require to help the Colony out of its difficulties. I have been referred to here as the warhorse, but I was thinking of going a bit further than that because in the old days opponents out of spite used to call me much harder names. I am glad that the member for St. Barbe did not come down to that, as who knows that a title may fall on my shoulders and I may not be able to carry it. Now I think that Mr. Scammell made his speech this afternoon solely for the purpose of speechifying. All the points that he has tried to make this afternoon in reference to the financial condition of he Colony; what the Government has failed to do and what they should do is purely a political speech. He was not in earnest and he was not sincere because he knows that the Government have been trying to do their best, under the circumstances, and will do better if they are allowed. But the Opposition will not allow the Government to do anything and are continuing their tactics with the hope of stopping the Government from doing anything. Any man or woman who came here this evening and who have listened so attentively

to the eloquence and nice language of Mr. Scammell can easily pick out the tricks behind his eloquence and these are the tricks that the Opposition have been playing ever since this House opened. I think the country at large would give them more credit if they would take the advice of the "daddy" of the House and alter their tactics. Cut out this "hold her up" and "hang her down" stuff and this idea of not allowing this Supply Bill to pass and later on have a general revolution. Surely this is not the kind of legislation that members of the Opposition should encourage. I say cry halt and let this money Bill go through and then the Finance Minister will bring in his Budget and let us know where he is going to get the money. I do not know whether he is going to increase taxation or not. I do not believe he is. No doubt he will raise the necessary funds to make both ends meet. I think that members of the Opposition would get far more credit if they helped the Government to get through their legislation and then if they are anxious to have a General Election this Fall, and I know they are, let us talk about it after we get through Supply. Personally, I have no objection to a Geueral Election in the fall. I am prepared for an election more so than they are just as we were ready for them in 1924. Now I do not think that the Government are as uupopular as the Opposition are trying to make out. At any rate, all we can do now is to pass Supply and get the necessary funds for public works so as to put the unemployed to work. There are many men looking for labour and cannot find it, and the sooner we get to work seriously the better it will be for this country. We should decide what can be done. It does not matter what the work is as long as the people get employment and the work is beneficial. Now cut out this "hang her down" stuff. Criticise the financial measures as long as you like, and as severely as you possibly can. It is your duty to do that. But when it comes to referring to every member on this side of the House, abusing the Government right and left and going for the Prime Minister from hour to hour, day to day and year to year, there is nothing to be gained by that. You get nowhere by it and you will not do the Government any injury. And the longer you carry on that game the more popular will the Government become with the public.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has said nothing yet to lead me to think that he has given any serious consideration to the financial position of this country. In other words, all that the hon. member has said amounts to this: "Give us the money that we want and let us go on." Now the people of this country are saying something different. I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not in his chair now. The Prime Minister in this debate here the other day in the course of the debate on the Labrador Lands Bill questioned some information that an hon. member of this side of the House was reading out in regard to land grants on Labrador. And he was somewhat taken aback to find that none of these grants were made during the regime of the Squires Government. He got up and said that goodness knows the Squires Government had been blamed for enough and he was glad that they were not to be blamed for that. I am going to tell him now he is not fit to unloose the latchet of Squires shoes. It is not within the character of the Prime Minister to cast such an aspersion against Sir Richard Squires or his Government. You went to the country in 1924, and you and some of the men associated with you brought on an enquiry to try to land him in the Penitentiary. Some of the men as-

sociated with him tried to make robbers out of them before this country. You promised the electorate of this country that you were going to carry on the work of cleaning up begun by the Warren Government. You carried on nothing. You were afraid, sir, the stuff was not in you. It was no more in you, and I will tell you this through the Chairman, to carry on that enquiry and clean up than it was to carry out the Manifesto with which you bluffed the country in 1924. And then you get up here and talk about Squires. You refused to go to the country with the F. P. U. You are sorry to-day that you did not go to the country with the F. P. U. Squires will get you and the crowd with you when he wants you when the right time comes. You brought along the Walker Enquiry, and when some idiot the other day, who presumed to write in a London journal, that because things were balled up at the Humber, a commission was to be appointed to come out from England, and Hollis Walker will be the chairman of that Commission to run the Humber. Is it any wonder that the Americans are putting it all over us to-day. They are going to get what they want and my blessing to them. This country to-day is 95 per cent. American, because when Newfoundlanders go out of this country they go to America, and in America they get friends and make associations. If the Humber has been balled up it is not the fault of the Government that put through the deal. If the crowd that had to do with that had listened to Coaker and the Liberal Party, Powell would have been manager of construction on the Humber and you would not have had an Englishman out there. And if we were to go to-morrow and get a plebiscite as to what flag was to fly over this country, I will tell you what will be the outcome. Our sympathies are alienated. I have talked with fishermen and I was surprised, as I did not think that they would give expression to the sentiments that I have given expression to here this afternoon, but I was positively amazed to hear fishermen give expression to the very sentiments that I am giving expression to now. I am only reflecting the opinion that I have come in contact with on that score. It is a fact. So, sir, if Squires made mistakes, you came in here with a mandate to make this country better, to clean up and put things right, and you have done nothing with it. I am not obstructing, but I am going to mortgage my future and stay here. You are not going to drive me out until the Finance Minister brings down his Budget Speech and shows this House where he is going to get for the next year $10,000,000 to balance the current expenditure which is asked for in these estimates, then I will throw up my hat and say that true it is what the Daily News said that he is a financial wizard.

Now I am going to tell the Minister of Finance a few things that he said here in this House three years ago. I remember the day when he told this House that he had visions for this country. Now, sir, you are long enough in politics to realise the difference between practical politicians and visionaries. You had no right with your experience in 1924 to come in here and put over this kind of stuff.

(Reads.)

You have not fitted your expenditure with your estimates. And are you not one of the men who soundly berated the Government which I supported for expenditure being over the estimates and all other things. I never expect to be in the precincts of the Custom House. My ambition is not in that direction, though I have ambitions in other directions. But there are many things patent. You

once stood on the very boards that I am standing on now, and you rated us on those points, and at one time you had almost convinced me that my duty was to clear out of the Squires Government. The position is this. A man in the position of Finance Minister as you are ought to have more regard for your position and not to have statements made about the affairs of this country that you are not prepared to refute. After all it is your business to tell us the truth. Now, sir, what have you done as Finance Minister to improve the position of your ministerial heads? You have the Minister of Justice, the Colonial Secretary and Hon. Mr. Chambers. You dwelt on that in your first speech.

(Reads.)

You made that reference to Ministers in the past. Would you mean it about Ministers in the present? Of course not.

(Reads.)

I wish to heavens that your Government had cut it down to the irreducible minimum. If you had done so no Government would have been able to come into this House and alter what you had done. And you would have for all time been written down in the history Newfoundland as men who after all had made a serious attempt to grapple with the biggest propositions before the country. I hope and trust that when the Hon. Minister of Finance brings in the Budget there will be no platitudes in the speech such as were in the one he first delivered. If he were to tell the bald facts he would not speak about the "cheerful endurance" of the people—if he were to tell the truth he would say that all he hears are groans and curses.

Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs says he thinks we are obstructionists, and I believe to-day that the Government is trying to convey that impression. But the trouble to-day is that the Government doesn't know how to treat the Opposition right. For example when the Buchan's Mine Bill came in here certain hon. members saw certain objections which they had to urge and asked the Government's consideration of these. But there was no such consideration shown—the Bill must go through. But when a couple of days later the Manufacturers' Association wanted to discuss them it was taken out of our hands and has lain by the wayside until it suits their pleasure. Who represents the people of the country to-day, the hon. members here or the Manufacturers' Association? After all, who is to be considered? I represent 12,000 people, and Mr. Halfyard here 22,000 or 25,000, and various other members represent thousands and tens of thousands of people. When we have a criticism to urge no attention is paid to it, but when a half dozen men on Water Street want to discuss a bill it is held over for them. That is why we object, that is why we feel disappointed and disgusted. Another example: Mr. Bradley asked certain questions relating to the Humber deal, and the Prime Minister said that it was neither politic nor wise in the public interest to table the information. And what do we find? We go out and take up the papers and find a despatch from the New York Times containing and covering practically everything asked by Mr. Bradley in that question. The Prime Minister would not read to the House the letter of Mr. Smythe of the N. P. and P. Co. concerning conditions of affairs at Corner Brook. He was asked and refused, but the correspondent of the New York Times got it, and I am not ashamed to tell the Prime Minister how he got it. He went to a member of the Executive Council and got it and cabled it to the world. We are elected to the Assembly and if we want informa-

tion we have to get it from the New York Times, cabled abroad to the world.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I take exception to the remark of the hon. member.

HON. MR. CRAMM—I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am a member of the Executive and don't want to be saddled with that. I think the hon. member should state where it came from.

MR. SCAMMELL—I am not ashamed to name him, and I will face the whole crowd of you. I will name him —Morine! I expect to lead a mob some day to clean him out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — The hon. member ought to be prepared to prove that.

MR. SCAMMELL—It is not my province to prove it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — The hon. member should tell the House where he got that information. It might just as well have come from the N. P. and P. Co. I take exception to a remark that a member cannot prove. The gentleman he has referred to is sick in bed, and while certain conferences have been held he hasn't been making any statements to the public press. Of that I am certain—as a member of the Executive he couldn't do so.

MR CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, Regarding the statement made by Mr. Scammell regarding the Nfld. Power and Paper correspondence, which appeared in the New York Times some time ago. This was the subject of a question asked by Mr. Bradley, which the Prime Minister declined to answer because there was something huge going on which might be prejudiced. We have been told by the Prime Minister that this was probably gotten from the N. P. & P. Co. If the International Paper Company got it they must have done it from the representatives of the Nfld. Power and Paper Company, and surely if they give away that information, representatives of the people are entitled to it from the hands of the Government where they got it. Probably the Government was not responsible, but when we ask for information which concerns the future of the country and its future liabilities, I consider that members of the House, whether in Government or Opposition, are entitled to the information. The Government have a director on the Board of the Company, who is not able to get information, and I contend that he is acting as the Government on that Board, and should be able to demand it. If the International Paper Co., gets it, we should. And there is only one way the International Paper Company could have received it, and that is from the Executive Government.

THE CHAIRMAN—This discussion is not germane to the issue, and should cease.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, it is germane to this extent—that the whole business of Corner Brook is in the melting pot to-day, and we may be called upon to incur an expenditue, and surely we can discuss it. I am going to reiterate now that there is an inside source of information. Mr. Cramm has seen fit to get up and object to my remarks—it is refreshing to see him get up once in a while. But I shall talk to him through the Chairman. Personally I have known him to be very fair-minded, and I hazard the opinion that there was no man more surprised than he when he read the despatches from the New York Times—he is in the Executive and knew these things already. But it is a galling situation; we represent on this side more people that the Government, and it is galling to ask for information on one of the biggest propositions we have to consider and be told that we can't have it, then take up a daily paper and see that somebody has inside information sufficient to tell an outside Press what is

being done—things that members of Parliament don't know and are entitled to. Forsooth it is not in the interests of the country to disclose to Hon Members the information they seek; it is not proper to have the minutes of the Railway Commission, as Hon. Members might talk about them. But there are other correspondents than the New York Times, and if one is allowed to take the insides of the deal, others have also the right. Treat them alike, and if you give an interview to one give it to another.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The crux of the reply made to the Hon. Member was that no answer could be made as to whether the Government admitted liability. We couldn't answer that.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I am not quibbling. Any Hon. Member with any spirit knows that I am right—information was asked for and denied, and we find it broadcasted to the newspaper world. I can picture the Hon. Minister of Justice if he sat in the chair that Mr. Halfyard occupies and this situation had arisen and I can imagine how he would take liberty and license of the English language to dissertate for an evening on a question like this. It is because we are in the dark about such matters as these that we feel so badly about the business that comes in. Then you call us obstructionists. You will be here until Christmas Day next so far as I am concerned, if you do not bring down this Budget now so that all the facts can be known. For instance, as the member for Ferryland has already pointed out, the Hon. Mr. Sullivan has no right to vote on the Buchan's Mine Bill. The Hon. Member came into public life in the Bond administration, but he is not doing the right thing by taking an interest in the Buchan's Mine proposition. He may not be a paid agent of the A. N. D. Company, but he is an agent of theirs just the same.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, Will the honuorable member state what interest have I taken in the Buchan's Mine proposition. Has he heard me make a speech in that connection? Have I got on my feet once about it? I am sick and tired of hearing of my connection with the A. N. D. Company, and if this thing continues regarding these veiled charged I will take steps to have my position confirmed. I have never made myself officious in connection with this proposition either in this House or outside this House.

MR. SCAMMELL—But the Hon. Member is naturally anxious to see the Bill go through the House. What is the use of quibbling? As far as Mr. Sullivan is concerned, I always thought, without being personal, that owing to his indirect connection with the A. N. D. Company that it is not constitutional or decent for him to vote on a proposition such as the Buchan's Mine.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I object to that statement. I am not interested in the A. N. D. Company's activities, and I ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his statement?

MR. SCAMMELL—As regards the Buchan's Mine, what galls the Opposition members is that the people who sent us here have as much at stake as the people who sent the Government members here, and when we ask for the consideration of an item we cannot get any response to our suggestions, but when some crowd on Water Street comes to the House with a Bill, the Bill is immediately withdrawn from the arena and referred to them for consideration and it is now relegated to the back stages of the Order Paper. Now, why does not the Minister of Agriculture & Mines who was so insistent that the Bill was so important and in the public interest use his influence and put the Bill be-

fore Supply on the Order Paper. If this Bill is not going before Supply it is not going at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN—This discussion is outside the province of the Estimates and this accusation against the Hon. Member shall not be allowed. The discussion is entirely out of Order.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to know how this discussion is out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN—It is on the Order Paper according to the rules of the House. Supply orders take precedence to all others.

MR. SCAMMELL—I will back up the ruling of the Chair and the rules of the House because for the eight years I have been a member here I have had the utmost respect for the Chair. I had no intention to enter into a discussion on the Buchan's Mine proposition this afternoon, but I was merely using it as an example to show that the Opposition are not getting the treatment they are entitled to in this House. I maintain that we as legislators, if we have any brains left in us, have a right to ask the Finance Minister to show us where he is going to get for the next year ten million dollars to run this Colony on current account. For instance what has been your record. In 1924-25 you spent $739,000 from loans and surplus trust funds, exclusive of railway account, and last year you spent $2,125,000.00 out of the same source. You are not running the country to-day on current account. The S.S. Earl of Devon was paid over $16,000.00 out of money that was allocated for able-bodied relief in 1925-26. In other words, a million dollars was voted for public works and the "Earl of Devon" was paid out of that money. Now are we going on to borrow money for current account. We were told that when the present Government came in power that once salaries would be voted in the Estimates that would be the end of them and we were roundly abused by the present administration for payments for special services. We were told that when a Government official was paid to do his job he would not get anything for what is called overtime. The Prime Minister or any other business man does not pay a man extra because he happens to put in a few hours overtime in his office. Well then why does he not deal with Government officials in the same way as he would deal with a man in his own business. Therefore, what is the use of him parading to the country that everything is alright and that the country is going to be run by business men. Why do they not apply their business knowledge in the running of the country. To-day we have most astounding revelations in that connection. I never thought that a Government who pledged themselves to keep the expenditures within the limits of their estimates and who were so outspokenly pronounced against Minute-of-Council methods and were so pronounced against paying civil servants for extra services, would be guilty of the transactions that the Auditor General's report says the present administration is guilty of. For instance, the Marine and Fisheries Department paid $2,580.00 to their clerks for overtime. A business firm on Water Street do not transact their business like that. It would be interesting to explain these extra services, particularly in view of the fact that the Minister owes his seat to a body of fishermen. There is Mr. Mews, the Deputy Col. Secty., who get $370.00, and who said that a poor fisherman from the French Shore had been dealt fairly with when Mr. Brownrigg of the Charities Department tore up a note for a passage to this man's home. The Charities Department officials got $1,793.00. The Assessors Department Clerks got $1,-194.00 extra and the Government Engineer got $1,749.00 extra. Was this man imported here to make a millionaire of him? As the hour is now 6.30

I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council intimating that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting the Ratification of a Contract for St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service" with the following amendment suggested by the House of Assembly:

5. Section 14 of the Agreement forming the Schedule marked A hereto should be read as if for the words "the last four years" there were substituted the words "the last three years."

Whereupon the amendment was on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice read a first time and was then, by unanimous consent, read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council accordingly.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Russell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Wednesday, July 6th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, July 6th, 1927.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Chairman, before the House proceeds with Supply I propose to move the House into a question of personal privilege. The question arises out of some remarks of mine when we were in Committee of the Whole yesterday afternoon and which have been adversely commented upon in the public press, and before I proceed, Sir, I want to ask the Clerk of the House to produce a record of my remarks. Until such time as the Superviser is able to produce a copy of my remarks and until such time as the Clerk reads the remarks I made, this Committee should not proceed with Supply, and, I, consequently, move the Committee rise.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I submit this is not the correct procedure suggested by the hon. member. Surely you cannot delay the business of the House and the business of the country until a member has his personal grievance satisfied. Surely if an injury has been done the hon. member it will not be undone by taking this improper course. I do not think that the whole of the attention of the House should be directed to him.

MR. SCAMMELL—The whole attention of the country has been directed to me.

MR. BROWNE — You directed it yourself.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I think I told you yesterday that I considered your ruling fair and square. Now my character to-day as a member of a British Parliament has been assailed publicly and I ask that Supply be not considered until the record of the Clerk be read to the House as to what I said yesterday. I appeal to the Ministers of the Crown for exonera-

tion, and if there are any gentlemanly instincts in this House I will get it.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I do not think for a moment there is any doubt that the hon. member will have the fullest opportunity to exonerate himself so far as his character is concerned. Whatever else we may disagree on I th nk that any member who feels he has been wronged by being incorrectly reported has a way to get amends. I might point out that it is purely a question of personal privilege and it has nothing whatever to do with the work of th s Committee on Supply. When newspaper reports are incorrectly made it is the duty of the member commented on to report and present to the House his explanation and steps will be taken by the House accordingly. Meanwhile I respectfully say that any comments not made here are not part of the records of this House and are not part of the work of this Committee. The procedure is rather different than is suggested now. I feel on second thought the hon. member who feels aggr eved will see the position.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Chairman, with all due respects to what has been said, the one man I expected to substantiate me in my position this afternoon is the first man to go back on me. I want to say right here and now that I am ris ng to a question of privilege and I ask the Minister of Justice and the members of the Internal Economy Committee what the rules are with regard to speeches being handed back to members of this House. I want and I demand a record of my remarks yesterday afternoon and I want the Finance Minister to back me up.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I was neither in the Cha'r or in the House when the hon. member made the statement. Of course, I must keep within the rules of the House and rule that a matter of personal privilege cannot stop the work of this Committee. It is a matter for the House to deal with.

MR. SCAMMELL—I am in the unfortunate position now that I am unable to refute what was said. In other words I cannot expla n the words that were taken down until they are produced here, and until they are produced I ask the Committee to rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN—If the words were objected to immediately and taken down and read by the Clerk it would be a different matter entirely. And why did not the hon. member bring up his question of pr.vilege before the House went into Committee to-day.

MR. SCAMMELL—The words were not objected to because the words attributed to me were never said.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of parliamentary proceedure I think that a question of privilege takes prcedence over all other mot ons. I do suggest that under all the circumstances and in view of the fact that the charge made against the hon. member is of considerable gravity that in justice to him and in justice to this House of Assembly as the Commons of an independent entity within the Empire the matter should be cleared up immediately. I do think and I would suggest to the Minister in charge of Supply that the best way out of the matter would be to rise the Committee for an hour when we can obtain the record from the reporters and then the matter can be threshed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN—Why did not the honourable member raise the question of privilege when the House was in session and not in Committee?

MR. SCAMMELL—You might be trying to put one over on me, and you are entirely outside your province in addressing such a question. No honourable member got up yesterday and demanded that the words be taken down. I was well advised in my attitude this afternoon and you

know it and I am asking now that the Committee rise until such time as the reporting staff is prepared to place the records in the hands of the Clerk and if the record is not as I have said it I will move for a Select Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—As I understand the report will be ready in a half an hour; I have no objection to rising the Committee. There will be no great loss of time and I therefore 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 and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again at a later hour.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again at a later hour.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act respecting Education."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I have already explained the Bill pretty fully to the House and there is no need for me at the present juncture to say anything more about it. As I previously stated, this Bill has the backing of the Churches, the Education Department and all those who are interested in educational matters throughout the Island are in favor of this particular Bill, as they recognize the necessity of consolidating the Education Act which this Bill embraces. I, consequently, commend it for the consideration of the House and move the Second Reading of it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: At the request of Mr. Halfyard, who is absent this afternoon through illness and who takes a great interest in this matter, also on behalf of Dr. Mosdell, who is absent, I would ask the Prime Minister to defer the Second Reading of the Bill. I do not think that Mr. Halfyard has anything to say against the principle of the Bill, but what he has to say will be said in Second Reading. Nothing will be lost by deferring it this afternoon and I ask that it be deferred out of courtesy to Mr. Halfyard.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: I certainly will assent to the proposition asked for, as I recognize that Mr. Halfyard took a great interest in this particular subject and in deference to his absence I move that the Second Reading of the Bill be deferred.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Education" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman: There is not much I can add to what I have already said. Honourable members will notice that sub-section (f) has been considerably enlarged by the addition of five new sub-sections. Sub-section (f) now reads as follows:

Provided that nothing herein shall be held to apply to:

(1) Fuel, hand-tools, food, clothing or
(2) Moveable articles of household furniture for, or of equipment for, private houses, staff-houses or hotels; or
(3) Articles intended by the importer for the personal and private ownership of individuals;
(4) Spruce lumber of sizes and qualities manufactured in New-

foundland from timber grown in Newfoundland if such timber can be obtained in Newfoundland as and when, where and of sizes and qualities required by the Company from time to time.

(5) Windows, doors, sashes, mouldings, boats and barges made or constructed of wood of kinds, qualities and sizes manufactured in Newfoundland from timber grown in Newfoundland if such windows, doors, sashes, mouldings, boats and barges can be obtained in Newfoundland as and when, where and of qualities and dimensions required by the Company from time to time.

I think that with the addition of these sub-sections the views of the Opposition are fairly well met. I trust that the members of the Committee are now agreed to pass this Bill so as we can be assured that no hampering will be done with regard to the operations of this mine. I think the Committee will realize that at the present time conditions are very serious respecting unemployment all over the country. Men are crying out for work and with the passing of this Bill we can feel assured that Buchan's Mine will take on a full compliment of men.

MR. SCAMMELL—It is only by an accident of circumstances this afternoon that the Resolutions are now before the House for consideration. They would not be here for discussion to-day had it not been that arising out of some remarks of mine yesterday it was necessary to delay Supply. In fact, Mr. Chairman, you will remember that yesterday afternoon you ruled that Supply took precedence to any other business on the Order Paper, so that as long as Supply is on the Order Paper these Resolutions that we are now dealing with could not possibly be discussed. Supposing that my remarks of yesterday had not been responsible for delaying the Committee on Supply, then in the ordinary course of events we should have gone on with Supply, and if we had gone on with Supply I think the Government would have been in a position to judge that, according to our attitude, Supply would be on for several days and Buchan's Mine Resolutions would not have come down before the House for a good many days yet. However as I have already stated, it is an accident of circumstances that brought them forward this afternoon and it is refreshing to find that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is in the fortunate position of being able to bring these Resolutions in the arena of practical debate once more; but I notice that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has not come in here this afternoon with any appendix to these Resolutions and which the Opposition members had been pressing for, namely, a schedule setting out definitely just what things under this Act the A.N.D. Company would require to be brought into this country free of duty under the period provided for in these Resolutions. I think the Minister of Agriculture and Mines will recollect that during the period of the debate on these Resolutions, as brought into this Legislature in original form, that the members of the Opposition made themselves clear and succinct on one particular point, and that was that we wanted to get from the A. N. D. Company a definite schedule as to what things they wanted imported free of duty under and in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Resolutions. The Committee will remember that the debate on the Resolutions on one particular afternoon closed in a somewhat heated fashion and amongst other advice tendered the Minister of Agriculture and Mines from this side of the House was that

he should personally go to Grand Falls, see the responsible heads of the A. N. D. Company and see whether he, in his official capacity, could not bring that Company around to entertain the views of this House. I say the views of the House because I believe the views held by some members on the Government side concurs with the views held by the entire Opposition. Now I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture & Mines is an enthusiast when it comes to a matter of mineral development in Newfoundland and in that I give him all credit and all praise. This is the age of specialists and it is refreshing to know that, when we are discussing such an important subject as mineral development in this country on the scale we are discussing it today, we have in the Minister of Agriculture and Mines a man, a good practical miner when it comes to the mining industry; but I am afraid that the Minister, although essentially a mining man, forgets that he is a statesman charged with the responsibility of doing the best possible in the best interests of the country and its people. In other words, I am afraid that in his enthusiasm to see Buchan's Mine flourish and in his enthusiasm to lend every aid that he can lend to the development of a mining proposition he has overlooked the fact that generally speaking, as a Minister of the rown, he has responsibilities in other directions as well. For if it were not so, then that is the only pretext that I can propose to excuse the Minister of Agriculture and Mines for not having been more enthusiastic in getting a schedule to these Resolutions. Supposing for example that it were not the A. N. D. Company we were dealing with. Supposing any corporation, be the name what it might, be the capital subscribed from where it might, does not the Minister feel that, after all, the point made by the Opposition about having a schedule attached to the Resolutions of this nature is a point well taken. Now you want to get credit for having moved in new directions, well I fail to see where you could do any better than by, right here and now, establishing a precedent that from this time henceforth all companies and corporations coming into this country and seeking concessions, such as are asked under the Resolutions that we have before us to-day, should outline definitely in schedule form the things they require to be imported free of duty under the terms of the agreement made. Are we asking too much, I wonder? Is it too much for us in the year of grace 1927 to expect and demand definite schedules I think not. We are here to-day, sir, not only as individuals, but as legislators, and in the famous lines of Tennyson from that poem,

(Reads)

We are here to-day with all the records of past legislators in this country behind us, with the records of their mistakes, the records of their shortcomings, the records of things that they had done and the records of the things that they left undone. Whether this Legislature is at present composed of Tories or Liberals or Conservatives, or call us what you like, surely the traditions of it should actuate us that we should learn by what has been done before and we should take account of all precedents that were made. Now what a wonderful thing it would be for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who has been a member of this House for about fifteen years, if it were said of him that the first opportunity he had to bring in a Bill here in which a wealthy corporation asked for concessions that he was the first man to introduce a Bill into the Legislature whereby all corporations seeking private concessions had to definitely lay down their schedule set-

ting forth the concessions they expected. Great men to-day do not make public opinion; they only follow. When I stood up here in the initial stages of these Resolutions and discussed these Resolutions I was apprehensive as to whether or not there was any public opinion in this country to support the attitude we were taking on this side of the House in relation to these Resolutions.

I am satisfied to-day that there is in this country a definite and determined stand of public opinion as regard the resolutions that we are now considering, and the greatest proof of that is this, that we were told when discussing these resolutions in the initial stages that there was no public opinion in the country as regards them. The greatest proof that we were right was the fact that you withdrew this bill from the arena of debate in this Legislature and submitted it to the Manufacturer's Association for their consideration. There was public opinion and you felt it to such an extent that you withdrew these resolutions and allowed them to be submitted to the Manufacturer's Association and they would have been there to-day if it had not been for the fact that you brought them before this Chamber this afternoon for discussion. I am going to tell the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines now, and I was going to preface my remarks by saying that I believe that he is sincere and enthusiastic for mineral development in Newfoundland, and I never thought the day would come when the democratic member for Placentia and St. Mary's was going to be enthusiastic in boosting the interests of the wealthy corporations of this country. There is no greater democrat to-day in this country than the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines. There is no man in this country to-day who has had greater reason perhaps to be sympathetic with the common people of this country than has the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines. The tragedy for the Hon. Minister is this that the Minister, with his democratic principles, his sole object in politics seems to be to conserve the interests, and advance the interests of the wealthy corporations, who are opposed to the toilers of this country. I regret that the Minister of Agriculture with his democratic principles should find himself in the position that he does this afternoon. I trust that my remarks directed at the present time to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, are not being taken by him in any way whatever as being intended to be offensive. They are not intended in that way. The Hon. Minister in pleading for these resolutions after all did not plead for them as he did for the fact that he had a great interest in seeing the mineral development of Newfoundland fostered and encouraged. No man in this Legislature within the sound of my voice, but has felt that Mr. Walsh is sincere and enthusiastic as regards mineral development. But as I said before it is not the matter of boosting this mineral development, but may be with his democratic ideas, he may use his voice, to boost this thing to the extent, where it may be questionable whether the interests of the country as a whole are being served in developing minerals in just precisely the way that the Minister is asking us to encourage and put through these resolutions.

The opening day of this Legislature sir, was an auspicious one, when the things that might have been said were not said and the things that were said might have been left unsaid. I did not know that the Buchan's Mine resolutions were coming before the chair this afternoon. I had some notes made but I left them home. But if I recollect aright the Prime Minister on opening day stated that in his opinion Buchan's mine, was worth

more to us than the Labrador, and surely then during the course of the debate on the Labrador he and his colleagues from the other side of the House exerted every effort to prove to us that after all the Labrador despite the fact that twelve thousand square miles of territory had been given away, that it was still a very valuable asset to this country. Now the value of Labrador has been written down from a conservative estimate as $150,000,000, and probably what may be termed an aggregate estimate would be $250,000,000. I think interviews have been given to the press by this company as regards Buchan's mine to the effect that minerals in sufficient quantity have been located there already to the enormous value of $180,000,000. I am speaking offhand and I have no report to confirm my statements. Now if the Prime Minister after all considered that Buchan's mine was worth more than the Labrador, why my goodness if somebody had Labrador with all the value that it means, that man would not consider people coming in here asking for concessions as regarding the holdings on Labrador. In Labrador to-day the position is this, that according to the act that has been passed here, if a man wants a strip of land on Labrador he has got to come to this Legislature for it and we are reserving ourselves the right as to the making of very stringent terms and conditions under which we are going to grant the lands. Still you say that Buchan's Mine is more valuable than Labrador in your opinion. And then you are prepared to come in here, and give sweeping concessions that are proposed under these resolutions. You are not consistent sir. If Labrador is valuable; if the timber lands down there are valuable; if the water power rights down there are valuable, valuable to the extent that this Legislature has the right to dispose of them and to lay down the conditions under which they shall be disposed of, then how much more incumbent is it upon the Government to lay down just as stringently conditions concerning a matter which the Government considers of more importance and of greater value than Labrador.

Now again I ask what is the pertinent objection that we of the Opposition have to these resolutions. One of the chief objections that we have to these is that the period that makes the various classes of these resolutions operative is too long. For instance

(Reads)

You get up here and in effect you say that the A.N.D. Co. and the American Smelters have a gold mine up there, and then you come in here and you say that because they have got that gold mine up there we will allow them to import into this country certain things to develop that gold mine free of duty for a period of twenty years. Now I am sick and tired of being written down in this country as being an obstructionist, and being told through the columns of the press that I am talking pointlessly. Now if there is not point in what I am saying now I would like somebody to get up and tell me why it is not a point. For you to stand up here and one minute tell us that they, this corporation, has a gold mine down there, and then after that you come in and ask us to give that corporation permission to import things into this country free of duty for a period of twenty years and you are not able to tell us what it is that they want imported into this country free of duty. Now supposing the positions were reversed to-day, and I was the Prime Minister of this country, and Mr. Monroe was in opposition as the member for St. Barbe, and he was developing a fishing plant, and he wanted certain things brought into this country free of duty, do you not believe that the Prime Minister would be able to tell me what he wanted in free of duty. But what can

I do, I can only voice my protests, in the presence this evening of a multitude of onlookers against what I consider is an outrageous proceeding that this corporation should have free access into this country for a period of twenty years certain things, on top of the fact that the Government has admitted that they have got up there a virtual gold mine. Now I notice that since this bill has been removed from the arena of this House that that clause has not been altered or amended. I wish that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines would tell us to-day that he has lost sleep and been worried, and spent a lot of money in chasing the A.N.D. Co. to see whether or not they would cut down that period to five years. After all is it not reasonable. Let them get their original machinery in, and they can bring in all the machinery in five years that they want, and surely they are not going on for a period of twenty years importing mining machinery into this country. They have got an area up there to-day and they know the extent of that area and what their requirements are going to be in regard to that area. And surely they can tell us that in five years they are able to bring in all the machinery that is going to be required to develop a mining area of which they know the definite limits.

But you have not got down to the point of making a fight for more stringent terms. I know that you have talked with Mr. Wood the solicitor of the A.N.D. Co., but I wonder has Mr. Harris come in here from Grand Falls, or has the Minister himself gone out to Grand Falls to put up a fight in the interests of the country in this respect. If the Minister of Agriculture stood up here and said that "I have been to Grand Falls, and I have worked hard, argued strongly, and exerted every effort within my power to bring the A.N.D. Co. around to a more stringent bargain" then I would not be inclined to be so critical of the Minister, as I am at present. But I don't believe that he took that trouble. I don't believe that Mr. Duff who claims to have the interests of Newfoundland at heart, and who says that he saved the country $300,000 when he walked across the floors of the House, I don't believe that he is doing his duty over there to-day. When he went over there I thought that he was going over there as a man purified from this side to try and purify those that he went over with. You were one of the most sincere men that I have ever talked to, or at least I thought you were. You had dreams like the Budget of the Minister of Finance of 1924, that was read in this House. But you are not fighting the A.N.D. Co. to-day. It is apparent that he crossed the floors of this House to conserve, and support the interests of the big corporations in this country and he is doing it with a vengeance. I know what the hon. gentlemen owe to the A.N.D. Co. but do not these hon. gentlemen owe more to the common people of this country. Supposing to-day that you represent a minority in this House, or supposing that we, the Opposition represent a minority in this House, our responsibilities individually and collectively, first and foremost are due to the common people of the country, more than to the corporations making deals with us. When the Humber was opened and the deal was put through, you hired a special train, you went out there and you had a nice time and there was great celebration. But Mr. Chairman the people said nothing about it. You were criticized for going up there. But if you had hired a special train Mr. Walsh, when this bill went out of the arena of debate in this House, and gone out to Grand Falls to fight these concessions as regards this bill, you would have got some thanks, and you

would have been merely criticised openly, but you would have been doing something in a practical way.

On general principles Mr. Chairman, I fail to see in the interim while this bill has been removed from this Legisture what material progress has been made. On the main points of objection to the Bill you have made no alteration. In other words the A. N. D. Co. seems to have dug its heels into the mud as it were, and you are protecting them. Now I want the Prime Minister to tell me this afternoon, whether if this thing was called off, and this legislation did not pass through this Legislature, whether operations at Buchan's Mine would cease. I think not. Operations at Buchan's Mine would still continue. We have heard a lot of talk about negative bills, legally speaking. This is a negative bill practically speaking. In other words if these resolutions never went through this House of Assembly, operations at Buchan's Mine would proceed. Because all the mining machinery that they want to get in for the development of that mine, is already offered them free of duty under the provisions of the Revenue Act, and what, therefore, is the good of bandying words, further. If I may be permitted, I would refer to a discussion that took place in another place. The remarks that I wish to refer to were made in connection with the Holyrood Fish Plant Bill. I was interested to know that an Hon. Member in that other place, in referring to those resolutions said one reason why we could give the concessions that were asked for, was because the capital of the enterprise was so small. It seems to me that one of the reasons why the concessions that are asked for in connection with the resolutions that are before us now for consideration are too large, is that the undertaking does not need them. They are not undertaking anything in the nature of a tremenduous speculation. Now what is this Buchan's Mine Company. Is it an incorporated concern to-day. Have you got a new company incorporated in this country. If so what is their capital. Or is this a side issue of the A. N. D. Company What ever the case may be it seems to me that considering the magnitude of the proposition, these people are asking too much. Now we have heard some talk here about coal the other day. And I think that the Minister of Agriculture will remember that a petition was presented in this House last year, calling upon this Legislature to make a substantial grant for the encouragement of the coal mine known as St. George's Coal Fields. I think that you will remember that I did not at that time present a petition, and I was the only member who did not present a petition. On that occasion the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines stood up and said in effect.

(Reads)

We were all enthusiastic about the St. Gorge's Coal Fields. But there is no parallel between the St. George's Coal Fields and Buchan's Mine. I did not stand up on that occasion and say that I supported the giving of a grant to St. George's Coal Fields. I had no petition to present and, therefore, I had no occasion to speak. St. George's Coal Fields and Buchan's Mine are not parallel cases at all. Coal is a mineral that as we know is badly needed in Newfoundland. But the enterprise is speculative. We were all anxious to see whether we had coal in Newfoundland because that might mean that Nfld. would become in a very short period of time an important manufacturing centre. But the men who are trying to develop that Coal Field are all poor men. We were trying to do something for a proposition in which the majority of men interested are Nfiders. They had no rich property and we only wanted to give them a helping hand to discover

whether they had a working proposition or not. You were satisfied to lend a helping hand to them to that extent, and I was satisfied. But Buchan's Mine was an entirely different affair. They have got a gold mine out there. If they have not somebody in this House ought to take back some of the things said. There is no parallel betwen the two cases. One is a corporation trying to develop an industry that might mean the life blood of this country, and we want to know what we have got in this country in the way of coal. On the other hand the Buchan's Mine Corporation have capital of enormous value. Therefore, what is the use of trying to draw a comparison between the St. George's Coal Field and Buchan's Mine. Can we argue further. I protest against these resolutions. I consider that taking into account the enormous value of the property, the extent of the property, which the A. N. D. Co in conjunction with the American Smelters own in these areas, that this Legislature has not any right to be called upon to vote the concessions which these resolutions propose. And I do not know whether it would be asking too much if I were to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to bring a map and show us exactly what this area is that is known as the Red Indian Lake area.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I can bring up a dozen maps. If you had asked for them I would have had them up here before.

MR. SCAMMELL—You ought to have seen to it that there was a map here. I think it should have been looked to that the Opposition wanted something to assist in the discussion of this Bill in the best way possible. Your sincerity as a mining man is not disputed, but you bring in this Bill with these concessions. Would it be wondered at if persons should go and ask their friends if you have not gone over in support of their interests. We have got quite a job on our hands this afternoon; we have two Bills, the old and the new. Might I ask the Minister if sub-section "E" of 2 is essentially the same?

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The only change is in "F".

MR. SCAMMELL—Isn't it possible; don't you think that the A.N.D. Company could get on without all these concessions? Do you believe, in your mind, to-day that the A.N.D. Company wants those concessions? Do you know anybody down North operating mines in Bett's Cove and Pilley's Island that had concessions? Of course not. But in those ventures at Pilley's Island, Tilt Cove and Bett's Cove it was mere speculation and these companies were prepared to come and spend money without any concessions from the Government. Still these people have valuable property and on top of that they want concessions. I have some faith in you yet, but you haven't convinced me yet that you have done all you should have. I don't want to be unfair or unreasonable but five years was plenty, and if you had as a Government refused to give more to them, had said that you were not going to grant them any more than five years, they would have come around and eaten out of your hands. You are too tame with them. I hope we will live long enough to get the inside story of this A. N. D. Company outfit and find what really happened; what kind of a fight did you put up to get them down to five years; what you did do and what you didn't do; what you tried to do and what you couldn't do. With regard to sub-section "F": I am not going to waste much time in discussion; I don't consider I am wasting time; I have got to say these things in the interest of decency and fair play to the country as a whole. And you haven't done anything about this closed town. What have they done where there were

closed towns? Are you going to allow the Royal Stores to go up there and do as they like. I wonder if the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister knows what is going on. I wish there was a man over there I could appeal to; a man from whom I could get a sincere thought. I wish there was a man over there. Do you know what is going on really to-day up in Buchan's Mine? I believe there are honorable members in the House who have first hand information of what is going on up there; the prices being charged the laboring man up there. Profiteering is rampant up there. And you are going to make it a closed town. You can stop that can't you?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have assurance from the Company that they are not going to have a closed town.

MR. SCAMMELL—I am glad to hear that. That is a different aspect of things. That is different from the position of affairs when we last discussed this. If you have been responsible for that in any way I give you credit. I trust that you have got assruance that they are not going to have a closed town; people are going to be allowed to go there and transact business. That is very different and if you have brought it about I am sincerely grateful on behalf of the common people. Now are you going to pass this twenty years duty clause? Can't you do something better with that? You can't. In other words they have got you.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —As a matter of fact they were looking for the same as the Humber. Thirty and fifty. Thirty from duty and fifty from taxation. This Company will be liable to any income tax of general application that may be enforced tomorrow.

MR. SCAMMELL—The point I want to make particularly is as regards net profits. How are you going to get net profits should this company assign; relinquish the whole thing in favor of some other Company?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —There is a Bill especially on the subject to be brought up, as I intimated to the House applying to all such things.

MR. SCAMMELL—When you bring in that Bill is it going to be brought in without prejudice to the Act.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It won't affect it a bit. In 1905 the Pulp and Paper Act was passed. At that time of course the mining aspect was more or less treated in a casual way and there is merely a provision that if they work minerals the Government gets five per cent. of the net profits, but in view of the fact as it occurs at the present time that these profits might as has been intimated arise from dealings with a third company, and in view of the interpolation of a third company it might mean a deprivation of the royalties to be collected on these properties, we now propose to bring in a general Bill which provides that where under any contract a royalty is payable that that royalty attaches to the land and runs with the land no matter in whose hands that land falls. In other words if the A.N.D. Company assigns the mining venture to the American Smelters that royalty attaches to and follows with the property assigned. It is of general application not particularly for this special case but it so happens it fits in.

MR. SCAMMELL—We have resolutions here that after a period of time are going to be law I suppose. The Government have made up their minds. However nobody over there seems to express an opinion on them. The Executive I suppose discussed them in Council. The rank and file of the party have not had much to say. I hope they all have my experience. I hope they are elected a term in the Opposition and then they will learn

more about the workings of the country in one day than over there in four years.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What we all expected was that you would say that this was a big advance on previous legislation that for the first time in twenty five years a duty clause of any value.

MR. SCAMMELL—What difference if mistakes have been made in the past. We ought to have made more progress. We have not gone far enough. Now a precedent will be laid down. If you laid down a precedent of five years there would be no complaint. Surely in five years they are able to import all they want.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —They say this development will be going on twenty years to come.

MR. SCAMMELL—I didn't think you were the sort of man to take people at their face value. The Government are all business men but in the Government they are different; they are not; they don't drive a hard bargain. Might I ask the Prime Minister in what form has he got the assurance that it is not going to be a closed town? Could I ask to have it laid on the Table of the House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—A letter from Mr. Harris.

MR. SCAMMELL—I give you credit for that and for having acted on the suggestion of the Opposition. I suppose if the Opposition had sat still and made no objections to this legislation going through it would have been a closed town and nobody but the Royal Stores would be able to go in there and sell the smallest thing.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They never intended to make it a closed town.

MR. SCAMMELL—Why could we not be told that when discussing this before?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We took it to be so but could not state it as we had not the assurance from the Company.

MR. SCAMMELL—In the amendment in the Bill subsection 5 of section 5, seems to me not to be strong enough.

(Reads)

Qualities. That leaves the Company just as free as they ever were.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Certainly.

MR. SCAMMELL—If you admit that it leaves them just as free why is it inserted? It is merely to look good and try and fool people?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —You have got to be in a position to say that you can supply them with what they require. It certainly doesn't make a man buy a Ford car when he wants to buy a Chevrolet.

MR. SCAMMELL—Can't they quibble on quality?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I think the hon. member's idea of this clause is a little warped by that clause that used to be inserted; that was in the Humber agreement when he was in the Government. It is not that kind of a joker. I consider it an excellent clause. You will pardon me for giving my opinion.

MR. SCAMMELL—I think the Minister of Justice should give some explanation and instruction just how this item amends the Bill. I have about finished as far as I am concerned speaking on Buchan's Mine. I felt that I should say a few words, and I still feel as strongly as I did on it in its early stages. We wanted a schedule and we haven't got that schedule stating just what this company wants in free and I don't agree that it is outside the bounds of possibility for the A.N.D. Company to comple a schedule. Did you say it would take three weeks? Haven't we been three weeks? You don't know what they are going to import.

To sum up what I have to say: I

consider twenty years period is too long. I consider that they ought to have a period of five years. I consider that a schedule, since that is a technical undertaking, a mining undertaking, a schedule of requirement, to be imported duty free, should have been attached to this Bill. And I consider moreover you are very weak in the position you are going to be placed in as regards collection of revenue on the outcome of these operations. I want to go on record now in concluding my remarks as being as sympathetic towards Government of any sort in Newfoundland as any member in the House or any man outside of it and I don't want to retard the Government but I do consider this that when dealing with a Company that has got at its disposal territory amounting to a virtual gold mine we ought not be required at least to grant it concessions such as the resolutions before the Chair propose. I therefore while welcoming the development of Buchan's Mine and being glad to hear that the A.N.D. Company are coming in and taking a hand in the development of that territory, despite all these things I must protest against the resolutions before the Committee in the form they are at the present juncture.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman: Before the committee rises I would like to thank the honourable member who has just spoken for the very friendly spirit in which he approached the subject in Committee. In doing so I want to assure him that the interest I had in the working man when I was one of them myself is not less to-day and is just as great to-day as it ever was. I want to also assure him that I don't think we have any cause for serious worry with regard to the sections he refers to. The original Act giving the A.N.D. Company 2000 square miles of land was passed in 1905. At that time the Government was presided over by the great incorruptible commoner, the late lamented Sir Robert Bond and I don't think the honourable member or any of the members of this committee will question the sincerity and honesty of that late lamented statesman. In 1905 when this original Act was passed the clause dealing with free importation of various articles for the manufacture of pulp and paper gave duty free for a period of twenty years. In the Act passed in 1923 when Sir Richard Squires was Prime Minister who was so eulogistically referred to by the honourable gentleman who has just taken his seat in the course of the debate yesterday the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company Act was put on the Statute Book and all materials for the making of pulp and paper at Corner Brook was allowed to come in duty free. This is the first time in the history of this Legislature that any attempt was made by any administration to try and specify the articles that would not come in duty free. At Corner Brook we know that all kinds of wearing material and numerous articles required for personal use of employees found their way into the homes of various officials at Corner Brook and were imported there.

MR. GRIMES—Was it smuggled?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Not exactly; brought in under the guise of material necessary for the erection of a plant. We have here outlined various articles the A. N. D. Company and the American Smelters will not be able to import. As to the twenty years period I would try and have it cut down to ten or five if possible but we must remember that we are dealing with a Company that has been so to speak finding its feet for the past thirty years. Since 1905 when the concessions were given to the A.N.D. Company so far as I know there hasn't been $500.00 spent with regard to development of mines on the property. There was

a discovery years ago on the south side of Red Indian Lake and there was some little prospecting done but because the nature of the ore was complex the ore was not worth five cents, but five or six years ago the American Smelters succeeded in getting a system whereby the lead, zinc, silver, copper and so on can be extracted. Then again because of the great depth of surface prospecting it is very difficult and very expensive and this new electrical mineral finder which has only come into existence in the past few years I might say is a very costly apparatus. Dr. Baker informed us that we had on Avalon large deposits of hemetic and I got in touch with the company to find if this machine could be used and found we couldn't touch it. It would cost three thousand dollars a day. They have an area of two thousand miles on which to use those machines and in twenty years from now prospecting will still be going on on sections of that two thousand square miles.

MR. SCAMMELL—How many will they bring in?

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—They may bring in a dozen. I doubt that they will. I don't think we have anything to be worried about. I sincerely believe that an honest attempt is going to be made by them. This also is going to attract a good deal of interest of people outside the country with regard to our mineral resources. We have heard a good deal about minerals on the island but in the past thirty years no serious attempt at development was made and now a serious attempt is being made. Men from all over England, Scotland, Canada and the United States are hearing of this or are connected with it. These men are not students but owners and operators of mines and I feel convinced that some of these men at least are going to be attracted by the reports regarding Buchan's Mine and St. George's Coal Fields. Now, I have no knowledge, neither do I think the Government has any as to the exact value of the find at the present time at Buchan's Mine, nor do I think anyone has a direct knowledge. The only reason why we may think that they have discovered something worth while is that they are bringing in a fairly large amount of machinery, and building 20 miles of railway—they must have found something. I should like to tell the Committee, also, that when I was in Montreal, I took with me, unofficially, a report of Mr. George Nicholls on Rowsell's Mine, and had an interview with the Consolidated Mining Company of Canada. I discussed the matter with the president personally as to the possibility of mineral on Labrador, and he brought in their engineer. As a result of that a geologist and mining party to investigate the possibility of Rowsell's Arm are on this boat. The mineral there is iron pyrites. That is very hopeful; the Consolidated Smelting Company is, perhaps, next to the American Smelting Company, and since the report of the mining engineer twenty years ago nothing serious has been done. These engineers went down on the boat, and if they are successful, Rowsell's Arm may be an excellent prospect. There are others in Mr. Ashbourne's district. The Consolidated Smelting Company have a half dozen parties down there, and it is very hopeful that some of these mines will come into their own. I now move that the Committee rise.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee rises, I promised the honourable member for St. Barbe that I would explain the additions in this Bill. I just want to say that I think that the whole section as it is is a very marked advance, and, in particular, as regards Sections 4 and 5, I want to draw attention to my suggestion that I thought he was labouring under a

misapprehension, and thinking of another agreement. I was referring to the contents of Section 6 of the Act of 1923.

(Reads)

It is quite evident that that made the whole section valueless, as even if the quality was alright the Company could take the position that the price was not satisfactory. This is exactly the opposite. Sub-section 4 says:

(Reads)

The matter of price can't come in; the Company can't come in and say the price is too high; if they import the timber, they have to pay duty. Similarly in Sub-section 5:

(Reads)

The important part that I want to draw attention to, which you must admit is the most important part of the whole section, which gets clear of the very objectionable feature that from time to time has been laid down in contracts. If they chose to import articles, they have to pay the duty. I think it will be admitted that in all duty concessions for the past twenty years we had everything that is included up to Sub-section (m), and when members will take (f) and see the extent to which it goes, it must be admitted that this is a radical departure and advance. Sub-section (f) lays down:

(Reads)

One of the great difficulties has been that of food and clothing. A series of abuses has been going on, on the ground that these were part of the material for construction. Similarly for household furniture; finally what I regard as the safeguard, which I trust will be imitated in the future, is that we fix liability on some one permanently—here the A. N. D. Company, making them guarantors. Sub-section (c) of Section 3 goes on to point out:

(Reads)

That is the ordinary civil remedy for the amount of duty, and independent of the criminality provisions of the Customs Law. The country has been handicapped down through the years by these concessions as to duty. Where they went out to subsidize agents or contracting agents who were probably here for six months, and no recourse upon their going out of the country. I think that, after looking after the whole situation, the Government, will be pardoned for taking this stand which may be regarded as radical. The whole thing is a marked improvement which ought to be commended.

MR. SCAMMELL—I don't think the Honourable Minister gave his opinion as to the schedule that we are looking for.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Regarding the schedule, I said before that this was the ideal method, but it can't be adopted for reasons that I explained, and that are correct—it is not possible to-day. I give their statement for that and believe it. It is not possible to lay down any schedule giving a list of what will be used in smelting processes in a couple of years. It does not matter what we do we will be driven to general words anyhow. No matter how we enumerate items, general words will have to be put at the end of the enumeration, so I say that having put in a general clause the expression that certain goods are not included is simply another way of getting a schedule. I am satisfied that it is not possible to prepare a schedule.

MR. HIBBS—Why spruce timber in Sub-section 4?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That representation was made by local people. We did not turn the Bill over to the Manufacturer's Association, or to any people. What actually did occur was that the Government took the views of local business people, and it is interesting to see that some of thost people ad-

mitted that some of the things they feared were more in their favor than against them. It was interesting to discover that some gentlemen quite candidly said that they thought this was to be the same measure as the Corner Brook, and they were relieved when they found that some things were not included. The spruce timber clause is simply a suggestion of these people.

MR. BRADLEY—Were food and clothing included under the Humber agreement?

MON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — They were not supposed to, but they actually did come in under the general clause.

MR. BRADLEY—Is there any guarantee that these people will build a smelter?

MON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — No particular guarantee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, before the House proceeds with the discussion of the Estimates or Supply I want to rise on a question of privilege. I have learned during eight years' experience in this Legislature that some latitude, some extra latitude, is permitted to honorable members when discussing a question in Committee of the Whole, particularly on Supply, and during the course of my remarks yesterday afternoon in talking here on Supply, I have no hesitation in saying that I availed of that latitude to the fullest extent, and I propose to avail of it as long as I occupy a seat in this House, and consider it my duty to speak out on behalf of the section of the community I represent. This afternoon when the House was in Committee I wanted to raise a question of privilege but could not do so, because after all, I suppose, we are to take it that the official reports of the Legislature as a whole are the proper record of what we have said in this Chamber for us to refer to, although I would like to preface my remarks with saying that every member knows that the reporters do not report us correctly, and we have every one of us, after making a set speech here, and coming in and making our speech, and there is not an honorable gentleman here but has to go over his speech and spend some time in correcting it after he has had a copy presented to him. Twenty-four hours, I understand, is the time permitted to reporters to make their copies of speeches and hand them to members who have made speeches. I have in hand now a twenty-four hours' report of the speech I delivered yesterday and I want to say now that I propose to read out what the reporters handed me, but I am going to say it is not exactly what I said, but it will suffice.

I was referring here yesterday afternoon to the question of the Humber and to the advent here of the International Paper Company in connection with development in Newfoundland, and I said in effect that Newfoundland was becoming Americanised. I said in effect that Newfoundlanders were becoming Americanised and that the trend of our affairs in Newfoundland was such that the sympathies of our people were being more directed to America than to the Old Country. I did not say

that Newfoundlanders were anti-British, and I am going to challenge any member on that side of the House to say whether I said that Newfoundlanders were anti-British. Yet this morning I am assailed in the press. The cap fits me and I must wear it. I am assailed in the press—in the Daily News for example:

(Reads.)

Mr. Chairman, "Throne and Empire"! I referred to a great number of things and those words "Throne and Empire" were not within the content of my remarks. Here is another paper, an influential paper, widely read and largely circulated:

(Reads.)

It goes on to refer to my remarks not so pointedly, but the headline is enough that I had called the people of the country anti-British. I have been here eight years and there isn't a man in the House who has been here with me but knows that I have conducted myself as a gentleman with regard to the rules of the House; that I have been an honourable man, even though I have to say it myself. No friend of mine who reads that will believe that I made a statement that 95 per cent. of the country was anti-British. I said there was, and I do not retract from that position—I said there was a growing sentiment of friendship with America. Being friendly with America and being anti-British are entirely different things. A man can surely be friendly with either Britain or America and have no antagonistic feelings to either. Nobody would be so ridiculous as to consider that in the slightest way pro-American implied anti-British. As a matter of fact everybody knows that England and America have very much in common, and to-day statesmen of both countries are turning their minds to the perpetuation of amicable relations between them for the peace of the world. Here is what I did say:

(Reads.)

I say that this country is 95 per cent. American. I did not mean to say 95 per cent. of the people would take up arms for America as against England, and no honorable member believes that I implied any such thing, even though my language may have been somewhat latitudinous. It would be interesting to know how much money comes into this country from people who go out and earn their living in America. In view of that and other things I say there is a growing sentiment of friendship for America amongst our people. I can see no reason why on that account it can be construed that they are anti-British. I think it is very unfair that my remarks be so construed in the public press and that a statement be made that I said any such thing in this House as that our people were anti-British. There is no foundation in fact for the statement that I said any such thing. How can I exonerate myself? What evidence can we take that I made no such statement but that of those present here, to whom I appeal to bear me out, backed up by the official report of what I have said, which I have just read from the copy handed me as it was reported and it has not been corrected. I made no such statement that this country was anti-British. If Americans express their friendship for Britain does that make them anti-American? Can I not stand up and express feelings of sympathy with the American nation without the press coming out and saying that I said 95 per cent. of the people were anti-British? I said no such thing, and I feel I have no other means of exonerating myself than by standing up in my place here and making the statement I have just made. No honorable member here may say anything

to the contrary as regards what I have just stated that I remarked yesterday. Were it not for the fact that it is made as against a public man, and in respect of that is a rather serious allegation, I would pay no attention to it. When I make remarks that are wrong and I find that they are wrong, I am going to take them back, but I have nothing to take back from what I said yesterday afternoon. I have explained the sense in which I meant those statements I made yesterday, and have made statements to the same effect to-day, but I did not imply what the public press has said that I did, and I want to know how I can exonerate myself and put myself right by the country and the people. If I am not put right, I will ask that a special committee be appointed to take evidence.

MR. K. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I also had some very nice things said about me. I was referred to as "a scrapper," "going to wade through blood," and everything else. I might say that I did not pose as a scrapper. In the meantime, if I have to stand up in this House and take my own part, I have belief enough in myself that I can take it and I am going to do it, and I did put my hand up to the honorable member, Mr. Browne, and if I have got to do it, either inside the House or not, I will go further with my fists.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The honorable member apaprently wants to utter a challenge to me. In view of his remarks now, I see no injustice in his being referred to as "a scrapper." I don't remember what he said, but he held his hands up to me in a pugilistic attitude and said he intended to make a very small something of me in fifteen seconds. I don't know what I have done to deserve such treatment from the honorable member. Surely he does not intend to come in here in a serious mood and justify his conduct. I didn't do anything to interfere with his speech and I have no desire to do so.

MR. BROWN—There are hon. gentlemen on that side of the House such as the Hon. Minister of Justice, the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Sullivan, and Mr. Walsh, all these men are old politicians, and they don't rise and butt in when anybody is speaking. But he is a buttinsky.. He is up and down like a rat. He does not give other members a chance to speak at all.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion you sir never knew the first thing about the article that was in this paper. I give you credit Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you would not have put that in the paper if you knew. You would not have allowed that to go in. I know you long enough to know that you would not stoop to such a low despicable proceeding. I have every respect for your rulings in this House. And as part and parcel of that paper you would not allow that to go into it, if you knew about it. But there is a person down there called the night editor, a barber's cat, I call him, and you all know what that animal is composed of. He speaks of me in connection with the strike in Grand Falls. I have nothing to be ashamed of in that. It was all above board. And I would lead another strike on to-morrow if I were not in politics, in the interests of the working classes of this country. The Prime Minister smiles. He can smile away.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I was smiling at the barber's cat that is all.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I don't like to be referring to that strike and what took place in Grand Falls in 1921, but this thing that has been broadcasted in the paper has called me to my feet this afternoon. When I led that strike in Grand Falls

I did it in the interests of the working people of Grand Falls, and the country in general, because there are men working in Grand Falls from every constituency in the Island. After going through that strike for three months, and having at last to come to a compromise settlement, that strike did good and not harm, because if there had not been a strike in 1921, the common labourer in Grand Falls would have been working for fifteen cents an hour instead of twenty-five. That is what would have happened. And why then does this impudent clown come out and treat me in this respect. I don't deserve that treatment. I spoke on behalf of my constituents as being an hon. member in this House and then I must be held up to the country as being a Bolshevik. I am not a Bolshevik. I like to give every one fair play, and I like it myself as I am prepared to give it to anybody else. The man that put that statement in the paper is a skunk and you can smell him as you pass up and down Duckworth Street. If he was a member of this House he would not be allowed to say that. But he is not a member of this House. Now if this does not stop and I am not reported fairly and given fair play then something else will have to be done. Why not report what I said in this House this afternoon. I am not ashamed of anything I have said. I am a British subject. Why not this paper or any other paper give me fair play. Now if there is any more of this stuff coming out in this paper I am going to go down and see that man personally and he won't write for a night or two. I go as far as to say that. I do not deserve to be treated in that way, and I hope that to-morrow there will not be a similar statement in that paper, and if there is there is going to be trouble.

MR. SCAMMEL—Mr. Chairman, I am still rather in doubt about the ruling of the House and I would like to know if there is any possible way of having myself exonerated by the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN—That is a matter for the House.

MR. SCAMMEL—Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Minister of Justice whether I made the statement that the people of this country were anti-British.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I have no recollection of the hon. member making any such statement. As to the procedure of the House in such a case, it seems to me that his own statement this afternoon ought to be sufficient. That is what I meant by the expression, that apparently has been misunderstood by the hon. member, about not going on with the complaint in Committee. The hon. member says that he did not use the statement attributed to him, and so far as I am concerned I don't see any reason why the House should not accept that statement. I don't know of any action that the Committee can take.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I am not very much interested in what Mr. Scammel said. When I asked the Committee to rise I asked the House to rise and wait for the official report. That report has not been read to the House. I think that we should hear that report. I would like the clerk to read the official report.

(Clerk reads the official report.)

MR. SCAMMEL—I said that they were making friends in America and because a man is pro-American he is not necessarily anti-British, that is the point. And there is not a man on that side has guts enough to get up and defend me.

MR. CASHIN—I will stand up. I am as good a Britisher as anybody on that side of the House. The reports in papers in the past have been anything but correct. Personally I don't know what is the proper procedure to be

taken with papers that are controlled by the Government in power. But I have listened to the report read by the clerk of the House, placing it side by side, regarding the attitude of Mr. Scammel yesterday and placing it side by side with the article written in the papers this morning and afternoon,and there is not a statement in the Official Report that says that the people of Newfoundland were anti-British. None whatever. These papers send reporters to this House and they send them here as supporters of the Government, to take down any words which hon. members of this side of the House may use in the heat of debate, and these words are used against them politically.

I would like that if any paper prints any remarks of any gentleman in this House that he should give him the benefit of all that he says. That they have not done. This paper (The Telegram) is edited by a man who attempted to become a representative of the people of this country. The man who a few years ago went to the country with the party that I was associated with and got the magnificent amount of a hundred and thirty odd votes. This man has condoned wrong doing. And if every man in this country was given a square deal the columns of the press should have printed Mr. Scammel's speech yesterday in its entirety so that the public might be able to gather from the contents of the speech what he meant. He made some remarks regarding the mess made of the Humber. And goodness gracious this paper cannot get up and say that they did not make a mess of the Humber. I claim that some steps should be taken by this House immediately, and if we cannot control what the press says I was going to say that we might take some steps to ensure that the press does not misrepresent what people do say. And they have done it time and again. They have done it on me. And they can take it from me now, the editor of the Telegram and editor of the Daily News and the editor of any other paper in this country that I am as good a British subject as they are, and that the editors of these papers are not writing those editorials because they are good British subjects, but because they are trying to make political capital out of it. I have an editorial here written by an individual who edits that paper, and he ought to be proud of it. I claim that the editor of that paper ought not to occupy any Government position. He is the lackey so to speak of the Upper House. Then he comes in here and criticises members representing people in this Legislature. And if he has a right to criticise our actions he should remember that we have as good a show in this country as he has, and we are entitled to it. Now I don't blame any member of the Government for the article in this paper, but I do say this that the members of the Government to-day if they have any influence with this press, and surely to goodness they have, because the press to-day is bought by the Government, and they received $53,000 for printing and advertising from the Government, unnecessary half of it. They should take the necessary steps to ensure that the members in this House get a fair show. Otherwise we shall have to take the steps ourselves, and they may not be a Bolshevik steps. There were steps taken a few years ago in connection with the press. There were steps taken on that paper which I hold in my hand, some twenty-five or thirty years ago; steps where taken with the editor of that paper. And probably the same steps may have to be taken again to bring him to book. I want to issue an ultimatum to that individual now that if he misrepresents me in the future, or if any serious corruption is made of anything that I say or that has been done in

the past, that I shall take the necessary steps to put him in his place. I don't care whether the Government likes it or not. I owe nothing to either of these papers.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have had to rise this afternoon in an impetuous manner, in fairness to the people associated with me on this side of the House, in view of the fact that the members on the Government side have not taken any steps to try to protect brother members in this Legislature as after all they represent some people in this country and they have a right to say what they think as representatives of these people. I criticise the press because they misrepresent our speeches. Even if they do send a reporter here they pay him for nothing else but to misrepresent them. If they represented them right they would be fired to-morrow.

MR. HIBBS—I did not have the privilege myself Mr. Chairman of being present last evening when the words which were attributed to Mr. Scammell were made in this House. I can only, therefore, go by what we have just heard read—the official report of the speech, and I want to say here now that Mr. Scammell is not without some grounds in making that statement. I see nothing wrong about the statement that he made.

What is the use to hide the fact that we are to a great extent pro-American, but, as stated by Mr. Scammell, that does not mean to say that we are anti-British or closely associated with the American nation and the tendency to create that sentiment is brought about by so many of our men and women going to the United States and we are not doing anything to keep them from going there. I was in the United States last Fall and in one particular place I found that 95 per cent. of the people there were Newfoundlanders. The same applies to many other places in the great republic. Very few of our people go to the United Kingdom to settle down. Now all this tends towards a pro-American feeling amongst the people in Newfoundland who have relatives and friends in the States. But, despite that friendly feeling, if the time came to show our loyalty to the Mother country, I believe the response would be greater from this country than it was in 1914. But, Mr. Chairman, can you blame Mr. Scammell for what he said when a leading newspaper in Great Britain recently made an accusation against the British Government in connection with Newfoundland affairs, and that was regarding the taking over of the Corner Brook proposition by the International Paper Company. That paper accused the British Government of letting down Newfoundland and allowing an alien Company to monopolise that which was held by British capitalists and criticized the idea of pursuing such a policy, and that was the purport of the remarks advanced by Mr. Scammell. Now we cannot blind our eyes to these facts, much as any member of this House might deplore it; but I am afraid that past Governments as well as the present Government have not done much to keep Newfoundlanders at home or to foster a feeling of loyalty to Great Britain. I think it is very unfair for any newspaper in this country to take advantage of a remark made in this House by any member and to make political capital out of it. I notice that the Prime Minister and the Chairman say "here, here." I might remark that it is not the place of the Chairman of Committees to say "here, here' 'or "there, there." I do say, however, that when we talk about things which are purely local I do not mind a paper commenting on any remark that is made, but when a paper tries to reflect upon the loyalty of a member and broadcasts that commentary throughout the country and includes in it an organization of which Mr. Scammell is President for the purpose

of conveying the impression that that organization is disloyal, well the least I can say about such conduct is that it is most contemptible.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Chairman, I feel that I should not allow this opportunity to pass without having something to say. It seems to strike me very forcibly that when one gets a touch of the whip he has been swinging that it hurts. Everybody knows that since I have been in public life no paper ever said a bad word about me and the only consolation I have given myself is, to quote the words of Scripture, "Woe unto him who everybody speaks well of." I sympathize with Mr. Scammell, because I know that in the heat of debate things are sometimes said by members, who, perhaps, are often glad to take them back. Very often things are said that a man does not really mean. I think that the explanation given by Mr. Scammell has changed my opinion and I realize that Mr. Scammell did not mean to say what he did, but if I had said what Mr. Scammell had said I wonder what would the "Advocate" and "Tribune" say about me and how much political capital would they try to make of it? However, the explanation given by Mr. Scammell is satisfactory to me and I think has satisfied the House. I have been attacked and abused time and again for a number of years, but I do not care a continental what the Opposition press may print about me, even though I am not in a pugilistic mood at the present time.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I am of the Minister of Finance's opinion, namely, that so far as I am personally concerned papers can say or write what they like about me; but I want to get after this "Telegram" fellow this afternoon because he went to the limit. During my remarks on the Speech from the Throne I made some statements regarding an article printed in the "Telegram" while the Bye-election was on in St. John's East. I kept a copy of the original article and I want to read it to the House this afternoon and I think the Finance Minister will readily agree with me that this was not a personal attack on me. I do not mind being struck in the mouth because I may be able to strike back; but this lackey of the "Telegram" struck below the belt and I am now going to strike him between the two eyes. On April 9th of this year this individual wrote the following article in the "Telegram'::

(Reads Article)

These are the things I want to bring to light here now. This skunk was not referring to me because I had been out of the country during the period referred to and for years previously. He was referring to my father who was dead at the time and who probably had his political faults as well as anyone else. This low reptile of the "Telegram" went to Belvedere to dig up my father to use him politically. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that, if I lost my temper, I would be wrong in blowing the brains out of that skunk? Still he said in his rag a short time ago that he never assailed the dead. Well my father was dead some six or eight months when he assailed him. That same skunk—you can smell him when he comes inside of this House—was afraid to say anything against my father when he was alive.

And he was purchasable. I tell you now, last autumn you could have bought him for $50, and you can buy him now for a hundred. He's gone up fifty. Anyone that wants him. And that is the low reptile that is coming along at attacking members. I don't mind that so much, but making insinuations or trying to attack those no longer in this world. The ordinary individual may not know what it meant but I knew; and the Minister of Finance knew it; and the Minister of Justice knew it, and tried to use it

politically; and we thrashed you; and that dirty filthy editorial helped to do it. And here is that editorial:

(Reads)

He was trying to insinuate that Cashins owed money to the Colony and tried to get away with it. I didn't. I wasn't here then. I was in the fight. I was away at the war But if there is any political fault of my father's this cur brings it up and tries to make political capital of it. He is not fit to be allowed to associate with decent children. Every editorial he wrote during that bye-election was a lie; and when a man utters lies he is nothing more than a liar. He tried to deceive in statements on the affairs of the country and he couldn't do it, because to-day if he were in this House, which he never will be, although he was prepared to go to Fortune Bay for the Opposition, if he were in this House, he couldn't talk anyway intelligently on the affairs of the country. And we are up against something nice when we have got to be dictated to by an individual of that calibre who would go so low as to assail people who have passed out of the world. That is the character we are supposed to take our public morals from. We are told that the public press is a public educator. I would like to know where the public press in the persons of the Evening Telegram and its editor, C. E. A. Jeffery is a public educator. I say that individual is the greatest scamp ever within the precincts of an editorial office. He talks about British subjects. He makes use of a leaf given him by a lackey sent here by the Telegram to take down and try to misrepresent the sayings of the Opposition, but if a Member of the Government makes a mistake which they often do, which we all often do, it is a different matter. That doesn't appear. We are supposed to listen to an individual who knows nothing about the affairs of the colony. Talks about England and America. He hardly knows whether England is North, South, East and West. I question whether he knows his way round Fortune Bay and I think he should be proud he got a miserable 130 odd votes down there. He has his reporter here. I will ask him a question through his reporter. What is the true financial state or condition of this country? What was the actual deficit that existed on June 30th, 1926 on public revenue and expenditure of this colony? What is the actual deficit that exists on railway operations of this country for 1925-26? I want him to give the people something they want to know. He is supposed to do it as a public educator and a moulder of public opinion. If he answers those three questions competently it would be a nice decent editorial, but he is unable; he doesn't know how. I will give him a few more. I am after that individual and if I stay in public life I am going to get him; he needn't worry. I will ask him a few more: What evening paper in this country about a quarter of a century ago was entered into by two or three individuals and its editor horsewhipped for assailing a certain individual's parents? Are the marks of the horsewhip around the office in which he is at present? I will give him a few more questions now and ask him to give the necessary information to the public to-morrow. Where does he think we are going to get ten and a half millions this year to pay our public expenditure; from what source? If he doesn't know let him come up and listen to the debates from members of both sides and we will try and educate him. When does he intend to cease lying? That's another one. When does he intend to become a man and not a parrott? That's another one. And I might say a bigot on top of that. That's stronger still. Mr. Chairman, I have with all the power at my disposal expressed my opinion with regard to the editor of the Evening Telegram. The other paper has

treated me during the political campaign in what I term a fair, political, gentlemanly manner. It didn't stoop to the low methods that this individual on Water Street stoops to. I am always prepared to give credit where credit is due. I have expressed my opinion on that individual in no uncertain terms. I have an axe to grind so far as he is concerned, principally, and I may go so far as to say solely, on account of the editorial that appeared in that paper on April 9th, 1927.

As far as the rest is concerned it was knocking me personally and I am prepared to take my medicine and stand up under it, and with that we knocked them out, and after April 22nd he didn't have much to say. I have expressed my opinion I say with regard to that gentleman and now I want to serve notice on him that, I may or may not continue in public life, but if I do, which I probably shall, for one term anyhow, I want to make it public that I wouldn't be associated with the impertinent clown that he is, even if he offered himself body and soul and you could purchase him for nothing. I consider his composition is not clean enough to be associated with any decent individual, and I consider to-day, Mr. Chairman, that the Government would be acting very wisely indeed if they would get away from that crowd and try to heave them over on the Oppositiion. They would probably gain political kudos. With regard to their British feelings or with regard to their American feelings either one or the other, I bet dollars to doughnuts that if an American went down there with $50 and an Englishman with $49, that the Yank would land the crowd with the fifty, and they would let the Englishman go for the sake of the dollar. That's the kind of crowd you're up against. I bet you to-morrow that, if they put that crowd up to auction and that a coon from the Southern States offered twenty-five cents and the Prime Minister of England offered twenty cents that the coon would have precedence over the Prime Minister of England as far as they were concerned. That is my opinion of that crowd as regards their pro-British or pro-American attitudes. Now I hope they have a good column for to-morrow. I feel that they will advertise me to the four winds of Newfoundland to-morrow afternoon. It has only cost me ten or fifteen minutes to get free advertising from the Telegram and after all they charge so much for the sheet that the common people of Newfoundland won't be likely to read it. Anyhow I don't want to delay the Committee any longer, with regard to this particularly because it is hardly worth talking about, but I have got it off my chest. I hope that individual I referred to has an expert stenographer here to report for him this afternoon who will have a verbatim copy of my remarks on his desk for him at nine o'clock to-morrow. It may give him an appetite for lunch.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee rises I want to say a few words with regard to the efforts of Mr. Scammell to exonerate himself. I appreciate very much the action in having the Committee rise so that the words that Mr. Scammell said were reported. Whether we are in Opposition or Government one thing is that we should be fair and I know that Mr. Sammell has been improperly represented in the press, after having read what he did say we know that the words published in the papers as follows:—

(Reads)

are incorrect. Now, Mr. Scammell has been done a grave injury. He is a public man, the head of a large association known as the Fishermen's Protective Union,and he has been done considerable injury throughout this country. No doubt the papers which are supported by the Government will

not in any way give any free or beneficial advertising to the official report, and the members of the Opposition do not expect them, but I do say that in fairness to us we should be treated properly and the words which we say should be given exactly as we say them. I think that the Press,both papers being represented in this House, one paper has a representative on the floors of this House, and the other paper also has a representative here, these papers should to-morrow, in fairness to Mr. Scammell, publish what he did say more or less exonerating him for what they said about him. I cannot let this opportunity pass without supporting Mr. Scammell in his efforts to have himself exonerated.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to to-morrow, Thursday, July 7th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 7th, 1927.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: I had hoped that the reason that the Estimates were delayed was on account of the fact that the Government might be contemplating serious reduction in expenditure and that that was probably the reason why the Estimates hadn't been tabled before in the House; but, alas vain hope, when they were laid before us we found that whereas there was an increase of $138,000 last year over the previous year, this year the Estimates contain an increase of over twice that amount. Now, a few nights ago, a constituent of mine, who by the way [illegible] vote **for me, because** when I went to canvass him, he expressed his regrets that he couldn't vote for me because he wasn't in favor of our party, he was a supporter of the Monroe party because he believed they would reduce taxation and give the country better Government; that gentleman a few nights ago, of his own free will admitted to me that he was greatly disappointed because he hoped that under the Monroe Government taxation would be considerably reduced. Now, I hope it won't be taken that I am trying to obstruct, or impede the work of this House. I am not here to obstruct. I don't believe in obstruction, but I intend while I occupy a seat in this House to state my opinions and voice the sentiments of my constituents. As I said before, the members of the Opposition and probably the members of the Government as well, certainly expected this House to open before the eleventh day of May, and it is only fair to the Opposition to open the House before that time and fair to the country as well. This House should have been opened in February at least and should have been closed long ago. Instead of that it wasn't opened until May and here we are in the second week of July. Now I submit that the time given to this House is very short to get any real business done. We come in here at 3.30 and adjourn at 6.30; three hours a day for five days a week; fifteen hours' work; and I don't consider that good

enough; and I hope and trust that the Government will have some night sessions in order to get through the work of the House, because if we come in here for three hours a day it only takes a couple of long-winded orators to take up the time of the House, and how can you get on with any business; but if we come in here in the evenings and are here about the country's business let us be about the country's business and let us come in here and occupy more than three hours of a day, because I don't consider that we are doing what we should as regards the country's business by coming in at 3.30 and leaving at 6.30 and consider we have done a day's work. I have voiced these sentiments here in the House before. Now, Mr. Chairman; another thing I want to say is that the Budget should be brought down immediately or if not immediately just as soon as the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs can bring it down. Here we are passing a vote of over ten millions and we don't know whether the country can raise eight of it, and we are in a very unfair position when we are brought in and asked to vote ten millions and when we feel that probably the country can't raise more than eight. If the Budget is introduced and we can't see where the country can get more than eight millions revenue then it is our bounden duty to cut down the Estimates to within the amount that the country can raise in revenue. The country most certainly expected that the cost of Government would be considerably reduced under the Monroe Government. You were coming in to "clean up and give a square deal to all." I maintain that the civil service in Newfoundland is over-staffed, but we haven't seen any sincere effort on the part of the Government to reduce that and what can we do? We can come in and voice our sentiments and talk from now until Christmas and what effect will it have upon the Government? The only recourse that the people of Newfoundland have is in the ballot box and when a Government goes to the country and makes certain promises which it doesn't fulfill then I maintain that it should be fired out and if another Government takes its place and makes other promises that it doesn't fulfill that should be fired out too until we get some sort of stable Government that respect their word and the wishes of the people in that regard. When the Monroe Government took office it was a very opportune time for retrenchment. There was a popular demand for reduced expenditure and taxation, and that is not very easy to get often times. But for some reason or another we found that instead of a reduction there was an increase. Now I believe that as a man, a private man, should live within his income so the Govt. should do. It was said by some hon. members a few days ago that business men when they enter politics do not apply to the Government business the same rules as they apply to their own business. To-day what the country wants and what the Opposition demands is that a definite statement of the state of affairs in this country be given to the people. That is what we should have, and what we should have as quickly as possible. I see that this year the amount of $150,000.00 which was voted last year in this House for the repair of bridges and marine works, this year has not been placed in the estimates. Now I consider, if the Govrnment thought, in leaving that out of the estimates, to have it brought in in the Special Loan the chances are that the Opposition will not get its fair share of that loan. We have been told here by hon members on this side of the House that Opposition districts got very little from the million dollar loan, and the chances are that the same thing will occur with the next loan brought in

for public improvement. That is where I maintain that the Government has not carried out its policy of the square deal to all. I believe in the square deal to all, and I believe that unless we get down to some sort of policy like that of treating Opposition districts and Government districts alike as regards public works that we are not going to be in for anything in this country except chaos. What we need in this country, is more co-operation for the good of Newfoundland. $150,000 that were placed in the estimates for the repair of roads, bridges etc., that vote was divided per capita, and I maintain that any vote that goes through this House for the repair of roads, bridges etc., should be divided that way It should not be given to the Executive Government to be given out here and there just as they wish, either for political purposes or their own districts, or in any other way, unless it can be shown that there is an urgent need in some particular section for certain relief or for certain work. Last year there was a loan raised and out of that loan one million dollars was allocated for repairs and for special works. And out of that I find that the first amount that was tabled in answer to a question as regards expenditure of one million dollars, was $100,000 for pauper relief. I have on my desk now a letter written from a place called Pike's Arm in my district, in reference to a bridge that is needed down there over a canal. And I hope that the Government will soon be able to give me that allocation to take care of that work. I am not so unreasonable as to come in here and say that the Government can be carried on in this country without any expense. There must be expense. There must be revenue raised. And there must be estimates brought in for expenditure. But the country expected the Monroe Government to go into those estimates and to prune them down as it were, to the irreducible minimum. And as I said before I have not seen any determined effort at all on the part of the Govt. to do it. I claim now that the Government has delayed too long and that it is now too late. They are over the brink now and they cannot recoup or reclaim their good name. Ever since the time of Responsible Government roads and bridges have had to be kept up, and money has had to be provided by this House to keep them up. But what I maintain is this that each district, should have a proportional share. We are only asking for our share and I think that hon. members of the Government side as well as on this side will admit that that is a very fair argument, and a very square one. Now sir, we have in this country a Government that we must keep up, and money must be found, and I maintain that every business and every corporation should contribute its share to the upkeep of Government. A few days ago resolutions were brought into this House relating to the Buchan's Mine question, and as I said then and I reiterate now, I consider that the Buchan's Mine corporation should contribute a certain amount as regards the expenses of the Government. Why should we have to pay Customs officials and the clerks in the various departments to do Government work, without expecting them to reap some reward, and we getting some revenue thereby. Is it any wonder that to-day Newfoundlanders are asking whether or not we are fit to govern ourselves. The man on the street is disgusted, he sees no hope, no matter what Government comes in, and then to-day people are asking where we are going. I am very doubtful as to our standing at the present time. Unless something strange happens, that is going to get us out of the slough of despond that we find ourselves in at the present time, we can look forward only with despair. Like Mr. Macawber we are waiting for something to turn up.

That is where we are in Newfoundland, instead of cutting down our taxation, cutting down the civil service, cutting out the overtime, that is one thing that we were told was not going to be under the present Government. Increased salaries but no overtime. But we find monies spent now for overtime, practically everybody that does business in the country has to spend a certain amount of time in overtime. Every business man and clerk has. I think that the time has come for less Government officials. The civil service should be cut down. Let the civil servants be done away with except those that are absolutely necessary, and let them get to work the same as a business man on Water Street. Let them go to their offices at 8.30 or 9 and work until 6. No wonder that to-day the people of Newfoundland are disgusted. There is an Economy Commission that has been appointed. But what economy do we see on the estimates that have just been tabled. Can the hon. members point out any reduction. No matter what the report of the Economy Committee was it is very unlikely that the Government, in my opinion,is going to adopt its findings. So the ordinary man on the street is called upon year after year, to pay more taxes instead of less. The cost of Government in Newfoundland is too high and I maintain that it can be cut down. The question is to get a man strong enough to go in and do it. Now it has been mentioned here that this House of Assembly has been opened for two or three months or a long time anyway. Do you mean to tell me the man on the street cares how long matters are discussed up here. He will say that "They are getting paid a thousand dollars and so let them stay there and earn their money." To-day we find that the people are deserting the fisheries. And the Government has not fostered the fisheries, to the extent that the fishermen thought that they would out of the one million dollars loan that was raised in this House last year and according to the words of the Prime Minister I think that the chances are that another loan is to be raised bye and bye, to be devoted to the repairs of roads and bridges etc. My contention is that these amounts should be spent per capita. Twillingate district is one of the biggest districts, and probably the biggest district in Newfoundland, and we have not money enough to-day to take care of the public works which need attention. But if we had got our share out of the million dollar loan that was voted last year the chances are that we would have been able to look after those works that needed attention most urgently. And the roads are bad in the outports. Some of the roads in St. John's are bad. Particularly the side walks. I cannot understand the people of St. John's seeing the beautiful roads for motor cars, and sidewalks with holes in them and sloping, with the result that that the people have to walk in the middle of the street.But in the outports they are considerably worse. Now the position that the Government should have taken was that the first two years in office they should have reduced taxation, as I said before, down to the irreducible minimum. And then sir, they should have tried to build up a reserve during these two good years. What does any good business man do. If he is a wise business man he builds up a reserve in the good years to take care of the deficits in the bad years. But the Government does not do that. They say "Whatever money we can raise we will spend, and go and get a loan and spend more" without thinking that our children's children will have to pay the interest, on that, and not caring either evidently. But for the first two years the Government were in office they had two good years, a good fishery and good prices. Then you should have built up a reserve to

stand against a year such as last year, which was not so good and the prices were low.

What this country wants is a big fishery and high prices. But it also wants good Government. And that is the most essential thing of all, and I think that the time has come now when the Government has to take the advice of the Opposition, and has to reckon with the Opposition, and it would have been much to the credit of the Government if they had done so before. You have not got all the good men in the House on your side. What the Government wants to-day is to take the advice of the Opposition. If they had taken the advice of the Opposition as regards the dock and other expenses that have gone through this House they would have saved themselves and this country a considerable amount of money. Now a few days ago a member on this side of the House spoke about cutting out the telegraph offices where there was a railway telegraph office, and to try and reduce in that way to some extent. Now as regards the railway, it seems to be hoped by the Government that they will find a company that will come in and operate the railway. Is it reasonable to expect that any company is going to take this railway and work it at a loss? Is that reasonable to expect? If we hope that a company will come in here and take over the railway, then we ought to be able to show them where there is a chance of breaking even or making a profit. That is what I do not understand, why it is that we can not expect a railway to run for the country as cheaply as it could be run for a private concern. That is where I maintain that the railway should be run just as cheaply and as economically for the Government's sake, and for the country's sake, as if it were owned by a private individual or a corporation. Here we are in these estimates called upon to vote thousands of dollars as salaries, and when we come in here we know full well that there are thousands of fishermen in this country who have to live on hundreds, and a few hundreds at that, a year. We come in here and vote thousands for the civil service. I wish that hon. members in this House came as closely in contact with the producers and the fishermen of the country as I do. I know something of the conditions under which these men live. The reason that last year the revenue went down was because the people did not buy as much goods. They could not afford to buy as much. The income of the poor man was cut and he had to live on less. But we find that the cost of keeping on the Government is not lessened at all, although the man on the street and the fisherman in the boat has to live on less. Now a few days ago the question of the Prospero calling at Springdale was taken up. As I pointed out then, Springdale is a very important place in Notre Dame Bay. In the fall of the year a considerable quantity of herring is caught there. And the fishermen leave Green Bay and go to the French Shore, because the French Shore in some respects is similar to the Labrador. The codfish frequent the French Shore in greater quantities than they do in Green Bay and they catch more fish there than they can get in their own home. I understand that the railway management will be sending the Prospero to Springdale next trip. There are several items here in Supply which I intend to speak on as the votes come up from time to time. We are here now on the Governor's salary of $15,000.00. I consider that if the Government had wanted to cut down expenditure here was an oportunity to start in with the very first item in the etsimates; you could cut it down to $10,000.00, and then you

could make a cut right through, and you would save very considerable money for the country. There are salaries voted here in these estimates which are not necessary and should have been cut out, but whether or not the Government is too feeble or weakkneed, we find that the estimates have scarcely changed an iota from the estimates that were voted here last year except for the increases. I remember a few years ago reading a speech delivered by the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs and he spoke of the growing debt of the Colony, and he used this simile, that it was like a cancer growing, and bye and bye it would destroy and kill the person or country. This is what we find to-day, instead of relief from debts these debts are growing, growing, growing, and we are just putting off the evil day. A man does not have to be farsighted to see where that is going to lead us. Sooner or later the country may be defunct if we keep on borrowing and if we can't pay our bills, and then what is going to happen?

Somebody may come in here and assess the property of the country. The question is whether we are not financially crippled at the present time. That is why the Opposition today is asking the Finance Minister to bring down his Budget, so that we could find out the true state of affairs of the country financially. It would be all right to vote ten million dollars in the Estimates if we were sure that the revenue of the country would be twelve million, but if you find that the revenue of the country is likely to be only eight million, and we are called upon to vote ten, then we are doing something that may not be right. I notice that in the Estimates that there is an increase in the Honourable Minister of Finance and Customs Department of over $130,000.00 chiefiy for refunds. Perhaps when I sit down the Minister will explain why that is. I noticed last year when the estimates were tabled in place of the fifty thousand dollars that was voted the year before it was a hundred thousand, but I hope it will be cut from one hundred thousand to fifty thousand, but this year I find that it goes from fifty thousand to one hundred and forty thousand, or an increase of ninety thousand. I don't intend to take up any further time of this House this afternoon except to say that when the Estimates are proceeded with, I shall have something to say about certain votes as they come before the House.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I do not propose at this juncture to say very much on the Estimates, but I hope as the votes are being passed to offer criticism to certain votes, as I think, at least, some of them can be criticized, and any remarks I make at this stage will be mainly directed against the general policy of the Government. We are called upon, under these Estimates now under discussion, to vote $10,500,000.00 and I hope, before proceeding further, that the Prime Minister and Finance Minister, under whose jurisdiction the Estimates come, will feel that I have some appreciation of the difficulties which the Government of necessity find themselves faced with in endeavouring to find the wherewithal to meet these Estimates, and I do not want to offer any carping criticism. I would like that any suggestions I may make will be taken in the spirit they are offered and I would like such suggestions to be considered as constructive suggestions. It has been suggested here that the Budget should be introduced contemporaneously with the Estimates and in that suggestion I concur, and I feel that there is nobody in this House who agrees with that suggestion more than the Finance Minister himself. I think, Sir, that in view of present circumstances and in view of general conditions the Finance Minister should bring in his Budget now, and I might add that the Finance

Minister should treat the whole matter in a very serious manner. I do feel that it is rather unfortunate for the Finance Minister, a man who we know in his private business capacity regards business as a very serious matter, should treat the Colony's affairs apparently so lightly. In the conduct of his commercial business he achieved considerable success, due in no small measure to the serious and close attention he gave to that business; but he was never before concerned in a more serious business matter than he is at the present time, namely, the financial condition of this country. I think the present financial state of affairs should be regarded by all of us as serious and that we all should do all in our power to surmount the difficulties that confront this Colony. I think also that the Finance Minister should, at the earliest possible moment, bring in, not only his Estimates which call for an expenditure of over ten millions of dollars, his additional Estimates, as I feel sure there will be additional Estimates, and, so to speak, lay his cards upon the table and show to this House and to this country the true financial condition of this country and let us like men get together and see what way we can solve the problems of the country. I think that as far as possible we should cut out our Party system of politics and that the Government should take advice from the Opposition on measures that are brought in here and not be looking around to find something to counter that advice. I think the best way is to get down to a frank understanding and, if we, as trustees of the people, are worthy of the trust reposed in us, then we are going to play the game like men and try to solve the problems that are facing the country to-day. I concur with what Mr. Ashbourne said, that there are votes called for in the Estimates that are unwarranted and I am prepared to say that the Prime Minister in the conduct of his own private commercial business, which he has carried on so well and creditably, would not show the same business practice in it as he has shown in the financial affairs of this country. You have only to scan through these Estimates and you will be faced with the same array of salaries of officials many of which are unnecessary. We are not concerned to-day with what past Governments did or did not do. We are concerned with the present and the future. Things are different to-day and conditions are getting worse. We cannot go on forever as we have been going, so it is up to us now to cry a halt. The Prime Minister came into power in 1924 on a promise of retrenchment and a general clean up. The people of Newfoundland, believing in his integrity at that time, thought he was going to clean up the financial mess of the country and clean out useless officials—not so much to get after political opponents who were just as good as he or those associated with him were, however much their conduct was misrepresented—but the Prime Minister did not attempt to do anything of the kind. It is true that in the doing of that he would be faced with some grave difficulties, but if he was honest, as we hoped he was, he would, at least, have made some effort to cary out his promise. Surrounded as he was with men who did not see eye to eye with him and who wanted to play party politics rather than statesmanship the Prime Minister fell from his pedestal and he got down to the ordinary level; but if the Government that preceded him were in office to-day a very serious effort would be made to reduce taxation and reduce expenditure.

Before we go any further in this debate, I would like for the Finance Minister to pay attention and not be talking to the Clerk. If not, I will take my seat and wait until he is finished talking to the Clerk. I have

noticed here that when a gentleman stands up to speak, responsible Ministers of the Crown engage their attention with other trivial matters, and when one is addressing a question it is looked upon as a joke. Well if this is all a joke it is just as good to close the House and let us all go home. Surely goodness we are in earnest. If there is any principle or manhood in us, to say nothing of statesmanship, we should at least give some respect to the person who is speaking. The people who sent us here do not expect us to spend out time joking. Now, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that we have in this country a very large coastline of about six thousand miles, and the people we represent live along the fringe of that coastline and the very fact of their living over such an extended coastline and our country being so sparsely populated means that the keeping up of public works along that coastline falls upon the Government. Now we must remember that the people must carry on their avocations while to-day in many extern districts of the country bridges, roads, wharves and other public works are in a delapidated condition. As a matter of fact in my own district, which is a very large district and exposed to the elements of the ocean, the wharves, the only means of intercourse with the sea, are in a most deplorable condition. W.thin the past three years I have used every means in my power to try and get the present administration to have those necessary public works attended to, but I am sorry to say, particularly for the sake of my constituents who are the sufferers, but nothing was done :n the matter. Speaking of public works, I maintain that the most essential things should receive first consideration, and I maintain that you can take these Estimates and lop off a quarter of a m:llion dollars which would benefit this country greatly and that amount would meet the necessities for public works. In the district that I have the honour to represent there is a very large settlement called Carmanville which is composed of very industrious and hard working people. Carmanv lle is without a pub lic wharf although the people have been asking for one for a number of years. There is no reason why the people of Carmanville should not have this wharf erected this year, as it would only mean an expenditure of a couple of thousand dollars. I have interviewed and written the Colonial Secretary on a couple of occasions request ng him to place the matter before the Executive Government. He saw the need of this pub lic work and he assured me that the request would receive the consideration of the Government. Up to the present time not a cent has been forthcoming for this necessity. There is no wharf of any k nd at that settlement and no place for steamers to land freight or passengers, and, in consequence, the people are put to the worst kind of inconvenience. Now I do not think that any settlement on our seaboard is treated in such a fashion as that. The Prime Minister resented the accusat on the other day that certain districts were discriminated against. Well if what I have just stated is not discriminat on I do not know what is. Surely it is not because you are too economical that this wharf has not been built, because if I were to take the time this afternoon to show up the general econom cal policy of the Government then I think I could show where, at least, three or four thousand dollars might be saved for the carrying out of the pub lic work I refer to. Another matter that I would like to draw the Prime Minister's closest attention to is the bad supply of fresh water in the distr ct of Fogo. It is a traditional and notorious fact that down through the years, particularly at Fogo Island where the large proportion of the population

reside the people have suffered territ ly from a shortage of water. As a matter of fact that for the past seventy years there have been annual outbreaks of typhoid fever in many of the settlements of the d stricts due to the bad water supply. No serious attempt was made to remedy that state of affairs up to the time that I was elected to represent the district. I do not want to be boastful, but really I was impressed by the conditions under which the people lived. I was impressed purely from a humanitarian standpoint. There was never a year passed but that there occurred six or seven deaths attrit utable to bad water. In 1920 I induced the late Liberal administration to import a well drill for the purpose of securing water. As is well known to every member of th s House who visited Fogo Island that the island is chiefly composed of rock and it takes in the settlements of Tilting, Joe Batt's Arm, Barr'd Islands, Fogo and Changes Islands. All those settlements are thickly populated. To secure this well drill was a great expense t ut it was the only poss ble means to get pure water and in order to ot tain it we had to bore down through solid rock. Up to that time there was a great source of danger and there was a trained English nurse stationed at Joe Batt's Arm and visiting other places in the d stricts attending to the people who were suffering from typhoid fever on account of drinking water. She saw the dire need for a pure water supply and she implored me for God's sake to try and do something for the people. The first year we got down three wells at Tilting. It was an expensive experiment but conditions were so terrible that something had to be done to save human life. This well drill might be utilized in other distr cts as well and I understand that the Chairman and the Prime Minister are anxious to get it for operating in their own d stricts. At present it is lying idle at Change Islands simply and solely that we cannot get a dollar to operate it. In fact I have been told to take the money out of the district grant, but I have none t ecause last year I was compelled to take two-thirds of the grant to operate the well dr.ll. I did this to hasten the time of passing it over for use in other districts that needed it. I asked the Finance Minister for an allocation for the further operation of this mach ne in the interest of humanity and he told me he would do his t est and I hope he will now that the Estimates are before the House because it will help to save human life in every district that needs the use of machine. To-day the people in Barred Islands, Joe Batt's Arm, T.lting and Change Islands are getting pure water from their wells and they appreciate highly what this machine has done for them. In Fogo we also got good water for the people but we did not do so well as we did in the other places. Fogo is a large place and I think Mr. Long will bear me out that we might have got down more wells n Fogo if we had the means to do it. In 1909 or 1910 under the Morris administration an attempt was made to get a pure water supply in Change Islands, but without avail. The medical authorities pointed out to the Government of that day that something had to be done because the people were suffering so much from typho d fever which was rapidly spreading and lives were being lost. Drillers were sent there and they drilled through the rock and put down concrete from the bedrock to the surface t ut the result was that the people got the same old surface water again that they had been drinking before. It is a serious state of affa rs and I would ask the Prime Minister and Finance Minister to sympathize with us in this connection and give us a grant of $1200 or $1500 to finish our work and have that well properly dr.lled. This machine goes under its own steam and travels

three or four miles an hour and you can cut down three or four hundred feet to find water. I will try and emphasize the importance of a pure water supply from my own experience. There is a place in Fogo district called Offer Wadham's which is one of the most important fish ng places on our sea coast and three or four hundred fishermen from Fogo and Bonavista districts fish there annually. For upwards of three-quarters of a century there never was a summer but that there was a serious epidemic of typhoid fever. In the summer of 1920 four men from my district died from the malady and two from Bonavista distr ct died. The same year some thirty men were stricken with the disease early in the season and lost their summer's work. Therefore, you will consider I would be a poor representative if I did not attempt to do someth ng to try and remedy that state of affairs. I set to work and got two wells cut through the stone and got a supply of good water although I had been told that our efforts would be useless because other representatives had tried and failed. We next got the fishermen who would be going there the following summer to fish innoculated. I saw the medical health officer and put the matter up to him and he said the vaccine would cost about $800. I told him I did not care f it cost twice that amount as I thought it worth while. I immediately arranged with the Government to get the health officer to order the vaccine and the vaccine came. Then the next step was to get the people to submit to being innoculated.

I asked them if they would be good enough to assist me in telling the people the operation would not be a serious one and that they would be absolutely immune for at least three years and at the same time I started propaganda work among the people. I enlisted the services of Dr. Leslie at Wesleyville and Dr. Whiteway at Musgrave Hr. and every fisherman except one or two submitted to the vaccination. For moral effect, altho perhaps it was not necessary, we got all the shack houses fumigated and not only that but we burnt the tall grass down and told them they should keep it short, because some fishermen have the idea that it shelters the flies in the winter time, which was absurd, but it was their feeling.

The next thing I did was to draw up some sanitary regulations which I did, and submitted them to the Medical Officer and appointed Mr. James Holden, Lighthouse keeper, as Sanitary Inspector for the place, and he enforced the regulations which provided that offal from the fish, night soil, etc., should be cast into the sea every day, and of course, being out in the bosom of the ocean, it was immediately washed away. This was done. Up to that time, Mr. Chairman, the flies which, of course, are a prolific source of typhoid and other diseases, which were peculiar to the Wadham Islands, being much larger than the ordinary fly because, I suppose, the Island is small and the offal was left around, they were so thick that I sometimes could not get a pin between them on the ceiling. Some people allowed the flies to pitch on the food that they were eating. It was a noticeable fact that those who were clean mostly escaped, and those who were careless were the victims. I said I would try to rid the Island of flies, and they left it. You would really be surprised to learn that after the operations of 1921 there was never a single fly seen there up to the summer before last. It was most surprising. It was simply because there was nothing for on which to breed. Mr. Moulton kept his instructions strictly; everything was kept absolutely clean and he made regular rounds. The result was that while the people went there dread-

ing the ordeal from their experience of the summer before, knowing that someone would have to suffer, they found that not one case of typhoid appeared. No flies whatever. The flies did not re-appear and the people went back the next year without fear and trembling. I do maintain that was an act for which we should get credit, and what I am saying now could be verified by Mr. Rennie and Dr. Brehm, who could tell the same story of how successful we were in ridding the place of that terror. Try to do the same thing for Change Islands. A minute or two ago in the absence of the Chairman of Committees I mentioned the fact that he had asked me several times when I could release the well drill so that he could relieve some places in his district. We have been keeping it down in Fogo and don't want to do it, but we are in a helpless position. It was primarily imported for general purposes, but I can't take it out of the district of Fogo. Won't the Minister of Finance and Customs give his word that he will allow us a sufficient amount to relieve the situation? Won't you give that promise?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I make no promise.

MR. HIBBS—I do think that Mr. Puddester, who has a great deal of influence, will help me out because he wants to get the machine for his district. I am going to ask Mr. Woodford, who is a member of the Executive, and who always pays attention to members over here when they are talking, and at least shows us a little deference and respect. I know that he will help me out because I am very much in earnest over this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—You have my very great sympathy. You deserve great credit and ought to be helped out. The only difficulty is the money. It has occurred to me that we might be able to contribute sufficient to help you out. How much do you require?

MR. HIBBS—$1500. Thanks very much for your sympathy and the offer of practical support which I feel we will get. I think the few words I have said this evening will result in getting this money, and you will be able to assure the people in Bay de Verde, Mr. Chairman, that they will have this machine within a couple of months. You have better roads there and can get around more easily. That was one of our problems. If you think $1500 was a large amount to spend, you must remember that the machine was 11 tons in weight and we had to build new bridges, strengthen the old ones and go over marshes, and the crust put over marshes was broken down, and there was a great deal of difficulty which at present members don't understand. I know this thing has been joked about for a couple of years, and that it has been referred to as a useless waste of money, but the members who spoke in that way didn't understand the circumstances.

Speaking generally, Mr. Chairman, of the policy of the Government with regard to public works, it is a fact that during the last three years, since the Government has been engaged in building highroads throughout the country that little or no attention has been given to the external districts. Now I feel that you are making a mistake—no Government can attempt to do that with impunity. The needs of the people are as great as in 1924. It is a fact too that your Government has been severely censured, because of your policy of highroads. You went so strongly into the policy that you seemed to forget the necessities and needs of the country; you were so thoroughly converted to the highroads policy that the sudden change seemed to upset your minds —a sort of mania. That is the sur-

prising part of it. I remember getting up previous to 1923 and advocating roads but I tried to put in my remarks the grain of common sense, and said that we had to live within our means. But I was laughed at, and honourable members who now sit in the Government looked on it as a joke. The Prime Minister made the statement that if he was Prime Minister of Newfoundland he wouldn't build a road within the next five years. He was not in office five weeks, perhaps not five days, when he inaugurated his highroads policy. Now I know I have been misrepresented. I have not been opposed to roads, but rather in favor of them, but there is this difference, that if my suggestion had been carried out by the Government, we would be living within our means. But we are going beyond our means to do it, and that is the reason that we are in the hopeless deplorable condition that we find ourselves in at the present time. No one appreciates driving over a good road more than I, provided we can afford them, but at the same time I wouldn't have to go far to find roads, or sea-side drives if you like, that the American Government would hesitate to build on the score of economy. I refer to St. John's East—it would take the rest of the session to even touch on the subject—I don't want to be considered as attacking the policy I agree with in principle, but the only thing I deplore is that we are going beyond our means. Take the road between Logy Bay, Middle Cove and going to Torbay, which cost a quarter of a million. Is that justifiable. Who in God's name would go on on the strength of a bankrupt country to spend a quarter of a million dollars? And what for, to buy land from people and put up roads that run along the fringe of the cliffs, so that tourists can get a little smell of the sea breeze. The men who have been weltering in the heat up in the United States don't come here to get the sea breeze, they are sick of it, they have probably been sea-sick on the way down, and you expect to make the roads pay by building roads for tourists who are sick of the sea and want to get as far away from it as they can. These roads go so near the cliffs as to be dangerous, but you buy them, spoil the farms, and spend a quarter of a million of borrowed money, wasn't that sheer madness? Of course it was. If you don't know wherein you were mad—there is an institution two miles away from here, and I have no doubt that everyone in it thinks he is alright. I am surprised that the Minister of Justice didn't put his foot down on that policy. I am surprised that Mr. Long, who represents a fishing district allowed it to go on. I don't blame Mr. Woodford, because he represents a district that had some highroads; he has been Minister of Public Works, and no doubt if the roads went through he would be unpopular if he opposed the scheme. I suppose that if I were in his place, in a spirit of justifiable selfishness I would have done the same thing. I think the whole scheme was conceived in the brain of a gentleman who does not occupy a seat in this House, and while I respect him in many ways, and for many things he has done, I have to censure him on this Highroad policy. The funny part of it is this, to hear people talk about the beautiful roads we have, but they never stop to think of the cost. They appointed a Road Commission, and the terrible fact of it is that they picked men of no experience and put them in charge of the job, men who lacked the required knowledge—they pick up a dry goods clerk and make him a Road Commissioner. It has never been done anywhere else and why here, not I suppose because they are

friends of the Government? What else do you expect when you put a crowd of new men in charge of a job requiring an expenditure of two million dollars. The only redeeming feature would be if you had an economic expenditure of that money, getting one hundred cents on the dollar. We haven't got it. I say we haven't got sixty cents on the dollar ,and I can prove it, there is no question about it. You can't place a right valuation on the whole policy by driving over a certain piece of road and saying, "It is very fine, and has withstood all the elements of winter." You must ask what money was expended on it. I notice in the report of the Highroads Commission they state they have built so many miles of road at a cost in the neighbourhood of four or five thousand dollars per mile; that is incorrect; first of all the number of miles outlined is incorrect; they never built them. Not less than one-third was fairly good road, and they merely had a gravel top put on, so that is not a correct answer to give to a question. I wanted if possible to ascertain what it cost to build a mile of new road, and what it cost to repair a mile of road. I do know that the Salmonier Road cost not less than five thousand dollars per mile, and all you have to do is come to Lance Cove and find a road that cost two thousand dollars a mile and compare them. In the Salmonier Road they didn't even cut off the corners; every creek and corner still stands. The roadbed stood up fairly well after the winter because they got good blue gravel, but they never attempted to straighten it, and a man needs a lease on his lift to drive over it to-day; there is no comparison. I want to remind the Committee that I was instrumental in getting that other road, and I didn't import men to build it either. I could have picked up men to fix up the Salmonier Road, and you would have saved three-quarters of a million, and would have been in pocket that much. I may instance this still further, that road cost two thousand dollars per mile, and I went to Mr. Warren who was then Prime Minister and asked him if it were possible to build the Salmonier Road; that I had a crowd ready, and I asked him if we could raise the money; he said how much will it cost per mile; I said we have a rough survey, went over it very carefully and knew the whole situation, there was plenty of gravel, and there was no comparison with the other ro d which had cost two thousand dollars, so that if he could find fifteen hundred per mile, we would carry it out. I couldn't get the money, and you go and spend five thousand dollars per miles on the same road and you can go and boast about the splendid work the Road Commission has done. I say that the man who would go and spend as I have seen expended, four thousand dollars upon a quarter of a mile of road or in the neighbourhood of sixteen thousand for one mile, and that just for a gravel top, and not twenty miles from here, cannot be considered very praiseworthy in respect of it. That is from Middle Bight to Sam Tilley's in Kelligrews. I say that the people responsible for that should be in jail, considering the condition of the country. The Prime Minister told me that Mr. Hall had seen a piece of road which we had built. The road I am speaking about now is not one that required just a covering put on. I am speaking about going into the wilderness and placing a road through. Any gentleman who goes down to Bay de Verde and when coming to Old Perlican turns west will remember the four and a quarter miles of road from there to Lead Cove, built by our own Commission. We went right into the wilderness; chopped down trees; and put that road through for $3500. I drove over that road at

the rate of thirty miles an hour. The Prime Minister told me that Mr. Hall described that road as excellent. That's the work of Newfoundlanders; no imported men at that; no Dutchmen or Norwegians or anyone else. I am not making any personal references by saying that. I just want to stress what can be done by our own people. That was Newfoundlanders building roads and then you talk about the work of your Commission now. I am not saying anything against your results but the way you went about it. You could have saved much money. With regard to Mr. Cochius, I believe as far as his knowledge went he did the best he could. I am a great admirer of his work. I take my hat off so to speak to him for some particularity of his work done recently. He is a particular friend of mine and I have great respect for him, but I think just as good a man could have been procured without going outside of Newfoundland and with regard to the money that was wasted for him to go around inspecting roads I say it is a scandal and a crying shame. There was seven thousand dollars spent in two years for motor car driving for that purpose. I suggested once here that Mr. Cochius might have a car. You could get a two-seater car for seven hundred dollars. You would not have to pay any duty on it. That wouldn't do you. You had lots of money; you had borrowed two millions and away it goes. You were never going to see the end of it. Mr. Cochius can't own a motor car as a result but must drive wherever he goes in a high-powered motor car and the country pays out of borrowed money something like seven thousand dollars in two years. The Minister of Finance and Customs told me himself that it was a scandal over a year ago. Now Mr. Cochius has got a car. I don't know whether it is a private car. That is none of my business but I do hope it is arranged by the Commission that he will drive that and not have to be paying out public money that we can't afford. It is a fact that the poorest people are sometimes the most extravagant. Here is a poor, poverty-stricken country goes and borrows a couple of million dollars and throws it to the four winds. It is an outrage. I certainly hope that the tourist policy will be a success. I have always been in sympathy with it; but my plans were different. I said I would like to have good roads but I have often repeated I would like to have them in the same sense that I would like to have a 100 dollar gold watch instead of this old thing. But I can't afford it. We must live within our means. We must cut our garment according to our cloth. I said tax your motor cars. You have to-day a little over two thousand. If you were to tax every car $1.50 per horsepower it would raise a nice revenue. Surely to goodness the people tearing up roads ought not object if you make them pay for it. Instead of doing that you borrow money; imagine you have an inexhaustible supply; and immediately reduce the tax on motors from $150 to $1.00. Is it any wonder people would accuse you of catering to the well-to-do? A number of people not well-to-do have motor cars but still they would be fair enough to admit that if roads are torn up by their motor cars it is only right that they should pay for it. That is economic justice. Instead of that you reduce that tax and increased taxes are placed on the shoulders of others. You should raise half a million dollars. That is all you can afford. Earmark part of the income from that tax I suggested to pay off the interest on that half million and from the balance make a sinking fund which could be added to every year and in the natural course of events with cars increasing every year the fund

will increase every year you can pay the interest and start a sinking fund to pay off the debt in twenty years. Then you can say to the fishermen and labourers that you have built roads and that they have cost a fair amount alright, but that you have given them a chance to earn a few dollars, and that they are not being taxed to pay for it. You have not done that and what you have done is not fair. It is not fair to tax people all over the island to pay off your interest for money to build roads for tourists or joy riders, and I am very much afraid that at least 80 per cent. of the roads torn up will be torn up by local joy riders; not so much by tourists. If you followed out my plan to-day you would be much more popular. I will go further and say that half a million spent properly would have given you all the roads to-day that are really essential and necessary. No doubt you would not have the road in the East End to-day that is there, that crazy attempt to which I have referred. You have got to build a big bridge on that road yet and what is that going to cost? I suppose you have got no money now. It is a very nice drive over that road, of course, I won't say a word against it in that respect because I can't imagine your adding to all the other faults building bad roads, considering that you spent such an immense sum on unnecessary work for one thing. You had superintendents and sub-superintendents, foremen and timekeepers and God knows how many more. I stated here last year that the men couldn't do their work because they were tumbling over bosses. A great number were getting five or six dollars a day for political reasons. Lots of people drive over that road and say it is a nice road, and I agree that it is a very nice road, but we must stop to think of the cost. A man might build a certain building, and it might be a very fine building, and he would be deserving of great praise for it, and another man might build one exactly the same and be committing a crime because he was wasting somebody else's money because one might cost $10,000 and the other $25,000. We admire the beautiful drive and the nice roads, but we never stop to think of the cost and that we certainly have to pay for it. It is an outrage when we consider the squandering down there and the wants in other districts, in my own district, Fogo, in which I am particularly interested, and in others. It is shameful to have some districts discriminated against where people are trying to earn a living. Roads from one settlement to another in some places absolutely essential, have bridges broken down and are impassable; roads that are the only possible means of communication are in a frightful state, and the Government say that there is not a cent when asked for money to repair them and they take this money and throw it out. It is one man you had in charge of road building, and I pity him. I went over a road with him, and I know his idea of road building. On one occasion he was building a road at —— —— ——, and he spent such a considerable length of time at a short portion of it that I thought he would never get on with it. There I got my first insight into his road building plans. And this is the man that you are eulogising. I know some of the work that he has done. You could build four miles of road for what he built a 100 feet. I had to go and speak to him. I said: "What, are you going to stay here all the year, paying those men?"

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I wish the hon. member would tell me his name.

MR. HIBBS—Well, I will tell you his name now then. That man is T. A. Hall, and I claim that he knows no more about building roads than

watches. He was never a road engineer. He was a railway engineer. He came to this counry about twenty-five years ago as Gov't Engineer. He did not even walk over the roads because he drove in a train wherever he wanted to go, and he would not know a good road from a bad road.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—You are not going to teach T. A. Hall anything about his job.

MR. HIBBS—I am not talking about his job. He is a first class engineer, but he is not a road builder. You may be a civil engineer and not know anything about road building, or at least not be a good road builder. And roads in this country have beeen built in places where they were not needed at all—in St. John's East.

MR. LONG—What about the Road de Luxe.

MR. HIBBS—You have only a faint idea of what the Road de Luxe means. But I want to tell you that the man who is talking now was no more responsible for that road than you are for the extravagance of the present Government. I want to say that if there was one man that fought against that waste of money, and I admit that it was a waste of money, I was that man. But we were dealing with extraordinary circumstances. These were the times when the very men, some of them are against me now, induced the crowd to come down to this House of Assembly with the red flag.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Mr. Hibbs has said that some of the members of the present Government urged people to come down here with the red flag. Now I was a member of the Opposition at that time, and there is only one man in the present Government that Mr. Hibbs could mean, and that is me. Now I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement. Never in my life, or at any time while I was associated with the Opposition led by Sir Michael Cashin, did I induce or endeavour to attempt to bring people with a red flag down here into this House. I want you to take that back and I ask for a ruling now. If you take it back I am perfectly satisfied.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, my words have been misinterpreted by the Minister. I said that some of the men that are talking at the present time might have urged them to come down.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept the statement of the hon. member and as far as I am conceerned the incident is now closed.

MR. HIBBS—I want to further reply to the gentleman in the corner, my hon. friend Mr. Long, and I want to tell him that although that Road de Luxe was a very extravagant undertaking, that I also want to point out that we were living under very different circumstances from what we are living under at the present time, and perhaps the Prime Minister will see the truth of that. He perhaps realises that it is very easy to criticise what had been done in the past, but when you get into power yourself things that you thought were easy to remedy don't appear so easy then. However the Prime Minister has been honest enough to admit that he took on more than he could handle. I was the Secretary of the Newfoundland Road Commission, which was endeavouring to raise money to build roads, and we got a hundred cents to the dollar, and I state that without fear of contradiction. And the Road de Luxe was undertaken while that was going on, and I often passed by while the work on that road was in progress and I saw men standing up and sitting down and lying down. Of course it was none of my business but I often

went in and spoke to the foreman about it. And I think it is unfair for the member for Burin to try and throw a slur on me for the Road de Luxe, for if there was one man in this House who fought against that I was that person. But those things will happen. No doubt but that at the present moment there is extravagance going on. Things that the Prime Minister himself would not allow to go on in his own business. You have numbers of useless officials that if they were in his own private business they would be out of a job to-morrow. It is no use to go back and say that past governments did the same. We are not concerned with past governments now. But I will say this, that if the Liberal administration were in office to-day the present state of affairs would not have existed. We were waking up, and the country was waking up, to realise that this state of affairs could not go on. The Prime Minister knew where the weak spots were. He told us so in his Manifesto. If he did not know there would be some excuse, but he made no serious attempt to do what was right and what he knew was right. He knows that the Budget has been brought down the same time as the Estimates before this. Thirty-six years ago you find the very same thing done. I agree that there is a vast difference between then and now.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I never knew the Budget to be brought down the same time as the Estimates.

MR. HIBBS—The Minister of Posts says "never." Well in 1921 the Budget came in the same day as the Estimates, when the Minister of Justice and the Colonial Secretary were in this House.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Was that the time that Sir Richard Squires was Prime Minister, and he brought in the Budget when the Governor was down here and he was closing the House?

MR. HIBBS—I want to tell the Minister of Finance that he is dealing with representatives on the Opposition side of the House now and not with the Government when he gets that stuff off. I agree that that was done, but perhaps there were very good grounds for it.

If we get the assurance that it is the intention of the Government to have an election this coming Fall we might consider making more progress. I have no notes prepared this evening, but as the votes are passed I will have some comments to make on them; but I want to be clear on one point. Last year, and I think a couple of years previously, we had a number of men travelling around this country as fishery inspectors, who were suposed to send in reports of the amount of fish caught in the various districts. Last Spring there was a rumour that the grant for that purpose had been cut out. Only recently, and before I put the question to the Prime Minister who verified this rumour, a friend of mine named Canning, of Fogo, told me that he had been an inspector for the past few years and that as far as he knew the Government was cutting it out this year. In that I told him that the Government acted right and were well advised. Upon consideration the man agreed with me and he went to work in St. John's as a carpenter. Not long since he came to me and stated that the Department of Marine and Fisheries had re-appointed him fishery inspector for this year. Now I thought the Prime Minister stated the other day that there were no fishery inspectors to be appointed this year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I understod that any statistical work

in connection with the Fisheries Department was being done by permanent fishery wardens.

MR. HIBBS—The man I refer to was re-appointed specifically for that work. Now I am expecting to see a vote in Supplementary Supply or twenty or thirty thousand dollars to pay these inspectors.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—There is a vote already in the Estimates of $20,000.00 for fishery purposes.

MR. HIBBS—I want to thoroughly understand this thing and I would like to know from the Miinster of Marine and Fisheries if the inspectors and statisticians are being appointed this year the same as they were the past few years? If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says they are, and the Prime Minister has said they are not, then the Prime Minister must have misunderstood my question.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, might I suggest that when we get on the fishery estimates the matter alluded to by the last speaker will be taken up. It seems to me that some members are debating a general subject. If we are allowed to go through the Estimates as one would suppose we would be allowed to do and when we come to some particular department each speaker can debate the different votes as they come up and we want to hear the opinion of the Opposition on all those points; but the system of talking at random and talk about everything under the sun, without consideration for any particular department seems to me to be obstruction and nothing else but obstruction. The Opposition need not worry. The more obstruction by way of talk that the Opposition are engaging in the more popular the Government are becoming and I believe that the Opposition are doing themselves injury by the policy they are pursuing. Let us deal with the Estimates first and if Opposition members object to any particular vote let us talk about it. For that reason I would suggest to honourable members of the Opposition that when they come to the Fisheries Estimates members will have a perfect right to discuss these votes and I have no doubt we will have some remarks from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries thereon. The same suggestion applies to other departments and I simply throw out the suggestion to the Opposition now.

MR. HIBBS—I resent the insinuation of the Prime Minister. I have a perfect right to speak in the way I was going. It is no use getting mixed over this matter and it is no use for the Prime Minister to try and draw red herrings across the trails. Before I take my seat I want to have the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries agree on the point that I brought up. I was listening in this House to the Prime Minister saying that no fishery inspectors would be appointed this year whilst the Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that there is a grant in the Estimates for such Inspectors. What is the use of quibbling? Never mind waiting for the vote to come up. Let us clear up the matter right now. I know where the misunderstand comes in. I know that the Prime Minister would not deliberately make that statement because I know he did not know things definitely at the time.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, If the honourable member wants any particular statement of that kind he can get it from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. All the details are in the hands of the Minister. I do not know what has happened but I have absolute confidence in the Minister and if the honourable member wants any specified information regarding the fisheries department I have no doubt he will get it. As far as statistics are concerned, I understand that work is being done by

wardens who are the permanent officials of the department and not by extra officials appointed. It may be, however, that some officials have been appointed, but that is a matter that the Minister can explain and I am not going to interfere with him.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I do not think we could get a clearer answer than that as to what I was talking about. Everybody believed that this policy on the part of the Government of collecting statistics with regard to the amount of fish caught was a good thing. It is equally true that the appointment of these officials and the expenditure of that vast amount of money for the past three years has not resulted in catching an extra cod's tail nor has it resulted in increasing the price of fish or making the fishermen throughout the country any better off. You will have to be pretty logical about it before you convince us that such a policy and such an expend ture yearly of twenty thousand dollars has anything to do with increasing the price of fish.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—When you come to the vote for my department you will get the information asked for, but not before.

MR. HIBBS—I think it was utter madness to inaugurate such a policy. A few days ago the Prime Minister, whose integrity nobody doubted, in answer to a question directed to him by the Opposition as to whether or not the fishery inspectors who had been functioning the past few years would be appointed again this year, replied that they would not. It was just as well for the Prime Minister to say that they were appointed again over his head or without his knowledge because now Captain Winsor says they are appointed. I know of some men who were appointed as inspectors who told me that they could not see where the Government profited by the work they did, and I know another inspector who told me that he was paid more money than he was worth.

No, there are no returns commensurate with the amount of money expended—none whatever. I know this, that it was not justified, and the Prime Minister must see it. Must I wait until the vote comes up to discuss this? I may not be here then, and haven't I got a perfect right to talk on these things when the Estimates are before the House? I want to express my opinion and say that if we had started some sort of fishery policy to encourage and facilitate the fisheries, and to enable fishermen to prosecute them with less difficulty, I would be the first to back it up, but this only provides for jobs for friends of the party, and I can tell you that some don't appreciate it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—It was strongly recommended by Mr. Grimes.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Grimes is a level-headed man, but he makes his mistakes, but if the policy had been left to men of that calibre there would not have been so many mistakes as there have been. Before sitting down I wish to say that I listened to the Prime Minister's remarks that we were talking at random; that is unfair. Because I had been referring here and there, and merely touching on some of the most glaring instances, you ought to be thankful that I am not referring to more, but I will return to it later on and have more criticisms to offer, but I will reiterate again that since you ask for $10,000,000, and anticipate, as I know, to come in with additional Estimates and Supplementary Supply, it is only fair to tell the House where you expect to get the money. You have heard that so often that you have become indifferent, but the conditions to-day are not those that existed two years ago. They are become tighter and tighter; we have to bor-

row to pay our current bills. That is serious. Isn't it just as well for the Prime Minister to be honest and not look on us as if we were enemies? I know it is our job to criticize the Government—God help you if there was no Opposition, but why can't the Prime Minister play a big game and say "I am a successful merchant running a big business, and I came into politics and found that the condit.ons of the country are such that we can't make two ends meet"? If it was the same in your private business you would say you were bankrupt and go into the Courts at once. These are the conditions, and are you playing the game as I have said, not giving a square deal to all by cutting out party politics. You will be judged a 100 years from now by what you have done. You are the responsible Minister to-day. the Prime Minister and Trustee of the country.

PRIME MINISTER—Why don't you set the example and cut out party politics?

MR. HIBBS—We are prepared to do it, but it is up to you to set the example and do it first. You are the Prime Minister, it is up to you to play the game, and don't you think that your example would bring us all around. We call ourselves men and sit down and bandy words and argue, and bring in $10,000,000 estimates, and don't know where we are going to get it. We borrow to pay our bills. Suppose you did that in your private business, you would not carry on with statements that were not critically correct, and try to pull the wool over our eyes as you are doing. You wouldn't sleep to-night; you would go to your creditors and say that you couldn't carry on the business, but you are the head of the Government and I know you are conscient ous enough to do the right thing. Now what do you say if we cut out party politics and say to the Minister of Finance "bring in additional est:mates, put your cards on the table and show us what is necessary to carry on for twelve months." The Opposition, if they are men, and I am sure they are, will do the best they can do to tide the country around the corner, and we will find this out; you are only putting off the evil day; that is no good. I beleve the Prime Minister is going to state what his conscience dictates, because I look on him as a Christian gentleman. And slipping is dangerous.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Do you think we would gain anything by announcing that we are bankrupt?

MR. HIBBS—I wouldn't want to announce it from the housetop. If it is inevitable, why go on, but you invite the hostility of the Opposition; you conceal things, and we feel that you are playing politics. The Finance Minister must really know, as has been stated.

PRIME MINISTER—You know as much as we do.

MR. HIBBS—If you want us to associate ourselves with you, it is only a matter of figuring this thing out, surely you would have to come and say that things are so ser.ous that there is no way to coninue; that you are going to give up the farce. That brings us up to the most serious part, only a little while ago, an honourable gentleman, whose opinion I respect very much, made a remark. I asked him to be good enough to express his op.nion on a matter I regarded as a problem of the day, and I thought it was fair that it should be discussed in a book which I was about to issue, and the problem was, what is the destiny of the country, continuation of self-government, confederation with Canada, or annexat:on with the United States, needless to say politicians wouldn't write on this because they were afraid. Questions that would be discussed freely in England would not be discussed by Newfoundland statesmen, and they did not have backbone

enough to tell the truth. We don't expect thirty-six fishermen from Bonav sta Bay to guard the destinies of the country—it is up to us, and they expect us to do the best we can. Is it any wonder that the controversy was precipitated in the House yesterday. We have only one life to live, and we want to live it in peace and what might be regarded as comfort—that is the inalienable right of every citizen. It is our duty to make the country a better place for our children. What hope have we for these children of ours? Any man who expects his children to grow up and marry and live in contentment and comfort, is pursuing a vain hope unless something occurs. There was a ray of hope some l'ttle while ago, but that was dashed to the ground—we had hoped to capitalize the Labrador, but our hopes were dashed. When a man comes in here and tells the plain unvarnished truth, he is held up by the newspapers as anti-British, Bolsheviki, and all that kind of nonsense. This comes from frank acting and decent talk. Talk about being Americanized, I want to repeat that we are becoming Americanized, and God help Newfoundland if it wasn't, in the sense in which Mr. Scammell spoke. God help us if those Newfoundlanders couldn't get to the United States to earn their living and give their children an education, and God help us if these are thrown back on us. If every man who went to the United States this past summer were back, how would we fare, and where would we be. Is there any reason that they wouldn't have a favourable sentiment towards the land that affords them a living? They would be miserable ingrates if they didn't. I am going to make the statement, and the "Telegram" and "News" can come and say that Hibbs is anti-British, but I am not.

But I say right here now and I hope that the Prime Minister will take down these remarks, that I would rather be living in a prosperous Newfoundland under the Stars and Stripes than in an impoverished Newfoundland under the Union Jack. And I think that in that attitude I would be only doing my God given duty to my children that are to come after me. But all things being even I would rather live under the Union Jack. But at the same time if we can better the conditions of the country, and Mr. Prime Minister your name would rise in the estimation of the people of this country, and he may not think so, but that is only because of the environment that he lives in, but if to-day instead of going over there, and I don't say this in any disrespectful way, but if instead of going over there and hobnobbing with the officials on the other side, he was to go over there and say that he was not satisfied with the way that we were being treated by Great Britain, that they have not been playing the game with Newfoundland. The sum of thirty million dollars has been expended on account of the Great War when we rallied to the call of the Empire. "We played the game by you but you have not played the game by us." I was very interested to read that one of the most influential papers in Great Britain condemned the British Executive for their attitude to Newfoundland and other overseas dominions. And the result will be that you are going to be friendly with the corporations that come in and rescue you and show little loyalty to the people that turn you down. It is time for us to wake up. We have as good a right to fair treatment as Canada or New Zealand or any other of the countries of the Empire. We may be only a small population, but we have the right to live, just as good a right as they have, and I think that it is a mistake for the Prime Minister to say, and I am not reflecting in any way on what the Prime Minister said

or did at the Imperial Conference, because I know that he did credit to Newfoundland, but I do think that it was a mistake that he made in the statement that has been attributed to him, and I want to be corrected if it is not, that we were prepared to follow the lead of Great Britain even, I think, to the extent of war. I would rather hear the Prime Minister say that we are not satisfied and that we think that the Oldest Colony should be treated more liberally. We have got resources here and she has never come to our rescue to help us to develop them. British capital has gone world wide and none of it has come here to help us. We do not deserve it. She has not stood by us, the oldest colony under the British flag. Surely we deserve more consideration than we have been receiving. Now I will not ask the Prime Minister to make a pronouncement on it, but I would really like to understand the status of Newfoundland, the new status that has been given to us, as a result of the Imperial Conference, with regard to the right of self-determination. Here is a country alongside us, English extraction like ourselves; bonds of blood and friendship bind us close together, and we dare not say that we are friendly to them or we run the risk of being held up to the country as being disloyal to the British Crown. The only satisfaction for Newfoundland, as I see it, is to have some understanding with the United States. If Great Britain to-day would be satisfied by our annexation with the United States, could not we be just as good Britishers.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — We certainly could not.

MR. HIBBS—We certainly could. It does not matter what flag is flying over us. I would prefer, all things being equal, to have the British flag flying over us, but before we see this country and our children in poverty it is our duty to look around for some remedy. Now I do not want to be misrepresented, that unless something is going to be done we cannot hope for a continuity of self-government. Under the present circumstances I don't think we can carry on the party system of Government much longer. This is a frightful position to be in. It is like a man suffering from cancer. And this country, this Government, has cancer in its system and it cannot live for many years.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—A drastic operation is needed.

MR. HIBBS—There is no man in this country with sufficient courage to perform that operation. If you are the man to do that you will be eulogised, your name will go down in history. We will back you up if you will perform that operation.

Mr. Chairman, when I stood up to speak I did not intend to take up so much of the time of the House, but one thing led to another and I have talked longer than I really intended. But before the Estimates are passed I intend to offer some criticisms upon some very important matters in connection with these Estimates. Before sitting down I would say to the Minister of Finance that he should take this matter seriously because 'this is the biggest job that you have ever had on your hands in your life," because you are squeezed tighter than you were last year, and last year tighter than you were the year before. You should say to this House now, "Yes, we will raise the Committee and I will show you where you are going to get the money to meet this expenditure. I want to carry this old country along." If you do that the Leader of the Opposition will, I am sure, be one of the first men to get up here and endorse your attitude.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of Question.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker: Before the House adjourns I would like to have permission to make a few remarks, as I may be leaving town tomorrow, in connection with the Daily News and what it says in connection with leading a strike at Grand Falls. I want to say that in connection with that strike that whatever was done by me or anybody a party to that strike was done above aboard. I want to ask the editor of that paper and any member in this House who may be connected with it to drop the matter of the Grand Falls strike, because whatever happened at that time is passed and gone. I have nothing to regret. The country lost nothing by that strike only what it gained. Because as I stated here yesterday in this House, had it not been for that 1921 strike, I would go as far as to say that the common workman would be receiving fifteen cents an hour instead of twenty-five. During that strike the founder of the A. N. D. Company, in the person of Lord Northcliffe, was very much against that strike. He sided with the working man of Newfoundland from beginning to end. I had messages from him up to twenty during the strike. He sympathized with us in every way, but he was over-ruled by the directors. After the strike, and now I speak subject to correction, but I believe that I am right, when Lord Northcliffe made his will, he willed three months' pay to every man and woman in his or his brother's employ for three years previous to the date. This went to show that he agreed with the strikers at Grand Falls and in my opinion that three months pay was tantamount to an expression of sympathy because the men of Grand Falls were on strike for three months. I was one who received $400 from the estate of the late Lord Northcliffe and if anyone disbelieves that statement let him write to the A.N.D. Company and ask if these remarks are not correct. For thre months that strike continued and during that time not a man left the ranks and not a man went to work with the A.N.D. Company only what we allowed to go to keep the wheels of the mill turning. I, as leader of the strike, had much trouble and had very little sleep while the strike was on, but I was determined to stand by the men and see the thing through and I would never go away from that idea. In fact it is my intention at all times to do what I think to be right. When that strike terminated and when we refused to allow Mr. Harris to settle it they sent to the Old Country for the late Mr. Scott and in the middle of the night in the log cabin at Grand Falls, when everything was finalized and it was agreed for the men to go back to work at the earliest moment there was no discrimination made against the men. A compromise settlement was made amongst the lower laborers and Mr. Scott, as vice-president and director of the A.N.D. Company rose from his seat and congratulated me as the leader of that strike and he said that that strike was led above board in every way, and I am glad to say this evening that there is not one wound left as a result of that strike to be healed. My reason for making this explanation this evening, Mr. Speaker, is because the two daily newspapers in this city to-day would like to have the whole country believe that I am a Bolshevik and have no principle in

me. That is absolutely wrong. There is nothing of the Bolshevik about me whatever; and if any further proof is necessary in connection with that strike it can be had by a recommendation from the Company as to my behaviour. When I was elected a member to this House in 1923 the A.N.D. Company asked me if I was going back to my old position at Grand Falls. As I was a member of Parliament and a representative of a large and important constituency I decided not to go back to my old job. I left the A.N.D. Company on the most friendly terms and I can get a job to-morrow, if I want to, from any superintendent at that plant. I have no personal grievance with the A.N.D. Company or with any official there. The A.N.D. Company are the best Company that ever operated in Newfoundland. Like everybody else they have their faults, but the A.N.D. Company is a good Company and I should know what I am talking about after having worked with them for eight years. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for extending to me the courtesy of making this explanation.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Mr. Speaker: As one who had a great deal to do with the A.N.D. Company in my official capacity, I quite concur with what has been said by the gentleman who has just sat down. Since my advent to the office of Finance and Customs I have had no trouble of any sort with the A.N.D. Company and they always manage to carry out their obligations. If at any time any contentious matter comes up it is very easily settled. I am glad to have the opportunity of verifying what Mr. Brown has said with reference to the A.N.D. Compan and I wish that every company coming to Newfoundland were as good as the A.N.D. Company.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker: On the motion for an adjournment I would like to point out that there is quite a lot of rumour around town with regard to the St. George's Coal Fields. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines if he has any report from Dr. Baker as to recent developments and if he has would he mind tabling it. A great many people in the district I represent are interested in these coal fields and I heard that there is an individual in town with a copy of Dr. Baker's report and I would like to see it.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Speaker: It is news to me that a copy of Dr. Baker's report is in the hands of any private party. I sent his report to the Executive Government addressed to the Colonial Secretary. As far as I know now it is in the hands of the Executive Government. I will be pleased to table a copy of the report to-morrow.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the Prime Minister when he expects to have something definite to communicate to the House with regard to negotiations between the Government and the International Paper Company?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I hope that during next week I will be in a position to bring something before the House in that connection.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 8th, 1927.

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

Mr. Power gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to these Estimates I wish first to make a few preliminary remarks, and to say first of all that it is an easy matter to criticise, but it is hard when we come down to the question of expenditure on Government affairs to suggest an easy remedy. The chief cause for objection that I see in these Etsimates this year is this, that we are asked to vote more money to spend than we have in sight as revenue. For each of the two past years it has been under eight million dollars. And it is difficult to see where we shall end up if we continue year after year spending more money than we earn. I believe, however, that this year the Hon. Minister of Finance can expect a bigger revenue without necessarily increasing taxation. I think that in the ordinary course of events that the imports this year will be greater than they were last year, and that we will get an extra revenue in consequence but only to the extent of two million dollars extra. As I said, it is easy to stand up in this House and criticise, but I would chiefly criticise and chastise the Government to-day because of the promises that they made to the country, that of an avowed policy of retrenchment. I would not mind if the Government was composed of members new to politics, such as the Prime Minister himself. When I first became a member of this Chamber I had quite a number of ideas as to how we should cut down expenditure. But I must freely admit to-day that after three years in closer touch with governmental matters I have had to change my views considerably. But what may be an excuse for new men to politics is not an excues for certain members of the present Government, who have had years of experience, and must have known that there were certain, perhaps insurmountable, difficulties that would prevent them from carrying out the promises that they made to the electorate of this country. Therefore I would criticise and chastise them not only for making promises heedlessly, but for not attempting to carry their promises out. I fully believe that the Prime Minister meant what he said when he spoke of cutting down expenses in all departments. And I would be very interested to hear, as you pass the votes for the different departments, just how the honourable ministers that are at the heads of those departments will excuse themselves for not backing up their Prime Minister in carrying out their promises. During my three years as the elected junior representative for Trinity District I have become fully aware of the numerous necessary requirements that that district is asking for. Roads, bridges, public wharves and buildings, all badly in need of repair, the ordinary grants which have been given being quite inadequate. Perhaps Trinity District has been worse off in that respect because the representatives are so unfortunate as to be in opposition. But what can be said of Trinity District can be said also of the Government districts, perhaps to a lesser extent. The votes for public works are inadequate. How then can any Government carry out a policy of retrenchment? This Government is not more to blame than past Governments. I fail to see where in the past eighteen or twenty years, since I have been privileged to get a living in Newfoundland, I fail to see where any serious consideration has been given towards the reduction of our expenses. But perhaps, Mr. Chairman, we may be standing on the threshold of a new era in Newfoundland. Gradually we are becoming better educated. As we become better

educated our people become more independent in their ideas, and instead of being led they are thinking for themselves. And ideas of Government are assuming a different aspect in the minds of the people. And to that we have added woman suffrage, that will perhaps have another effect. Then again under our new redistribution of seats we may get a better type of man, a man that has to stand on his feet and not depend on another man to pull him through his election. These things speak for better Government. And so perhaps it is a waste of time to cast aspersions or to get heated over what the Government is doing. We can, I trust, look for better times. This perhaps is the last time that this House of Asesmbly will meet under the old scheme of things. Let us hope that future Governments will profit by the experience of past Governments. Right now serious and grave problems must occupy the legislators of this country. Even now we see prospects of development on a very large scale in this country, and it seems to me that in this time of our history never more were we in such sore need of a strong hand to govern us and to shape our destiny in the future. One of the greatest problems in Newfoundland, as it is in some other countries, is that of finding sufficient employment for our people. And we are too apt when big companies come here with a proposition to work some of our assets, we are too apt perhaps to grasp them by the hand too eagerly and to promise them all sorts of concessions without asking anything else in return other than mere labour. Too long have our people been the common "drawers of water and hewers of wood". And in connection with that rich mine that exists we believe at Buchan's, we are asked to give the A. N. D. Co. fairly liberal concessions. We have not any definite promise, as far as I can gather, as to what that company that proposes to operate that mine at Buchan's, we have not any definite promises as to what they will do for us. All we can see is that the mine will be developed and that it will give a certain amount of employment to our labourers. We should be broad-minded when we settle with these companies ,and yet it seems to me in this particular venture, cannot we ask that wealthy company and get from them a definite promise that they will erect smelters in that district, so that we would not have to suffer what we have had to suffer regarding that other valuable asset of ours at Bell Island, where our raw material is exported somewhere else to be manufactured. By erecting smelters at Buchan's Mine and Bell Island it would necessitate more labour. These things I say should be seriously considered and before giving concessions to people let us find out what those companies will give to us, and then why quibble about concessions which we feel that they will not abuse.

Various suggestions have been made in the past as to how to reduce expenditure and I quite see the difficulties that face any Government when they try to reduce. We know that we have too many officials in our civil serive and we know that we have lots of excellent men in our civil service and these good men that we have are worthy of their hire. In order to retain good men they should be paid decent salaries, and, therefore, what a man gets this year is a totally different salary to what he should get five years hence. Ability merits an increase of salary, so that salaries cannot all be made on the same footing, some of them must be increased. We know why we have too many officials in the civil service, because to-day as in the past politicians have been more or less busily active, in placing friends. The

country has got to get down to serious work on a serious programme of ways and means in Newfoundland. There are men in the civil service whose services can be done without, but then these are not the ways of the politician. I notice in the Auditor General's report for this year that amounts aggregating over fifteen thousand dollars were paid out for extra services or overtime. I venture to say that 50 per cent. was not deserved inasmuch as the extra duties performed were done between the regular cival servants' working hours. Now I contend that a servant of the Government should, be like the servant of any other employ and he should be prepared to do anything that he is asked during his regular working hours. The fact of paying extra amounts to officials who are already drawing adequate salaries is hardly fair particularly when we see men for whom we have the greatest sympathy and who have no employment at all. Now I have already expressed my sentiments regarding the waste of time in this House. The Opposition members have been blamed for wasting the time of the House, but I want to say that we were set a very bad example inasmuch as this House was not called to meet until the middle of May—a most inopportune time—just when the spring business of this country commenced. Today we are down here and I know that every one of us feels in our hearts that our offices is the proper place for us; but we must do our duty to our constituents. I am sorry to have heard members on both sides of the House say that they are prepared to wait here until Christmas next. These are not my sentiments. There is too much child's play going on. Surely it is time that there was a compromise made—let us act like men. It has been stated by members from this side of the House that if there was an assurance that a General Election would be held this fall that business would be carried on with despatch and that the House would quickly close. Now I do not believe that the Government cares very much whether there is an election this fall or next fall and I am sure that I do not care either. But if a fall election is the only thing uppermost in some people's minds for heaven's sake let us have it and get out of the House. This is too small a thing to be considering. The main issue before us now are these Estimates. Let us remember that ten millions of dollars have to be found to pay our way. In fairness to the people of the country you cannot have increased taxation. Then let us get down to business, cut out the game of politics and study how we can retrench especially in view of the many public works that need immediate attention throughout the country at the present time.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: The objection that I make to the Public Accounts, as recently tabled in this House, and to the printed Estimates now under discussion is their obviously strict adherence to the old order of things. There is here absolutely no departure from the financial policy that has been the guiding rule of governments for a generation past. There is no disposition manifest to initiate a new order, to strike out along new lines and to endeavour thereby to improve the condition of our country and the condition of our fellow-countrymen generally. On more occasions than one elections have been won by parties raising the cry: "The Country Needs a Change!" I am using the slogan to-day, obviously not with electioneering intent, but because I am persuaded that unless fiscal reforms are undertaken, unless financial economy is practised and unless a radical alteration is effected in administrative methods in these particular connec-

tions, Newfoundland cannot hope to weather the breakers that are just ahead.

A few days ago, a member of the Opposition made some remarks in a public connection that called down the wrath of Government supporters on his head. Honourable gentlemen opposite and the newspapers that champion their political cause, were pleased to treat his words as having a revolutionary meaning. So, they subjected my associate to the strongest and severest hostile criticism, scornfully dubbing him "a revolutionist." They appeared to think that the use of the epithets "revolutionary" and "revolutionist" constituted the utmost of condemnation of the words or acts of any public man. Some stigma, they evidently decided, attached to such terms and to the man to whom they were applied. Of course, I am well aware, that denunciations of the sort to which I refer had nothing whatever of sincerity about them. The flag-flapping resorted to simply represented what the supporters of the Government regarded as good political tactics for the time and for the circumstances of the times. Opposition denunciations were hitting the Government so hard and Opposition criticisms were damaging the Government cause so badly that the first "red herring" to hand was eagerly grabbed and frantically and assiduously dragged back and forth across the trail of debate.

However, Mr. Cha rman, I am quite willing to meet champions of the Government upon debating ground of their own choosing. Let's talk of revolutions, of what they mean and all they involve. What does a revolution signify? Merely, according to the dictionary, "a total or radical change," a rooting up of evils or abuses. Or, alternatively, it signifies "a fundamental change in a political organization," or in the political order of things. That is, when a revolutionary change is effected in the conduct of public affairs, one digs down to the very foundation of things, and having prepared new foundations a stronger, sounder and more lasting edifice can be erected thereon. We cannot hope to ensure a change from a bad order of things to a better unless and until we stage a revolution. Some outstanding revolutions in history have been accompanied by bloodshed and it is usually of these we think when we apply the term revolutionary to any public man in an unflattering sense. But, there have been scores and scores of bloodless revolutions—revolutions in the commercial world, revolutions in financial connections and revolutions in the moral order of things. Nothing radical can be done and nothing can be fundamentally altered without revolutions and revolutionists to achieve the necessary changes.

Now, I want to point out to honourable members of this House generally that it was as a revolutionary that our present Prime Minister made his first appearance as leader of a political party in this country. His manifesto, embodying his political doctrines and his political undertakings was definitely and distinctly revolutionary. It was as such and it was on such platform that he was welcomed, endorsed and elected to power by the people of Newfoundland. The Monroe Manifesto of 1924 totally condemned the old political order and promised its complete destruction. It pointed out the urgent need for immediate and radical reforms. It promised reform activities. It outlined a programme of reform to which strict adherence was pledged. It was because the present Prime Minister preached along such definite lines and definitely promised such revolutionary changes in methods of administration of public affairs that the electorate returned his party to power and gave him a mandate as leader of the Government of Newfoundland. The com-

mon people, severely pinched by poverty recognized the need of radical change in political life. The business community, up against tremendous difficulties, endorsed his revolutionary proposals. The country generally, restless under its great burdens and generally dissatisfied with its harsh and trying conditions, hoped and for the most part believed the Monroe party would radically benefit them and their interests. The Leader of the present Government, then, had to enact a revolutionary role in order to secure the support of the majority of the electorate, and he came into office pledged to the adoption of revolutionary methods which would make it easier for the ordinary man to live and to earn a living which would give the business man a chance of escaping his own particular difficulties and which would make the lot of Newfoundlanders generally far less irksome than hitherto. There has been a disposition on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite to complain of the persistence with which members on this side of the House drag the Monroe Manifesto into the debates. One of the Government newspapers stated that readings and quotations from that Manifesto simply represented a waste of time and effort. It was inclined to censure Opposition members who indulged in the practice. I cannot agree with these legislative and newspaper critics of the Opposition at all. There is no previous standard of public life with which we can compare the Monroe regime. The founder of that regime totally condemned previous administrations and not only promised us something new and better than had ever hitherto been ours, but gave us exact specifications of the characteristics of the administrative edifice he proposed to erect. The ideals preached, the promises made and the undertakings given by the present Prime Minister are the standards with which we contrast his record in office. Hence, then, the persistence with which the Opposition refer to the Monroe Manifesto, read it, quote from it and keep it ever to the fore both in debates in this House and in discussions throughout the country.

That is why, then, I propose to undertake this afternoon a careful examination of that Manifesto, to note the references it makes to public affairs and to general conditions, to mark its diagnosis of the cause of our political ailments and to take cognisance of the remedies it prescribes for the cure of the ills of our body politic. Having done that, it is my intention to note just how nearly practice has coincided with precept under the Monroe regime, or, alternatively, the whole course of treatment was abandoned just as soon as opportunity was secured for giving it effect.

The Manifesto references of the present Prime Minister to general conditions observable at the time of the 1924 election were straight and to the point. They announced, first, a conviction that duty demanded the assumption of party leadership and that on that score and that score alone he had consented to assume the responsibility. Now, if there be one thing more admirable in the estimation of the world than another it is a man who not only possesses strong convictions but has the courage to assert them. From admiration of the courageous man to firm trust in him and his sincerity is the shortest of steps. The present Prime Minister did not hesitate to tell the people just what he thought of the position and prospects of the country. Solemnly and outspokenly, he warned them it was his conviction that a disaster menaced the country and that it was his duty to render what aid he could to avert that general menace. That is the sort of sturdy assertiveness that is calculated to carry a man far along the

road to any goal. It decided in favor of the Monroe Party the majority of the Newfoundland electors who went to the Polls. Blunt in his pronouncements, outspoken in his criticisms and hard-hitt'ng in his denunciations, the present Prime Minister was generally applauded for having "spoken like a man." But, strangely enough, those who applauded that gentleman for this displayed trait of character now resent and resent bitterly similar conduct on the part of the Opposit on when they turn the Prime Minister's weapons against himself and his administration. Strong and sincere convictions were presumed to have :nspired the nature and the terms of the Prime Minister's election time comments on the conduct of public affairs by other public men. Nothing but resentment is d splayed when the Monroe regime is discussed in similar terms by His Majesty's Opposition. The bluntness, straightforward critic sm and outspoken comments aimed at the Monroe regime are interpreted as inspired by prejudice rather than by sincere conviction. Press champions of the Government indignantly assert that the Opposit on are wilfully endeavoring to besmirch the reputation and to damage the credit of the country abroad. Obviously consistency is not included amongst the jewels of their political collect on.

I am very much struck too by the urgency of the references made by the Manifesto to what was represented as an existing menace to popular liberties. That note of warning had been so long a favorite with political demagogues and had been struck so frequently dur ng election campaigns that I had come to regard its usefulness and effectiveness as completely outworn. The events of 1924 proved I was altogether wrong. The present Prime Minister rung the changes again with marked success. He proclaimed to the people of Newfoundland that "the principles of a representative Assembly and responsible Government, for which your forefathers fought and suffered, 'Government of the People, by the People and for the People," the very essence of L'beralism, have been set at naught of late years," The people accepted it from him as a novel and altogether correct presentation of the state of affairs. That line of denunciatory argument was preached by Monroe candidates in 1924 from every political platform in the country. It helpmaterially to ensure the return of the Monroe Party to power. Used by the Opposit on Party in 1927, that same line of argument is dubbed as cheap sensationalism, a doctrine too ridiculously futile and unbiased to merit serious consideration. That was the d splayed attitude of champions of the Government on public platforms and in the press during the course of the bye-election campaign in the district of St. John's East. The voters were exhorted not to permit such political claptrap to stampede them into defeating the Monroe Government. Yet is there good and sufficient cause, far better cause than Mr. Monroe possessed in 1924, for warning the Voters that there does exist such a menace to Popular Liberties. Such is the admitted condition of the country, financially and economically, that prominent members of the Government are frankly discuss ng the advisability of the surrender of our Charter of Liberties for a period of years and the administration of public affairs by a Commission, which would funct on instead of the suffrage and in place of this representative Assembly. Obviously, then, the Monroe regime has stripped our democracy of its protection, instead of adding to its safeguards and has rendered any menace to popular liberties that may have existed n 1924 more real and more insistent than ever.

Then, again, Mr. Chairman, I find in the Manifesto under review some

very plain references to class rule and charges that that was the sort of regime that held sway under a previous administration. Much has been said and written of late about Bolshevism and the tactics it uses to set class against class; to ensure its own profit by trading on class differences. But I can find nothing in Bolshevik denunciations of the so-called ruling classes more specific, more calculated to incite class differences and class hatreds than the Monroe Manifesto declaration that public money has been "extorted from the people at large by grinding taxation." The idea, of course, was to conjure up imaginary enemies of the people before the eyes of the people, to play upon popular passions, to stir up popular resentment and to inflame popular anger. Those are the actics of Bolshevism precisely. Well, from crafty references to "grinding taxation" to sly insinuations that the Government of the day had "used the money of the many for the benefit of the favored few," is but a short step and the Monroe Manifesto makes haste to take it. The use of that sort of propaganda in every district in the country swept the present Government into power. Developments since 1924 have proven it was sheer, hollow pretence, a mere mouthing of empty phrases, catch-cries to fool the Electorate. It has reacted, though, and has since proven a boomerang against an administration that is really dominated by class interests, exploited for class interests and those favored few whose concerns are not coincident with those of the masses of our common people. Developments of the last three years have provided some severe shocks for the voters who trusted the Monroe Party so implicitly at the last general election; they have dispelled the delusions under which the electors were suffering; they have aroused the righteous wrath of those who were bluffed, deceived and betrayed.

That the people have now the right understanding of the present Government and have listed them correctly as foes of those who earn their living by the sweat of their brows is evident from the recent Opposition victories in bye-elections in the Districts of Fortune Bay and of St. John's East. The voters have delivered their verdict and it is to the effect that the present Government is a class Government but its record and its deeds have proven its lack of interest in the fishing classes and the working classes of the country generally. Thus is Barnum's dictum that while you can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, you cannot hope to fool all of the peoply all of the time, prove to be as correct in these times as when it was first made.

Dealing with financial conditions, the present Leader of the Government undertook to make changes and institute reforms calculated to create a heaven on earth, almost. Observing that "the condition of public finances is very bad," the Monroe Manifesto undertook to inaugurate a financial and economic revolution by, first of all, taking drastic action wherever it was needed. Such a preachment and such a promise could have but one signification, namely that immediate and strenuous and effective methods would be adopted for the relief of the people from crushing burdens imposed through extravagant expenditure which made necessary that "grinding taxation" to which I have already quoted the leader of the Monroe Party as referring during the general election campaign. The Monroe Manifesto abounds with specific pledges as to the reduction of expenditure. Its statements on this vital subject are definite and unequivocal, as for instance: "The trappings of Government are too costly"; and "the cost of the public Service must be reduced and efficiency increased"; and "public ex-

penditure must be drastically reduced" and again, "there are too many unearned salaries." The position taken is too plain and too emphatic to be misunderstood. St ll, if there be the slightest doubt harbored as to the attitude and intentions of the Leader of the Monroe Party, it is swept completely away when he declares through his Manifesto: "I shall enforce a policy of wise economy and retrenchment." There is the definite pledge, the spec fic undertakings to which the harassed and over-burdened voters of Newfoundland pinned their hopes and through which they confidently expected to be relieved and benefitted. It is not at all difficult for one possessed of knowledge of the circumstances of the times when this pledge was given to understand how potent it was in securing a pol tical victory for the Monroe Party. A great, a general and an overwhelming popular desire and demand for relief swept into office as a Government the party that had pledged such relief measures as the condition of the times necessitated.

It follows next, of corse, that the present Prime Min ster, having promised a reduction in expenditure, should next undertake to effect a corresponding relief in taxation and one which would result in substantial rel ef to the taxpayers generally. He promised in his Manifesto to do that, not only in respect to the rate of taxation, but also in respect to the manner in which taxation bore on the various classes of our population. Having taken the position that the people were being taxed grievously and for the benefit of the few, he pledges himself to a more equable distribution of tax burdens, to a policy whereunder general tax reductions shall benefit the working classes much more than the well-to-do. These points are made and these prom ses are given by the Leader of the present Government in the definite and specific terms used in his Manifesto, as follows: "The Customs Tariff requires readjustment, with a view especially to encourage the prosecution of the fisheries"; and, aga n: "I am personally favorable to a bounty upon fish caught, believing that the stimulating effect would abundantly repay the expenditure. . . . I promise that, if my Party be returned to power, a bounty shall be given." Seeing that the Monroe Manifesto was used throughout the general election of 1924 as a text from wh ch to preach, in every settlement in the country, a general reduction in taxation and a bounty on fish, it is not surprising that the Monroe promises, made under c rcumstances then existing, proved an .rresistible lure to the hard-pressed people of Newfoundland.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, to a great admiration for the political shrewdness respcnsible for the terms in which the criticisms made and undertakings given n the Monroe Manifesto are couched. Take, for instance, the very original terms in which Mr. Monroe's personal appeal to the electorate was couched: "I am no plausil le professional politician, no writer of pleasing promises intended to corrupt the Electorate, but a plain man of business, meaning what I say and trying to say what I mean. . . . . I shall endeavor to state simply and honestly the policy which I shall aim to carry out if entrusted by you with the Government." Coming from a man of high personal reputation, trusted and respected in commercial circles and of unsullied public record, such an appeal was calculated to be the most effective move ever staged in an election contest in this country. It realised the brightest hopes of those who staged it. The character and standing of the man who made the appeal; the nature and allurement of his promises, and rainbow-like glitter of the programme he outlined for his Government induced the majority of

our electors to accept the present Prime Minister as a deliverer of their political Israel.

Such was the policy outlined for the present Government Party when, in 1924, it fought the general election under Mr. Monroe. Such was the platform upon which that party appealed to the electorate. Such were the undertakings given by the Monroe Government in anticipation of its election to office. What has been the record of that Government since it won its victory of three years ago? What more regard has that Government showed for the demands and desires of the common people than did their predecessors in office? Popular rule was to be restored to its rightful perdominant position. Note, first, how that undertaking has been broken. The classic example is found in the circumstances preceding and surrounding the bye-election in the District of St. John's East. For months the pretence was kept up that there was doubt as to the meaning of the provisions of the Act governing the procedure of filling the vacancy created in that section of the electorate. The doubtful point was not decided by the Monroe Government in favor of the people. To those who demanded that that seat be filled before the expiration of the statutory six months, the Government retorted that the Act was not clear on that point, that a bye-election was inadvisable because it would cost money the country could not afford to spend, because it would have a most unsettling effect on business, because the District already had two representatives in the Assembly, and because a general election was only a few months distant and that then the whole district would be recast and its representation altered by the terms of the Re-Distribution Act. Memorials and petitions demanding the opening of the District were presented to Governor and Government. All were refused. The Government maintained firmly thir decision against a bye-election. Then, a few months later, the whole scene changed. A bye-election was held in another section of the country and the Government candidate was defeated. It was then decided that the Government should endeavor to elect a man in St. John's East to counteract the effect of the Fortune Bay defeat. So, in spite now of the alleged menace to business interests, in spite of the alleged unjustifiable expenditure of public moneys and in spite of the former claim that the District already had sufficiency of representation, the bye-election was staged. Why? Not because of public demands and not because of any desire to serve public interests, but because a party emergency called for action of that sort. There was never presented in all the political history of this country a more glaring instance of defiance of popular desires and popular interests on the one hand and of truckling to partisan interests on the other. The whole transaction covers the Monroe Government with shame, just as the result of the bye-election brought upon it the humiliation that its action under the circumstances and that its general record deserved.

Where, in the whole record of the present Governmnt in office, Mr. Chairman, do we find the slightest evidence of that strict economy and wise retrenchment that was promised the country by the Monroe Party? As a matter of fact, the financial policy of the Government has not only violated that promise and has not only been characterised by outrageous extravagance, but constitutes a violation of the present Prime Minister's pledge to restore popular rule to the Throne in this country. I have in mind, particularly, the Liquor Control Department, responsible for expenditures totalling over six hundred thousand dollars annually, and the Railway Commission, controlling the New-

foundland Railway, the maintenance and operation of which costs this country over three and three quarter millions of dollars per year. As far as the Liquor Control Department is concerned, the only amounts of which this House has cognisance are those representing the salaries of the three controllers, and totall.ng $13,000. For the rest of the expenditure of the Board we take no vote at all. The outlay of the huge sum of six hundred thousand dollars is left entirely to the discretion of the controllers. We are in exactly the same position in respect to the huge annual expenditure on the railway. That branch of the public serv.ce comes under our cognisance only when, as is usual, there is a deficit in operation and we are asked to vote the hundreds of thousands of dollars required to make good the loss. We have, then, two outstanding public departments placed in positions of extraordinary priv.lege and advantage by the Monroe Government. Public moneys, the property of the people of Newfoundland, are handled and expended by a few public men, while the representatives of the people are refused control of the manner in which such great expenditures are to take place. Over four million dollars of public funds are, by act of the Monroe Government, taken absolutely from the purview of the People's House. This House sedulously and jealously guards its ancient r.ght and privilege of voting public moneys and of dictating the purpose and the manner in which these moneys shall be spent. It is nothing less than a constitut.onal outrage that such enormous disbursements should be taken and kept beyond our ken. Special privileges are assigned a handful of politicians at the expense of the People's House and a principle if recogn zed and sustained that entails the most serious menace to popular rights and popular interests and that threatens, if it becomes general, to substitute a domineering bureaucracy for democratic rule through popular representatives elected through the exercise of the Franchise. Moreover, n rspect to these two public departments, the House of Assembly is deprived of another ancient right and privilege, that of considering and redressing gr.evances which may be referred to it by scores of public servants.

In the next place, Mr. Chairman, one discovers in the record of the present Government cause for finding fault with the illconceived purposes on which large expenditures of money have been made during the last three years. Not for many years to come, if ever, can the majority of these expensive undertakings be expected to make anything like adequate returns to the taxpayers of the country. First of these speculative undertakings is the highroads expenditure, to wh.ch two and a quarter million dollars of public moneys have been devoted during the last two years. That policy is based on nothing more tangible than the fact that every year thousands of tourists from the United States v sit Canada. When that policy was devised and put into effect no particular regard was paid to the circumstances under which the annual and temporary migration of Americans to Canada takes place, circumstances that do not now and never can apply to Newfoundland. Following an orig nal estimate of a little over a million dollars, there has been an actual expenditure of two million dollars on the construction of a new and elaborate dry dock here in St. John's. That expenditure was undertaken in spite of the lessons of the past, which taught us that there was not sufficient business available here to make even a half-million dollar dock profitable in operation. By a further expenditure of a million and a half dollars, part of the cross-country railway was re-railed and a big new

steamer was purchased to ply on Cabot Straits. The highroads, the dry dock, the railroad and the steamer Caribou, therefore, represent a total outlay of about six million dollars and the taxpayers of the country must shoulder an additional burden of over three hundred thousand dollars annually to take care of the interest on that borrowed money.

Possible, Mr. Chairman, the claim will be set up by the Government that the expenditures to which I refer were made necessary on public works to provide employment at a time when unemployment was almost general. I have heard no such statement made here, though I have in another place, and by a member highly placed in Government circles. Or, it may be contended that road construction, apart from its relief aspect and apart from the tourist traffic idea altogether, is always an undertaking that justifies itself because it increases public facilities of the most important and most necessary sort. To my mind, this much is certain, that, whether you regard the highroads policy as of value from a tourist standpoint, or a local facilities standpoint, purely and simply, it was badly conceived and it was just as badly enacted. Road construction and improvement were carried out in sections where they are of least value from a tourist standpoint and they were undertaken in portions of the country already possessed of fairly good road systems, while other portions are left with scarcely a semblance of any such system of roads at all. The highroads policy is objectionable because it is so glaringly discriminatory. The taxpayers of the country generally are assessed huge sums of money annually for the construction and maintenance of high grade roads radiating from St. John's., serving only a small section of the country and of special benefit only to a few hundred motor car owners and drivers. On the other hand, those out of whose pockets the money comes, the majority of them, at any rate, must be content with apologies for roads and must continue to suffer many avoidable hardships and inconveniences as they pursue their ordinary avocations. The same charge of illconceived plans can be made in connection with hotel provision for the mighty army of tourists that has been predicted as coming here to spill millions of money for our financial salvation. There is located in St. John's headquarters hotel that has no subsidiaries to feed and that therefore loses the major portion of its potential value and usefulness. The construction of that hotel was possible only through a Government guarantee of the bond issue and of the interest thereon. A special tourist steamer, which cost the country five hundred thousand dollars, is plying on Cabot Straits, landing tourists and other visitors at a port which has not modern hotel accommodation and which has no road facilities for taking sportsmen to the undoubtedly attractive resorts that would ordinarily be within easy reach of it. These are the bungling, the stupid, the extravagant and the altogether indefensible purposes for which six million dollars of public moneys have been spent by the Monroe Government. As a result of that illconceived and badly applied policy the taxpayers of Newfoundland must find out of earnings already too meagre for comfortable living, additional annual taxes to the amount of $300,000.

The general administrative policy of the present Government has so obviously not been that of "plain business" that it is condemned by so nonpartisan a critic as the Auditor General. The Leader of that Government, as one of his election undertakings, pledged the application of the principles of plain, serious and legitimate business to any administration of our public affairs which he should control. It is not necessary for me to ask this

House to accept my unsupported word that such a policy has not been pursued by the present Prime Minister since he came into office. I don't ask the country generally to accept from me a bare and unproven statement to that effect. I will go further and say that the case I am now presenting against the present Govt. is not my own at all but is one that has recently been stated by the Auditor General, the watchdog of the Treasury, of whose sincer ty of purpose and integrity of action many complimentary things have been said in this House during the present session, by such outstanding public men as the Prime M nister and the Minister of Finance and Customs.

Well, the Auditor-General, in his last report to this Legislature, asserts that considerations of political patronage control those who place orders for supplies for public institutions; that that system is persisted in though it costs the taxpayers some extra thousands of dollars annually, and that, in a word, favorites or supporters of the party in power to-day are subsidized with business orders at the expense of the country generally. On this subject the exact remarks of the Auditor-General are: "I should like to say a few words on the subject of patronage. It is only natural, other things being equal, that Governments should favour their friends and supporters in the matter of purchases for Government requirements, and to a great extent no objection can be taken to this, provided other things are equal—unfortunately, I have not always found them so. Of much greater importance than the matter of prices, which do not as a rule vary to any great extent from market prices, is the desire to purchase material that is not really required, in order to satisfy the constant demands for orders by political supporters. Purchases should be governed by the actual requirements of a department, not by the desire of political friends to increase their sales." In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Auditor-General not only finds that the policy of subsidizing party supporters with Government orders prevents purchasing for public institutions at prices that are the cheapest obtainable, but he finds also that purchases are made of goods that are not required at all, simply and solely to satisfy the importunities of political partisans. In either case, in both cases, of course, the taxpayers have to foot the bills. The Auditor-General admonishes against the continuance of such procedures. Admonitions of that sort are, admittedly, frequently necessary to ordinary politicians, to ordinary human beings playing the political game to best party advantage and regardless of consequences, but surely not to a Government that came into power on the strength of such high pre-election ideals and with a mandate to effect immediate and specific reforms in procedures of just this sort. Yet, it is found that the present Government have as grievously sinned in such connections as have thir predecessors in office. They have been as ready, as willing to exploit office to political advantage as those whose practices they condemned before they themselves were boosted to power.

The Auditor-General next proceeds to state it as his firm conviction that thousands of dollars could be saved annually to the Treasury and to the taxpayers of Newfoundland by strict adherence to the contract system of purchase as provided by law. Now, the Prime Minister is, by his own election-time declaration, a plain business man of plain business methods. If he is going to have a particular job done in the ordinary way of plain business, he takes care to call for tenders, to choose the lowest offer submitted and then to make a contract to bind the tenderer to the

figures mentioned. That was the policy he promised the electors to adopt in connection with the conduct of public business, of the business that has to be subsidized by the taxpayers generally. Perhaps, the Prime Minister, busy man that he is, has hitherto been ignorant of the fact that the practice followed in some departments of his Government have been so utterly at variance with his pledges. He cannot plead such ignorance now. He cannot plead ignorance of the comments, the warnings and the admonitions of the Auditor-General, because I am now bringing them squarely and definitely to his attention. I have not much hope of reforms, however, because I find that the Auditor-General complains he has frequently made similar observations before, even during the term of office of the present Government, and that his remarks have been unheeded and his advice has been refused. The Auditor-General says: "I strongly advocate a return to the contract system of purchase of supplies, particularly provisions . . . I am firmly of opinion that thousands of dollars could be saved to the Colony annually, if the contract system were generally used." And again, "I have repeatedly, in my Report to the Legislature, and in communications addressed to the Government from time to time, referred to this important matter." And, still more important: "I have still to complain of the lack of interest taken by officials in charge of open-vote expenditures in the matter of economy. There seems to be no desire to 'cut the garment according to the cloth.'" If business concerns or private individuals could not afford to spend money for a particular object, they would do without it. Should not the Government be equally wise? It seems to me to be futile for the Legislature to vote a certain sum for a certain service, considering it to be sufficient, with proper economy, to meet the requirements of that service, if the Government, or heads of the departments, willfully ignore the implied instruction, spend what they think fit and then look for a supplementary supply which, judging from the past, does not seem difficult to be obtained." The Auditor-General, in effect, complains that he has notified the Governments of waste and of extravagance in public departments, that he has advised as to the proper and effective remedies and that a Government, headed by a plain business man of plain business methods, has refused to pay any heed to him. Officials refuse to cut the garment of departmental expenditures according to the cloth of voted supplies, the limits set by this House are ignored and exceeded, but our plain business Prime Minister refuses to take the active steps necessary for putting a stop to such an arrogant and extravagant procedure. What a commentary on the value of the economy and clean-up pledges on which the present Government was boosted into office! The Estimates are now under consideration by this Committee show increased expenditures totalling $277,000. Supplementary Supply and Additional Estimates have yet to be brought into this House. They will represent many hundreds of thousands of dollars more. Yet, this is the Government party which is headed by a leader who, during the General Election of 1924, pledged the country to adopt a policy of wise economy and retrenchment!

It is significant of the attitude of the Government of the day, Mr. Chairman, that none of these huge expenditures have been made particularly on behalf of the common people of the country. It is true that these expenditures have involved employment of our laborers, but we have no assurance, even, that they were undertaken with this idea in mind. As

a matter of fact, one of the extraordinary expenditures that was formerly made in the peculiar interest of the bulk of our population of fishermen and workmen has now been cut out. I am referring to the vote of $150,000 that has been omitted from the Estimates as at present before us. That sum was used to supplement district grants for roads, bridges and marine works and, being spent per capita, was found of general and uniform benefit throughout the country. Before passing on to consider the significance of this omission, permit me to observe that, had that amount of $150,000 been voted for the purposes mentioned and in the usual way, the total of the Estimates for 1927-28 would have represented an increase of $527,000 over the Estimates for last year. The actual expenditure policy of the Government of the day, therefore, is in striking contrast to the undertakings made to the electors by the leader of that Government. It embodies nothing that even remotely resembles wise economy and retrenchment. It does, though, embody features of very unwise and unfair economy and retrenchment. If only because of the discrimination in evidence, I would strongly object to those huge expenditures on highroads or motor roads, dry dock and railroad and tourist steamer. Because where six million dollars could be found for these purposes and the ordinary taxpayer is being forced to pay annual interest charges of $300,000 thereon, the expenditure was not only not in the interests of the people generally, but the fishermen and other working classes are now being deprived of the special road, bridge and marine grants, totalling $150,000 that were formerly made on their behalf. I represent here what is, to all intents and purposes, exclusively a fishing district. Knowing conditions in that district I know that those who undertook the huge expenditures on the works to which I have referred have not paid any attention at all to the interests of my fishermen-constituents. The district of Fortune Bay is destitute of many of the ordinary facilities that are usually afforded at the public expense. Very few marine works are to be found and even some of the larger settlements, the scene of big herring and other fishing activities, are without public wharves. In the smaller settlements it has been found impossible to obtain even the few hundred dollars necessary for constructing dock slips on which the fishermen can draw up their boats beyond the reach of destructive seas. There are very few miles of main roads in the District and such local roads as are worth calling roads are a disgrace to our country and to those in charge of her affairs. The worst roads to be found around Conception Bay or in northern sections of the country are boulevards, compared with those with which Fortune Bay District fishermen must be content. The explanation, or excuse, given for this neglect is that there is no money. The same contention is set up when a demand is made that the Government respect its pledge to give a bounty on fish.

The policy of the present Government since they came into office more nearly approaches one of neglect of the fisheries, instead of the assistance and encouragement promised in the Monroe Manifesto of 1924. There was, for instance, the definite promise made of a bounty on fish. I am not claiming that a bounty on fish is financially possible in this country under present circumstances. I am not claiming that a bounty on fish is economically desirable or defensible at any time. I do not claim it is good business for a Government to pay such a bounty, nor do I assert that payment of bounties would be bad business on the part of any Government. What I am attempting to point

out is that the Prime Minister is on record as declaring his own faith in such a policy and that, in his Manifesto, he gave a specific pledge to pay a bounty on fish for the assistance and encouragement of those engaged in our staple industry. His Government have not excused themselves for their breach of faith with the people in this connection. They have made half-hearted explanations based on an alleged shortage of money. Apparently, they have found it easy enough to secure the huge sums of money necessary for financing undertakings of no immediate or prospective value to the common people of the country. I consider, therefore, sir, that I take a reasonable stand when I claim that the interests of the majority of our people are neglected, when millions of money are spent on speculative enterprises like motor roads and a huge dry dock, while at the same time those engaged in our great staple industries are denied the assistance they were promised and that the circumstances and needs of the times appear to dictate should no longer be withheld. There is a displayed eagerness to induce and to encourage new industries to locate here, but there is not the same readiness to assist our languishing fishing industries, on which our people have lived for generations past and from which the great bulk of them must continue to draw a living for many more generations to come.

There is one particular connection, Mr. Chairman, in which I consider the present Government have done rank injustice to the fishermen of the country and that is in the manner in which the close season on the lobster fishery was inaugurated. I am not claiming that there was no justification for instituting such a close season. Personally, I believe that that action was not only necessary, but had been far too long delayed. It constituted the only means whereby our once great and profitable lobster fishery could be saved from the total destruction that menaced it. The injustice was perpetrated by closing the industry practically without notice to those engaged in it, by throwing thousands of people out of employment without making provision for their relief or in the way of remuneration for gear that was as certainly destroyed by that legislation as if the Government had sent round officials to see that almost the last vestige was removed. That gear and that equipment will be idle for years; by the time the fishery is reopened it will be worthless. I judge that each lobster fisherman owned gear worth an average of $200 per man. At least three thousand people were engaged in the industry when the close season came in. The total value of gear, boats and equipment affected, therefore, is not less than $800,000. At least half a million dollars' worth will have been rendered useless when the close season ends. All along the Southwest Coast, the banks are piled high with gear formerly used by lobster fishermen. Thousands of lobster pots have been thrown here and there along the shore because the fishermen have no storage room for them. When they are free to resume this occupation, these fishermen must get entirely new outfits to replace those they lost. It is a striking commentary on the sincerity of the Government that, attaining power by virtue of its promises of encouragement of the fisheries, one of its earliest acts should be destructive to the interests of a considerable section of our fishing population. The fishermen have not only not received the extra encouragement and special assistance promised them, through a bounty on fish, through general economy in expenditure and reduced taxation; exactly the opposite has been their experience under the regime of

the Monroe Government. Now, in these days, when profitless fisheries the cost of living and general unemployment are driving the fishermen from their ordinary local avocations to seek work and wages abroad, the Government that has broken faith with them and played them false is enacting legislation whereunder even their passage money is to be taxed to provide funds wherewith to induce tourists to come here.

The Manifesto of the present Prime Minister asserted the necessity for financial readjustment calculated to reduce public expenditures and lighten the burden of general taxation. At the last session of this House there was appointed a Finance Commission to enquire into details of such expenditures and to make recommendations that would enable the Government to effect economics. What has become of that Commission- Why has it not reported to this Assembly? Why are not some of the results of its investigations and its activities visible in the Estimates now being considered by this Committee? Perhaps the trouble is that the Commission in visiting some of the departments have encountered officials who are not interested in the practice of economy in connection with the expenditure of public moneys. The Auditor General had previously met some of these extravagant gentry. If the Auditor General failed to induce in them a proper sense of their duty, it would not be at all surprising if the three politicians who composed the Finance Commission met even less of success in some of these quarters.

I find fault, Mr. Chairman, not only with the general policy of the Government but also with the particular personal attitude displayed by the Prime Minister. The Leader of the Government occupies something more than the chief official position in the administration. It was on the personal undertaking that he gave the electors to abolish the old order of things, to set up a new and better regime, to reform public administration and to lighten the burdens of the people, that his party was returned to power in 1924. The hopes of the people of the country centred round the Prime Minister personally and particularly; because they regarded him apart from and likely to remain aloof from politics as ordinarily played in this country. They knew that the Prime Minister would have to associate with many of the old school of politics; they realised that he would have to depend on such politicians, or a considerable number of them, for the maintenance of the majority on which a continuation of his Government had to depend, but they had faith in him as a man who held strong convictions as to what was right and what was wrong, a man who had the courage to apply as well as to enunciate those convictions, and one who would rather quit office than be put in the position of being charged with being false to the trust that the electorate had reposed in him. So, the other day, when questions as to possible public economies addressed to the Prime Minister were referred by him to one of his ministers, it occurred to me that that was scarcely the attitude for a public man of his standing and his reputation to assume. It might be quite the thing for an ordinary politician but not for a politician of the alleged and reputed type of the Prime Minister, to whom our people are looking for a tight grip on the reins of Government, for a firm hand in reducing waste and extravagance and for that retrenchment and that economy he promised them three years ago. If the present Prime Minister does not personally intervene in matters of finance, and if he does not steadily and persistently assert himself in all such connections, then it is perfectly useless for the country to expect public economies on any general scale, because the bulk

of his associates simply admit to being ordinary politicians who are content to play the game of politics in the ordinary way. I again emphasise my conviction that the hopes of the country are centred on the Prime Minister and on him alone. Should he continue to disappoint them, or should he fail them utterly, then I feel that such general desperation and cynicism will be created throughout the country that it will be almost useless, almost unreasonable to exhort the electorate to place their faith in any other public man. They will scarceely care to risk repeating such a bitter experience.

Another definite promise made by the present Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, by those associated with him as party candidates, by his party press and by those who canvassed for him throughout the country, was that the abuses due to public expenditures by Minute of Council would be abolished by his Government, if elected to office. Discussions of this subject inspired the fiercest denunciations of opponents of the Monroe Party. The practice was represented as an invasion of the rights of the House of Assembly. The right of elected representatives of the people to allocate public moneys and to specify the purposes for which they were to be used were declared thus to be arrogated to the few politicians composing the Executive Council. It was contended that the proper place to vote moneys and the only place in which such moneys should be voted was the Peeople's House. It was strenuously and persistently argued that those and only those who were elected to represent the people who had to pay the taxes from which these expenditures are derived should be permitted to make financial appropriations and allocate them for any purposes soever. It was asserted that the success of the Monroe Party would result in the immediate discontinuance of this practice and the disappearance of this abuse, as it was described, and that there would at once be a reversal to the proper constitutional practice of voting all moneys in this House in Legislative Session convened. Thenceforward, we were assured, the rigidly correct practice would be adhered to strictly. The fate of this Monroe promise has been that of the others to which I have already made reference in the course of my remarks. Public moneys have been voted by Minute of Council since the Monroe Party came into power, as and when it suited those who were pledged to abolish the practice. The remarks of the Auditor General, previously quoted by me, have a specific bearing on this subject. So, too, has this statement and this complaint of his: "While reiterating my protest in last year's report, I wish to call attention to an added danger. Expenditure by Order in Council has a tendency to weaken the salutary effect of pre-audit." It was, this Committee, will remember, by checking over accounts before as well as after payments were made, that the Auditor General hoped to prevent some repetitions of the abuses and the extravagances of the past. Now he complains that the perpetration of abuses by the Monroe Executive Council brings to naught his efforts to prevent the occurrence of irregularities amongst the rank and file of the Civil Service.

The Prime Minister, sir, had a great deal to say in his Manifesto about amounts of money paid by former administrations to civil servants for extra services. He roundly denounced the practice as indefensible and promised its discontinuance. Strong endorsation of his remarks in this connection was made by an Executive member of the p resent Government, who designated the practice as demoralising, almost criminal and an incentive to laziness. The practice has not been abolished, however; it is still being continued by a Government party that

promised to abolish all real or imaginary evils and abuses in public life and to undertake reforms here, there and everywhere in methods of administration. In his most recent Report to the Legislature the Auditor General states that extra payments of the sort I am discussing totalled $15,-346.18 fo r the year ending March 31, 1927. That large amount was distributed amongst officials of the various departments as follows: Marine and Fisheries, $2,508.05; Colonial Secretary's, $4,145.00; Justice Department, $600.00; Assessor of Taxes, $1,194.91; Charities Department, $1,793.00; Government Engineer's Department, $3,-499.90; Agriculture and Mines, $533.-34; Customs Department, $1,000. Thus the present Government h ave perpetrated in practice that which they roundly denounced as an abuse during their general election campaign and that which they straitly promised the electors they would discontinue immediately after their return to office. Mention is also made in the Auditor General's Report of new pensions created since last session of this House, and totalling $7,300.00. Salaries were increased by Order in Council to the extent of practically $5,000.00, whi le the Executive Council also made many new appointments, the salaries therefor totalling $12,-000.00. All these increased expenditures were absolutely without sanction of the Legislature and can be so sanctioned only if and when honorable gentlemen here present vote in approbation of them.

The Auditor General c alls attention to another very startling fact. It is that during the last financial year there were made to officials already permanently employed in the Civil Service payments totalling the large amount of $26,000. Not a dollar, not a cent of these payments was authorised by the Governor in Council, even. If it be wrong in practice for a Government to make payments on the sole authority of Orders in Council, and if it be inadvisable for this House to countenance these payments by legalising them, how much worse is it for departmental heads to undertake such payments on their own sole responsibility and how can the Government expect honorable members to indemnify them fo r such absolutely illegal practices?

The Auditcr General has already been quoted by me as censuring severely the extravagant tendencies of some officials. In the part of his report from which I am now quoting he mentions figures that give us some idea of the tremendous financial extent to which irresponsible and wasteful civil servants can involve the country. During the last year, Mr. Chairman, there were overdrafts or over-expenditures by the various departments of the Crown running up to the staggering total of $280,000.00. Now, I don't charge that all that money was dissipated uselessly or extravagantly. I claim, however, that there is something highly irregular and very objectionable about a system that permits of an administration expending almost $300,000.00 more than this House has decided is necessary for certain public services. Here are the words of the Auditor General himself on this matter: "All payments on account of extra services, new pensions, increases to salaries, salaries for new appointments and overdrafts, in short, all expenditures for which there is no Legislative autority have been disallowed by me, no repayment being made therefrom from the Exchequer Account. It, therefore, remains as a debit balance in the Bank of Montreal of each department making such pay ment. This indebtedness will not be covered unless and until provision is made for it by the Legislature under Supplementary Supply." In other words, the Government, having failed in it undertakings to the electorate, having

broken its pledges to the people, having indulged in all the practices it had denounced as irregular and objectionable and as such to be abolished utterly and without delay, and having exceeded by $280,000.00 the amount of moneys it had any legal authority to expend, now approaches this House with the request that we here condone their insincerity, their breach of trust and their financial irregularities by a vote of indemnity.

I next call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the strong Monroe Manifesto references to what are termed "unearned salaries." They, too, were to go into the discard when the Prime Minister had staged his revolution in local administrative affairs. I have not gone thoroughly into the Estimates now before this Committee, but I have examined them in sufficient detail to discover a considerable number of what appeal to me as "unearned salaries" within the scope of the meaning of the term as employed by the Leader of the present Government. I regard these salaries as "unearned" because they attach to positions that are, relatively speaking, useless and are paid to officials whose services could readily be dispensed with. As an instance of such unearned salaries, I take the amount of $8,000 paid for two members of the Liquor Control Board. I note, by the way, that that department is costing the country $13,000 for management now, whereas, under the previous administration the cost was less than $3,000. At any rate, there are now three liquor controllers who, as I have just said, enjoy between them salaries of $13,000, an utterly unnecessary and unjustifiable expenditure, for the most part. The chairman of that Board, who is paid the very respectable salary of $5,000 per year, is quite capable of doing the work himself, without the assistance of his two present colleagues. Again, when the highroads policy was inaugurated the country was informed that administration of the finances of the Commission w ould cost nothing extra. On account of the railroad having changed hands, it was represented that the Government Engineer, who had very little to do, could take over this additional work and responsibility. As a matter of fact it was explained that his activities as chairman of the Highroads Commission would really justify his continuance in receipt of his annual salary of $4,600. What do we discover now? That, according to the Public Accounts, the Government Engineer last year was paid $1,400, in addition to his regular salary of $4,600; that his assistant in a department where we were told there was so little to do got an addition of $1,000 to his regular salary of $2,400. The $2,400 extra payments made to these two gentlemen I would unhesitatingly list amongst the "unearned salaries" of our Civil Service. Let us consider next the relative value of the services of the Government Analyst who receives an annual stipend of $3,800. The gentleman occupying that position is just back to this country after a couple of years in England, superintending the Newfoundland exhibit at Wembley. During his lengthy sojourn I never heard of anybody missing him overmuch, nor am I aware that research work suffered any injury or that the business of assaying minerals was unduly protracted. If we got along so comfortably without him for a couple of years, I feel confident, Mr. Chairman, that we could continue to do so and could at the same time save his annual salary of $3,800. The Estimates, I notice, provide for an Archivist at $1,800 per year. Who is this official; what does he do; to whom does he report, and is he indispensable to the wellbeing of the general public? Two moving picture censors are paid $625 between them. They are probably as valuable in their activities as is the archivist. A couple of gentle-

men who adorn the Pensions Commissioners Board with their occasional presence receive, each, $750 per year. I hapen to know that the work of that department is done by the chairman, who could get along quite comfortably, even though he were derprived of the assistance of these two colleagues of his. I have cited but a few of the many instances discoverable of payments that can reasonably be list- are to be found here, too, salaries provided for in these Estimates. There are to be found here, too, salaries for officials not yet appointed. I understand that the practice in such cases has been to divide up such appropriations amongst other officials in the departments concerned. Through casual scrutiny of the Estimates, I have shown how the respectable saving of at least $25,000 can be made. Other and much larger economies could be effected by noting the other numerous unearned and useless salaries provided for and by cutting them out.

We have got now, Mr. Chairman, to where we can proceed to contrast the Monroe undertakings in respect to expenditures and to taxation generally with the actual record of the Government in office. This Committee must remember that the undertaking given was for such a revolution in financ al methods that wise economy and rigid retrenchment would be practiced consistently and persistently. What has been the record of the present Government in that respect? Certainly not one of reduction of expenditure. Most assuredly not one calculated to lighten the tax burdens of the people. Taxes have been increased, rather than reduced. Still heavier burdens have been imposed on the taxpayers. The Monroe Tariff of 1925 was responsible for an annual increase of at least $750,000 in taxation. Every year, the Estimtes submitted to this House show higher totals for expend ture. This year the Estimates represent the huge increase of over $400,000. Obviously, then, neither retrenchment nor economy is given any consideration by the administration now in power. Th s session had scarcely commenced before a fresh increase in taxation was announced, to take the form of reimposition of the Income Tax, from which an addit onal revenue of $300,000 is anticipated. In other words, expenditure has been so great and so wasteful; the Government's financial policy has been so irresponsible and so extravagant, that the financial demands on this House and on the taxpayers of the country generally become greater and more str.ngent as the years pass and as session succeeds session. The Government has not made and is not making, nor does it appear to propose to make, any sincere effort to undertake that economy and reduction of public expenditures that is a condition precedent to the lessened taxat on ardently desired and badly needed by the people of Newfoundland.

In one connection, Sir, and in one only has the present Government reduced taxation during its term in office. The Income Tax and the Bank Tax were abolished early in the regime of the Government. Relief from this spec al taxation was given to persons and corporations well able to carry the extra burdens. In three years the banks and business men and salaried men have been relieved of the necessity of paying over to the treasury taxes totalling more than one million dollars. Seeing that the ordinary rate of expend ture has been maintained, that huge amount has had to be found elsewhere so that the Revenue could be maintained. The million dollars has been made up by the imposition of additional tax burdens on classes not so capable of shoulder ng them. Because of this tax relief of the well-to-do, the general public have been forced to pay increased taxes on almost all the neces-

sities of life. The fishermen, particularly, has had to pay them on his lines and twines, his nets, his traps, his salt, his boots and his butterine. Increased taxation has made it still more expensive and still more difficult than hitherto to perform his work and to earn his livelihood. The common people have to pay more taxes, but they are getting less service than hitherto. All over the country there goes up a demand for the provision of new public works and for repairs to such necessities as roads, bridges and marine works. These demands have been denied. The ordinary man will get still less consideration in connection with public expenditures once these estimates are through Committee. Even the one hundred and fifty thousand dollars formerly included for use in very ordinary and very necessary connections has, as I have already pointed out to honorable members, been stricken out altogether. The numerous charges made of discrimination against the ordinary people in this matter of public expenditures are strikingly proven by consideration of the manner of disposition of one million dollars appropriated from the five million dollar loan floated last year. That mill on dollar appropriation was supposed to be spent on the provision of new public works and the improvement of such as already existed. It was so ear-marked in the statement of purposes for which the loan was being raised. Recently, and in answer to a question, the Minister of Public Works tabled a statement in respect to the expenditure of $775,000 of the total of one million dollars. A few quotations from the statement will give the Committee and the country generally an idea of the manner in which that huge amount of money was allocated and spent. The first item shows that over one hundred thousand dollars were spent on able-bodied poor relief. A quarter of a million dollars was given to the Highroads Commission to spend on motor roads. Almost one hundred thousand dollars wast taken out of the appropriation to pay English lawyers who acted for us on the Labrador Boundary Case. Thousands of dollars went to the Tourist Publicity Bureau and to its representative in the United States. In short, most of the portion spent was diverted from the real purpose for which it was allocated. Very little was spent on undertakings of actual benefit to the bulk of our people. What has become of the balance of one quarter of a million dollars I don't know and, apparently, the Minister of Public Works is unable to give me the information.

That, Mr. Chairman, is the record of the present Government in respect to its pre-election undertakings generally and in respect to its financial policy particularly. In his Manifesto, the honorable the Leader of the present Government made some observations on statements that appeared in the Manifesto of his opponent, the honorable the Leader of the present Opposition. Because of the comments of that last mentioned gentleman on public affairs, because of the promises made and undertakings given therein, the Leader of the Monroe Party was pleased to refer to his opponents as "hypocrites." He treated them as pretenders. He dealt with them as men who were endeavoring by bluff and deceit to obtain the support of the people of the country. What terms must we, then, apply to the Leader of the Government and his supporters here, in view of the failure of that leader and his party to carry out express, specific and definite undertakings to the people of the country during their three years' term of office? Anything more moderate than hypocrites strikes me as being altogether inadequate to describe the case. If those who opposed the present Prime Minister in the general election of 1924 wrote themselves

down as hypocrites in intention, surely the present Government have proven themselves hypocrites in fact.

When the present debate started, Mr. Chairman, the Opposition made a demand of the Finance M nister for the production of the Budget and Loan Bill for discussion in conjunction with these Estimates. Substantial reasons were advanced in support of the demand. There is no precedent against such a procedure, ndeed there are a numl er of precedents to justify it. The inspiration of the demand is discoverable in the admission of the Prime Minister, earl er in this session, that the Revenue for last year shows a deficit of a million and a half dollars, while there will t e another deficit of three quarters of a million dollars on account of losses on railway operations. We thus have a shortage on current account of two and a quarter mill on dollars to be made up some way or other. The Estimates show increased expenditures totalling over four hundred thousand dollars. Adding all these amounts together and taking into account other outstanding obligations of the Government, the huge sum of three million dollars :n excess of actual revenue returns has to be found. If there t e justification for undertaking the expenditure of nine million dollars under these Estimates; if there t e any reasonal le t asis for mainta ning expenditure to such a tremendous degree, why not show us cause and why not make plain your justification? Whence is the money to come to meet the charges incurred :n these Estimates? The Estimates show increased expenditure and a Revenue deficit of over two m llions of dollars has to t e met. What Ways and Means do the Government propose to adopt to meet that over-expenditure and to liquidate those deficits? This House, the whole Country is anxious at out the prospects of additional taxation. That, of course, is inev table under present circumstances. But, what form, other than that of the re-imposition of the Income Tax, is it to take? What is to be proposed in the way of money raised on the credit of the country? To what extent are the taxpayers to t e obligated in respect to new loans and of interest on these loans, of necess ty? These are questions demanding immediate and satisfactory answers. On the nature of these answers depends, to a great extent, the attitude that the Opposition will eventually assume in respect to the totals represented in the Estimates now under considerat on. Most assuredly, the Opposition will not vote for expenditures that entail additional taxation of a people who are already groaning under the t urden of tax rates more oppressive than the country has ever had to carry.

Yesterd y, Sir, wh le answering an observation made t y a meml er of the Opposition, the Prime Minister stated that he felt too much in the way of party politics was being displayed in this House, particularly in connection with financial matters. Personally, I do not plead guilty to any such charges. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that the demand of the Opposition for the production of Budget and Loan Bill at the same time as the Estimates, showing us not only the extent of our expenditure but ways and means whereby it is to t e met, constitutes not partisan politics, but true statesmanship. That is the only common ground of meeting and of deli t eration and action possi t le to t oth sides of this House at this juncture. Only through del t erations so staged can we hope to reach the proper t asis of a policy for cutting our financial garments according to the available cloth. Only by the adoption of such a procedure can we hope to obtain unanimous consent to the very necessary economies. Surely an opportunity such as this, of cutting down expend ture, of abolishing unearned salaries and dismissing useless officials, of reduc-

ing taxation and affording overdue relief to the general body of our taxpayers, will not be ignored or neglected by the Prime Minister or by the gentleman particularly concerned with the conduct of these Estimates through this Committee, the Minister of Finance and Customs.

MR. GRIMES — Mr. Chairman: I have been in the House for most of the address by Doctor Mosdell on the Estimates, and I noticed the indifference that has been manifested by members on the other side. The Minister of Finance goes to sleep in his chair.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I must object to this—I have not been asleep.

MR. GRIMES—There is no question about it that the question we have before us is one that requires more serious thought than most members in this House have given to it. We are asked to-day to pass these Estimates without having the knowledge as to where the money is to come from. The total amount for the carrying on of the Government for 1926-1927 is estimated at $10,000,000 and despite the fact that the revenue was short last year to the extent of two and a half millions, we are today asked to vote Estimates to the extent of $10,000,000 without knowing where it is coming from. I read with a great deal of interest previous to 1923 the speeches and the addresses that were made in the various institutions in this country and in St. John's particularly and in the debating societies as well, about the waste and the extravagance in connection with the running of Government that was carried on by the Government of that day. The Board of Trade had meeting after meeting and the different debating societies treated it in like manner. The members of the present Government, some of them, were loud in their exclamation as to the need for economy in the running of the Government. And they also stated that it was possible to reduce expenditure to the extent of one and a half millions. And now we have had these gentlemen in charge of the affairs of the country for the last three years, and up to the present there has been no indication that they meant what they said, or that they have made any serious effort to carry out the promises that they made to the people at that time. Now when the present Government came into power the people of this country were rife for a reduction of expenditure. That is my conviction from the experience that I had in travelling through the country that the people of this country were prepared for sacrifices in the way of a reduction of salaries, and a reduction of expenditure on public improvements in order that the country may be able to get on an even keel again without having recourse to borrowing, and paying interest charges on our debt every year. I say that there was never a time in the history of Newfoundland, when the people of the country were more ready to make sacrifices, than they were when the Monroe Government came into power. And a great many of the people were fully convinced that because the leader of the Government was interested in the business of the country, that his promises were going to be faithfully carried out. But to-day a large number of the supporters of the present Government and admirers of the present Government, are sadder and wiser men. Instead of decreasing expenditure they are increasing it all the time. Instead of the debt of the country remaining stationary or being reduced it has been added to to the extent of $12,000,000. And next year we will have another five millions added to it. So that the people to-day are generally disappointed over the failure of the Government to carry out its promises that it made

in 1924. If there had been any industrial policy carried on by the present Government it would have enabled the people of this country to keep up their earning power at least to what it was in 1923, there might have been some justification for allowing the expenses of the Government to remain as they were because the people would be able to carry their extra expenditure. But that is not the history of the country in the last four years or three years. We find that the earning power of the people instead of remaining the same it has decreased and that is borne ut by the decline in the revenue that was shown for last year. Now I do not say that all of the decline in the revenue was attributable to the decline in earning power; it was probably due to the reduced cost of goods coming into the country, but a very large portion of it is due to the decreased earning power of the people. Now we all like to feel hopeful about 'he future of the country. None of us care, or at least we ought not be always crying about the conditions of the country. But certain it is that we ought to face that fact that is before us. We ought to recognize that there is no doubt whatever about the earning power of the country decreasing; that the revenue is declining; that the expenses of the Government are increasing rapidly and that if we are to avoid bankruptcy and ruin, that is threatening the country, for five or six years longer, there is only one way in which that can be done and that is by reducing the expenses of the Government. And not only is the declining earning power of the people borne out by what we see in revenue returns, and you can go to the different cinemas and ask the different proprietors of these places if these places are patronized to the same extent as they were a year ago. And the answer is "No." That the revenue is declining, and when you ask them why they say that it is because the people are not attending in the same numbers as they have been. You have various men on the different sports committees in this town and they tell a tale about the attendance at garden parties, and other sport gatherings, at football, etc. The numbers at these are not near as large as they were a year or two ago. The people have not as much to spend as they did in years gone by. Ask the store-keepers around the town of St. John's what their experiences are in connection with the laboring and working classes that deal with them considerably. What is their opinion as to the trade that they are doing. They will tell you that in their experience it is more difficult to collect bills to-day than a year ago. And in many cases they cannot collect them at all. No man is as well off as he was a year ago. and consequently there is not the same amount of trade doing as there was last year or the year previous. And I have no doubt whatever but 'hat the greater portion of the members of this House are acquainted with the conditions that are prevailing to-day in St. John's and throughout the country, and not only in the country do these conditions prevail but all through the country with the exception perhaps of Buchan's Mine or around Grand Falls or in the Humber section. But take around Trinity District and Harbour Main and practically every district in the island with the exception of the settlements that I have mentioned, and you will find many that will tell you that trade to-day is far worse than it was last year. We have been accustomed now for a number of years to be talking about what a splendid thing it is in this country to be able to say that everybody is employed. To see them in the happy position where they will be able to bring up their families and train them, and

feel that they will be able to educate them as they ought to be educated. But I don't think that any gentleman to-day if he is seriously interested in the common people of this country will sit down passively in this House and allow these Estimates to go through which instead of arresting the decreased earning power of the people so as to leave the incomes the same as they were a year ago, but to sit down and see this expenditure going on greater than ever, and that it of necessity must cut in still more upon the declining incomes of the great mass of the people who contribute the greater part of the revenue to the country. I cannot see how any member in this House if he has to go to face his constituents again, and he was asked, knowing the conditions that prevail in the country at the present time, how he could sit calmly in the Hous of Assembly and vote for the increase of expenditure that he denounced so strongly in 1923-1924, would he be able to look his constituents straight in the face and say that he did the best thing he could during the three or four years that he was representing them. No, sir, there has not been any serious consideration given to this problem of expenditure in connection with revenue of the country. It was pointed out by members now sitting on that side of the House that the Coastal Service could be reduced, considerably. That the supplying of the various institutions of the country to-day could be done on a much cheaper basis, in fact one member has gone so far as to say that at least one hundred thousand dollars could be saved in connection with the running of public institutions in this country by the adoption of the contract system which was referred to by the member for Fortune this afternoon. Whether this is correct or not I am not prepared to say, but I am prepared to say this that if there was that regard for economy in the expenditure entailed by the carrying on of these public institutions that at least fifty or sixty thousand dollars could be saved. The member for Fortune has pointed out that if extra salaries are paid to men in connection with these institutions who can find time to go outside and do extra work on their own account and earn incomes, if paid by the Government or the country, should be spent on governmental work and not on themselves. If they can find time to do that and earn incomes outside as well, I say let their salries be paid accordingly and not have the taxpayers of the country to-day who find it so difficult to live, paying for the services of men who are not rendering service according to the salaries that they are paid, and these salaries coming out of the taxpayers' pockets. I took a note this afternoon as to the amount that has been provided in the Estimates in connection with the supply of the various institutions, and we are asked to vote in the Estimates an amount exactly the same as last year for the carrying on of these institutions, or for the supplying of them, despite the fact that prices have gone down and that goods have declined in value anywhere from ten to twenty per cent. Groceries have declined in value since last year to the extent of about ten per cent. and in that connection particularly there should be due regard paid by the various departments of the Government as to the declining prices that may occur from time to time. If that was done and if there was serious consideration displayed on the part of the department towards the providing of equipment and supplies generally for that institution I venture to say that instead of providing $300,000.00 for the supplying of that institution that you could save at least $75,000.00. Take the Police Department. Uniforms and bedding is

down for $10,600.00 the same as last year. The price of clothing has declined and yet the same estimates are provided as when the higher price prevailed last year. The amount provided for clothing and equipment at the Penitentiary is $2,400.00; Outport offices and gaols $2,200.00; Lunatic Asylum $71,000.00 including clothing; for General Hospital $57,000.00; Sanatorium $45,000.00; Poor Asylum $25,000.00; Fever Hospital $20,000.00; Sudbury Hospital $7,500.00; General Post Office for uniforms, etc., $9,000.00, a total of $300,000.00. I submit, sir, that if the Government were serious and sincere in their efforts to reduce expenditure they could easily make a save in the way I have pointed out without doing any injury to any of the public institutions. But there is no apparent attempt to do anything along the lines I have suggested. As I stated in my opening remarks, it is simply taken for granted that the same expenditure must go on year after year. The people around St. John's are evidently indifferent, though the most of the people in the outports are wide awake, to the manner in which the Government of to-day are tackling the situation, and I have no doubt that, if the opportunity was given to the people of the country to-day to decide as to whether or not they would retain this Government in power, their decision would be overwhelmingly against them. We are asked to vote $10,050,000.00 for the year 1927-28, or in other words 50,000 families have to contribute an average of $200 per family to provide for this expenditure. That means nothing to some people, but when we take into consideration to-day that perhaps a large number of the family men of the country do not earn more than about $500 a year—and a great many earn less than that—I think it shows utter callousness on the part of the Government to ask for an expenditure that necessitates the taking out of the pockets of such people an average of $200 per family. That is one of the reasons why the people of this country, especially the poorer class are not able to keep their children at school as long as they would wish, they are not able to clothe them as they would like to and they are not able to give them the ordinary necessaries of life because they are not able to provide enough food for themselves on account of the way conditions are obtaining in this country at the present time. Is it any wonder then that Newfoundlanders are made "hewers of wood and drawers of water." Can we wonder why so many of our people go to Canana, the United States and elsewhere in order to make a decent livelihood for themselves and their families. I venture to say that if an election takes place whenever it will that there are members of the Government who will be most vociferous in the interests of the common people. They will promise all sorts of things which they never intend to fulfil and they will show that they are deeply concerned about the people's welfare, but I am glad to say that there is an awakening amongst the people and the people are thinking differently to-day from what they did fifteen or twenty years ago. It is not so easily to gull the people to-day as it was then and they are asking the question as to whether our politicians are in earnest when they come around giving sentimental expressions and then during their four years in office they sit idly by and fail to carry out any of the promises they made when seeking votes. A great many people throughout the country are expressing themselves as being in favor of having Responsible Government abolished altogether. There are some people who want a real clean-up policy or a set of new men to take charge of affairs and that kind of talk is not only going on

in St. John's to-day but in many of the outports as well. One can readily understand why there are a large number of people thinking and talking that way to-day in view of the fact that there is no serious attempt being made to carry out the most important problems concerning the people, namely, reduction of expenditure and reduction of taxation. If I understand rightly, it was stated recently in this House that the deficit in connection with the country for the past year was in the neighbourhood of two and a half million dollars, including the railway deficit. I am wondering if that includes all. I wonder if there is any provision being made this year to meet any further deficit that must arise unless there are other ways of raising revenue than what we had last year. As I said before in referring to the revenue of last year, we had higher prices prevailing last year than what we have this year with regard to all imported goods. On perusal of the figures of the revenue returns for last year I find a number of items in which there have been reduced prices.

(Reads)

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday, July 11, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 11th, 1927.

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

A petition was presented by:

Mr. Grimes, from Point Leamington, re Road Boards.

Mr. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, when I left off here on Friday last I was endeavouring to point out how the Govt. could save $100,000 in the way of expenditure in ocnnection with the various departments of the Government without in any way impairing the work of these departments. It is only natural to think that when an administration is composed of business men that one would expect when the Estimates are being presented that an effort would be made to cut down expenditure wherever possible. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works are both business men and surely they are not going to leave the votes in connection with the supplying of the various institutions the same as they were last year because prices have decilned since then. You cannot expect any reduction in the civil service unless you make provision for it in the Estimates. When you put down the same amount for supplies as you had down last year the money is going to be spent. I endeavoured to point out on the last day we were in session that commodities that are being used by the various institutions have declined all the way from five to twenty per cent. and I would like the Minister of Public Works and the Prime Minister and those associated with him in connection with purchasing supplies that they suggest to the Finance Minister that

he could cut down the vote for supplies for the public institutions to the extent of $75,000.00 and that that could be done without in any way interfering with the work that these institutions are doing. I might also point out that you are spending in the various departments about $150,000.00 a year on contingency account. Well I have not the least doubt whatever that if the Government had any serious intention of meeting the great needs that the country is faced with to-day with regard to reduction in expenditure that they could easily cut off another fifteen per cent. Thus in that direction alone you could save $20,000.00 which could be utilized by the Fisheries Department for the collection of fishery statistics, although with all due respect to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries I have yet to be convinced that this system of getting information is of any value either to the trade or to the country and a comparison of the figures furnished by the Customs Department and the figures furnished by the Marine and Fisheries Department shows a big discrepancy of about a hundred and fifty thousand quintals of fish for last year. That shows clearly that the work in connection with that system is of no value. After all, it is only what is to be expected, because what fishermen to-day are going to give a true and accurate statement. I have known of statisticians to ask fishermen for statements of the amount of fish they caught and they were deliberately given an amount less than what fish was caught, because they, like most of fishermen to-day, would be afraid that it would have a bad effect upon prices, consequently, the information gatherers do not give a true account of the catch of fish at the different places around the Island. In view of what is happening in that way what is the use of throwing away $20,000.00 this year? When we know from last year's experience that the total catch of codfish was actually over a hundred and fifty thousand quintals over that what was estimated was the total catch. These are facts which can be verified. I submit then that this vote of $20,000.00 is an absolute waste of time and money. The need of a reduction in expenditure and reduction in taxation is greater to-day than ever it was before in the history of this country. I endeavoured to point out on Friday last that the country's revenue was declining and that last year we suffered a deficit of $1,500,000.00, exclusive of the defict on the railway, or a total deficit of $2,500,000.00. I stated that prices were still declining in connection with most of the Commodities that come in under Ad Valorem rates of duty. These commodities amount in value to a very large sum and with a reduction in the prices of these commodities there is a consequent reduction in the duty amounting to about $275,000.00, which amount the revenue is going to lose this year owing to the decline in prices. Well, Mr. Chairman, does not that show to the Government the necessity for retrenchment and for reduction of expenditure. and yet we are asked to vote in the Estimates to-day $10,050,000.00 for 1927-28 in spite of the fact that we only collected for last year a little over eight millions of dollars. Then it is not only fair on the part of the Opposition to request that, if we are asked to vote Estimates in connection with the running of this country of ten million dollars and the revenue, based on last year's revenue, will be eight million dollars, this House should know where the balance of the money is to come from in order to pay for the expenses of the carrying on of the public service for the coming year. No information is yet forthcoming on that point and we are asked to vote away two million dollars more than we are going to collect in revenue. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the members of the Opposition are not

being dealt fairly with by the Government by not getting the information concerning the finances of the country that we are asking for.

That a decline in revenue is bound to follow can be gathered from a consideration of the articles that come in at ad valorem rate. We have brought in in the past year manufactures of woollen produce to the amount of $80,000, on which duties were collected to the extent of $450,000 and manufactures of cotton having a value of $960,000 on which duties were collected of $480,000. The decline in prices on these two commodities averages in the neighbourhood of 15 per cent., so that you are going to have a decline in revenue on these two items alone in the neighbourhood of $100,000. The loss to the revenue in respect of decreased prices on woollen and cotton goods was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It states that the loss in revenue is partly due to the decline in prices on cotton goods. There is a decline not only in cotton goods but practically every article of wearing apparel and in the same line to-day coming in to the country from outside. In haberdashery; we import about $250,000 of articles in that line on which revenue is collected of $120,000 and the decline on some of these articles amounts to 25 per cent., so that we are going to lose there at least $20,000 on these articles alone. Then there are other manufactures of cotton such as sewing thread, buttons, ties, neckwear, readymades,etc., which amount to seven hundred thousand dollars odd. There is a decline in these all the way from 10 per cent. to 25 per cent. with a likelihood of a further decline. Anyone following market conditions in the United States to-day knows that trade depression there is very marked;; they must see that we have quite a number of people returning back to this country who went away in the early part of the year, and as a result of the trade depression in the United States there has been a corresponding decline in the prices of manufactures of cottons, woollen goods, boots and other articles manufactured in that country.

On these articles I spoke of just now ready-made cotton goods, amounting to $700,000 odd, with an average decline of 20 per cent. you are going to lose in revenue in the neighbourhood of $50,000. Boots and shoes; we collected last year in revenue about $120,000 on a total amount imported $300,000. We import most from the United States, and there is a decline in prices ranging from 10 per cent. to 15 per cent.; in fact, more than that in certain classes in the United States that are referred to as off style. Americans have methods of business that any goods carried over from one year to another they reduce the prices half or one-third of what they originally cost, and these manufactures are dumped in the foreign market and in connection with the manufacture of boots and shoes a lot of it finds its way into Newfoundland and we will find, from that source alone, a decline averaging somewhere around 25 per cent. Rubber boots; what is the condition of the rubber market to-day? From some English newspapers within the last week I find that although prices have declined those who control the rubber market say they do not intend to let down on restrictions so far as export is concerned of quantities from countries producing, but even so it has no effect whatever on falling prices of rubber wear, and prices on rubber boots in the United States and Canada are 15 per cent. lower than last year on an average, and there are a good many who would take advantage of that who would import those goods into this country and you are going to suffer a corresponding decline in revenue collected on rubber products. In hats and caps; we import these into the country to the value of $100,000, with a duty collect-

ed to the extent of $40,000. The agents of all the big manufacturers who have been here the past month will quote prices on these articles somewhere around 15 per cent. lower than last year. If you want to buy off style about 30 p.c. lower and there is always a number bought that way suitable for a certain class of trade in Newfoundland, so you are very likely to have a decline in revenue on hats and caps to the extent of another $10,000. Oil clothes and linen wear—last year we imported in the neighbourhood of $120,000 worth, on which duties were collected to the extent of $52,000. If we ask dealers in oil clothes in this town they will tell you prices will decline on these two commodities to the extent of 15 to 20 per cent., according to the class of oil cloth. Then we are going to lose in revenue on hats account from $6,000 to $7,000, so that altogether I see, putting it at a very conservative estimate, we are going to suffer a decline in revenue on articles I have mentioned in the neighbourhood of $300,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is only fair to ask the Finance Minister, taking into consideration the fact that prices are declining, that the revenue is going to suffer in consequence and that we must necesssarily make that difference up some way, if he is at all to keep his accounts in some sort of condition; if we suffered a deficit last year to the extent of two million or more, including the railway, and we see ahead of us a new decline in revenue to the extent of $300,000 due to the lower prices of goods, how does he propose to make up that difference? And this House has a right to know before these Estimates are passed where the money is coming from. It may be said that the Income Tax is going to be introduced. Well, I fail to see that the Income Tax is going to make up the deficit of two and a half millions. I don't think it would be fair to introduce an Income Tax at the same rate as prevailed formerly, with conditions in the country as they are to-day. The exemption should be higher and the tax rate lower. At the most I don't see where you will get, from the introduction of the Income Tax, above a quarter of a million dollars.

If we had any hope that there was going to be a general revival in trade that would be worth speaking of, there might be some justification for the Finance Minister in presenting Estimates such as we have before us now for our consideration, but the prosperity of Newfoundland is like that of every other country, dependent upon the prosperity of other countries, and anyone who watches the trend of affairs in the outside world can't help but notice that things are not prosperous or improving in any country, perhaps with the sole exception of Canada. In Great Britain for the last six or seven years they have been predicting that there was going to be a general revival of trade the following year, and every year the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Churchill, has to say that the long hoped for revival of trade hasn't come; that they are still suffering from unemployment problems that are a heavy drain on the resources of the country. That is as applies to Great Britain, but over the whole of the countries of Europe, including the countries we export our fish to, the situation is much the same, and the trouble is that the low prices of our fish are due to the rather impoverished conditions in Portugal, Spain, Greece and Italy. These are the countries to which we export our fish. Now, all these countries have expected a revival in trade, as many of their Finance Ministers predicted it a few years ago, and in the rest of Europe the condition is the same. So I can't see where the Finance Minister is expecting to see a very big revival of trade. Even with Buchan's Mine, a possible new industry at the Gander, and an addi-

tional couple of machines at Corner Brook, we cannot expect that those will be sufficient to take care of the whole unemployment problem in Newfoundland to-day and provide revenue enough to provide for an expenditure of ten millions. If these problems are to be settled by these and other means I don't see it coming in a hurry. It may come in the course of a few years, but I submit that we have no right to bank upon the future of this country as to what prosperity we may be likely to have in three or four years' time. We have been taking too much of a gambler's chance on prosperity in this country for the last ten or twelve years and we are faced to-day with a debt that is staggering—now up to seventy-three millions. We have to take from every household in this country on the average two hundred dollars a year out of its income in order to run the Government of the country, and those men who have the care of a family and find it hard to bring up a family in comfort have imposed upon them a burden cruel in its effect when you take two hundred dollars a year from them. It has been stated, Mr. Chairman, that the Opposition have been holding up the House, and by doing that in connection with these Estimates have been injuring the trade of this country. Well I would like for some honorable member to make it clear to me as to the Opposition affecting the trade of this country injuriously. What is the business of the Opposition in this House? Is it to accept everything the oGvernment brings forward and say of it "That is alright; let it go through. You are in charge and it is your business. Do what you like about it." What is the use of an Opposition if that is the attitude that is going to be taken in this House? The business of the Opposition, what the Opposition really is, is the watch dog of the country. The Government is not expected to criticise itself. That is the business of the Opposition, to point out to them any weaknesses they have shown or shortcomings, and if they are too good to accept advice that is their own affair; but at any rate, so far as the people of the country are concerned the Opposition are discharging their duty. Now I would like to point this out Mr. Chairman, that if I am informed correctly there is a large amount of last year's loan unexpended that was voted for public improvements. Well there is nothing to interfere with the Government's going ahead and starting public improvements if they are really concerned for the welfare of the people. They can start work tomorrow; building new roads, repairing old ones ,any kind of work that is necessary. It is an attempt to make politicay capital by saying the Opposition are holding up the House? That is the inference one is to draw. We know you have got that money and you could have started a month ago to spend it on necessary purposes. We think the Government stands condemned in the eyes of every right-thinking man who knows what they can do and they are not doing it. Ask any man on Water Street, or New Gower Street, or around those back streets, running stores, the condition of business and he will say that the people of the town have not the earning power of last year because work is not being done this year. And that work is available. The Government could go ahead to-morrow if they wanted to do it. There are lots of improvements absolutely necessary in the way of public roads and other ways. A public market for produce is absolutely essential in order to help the agricultural industry of this country. You have got $200,000.00 for public improvements and you are not doing anything with it. What do you propose to do about it? Mr. Chairman, the position is this, that to-day

the country is in need of retrenchment. You had the opportunity to retrench and are not making any effort in that direction. You had money at your disposal for the start of public works and you haven't done it. The Opposition is being held responsible for holding up public works, when it is in your power, this House having given you the power last year to go ahead with these improvements. Are the people expected to take that as the reason that work is not being done to-day? There was a time when they might have been too green to burn, but that doesn't prevail to-day. Last year when we were discussing the Estimates it was pointed out the need there was for relieving officers and for some control particularly in connection with the care of pauper relief, care of able-bodied relief. The Board of Health was appointed with the authority given to them to look after that kind of work. It was practically taken out of the relieving officers' hands and they had to refer to this department of health here in connection with any relief work they felt essential. What is the consequence to-day? That the expenditure in connection with the Public Charities Department has increased, I think, in the neighbourhood of $25,000 or $30,000, with no benefit to the country and with that much greater drain on the pockets of the taxpayers of the country. An illustration was given to me a few days ago of a relieving officer who formerly when asked to call a doctor for such and such a person at such a place, would allow so much for doing it—about $2 covered travelling expenses and medical attendance. To-day the doctor is allowed $1 per mile and $1 per visit, and still some of those same doctors will take any one family in the outports for $4 a year for as many visits as that family is going to have. Now, being allowed $1 per mile and $1 per visit, of course it is going to be taken advantage of, and it has been, as we can see by the extra expenditure of $25,000 or $30,000 in consequence of these new regulations; and we have heard nothing from the ranks of the Government that they are going to make any revision in that direction; monies are still voted in the same sum as last year. Mr. Chairman, I know the matter of having this House despatch its business and close down depends largely on the members of the Opposition and the extent to which they speak and oppose or try to improve various matters, but the members of this Opposition have a duty to perform to this country; I am one of those members and I want to go on record as absolutely opposed to the Estimates presented to the House today, and further, I would say that the Estimates can be reduced without any hardship to any public service to the extent of one hundred thousand dollars, and it is not being done. When we go through this in the next few days and consider the various amounts in different departments I will have a little more to say.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: Before this vote passes, I would like to make a few remarks regarding the Government Engineer's salary. When the Highroads Commission Act was passed, there was some discussion here and in another place regarding the personnel and remuneration of that Commission. Honourable members were informed that the Government Engineer would take the chairmanship. It was asserted that, since the change in management of the railroad, many of the duties of the Government Engineer and a great deal of the justification for the maintenance of the full staff of his department had disappeared. But, it was further asserted, he could now justify his position and his continued receipt of a salary of forty-six hundred dollars per year, by undertaking the important duty of supervising the ac-

duties of the Highroads Commission and of managing its expenditure of two million dollars. So, he was named and appointed chairman of the Commission and the specific undertaking was given that he was to perform these duties as part of his ordinary job and for no extra remuneration.

Now for the surprise. Examination of the Public Accounts shows that extra payments to the Government Engineer last year totalled almost $1800. The Government Engineer received $1400 of that amount as payable for his activities as Chairman of the Highroads Commission. He also got his full regular salary of $4600. That is, his salary in respect to both positions reached the large total of $6000. As a matter of fact, he received several hundred dollars in excess of that amount, large though it is. Furthermore, his assistant also received an additional $1000 in respect to his highroad activities, bringing his salary up to $3200. Now, it appears to me, if there be any sincere desire on the part of the Government to reduce the total of these Estimates, that the Government Engineer's salary as such could reasonably be reduced by that $1400. Alternately, if his job as chairman of the Highroads Commission is to be continued and if his duties as Government Engineer are not sufficient to occupy his full time his highroads activities should be regarded as part and parcel of his ordinary undertakings and should certainly not be used as an excuse to vote him such a large bonus as that I have just cited. I take it that the position to-day is such, financially, that the country cannot afford to go on voting salaries that can be cut out. The first to be stricken out should be "the unearned salaries," as the Prime Minister termed them in his manifesto. Here is a striking opportunity of economising in connection with the Government Engineer's office. Two or three thousand dollars could be saved here. What objection has the Minister of Finance to making such a saving? My suggestion is not inspired by any personal dislike of the Government Engineer or any of his staff. I am concerned now merely with suggestions as to financial economy as opportunities appear to me. Of course, it may not appear to the Finance Minister in the same light at all. Perhaps some honourable member opposite will explain to me just what are the Government Engineer's duties apart from his recent and his present activities as Chairman of the Highroads Commission.

MON. MR. SULLIVAN—He has to go around everywhere inspecting breakwaters and bridges and he has to make reports on these public works. He has also to make reports on any mining operations that may be going on.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, that surely is a matter for the Department of Mines.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Under the Act, every investigation must be held by him in respect to such matters.

DR. MOSDELL—Then the honourable gentleman, at least, thinks that the Government Engineer is worth six thousand dollars a year to the country.

I admit, Mr. Chairman, that the Government Engineer is a good man. I have never heard any objection to him on the score of his abilities or of his devotion to the duties of his office, as far as they go. I am not now attempting any personal hostile criticism. Possibly, too, in connection with the duties just cited by the honourable the senior member for Placentia and St. Mary's he is kept moderately busy. It certainly cannot be claimed that he is overworked. We have it, on the authority of another member of His Majesty's Executive Government, that

the Government Engineer could undertake supervision and management of highroads activities without crowding his ordinary office hours. Then, why was not this work simply made a part of his ordinary duties, instead of being exploited as an excuse for giving him an addition of $1400 to his already respectably large ordinary salary of $4600? Surely, too, the Government doesn't intend to leave this matter in status quo and practically invite the Government Engineer to make a similar claim for special payment next year, provided he continues his activities in connection with the Highroads Commission.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Mr. Chairman: The only answer to that is if you want to get a qualified man you have got to pay him. I think that you will find that there are a number of things that the Government suggested to be included under his jurisdiction. For instance in the recent development at Buchan's, I know that the Government arranged for him to go out there, and take up with them the matter of regulations regarding a townsite. All work like that. And you have got to have a technically trained man. As a matter of fact he reported to the Government his idea as to the form that he thought that the townsite should take, the object being that the Government want to see to it that in the interests of the public health the best possible arrangements are being made. And in matters of that kind if you had to go outside and employ an engineer, he would charge for one item alone probably a year's salary. And I would say myself that probably in the run of a year, there would be works of that kind sufficient to give us value for our money. If he was dispensed with we would have to pay an outside man and we would have to pay him a lot more.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, the trouble is this and I admit that the Government Engineer is a good man. I have not heard any objection to him as far as his work is concerned. And possibly in connection with public works such as Mr. Sullivan mentioned, and other aspects of the public works mentioned by the Hon. Minister of Justice, he has enough work to keep him busy. But the trouble is that as soon as you give him something out of the course of his ordinary duties he gets the sum of fifteen hundred dollars. If the Government Engineer's duties are so defined as to pin him down to the duties in connection with his salary, and if then you put it up to $7500, which he gets now for his activities, there would not be very much objection to it, but now the work of the Highroads Commission permit him to take up other additional spheres of work besides.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one of the members of the Government side whether they think that office of High Commissioner is necessary.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman: I may say that that has been considered by other administrations, and it has been a sort of felt here that he does give value. It is as it were a sort of Mecca for Newfoundlanders when in London and I think that business people here find it of use, and I know that in connection with matters requiring investigation over there, it was found to be a convenient channel. So far as Captain Gordon is concerned, I must say this in fairness to him, there are commissioners over there who are getting far more than he gets. He receives no more salary now as when he was secretary to Sir Edgar Bowring, and I think that whatever we may say about the necessity of that office, that so far as I am personally concerned, I know that only that he is a bachelor, and has some private means, that he could not attempt to hold that office.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I am not raising any objection to the High Commissioner on a personal score, but the Government should show what value he is giving.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, we have discussed this point and the point of dispensing with Government House and the Governor, and various other subjects. But we do not feel that we are justified just yet, in launching on these big curtailments. There is no doubt that the Commissioner's Office has been very useful to us. It was useful only a month ago in enabling us to get that Spanish Treaty put through by which fish going into Spain is not taxed now as they threatened to tax it. There are various other subjects that have also come up. Through the High Commission's Office we made a treaty with Australia by which we could get paper into Australia on the same basis as Canada gets it in. The question was brought up to us by the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company; perhaps it would not be as important now, but it was important that Newfoundland should stand on the same footing as Canada with regard to the importation of paper into Australia. I took up the matter with Mr. Gordon when I was in London last year. There is hardly a week that there is not some correspondence in connection with various subjects. The High Commission has been useful in the last three years in connection with the War Graves, in getting the complications in connection with those things straightened out. One has got to consider on the one hand whether we can come down and recognize his capabilites financially, and on the other hand he stands there as the representative of the Dominion on the same basis as Canadian and other Commissioners and we feel that it lends a certain air of respect to the Dominion by keeping a commissioner in London.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to cause any delay in connection with this vote, but this Government if they are anxious to cut down expenditure here is a way. We have thirty six members voted here at the rate of $1000 each. Under the new redistribution bill we will have forty members. Probably their salaries may be the same or less. I have always contended even during that period when I was in the Government, that forty members representing this country was too many altogether, now more especially when it was stated in the party that you could run forty members cheaper than thirty six. My contention is that it would cost twice as much as thirty six did under the old system. To begin with you have woman franchise which will cost considerably in the way of taking the voters list, and you will have the same number of booth rooms as you had of old. And as a matter of fact there will be more returning officers, because you will have one for each new district. I would suggest to the Government that if they are in earnest in regard to the cutting down of expenditure that they will amend that act Cut the membership down to twenty four, that is plenty. I think that is only common sense. And I cannot be accused of playing politics now when I say that the membership should be cut down to twenty four.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You will get forty members to do it for nothing bye and bye.

MR. CASHIN—They are the most expensive people that you could get. I think that this present administration has had experience with individuals that are going to do things for nothing. You discovered after you came into power and these men had been in charge of offices for a few days that they were demanding more than their predecessors had. I would make that suggestion Mr. Chairman, but I know that you will not carry it out because it is economical.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, that redistribution bill reminds me of a request from Garnish in Fortune Bay that it remain as of old.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I may say that the po nt was raised and that matter was spoken of last session, and I have heard nothing of it since except that it was brought to my attention some time ago, and the difficulty that I see about it is this, that if you recast the bill now, you are go ng to have the same kind of difficulty all over the country. If we could get clear of the denominational system of representation, which is the basis of that bill, in the sense of number, that trouble might be got rid of. Now w th regard to the point raised by the member for Ferryland, I frankly admit that forty members representing 250,000 is ridiculous, on the face of it. But there have been numerous complaints that the coast is too long, and that the territory cannot be covered. I think that in particular that this one man representation, has been more or less the policy of administrations for some years past. I would not like to undertake to say that I would accept the responsibility of br nging an amendment, because the difficulty as I see it is, that if we change the status of one district, we will have requests coming in from other distr cts as well. And we are shortly going to have an election I understand, and it seems to me that the new bill ought to get a trial. It will only mean the salary of forty members when you get them in the House, and you can see what kind you get. But this bill has never been tried. It may prove a great success, and on the other hand it may be found as a matter of fact as members have suggested that it is going to make things more unwieldly still. But having got it and passed it and placed in on the Statute Book and having accepted that as the basis of the territory that has been carved out for the next general election, I feel that we have to give it a try out.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Minister of Justice and his suggestion that this new bill be tried out, and then if it is not a success cut it out. Well even if I may not be in this House when this Bill is put into effect, for one thing I may not be returned. But I want to venture to say that if you elect forty members in this House they are never going to inaugurate a system whereby they are going to be less. Because everyone that is elected will want to be a member again ,and so if he intends to stand for election again he will want his district to remain in the bill. Consequently you are not going to get any of those individuals to be drastic enough to cut themselves out. I notice that the Minister of Justice made some remarks regarding an amendment. Do I take it then that the Government will even seriously consider my suggestion. Regarding the next general election, whenever that may be, that we can go back to the old system and have thirty six members instead of forty. If you are going to be in here and to be sincere and try to cut down expenditure, then the least you might do would be to begin it yourselves, and give the good example.

MR. LAKE—I discussed the matter with Mr. Warren before Dr. Mosdell came into the d strict and he said it was alright for the settlement of Garnish to remain in Burin district; but since that time the people of Garnish have apparently fallen in love with Dr. Mosdell. Personally, I have no object on to the change.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to get a definite understanding from the Minister of Justice on the point raised. The people of the settlement of Garnish want to be restored to

Fortune Bay district and I would like to know if there is a possibility of their request being acceded to?

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I would not like to say that the request would or would not be acceded to. The matter has been brought up before and acted upon as it is in its present verbiage. To change the act as regards one district would mean a change in other directions also. I know of a particular section of a district where I would like to have conditions altered.

MR. CASHIN—The people of that section are all protestants aren't they?

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE No, that is not the reason. It is not likely that there will be an amendment made to the Act, although it is not a Party matter at all. At all events, I will submit the matter to the Prime Minister for further consideration.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: As regards the Re-Distribution Act, I take it, according to the reply of the Minister of Justice to Dr. Mosdell, that we can only alter the Re-Distribution Act by an amendment in a proper legislative manner. If that is the position taken by the Government and I know that there are people in various settlements throughout the country who want to be placed in other districts and are petitioning for such requests to be granted, I can quite see that the Government are going to have to consider a series of amendments. I might say that a large number of residents of Cook's Harbour would much prefer to be included in the District of St. Barbe Western Section of the district, although from trade and commerce standpoint they belong to White Bay District, but for political reasons they would like to be attached to St. Barbe West. Now I do not think that this an occasion on which one should enter into the merits or demerits of the Re-Distribution Act. As I have already said, it was a mistaken policy from the start and now we are beginning to see the fruits of it. It was a mistaken policy economically and by creating such a situation the Government have multiplied the cost of an election in this country. If Mr. Duff, by crossing the floors of this House saved this country $300,000.00, as is contended in some quarters, then under the Re-Distribution Bill, he would save us an expenditure of $600,000.00. I have no hesitation in saying that the cost of running a General Election in this country under the new Act is not only going to double but is going to treble. I repeat it was a mistaken policy on the part of the Government to have brought such an Act in here at all. Whoever lives to come back here again they will find themselves faced with this position that in the next Parliament whoever lives to be here there will be insistent demands for the alteration of that Re-Distribution Act and you are going to find that the northern bays are going to ask for an entire change of the Act in this respect. Under the new Act there are forty men provided for. Take the district of Bonavista Bay to-day. Two men would represent that district thoroughly and well. Instead of that, under the new Act, you have four men provided to do the work which was formerly done by three members.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Do you think that for years there have been demands for one man districts instead of three men for any particular district?

MR. SCAMMELL—No. During the few short years that I have been in public the thoughts of the people and the demands of the people have been to curtail the number of representatives in the country.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—On platforms throughout the country that the honourable member is associated with and I have heard it re-

peated here on the floors of this Assembly that one man districts were preferable.

MR. SCAMMELL — Whilst you might subscribe to that recommendation you did not give effect to it when you had the opportunity to do so. That is why I say you are going to have a come back and a demand for a change in the next Parliament, and, as has been pointed out by the member for Ferryland, thirty-six members are too many. We have but to quote from the remarks of a late, illustrious finance minister who said that "It is the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat." Now we are not lessening the trappings of the elephant nor are we lessening the elephant carrying these trappings on, nor are we increasing the strength of the cat to carry those trappings. Now I hope we will be reported and as well reported, because of recent utterances of mine, that the next Parliament that meets will find demands for alterations to the Re-Distribution Act and to see that the number of representatives will be cut down. They will be like members of New South Wales. They will not feel like voting themselves out of business, but I believe that the sentiment prevailing throughout this country today is that there should be a curtailment of members in this House of Assembly. Now if the Minister of Justice is going to see that petitions that were sent from Garnish are likely to have their prayers acceded to I hope that the people of Cook's Harbour will be still joined up with the western division of St. Barbe District, as requested.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— As I pointed out before, that can only be done by an Act of the Legislature.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: The people of the country have their own minds and experiences on these matters; but there is an old saying that "In a multitude of counsel there is wisdom." I have yet to be convinced that there is reason for having forty members to represent the electorate in this Assembly. Some of the districts think that they can be handled by one man instead of having three man districts because very often there is increased expenditure on account of one man wanting his own way to run a district. That is one reason, I claim, in order to satisfy each one of the members, there should be a change. The next point is a question of economy, that is, that there could be $4,000.00 saved. Yet the answer to that is that the country is not dependent on such a small amount as four thousand dollars to save it. Then there is another point that appeals to me and that is, supposing you have a certain number of members in the House and you reduce them to a smaller number and supposing you have a big corporation bringing in a Bill that a number of members are interested in, it is not a very easy matter for fifteen or twenty members to handle the various things that are to be considered in that Bill.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman: I take it that honourable members are not going to debate the Re-Distribution Bill all over again, but I would like to point out that there is not the slightest reason why forty members representing smaller districts should be paid as much as members are paid to-day, and I think that men representing the smaller districts would be much better paid at $900.00 a session than they would be paid at $1,000.00 each for representing smaller constituencies. I merely mention that, as I take it that a member is not paid his salary for simply attending the House. I remember I very strongly criticised the idea of members being paid $1,000.00 for attending a one day session of this House, but it was drawn to my attention afterwards, and not with-

out a great deal of justification, that a member is not paid so much for the session as he is paid for representing a district and this includes a lot of overhead expenses, such as telegrams, postage stamps, etc. Now, with a smaller district, under the Re-Distribution Act, a district representative has very much less expenditure to be faced with. For that and other reasons I think that the Re-Distribution Act which I have introduced here is a good thing for the country as well as making a district representative much more independent under it; besides you are going to get, under this new Act, the various districts to select and elect their own men instead of leaders of parties in St. John's selecting the men for the various districts, as has been the practice heretofore.

MR. CASHIN — Mr. Chairman: I agree with some previous speakers that there is no necessity for an expenditure of an extra $4,000.00 for members of this Legislature, because I claim that the cost of a General Election for forty members will be nearly $100,000.00 more than it was last time. Take two large districts like Twillingate and Placentia and St. Mary's. That will mean three Returning Officers for each place whereas they each had one before. The same applies to the districts of St. John's East and West. Then on top of that the women of the country have a vote at the next election and that will mean that the cost of the next General Election will be twice as much as it was the year previous.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what is the actual practice about the printing of the Journal of the House? If you are going to keep your expenditure within the limits of your estimates why does it cost $2,-300.00 to print the Journal of the House? I have not the time to see what the actual facts are, but I feel sure that if we had all the accounts before us we would find that the amount for printing debates, etc., of the Legislature would exceed $11,-000.00, which is the amount voted here. I notice you have also got in here miscellaneous for printing. Now I would really like to know what this word miscellaneous means for printing? And I would like to know what the figures for printing in connection with the Legislature were for last year?

DR. MOSDELL—I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary, in the absence of the Prime Minister, to state the policy of the Government with regard to the reporting of the debates of this House? I would like to know whether the reports published by the Daily News and Evening Telegram are officially served them or are they serving out such reports off their own bat?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —No, the official reports are compiled for Hansard. The only newspaper, and that is a weekly newspaper, that is being paid for circulating a synopsis for the outports is the Free Press.

MR. SCAMMELL—Is it not a fact that you are paying certain outport weekly newspapers for publishing an official synopsis of debates?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —No, not this year.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know how much of this work was done by contract or otherwise? As the Chairman of the Committee has had very considerable experience in that connection, perhaps he will be able to tell us if there is a possibility of reducing the cost of debates and the printing of Hansard this year?

DR. MOSDELL—As I know certain reports are boosted very much in the Government newspapers, I want to know what is the amount paid these newspapers for such work and what is the justification for it?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The reports of the newspapers are and have been entirely their own work, without cost to the Government.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —The newspapers that are published daily in St. John's have volunteered to make a digest and are publishing them as a matter of news on their own account.

MR. SCAMMELL—Why not give the Western Star, the Advocate and the Twillingate Sun the weekly synopsis to publish. I am sure if you gave them a digest to publish and paid them like you are paying the Free Press they would not alter the copy.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —It is purely a matter of economy. It is generally known that all over the country the Free Press has built up a large circulation. The Free Press is publishing a weekly synopsis of debates this year the same as last year. The other papers mentioned by the last speaker were paid last year but are not publishing them this year, nor are they being paid.

MR. SCAMMELL—From what I can gather from the remarks of the Colonial Secretary neither the Harbor Grace Standard, the Western Star nor the Twillingate Sun are publishing and are not authorised to publish the synopsis of the debates this year and that if they do publish them they will not be paid for it. Simply, I understand, the Free Press are publishing the synopsis this year and are being paid for it. Last year you printed a synopsis of the debates in the weekly papers I have mentioned and you now state that you are going to save money this year by it, but that is not in keeping with your estimates, as we find the same vote for this year as was voted last year.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Prior to the opening of the Legislature the Internal Economy Commission meets and makes regulations, and arranges for the printing of debates and deals with matters pertaining to the Legislature; and when it met this session it was thought it wasn't necessary and for the purpose of cutting down expenditure the papers in the outports having a limited circulation were discontinued and the Free Press alone, which has a big circulation all over the island, was given a synopsis to publish as it was thought that would be sufficient and would reach the people generally. The money is voted this year to the same amount, but I don't know whether the estimates here will reach the expenditure. Bills are paid, I think, on the certificate of the Speaker and the Clerk of the House and sent to the Finance Minister to pay.

MR. SCAMMELL—Might I ask who writes the official synopsis for the Free Press since the country is paying for it? Is it non-partisan and impartial?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY Mr. O'Reilly compiles the synopsis. I presume it is impartial.

MR. SCAMMELL—Can we ask for the accounts of the Internal Economy Commission?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Certainly.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I judge, then, that there is an official synopsis of debates prepared by one of the reporters of proceedings here. That reporter, I think, is also connected particularly with one of the party papers published in the city. I am of opinion that the synopsis, as prepared, should be referred to members before it is given publication. It is not at all impossible that the speeches of honorable members could be misreported in that synopsis. We have had some glaring examples of that sort of newspaper conduct during recent weeks, though not in an official connection. I am not charging that honorable members would be wilfully misrepresented by the reporter who handles the synopsis referred to. It

is possible, though, that misrepresentation could take place. The reporter might misunderstand the statement of an honorable member as made in th s House or might hear his words indistinctly and so misjudge the sense of his remarks. No honorable member wants to be placed in the position where some constituent challenges him with expressing sentiments regard ng public affairs that he never harl ored. I really think that this vote should be held over until we are given more facts and figures regarding the cost of publication of debates and until an attempt is made of devising some plan for referring to any particular member or members concerned in the synopsis of the debates in this House, before it is given publication in any newspaper in this country.

The Honorable the Colonial Secretary has made the statement that that synopsis of debates is to be given publicat on in one only of our local weekly newspapers. He alleges that this general policy has been adopted in the interests of economy. He has not shown us how economy is being effected and to what extent. The same vote as formerly is included in the Estimates now in the hands of honorable members. Surely, the one weekly newspaper is not to rece.ve an amount equal to that formerly paid all the local weeklies. There would be no economy and there would be a great deal of unfairness in such a policy What is to be paid the newspaper in question. The Free Press, I think it is? The Honorable the Colon.al Secretary says that all the other weeklies, even the long-established and non-partisan Trade Review, are to be eliminated and The Free Press, a party paper, alone used, because it has the largest circulation of all the weeklies. How does the honorable gentleman know that? How do members of the Internal Economy Committee know that? What ev.dence have they that any such claim made to them is founded on actual fact? Mr. Chairman, why camouflage in this connection? Publication of debates is being allowed this paper purely and simply for purposes of part.san patronage. No question of economy is involved. No economy will be effected by the extraordinary and unfair discrimination now practiced by the Government.

I beg to be permitted to reiterate my demand that honorable members be afforded an opportunity of scrutinizing the manner in which their stand on any public question in this House is reported in the official synopsis. That scrutiny should be permitted before publication takes place. At the very least, honorable members should be supplied with a copy of all the issues in which the synopsis may occur, so that, if necessary, they may take steps to correct any misrepresentation that accidentally or otherwise may from time to time occur. We should be provided, too, with a statement of the cost of publishing that synopsis together with comparative costs for other years and other sessions. We will then be in a position to judge as to the correctness or otherwise of the Honorable the Colonial Secretary's claim that the change of policy has been made in the interests of economy.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I might say the official reporter makes his synopsis from the corrected speeches of honorable members of both sides of the House. I don't know what other system could be adopted. You have to depend on some one to do the work and Mr. O'Reilly is an experienced newspaper man, so the pos.tion is that we consider we have a competent man and he makes a report from corrected speeches and that is as good as we can do. It would be a rather complicated system to have that synopsis sent to members again to be corrected. With regard to the

cutting out of the papers it was done in the interest of economy. The Free Press was considered the best newspaper to keep on. It has a very large circulation in the outports.

MR. LAKE—I understand when the present administration came into power a Bill came into the House to take care of the printing. What was done on that line? Anything at all? I remember the Prime Minister and the Colonial Secretary at that time said that there were going to be big savings to this country. Still I think we have gone back to the old way.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I might say in connection with that, that there was a Bill passed in this House creating a department of the King's Printer and the Colonial Secretary was to be King's Printer. The matter was gone into very thoroughly and it was found it was going to be a pretty expensive department and personally I did not recommend the Government to make the department because what would be saved would be more than offset by the expenditure on the administration necessary to run it. There would have to be officials and stenographers and some person to keep all the stationery and all that kind of thing and a great deal of expenditure involved that would not be justified by the saving made. The difficulty of the King's Printer brought in by that Act was got over in this way. Mr. Thistle who at that time printed the Royal Gazette as the official organ of the Government under the old Act; was appointed King's Printer as necessary under the new Act and the Gazette was changed from the Royal Gazette to the Newfoundland Gazette, and the Department of the Colonial Secretary was given supervision of the publication of that paper, and I think it is working very satisfactorily and economically and I don't think any honorable member on either side of the House will have any fault to find with the way that paper is issued. It was only the other matters providing for the control of expenditure in relation to stationery, and the looking after the printing of Bills and so on in this House, that were not gone ahead with, as I pointed out, we felt it would not be in the interests of economy when everything was considered.

MR. LAKE—In other words it might be said I think that it was a waste of time to draft that Bill? Nothing is being done.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —No; we have got a King's Printer. The suggestion made by the honorable member that copies of The Free Press be sent to each member of the House is an excellent one, because after all that is of interest to the greater majority of the members in this House, as to how their speeches are being reported, that have to go to the outports, and they have every right to protect themselves and if the report is not satisfactory, they can point out the discrepancy and have it corrected. I am sure that the Internal Economy Commission would be glad to have those copies sent to each member of the House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: The point I want to insist upon is this, that last year you published a synopsis in certain weekly papers, and this year you tell us that the Internal Economy Commission has decided to cut them out. Therefore you suggest that you are saving money. But still we are asked to vote the same sum as last year. I suggest that if you are only saving even $200, then cut down the vote here by that amount. Tell us what you are actually saving and cut that much out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That vote never covered the cost.

MR. SCAMMELL—We know it to our cost. Therefore why not vote the same money as last year. Why are

you cutting out the synopsis of the digest and confining it to the Free Press. Why are you cutting out the Harbor Grace Standard, the Twillingate Sun, and the other papers. If there is any economy effected by this procedure then reduce the vote, and if there is not then let the vote go on.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—I explained to the honourable member why this was done.

MR. SCAMMELL — The Colonial Secretary has not explained to us. If you are cutting out the synopsis in these weekly papers and confining it to the Free Press then you are doing it from the standpoint of economy. Then ask us to vote less money than last year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You are voting less.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to discover what we are called upon to vote this year, and there are other things that I would like to discover and I cannot.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: With regard to the point just raised by the hon. member for St. Barbe, the Colonial Secretary has just given his reasons. But as to the question of voting, it is a fact as far as the cost is concerned with regard to the vote for printing of the journals. We voted that amount last year in addition to the amount down in the Estimates there. Now as far as the outports are concerned, there is another aspect that I am sure we have heard repeatedly stated in this House, and that is that one of the great troubles is in getting the digest printed at all. We actually discovered ourselves being expected to pay for a digest that have never been printed. Honourable members themselves are practical minded enough to appreciate that the papers that publish once a week, and that does not go into a special edition in the sense of extra pages, even with a digest they did not get the report through in the same number of weeks as the House was sitting. The explanation of the digest being published at all is mainly due to the fact that the printing of so-called verbatim reports in the daily newspapers became a joke. Even our own city papers with much more space and greater facilities, could not keep up with the proceedings in the House, the people were reading about the debates six months after the House closed. And if the House continues as it is at present, it will be difficult to distinguish between which particular session the debates are referring to. The digest was the solution. It was suggested that this was the only way in which the public could keep in touch with the debates in the House. I was speaking of the digest as we had it up till now. It was quite a common thing, when the time would approach for the settling of the bills for the publishers to crowd into papers nothing but House of Assembly news, in order to complete their matter and get the certificate signed by the Clerk of the House and the Supervisor of Debates, and I am sure that honourable members will see that in that sense alone the digest reporters did not give value for their money.

I just want to say one other word as to the cost. We found ourselves in the position, that each paper got three hundred and fifty dollars for the Lower House and $150 for the Upper House. They claimed that debates had become so extensive in matter that they should be paid in accordance with the length of the debates. Arising out of that it was thought that the digest would be the solution, but I don't think that the outport people got much satisfaction out of it. We felt that as far as the people around town were concerned, they were served anyhow as the papers had their own reports of the

debates. I think it will be found that the cost was not covered by the vote last year.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: It seems to me that we are spending too much money on this sort of thing. A couple of years ago, when the Bill was introduced to create a King's Printer I believe that we had considerable debate on this, and it was discussed as to whether or not we ought to print the speeches in the daily papers. I know right well that I was not in favour of that idea. If any man made a speech I suppose that he could get a newspaper to print it if he wanted to. And if a paper does report a member of this House I consider that he will get a very fair report. On the whole the newspapers report me very fairly, though sometimes they may change what a member says to create a bad impression. But every newspaper in effect had its own report and that report is accepted by the generality of the readers as news. But when it comes to what the country wants to know about the House of Assembly, I was always of the impression that it might be left alone as far as the Legislature was concerned. But I have always thought that there should be a Hansard. And I believe in it to-day, and I would prefer a Hansard to verbatim reporting. However I just mention that but I think that you are spending too much money on this sort of thing. Perhaps we did it ourselves, but that after all does not excuse you. The printing establishments have gone too far with this thing. I believe in a legitimate printing business, but at the same time I like to be fair and reasonable. I think that we are spending too much money on this sort of thing. I don't propose to labour this point any further. But it is rather a big item,if it were not we would not be saying so much about it. Here is what I see now. The Minister of Justice was labouring the point that the debates were printed so long after the House had been in session that they were not of much value. We have been in session now for two months and I would like to see the reports that the Free Press has given, since the House opened. Now if you cut out all the other papers for economy show us where the economy is. But you have not shown us. If the Internal Economy Commission is manipulating these votes, and is influenced by a partisan aspect, and has cut out all the other papers and confined the printing of the synopsis to the Free Press, then that is not square. The outport people have to live as well as the city people. Show me where the economy is, but you have not shown me.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: I want to support Mr. Scammell in that argument. I understand that the Twillingate Sun is not getting any printing of the debates of this House this year. And around the outports in the various sections there is the Harbour Grace Standard, Western Star, all of these have been cut out, and my contention is that if this is done for the sake of economy then let us get it and cut out the Free Press as well.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I have listened to what the honourable gentlemen have said in regard to the papers, but I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that these Estimates are all wrong. You take Section 39 B of the Audit Act and you will find a whole lot of new jobs created, and there is hardly one in the Estimates to-day. Take the carpenter in the Public Works Department I don't see any vote for that in the Estimates.

(Reads)

The whole thing is wrong. And how can we discuss this matter intelligently with that kind of information. To discuss this matter intelligently

we should have Additional Estimates and Supplementary Supply in here together. There is no member on this side or on that side outside of a few that knows what he is voting for. There is not a member on the Executive Government outside of the Minister of Finance that can tell me what he is voting for now. Take the Public Works Department. There is a Mr. Halleran down here, a tallyman but he is not in the Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—He has been there for years and his salary is voted every year. He is paid out of contingencies.

MR. CASHIN—But you must admit that if an official is permanent his salary should be in the Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—One of the contentions that has been set up down the years is that if you make him permanent you are making your pension list greater. If he is not permanent he does not become eligible for a pension.

MR. CASHIN—Anyhow there is $280,000 worth of extra salaries down here, and my contention is that we should have Supplementary Supply and Additional Estimates in with these Estimates and then we cannot make any mistake. But we are voting like a crowd of fools now, on both sides of this House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to refer to the point raised by Mr. Cashin just now. We have a Minister of Public Works who should know what these incomes are being paid for and it seems to me that he should be able to explain anything that he is called upon to explain. Now I am asking the Minister of Public Works to tell me why this country is paying $100 for a tallyman in the Department of Public Works.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman: As far as I understand the appointment of a tallyman was to look after the coal; to go into the various institutions and see that good coal is produced and of the proper weight. We cannot expect him to do that for nothing. That 's all I know in connection with it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister has told us what he knows. I leave it at that. Now as regards the dispute on these salaries, we are rather precipitating matters. I want to go back again and find out where he has effected a saving by cutting out these papers. We are voting eight thousand dollars for the Hansard and we have been told that you have decided to cut out the publication in certain papers, presumably on the basis of economy. But still you are asking for as much money as last year. And you will go out of this House and out of contingencies grant you will spent as much more. Now I would like to know just what the Free Press cost us last year for that digest that it printed in the weekly paper. And what it is going to cost us this year for having it printed in the Free Press.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: It is only fair to the members of this Assembly that some paper at least should print an extended digest of the speeches in this House, so that we may get them into the hands of the different districts in the country. Only members on the other side have fault with us on that score in that we did not get far enough with our economy.

MR. SCAMMEL—That is not my point.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Your point is that we have not economised at all. I say that we have. There is no paper now outside of St. John's that is getting any patronage with regard to the publication of debates in this Assembly. The only paper that is paid is the Free Press and there are no daily papers paid at all. Now I am prepared to recom-

mend that that paper be cut out, and no further digest furnished if the House wants to test the sincerity of the Internal Economy Commission in this respect.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman: To get back to the tallyman business. I know that since I have been in this House that Mr. Halleran has been tallyman in connection with coal. I do not know how he was paid, but it has been brought to my notice that there is a carpenter at Government House, and there never was one there before. Mr. Molloy did the work before. But now the carpenter lives there and he is there stationary. Mr. Molloy has a shop at the back of the Board of Works, and he could go to Government House anytime that he was needed. And now they have another man down there pulling down a salary of twenty-five dollars a week, and he is doing nothing.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman: I understand that he was appointed in 1923, before this Government came into power, and since last fall, about December he has been working at the Hospital.

MR. MOORE—That shows that he was not wanted at Government House.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Molloy has been sick.

MR. MOORE—But this man has been three years there and there is no necessity for him to be there at all.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I don't think that the idea in bringing up this man's name was to be personal, but the principle on which we are voting I object to. We are voting for people not in these Estimates at all. I have no objection to Mr. Halleran tallying coal provided that his salary is voted properly, but we are in here like gauks trying to vote on Supply and we know nothing about it.

Now as regards tallying coal, I could tell a story about coal, and if the Department of Public Works finds it necessary to have a tallyman they should also find it necessary to accept a tender when that tender is the lowest. With respect to this Besco crowd, I think it is just as well to have a showdown while we are at it. There is an aggregation in this country known as a combine that was organized on Water Street and outside of that combine no one else is allowed to buy coal from Besco even though a man is willing to pay for it. Now the Finance Minister can corroborate my statement in that respect. I want to ask the Government to-day, not that I want any favors from the Government or Besco, to force Besco to give the people of the country a fair and a square show. Besco are nothing less than a pack of robbers and thieves, and convicted ones at that, and I can prove what I am talking about. The President of Besco is Mr. Roy Wolvin and every member of this House knows or should know what kind of a person he is. This fellow Wolvin simply stated that he made a combine out of a crowd of Water Street merchants and that they would not sell to Cashin, Crosbie or anybody else that they did not care to sell to, and yet this Government has stood for such conduct. In April 1921, there was an Act passed here in which there was a contract made with Besco and that Act has not been enforced, although I presume owing to the embarrassing position that Besco find themselves in at the present time it would seem ridiculous to try and make them carry out their contract, but still it is the duty of the present administration to investigate and see that the people of this country get a fair show.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That contract was never intended to be carried out by the people who made it.

MR. CASHIN—Well then it was carried out by the people who were prepared to pay for the coal and did not get it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is not a Government job; that is what the Court is there for. If I were in the coal business and if I wanted coal and was prepared to pay for it I would take steps to see that I would get it.

MR. CASHIN—You are all eating out of Besco's hand. You are here to protect the people and to see that neither Besco or no other corporation puts anything over on the people of the country. I will buy coal wherever I like so long as I am prepared to pay for it and I usually buy where I get the cheapest prices. I care not for Besco or any other corporation or combine but as a representative of the people of this country, I am not prepared to sit idly by and allow Besco to fleece the taxpayers of this country without having something to say on the matter. Here is a position, Mr. Chairman, where Besco created a combine in this city. Now one of these days I am going to move for a Select Committee of this House to investigate the coal transactions that have occurred in this community in relation to Besco. It is all very well for the Minister of Justice to say take action in Court, but how many individuals in this country are prepared to make an outlay of thirty or forty thousand dollars to take a case before the Privy Council with Besco. In other words, the people of this country can go whistle so far as getting back at Besco is concerned, yet Besco can come here and get all sorts of concessions, and the present Government attempted to give them all Bell Island, if they had to get ahead with it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No such thing ever happened.

MR. CASHIN—Yes it did. A Bill was drafted by your own party and it died here.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I wish a Bill of a similar character was born again to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN—I hope someone different than you will be in power, if such another Bill is brought in.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—For the sake of Bell Island I wish the Bill was re-born to-morrow.

MR. CASHIN—I do not think that either you or Besco had a great lot of sympathy for Bell Island or its people. I was there only on a couple of occasions and I want to tell you that you, as the senior representative of the district, ought to be ashamed of conditions over there. As bad as I am in your estimation I am better off than you are, and if the people of Bell Island thought that the Minister of Justice had done the right and proper thing for them they would have elected his man in the recent bye-election.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I arranged that with them and that accounts for the result of the election.

MR. CASHIN—You arranged nothing with them. You are the sorest thing in this country to-day. I know too much about you.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You take things too seriously.

MR. CASHIN—I take life too seriously in your opinion, because I always like to try and treat my friends decently.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Don't get cross.

MR. CASHIN—I think the crossest man in the country is yourself.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I was never cross in my life.

MR. CASHIN — You looked the crossest and sickest individual I ever saw in my life the night after Brophy was elected. I don't believe you are come to yet. Now, Mr. Chairman,

the Minister of Justice is the slickest artist there is in Newfoundland to-day for quibbling. I am not professing to be a financial wizard or anything of that nature but I have a certain amount of common sense, in spite of the fact that probably the Minister of Justice does not think I have any, and I maintain now that these Estimates that we have before us are not correct and therefore cannot be discussed intelligently by this House. These Estimates are wrong because they do not agree. Now with regard to Besco again, I wish to say it is the job of the present Government to see that they are doing the right thing in this country, but I know the Minister of Justice is in an awful fright to see that Besco carries out their contract with this country.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is unfortunate for Bell Island that they have no contract with the Government to carry out.

MR. CASHIN—There are two thousand men working on Bell Island and it would be as well if they were working in some other section of the country because they will not get fat on the salaries you people last year wanted to give them, namely, twenty-five cents an hour. Now I want to say further that Bell Island is the only proposition that is paying Besco, but our Government were prepared to play into the hands of Besco and are to-day toadying with the big fellows of Besco. One would imagine that when Besco is not carrying out the terms of their contract in their dealings with private firms that it is the duty of the Minister of Justice to see that they do carry out their contract.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I am afraid that that contract is in a state of suspended animation.

MR. CASHIN—The fact of the matter is that these Besco people put the gun to your head and neither you nor Governments in the past have had stomachs enough to see Bell Island closed down.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Unfortunately, you got to consider the people of Bell Island.

MR. CASHIN——I know you considered that in 1923. I am just as much interested in the welfare of the community as you are. As I said before, you are a quibbling artist. I know you would not expect me to pay you any other compliment, but there was a time when you thought differently and I must say that I got considerable thanks for what I did on your behalf.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You do not come in my life at all. I have more serious things than you to think about.

MR. CASHIN—It is your job to see that the laws of the country are being carried out. You were two or three years trying to carry out one certain law. There was a law on the Statute Book in connection with the opening of the District of St. John's East that you failed to carry out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I thought it would come to that.

MR. CASHIN—Yes you did, but neither you or your Prime Minister ever told the reason why it was not carried out and it may not be a new story to some of the members of the present Government. Now in order to intelligently discuss the Estimates now before the House it is necessary to have Supplementary Supply and Additional Estimates brought in at the present time. If you will check over the original Estimates you will find a great many mistakes. Surely goodness we want to know what we are talking about, but under the Estimates now before the Chair we do not know what we are talking about in discussing them. We were discussing a few moments ago regarding the debates published

in the various papers, and I am going to say now that the various papers in this country at the present time publish what suits themselves, the Free Press and all of them. They never tell the truth. Not one of them. If Cashin or Mosdell or anyone says anything they twist it to suit themselves, and then we have to come in here and vote Estimates to pay these fellows large sums of money. Now it is no use making suggestions in here to the present administration for economy because they do not intend to take the suggestion. Why, a few moments ago as to the suggestion regarding thirty-six members being cheaper than forty, and that is only common sense, the Government did not even try to consider it. We have arrived at the point now with the present administration, when they are not looked upon by the people outside of the House as regards a stake in the country, as having more kudos than the present Opposition. That is the position to-day. You bring up a point in here to-day and all that you get is ridicule from the present Government. You make a point and you are interrupted in order to try and take away what good may be in the point. Now I don't want to hold up the Estimates. I would like to see this House closed to-day, but I want to see Supplementary Supply and Additional Estimates brought in here, and check them off with the Estimates that we have here now. I am sorry and I must apologise to the Minister of Finance, who is in charge of this thing at the present time, that such a state of affairs has been brought about. But I don't want to come in here and be called a voting machine. And I will challenge any member of the Government to get up here and explain these Estimates, and check up with the Auditor-General's Report, except the Minister of Finance who is probably acquainted with the facts. There are votes in here, and salaries being paid that are never going to be in the Estimates. Paid for political expediency, friends of the Government and friends of the Minister of Justice, in here getting huge salaries, and some of them walking around Water Street and doing nothing for their pay. And yet we are told that nothing can be done because of the difficulty of cutting down the public expenditure. Probably the expenditure for 1926-1927 will be over $11,000,000 according to the Estimates here this afternoon plus the other expenditure that is going to be added once this door is closed. Now I don't propose this evening to at any further length, discuss these Estimates. I feel as if I were just like a fool in this House and that the Minister of Justice especially and the Government generally, look upon me as a fool. But I look upon it in this way that I regard myself as a member of the Legislature, entitled to respect to a certain extent but that no man can be found who can do any good for the country, all the good rests in the present Executive Government, and anyone else who has the interests of the country at heart, with the exception of a few individuals who at present compose the Executive Government and who want to make political capital out of the matter that was brought up here this evening regarding the carpenter. I do not know who he is. I never heard of him in my life, but the Minister of Justice took occasion to preach it from the house-tops because Mr. Scammell has brought the matter up, and I want to say here now if I make any suggestion here, or if I think it fit to stay here and try to do something in some small way for the betterment of the country that I feel that the least that I am entitled to would be a certain amount of consideration from the members of the Executive Government. After all I

have as much interest in the country as they have, and as much say in it. I am going to say right here now and I serve notice on them. I do not want to be called an obstructionist, but I want one thing to be cleared up right now the Government press has been stressing the point as to the cause of the delay in the Legislation going through. Now I challende the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice and the whole aggregation that that is incorrect, and that it was published in the press for definite purposes. I want the Prime Minister or any member of the Government to get up this evening and contradict what I say and tell this country the reasons why this House was not opened until May the 11th. Tell the truth about it, because if they don't I will, but they have been trying through the medium of the Press to-day to have the country as a whole think that we on this side of the House have no other interests in the country than to remain here and hold up present Legislation. But the Government have not brought any legislation into the House until a couple of weeks ago. We were here with nothing to go ahead with for a long time. We have been dickering with a couple of Bills in conection with the Gander and I presume it will come to a head, and I want to tell them now that if this proposition is good it will get my support, and if it is bad I am going to knock it quick. I am not going to try and make out that it is bad just for the purpose of political expediency, but I would like to hear the Prime Minister this evening because I feel that he will agree with me, tell the House that the reason legislation was held up was because of the fact that the House was not opened until May the 11th, when it should have been opened in February. If that had happened the House would be closed long ago. Anyway as far as I am concerned with the exception of one or two items I am through with the Estimates, because I feel that it is no good to make any suggestions to the present Government regarding a reduction of expenditure. Suggestions have been made to them and they have laughed at them, they have been ridiculed by a few people, the responsible ones in the Government.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee rises there is one point that I want to go further upon, a point that was raised by the member for Ferryland. And that is that one feels that to-day the Government circles are trying to engender and the Government press to proclaim that the Opposition is obstructing legislation in this House. Have we no rights If we were not here to-day debating these things the Government would have to adjourn this Assembly. The Prime Minister told us here on opening day that one of the things why he left the opening of the Legislature so late in the season was that he wanted to be ready. Now the House was not opened until May and legislation is not ready yet. If the Opposition was not here discussing this to-day there would be nothing here for us to do. There is nothing on the order paper to-day that is at all contentious with the exception of Buchan's Mine, and with regard to that the Government's mind is made up. And I make the suggestion that in the dying hours of this session you will have legislation to put through, that you did not bring in before, because you feared that it might be too strenuously opposed. Now as far as I am concerned I am going to stay here. I have just voted my own salary of a thousand dollars as a member of this House and I am going to stay here, and the people of my district want me to stay here. And anything that you might say about obstruction is not go-

ing to affect me in the least. I am going to d.scuss all the votes that I think that I ought to discuss and I am going to ask all the questions that I choose to ask, supposing there is no other member of the Opposition stays with me, and nothing that you say about obstruction is going to h nder me from my manifest duty as a member of this Opposition. I think that I will begin all over again where I began two months ago, and go on with the job.

It is not fa r. It is not fair for those who coined the phrase "Square Deal." We are only asking what is reasonable to bring down supplementary Supply and the additional Estimates, and tell us where we are going to get the money to meet our expenditure. I resent any suggestion coming from any member of the Government side that we are here obstruct ng legislation to-day. We are here to-day trying to find out where we are going to get $11,000,000. I resent it, I am not an obstructionist. I don't want to stay here but I am going to stay here to do my duty and to get all the information that I want. I am going to ask the Minister of Finance whether he th nks that he can have the accounts for 1927 up here to-morrow. But at least I do not see any reason why we cannot get the accounts for the last fiscal year which we have just ended.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —No we never get the accounts closed until the last of October. I could not give you much more information than you have.

MR. SCAMMELL—We are here now discussing the two fiscal years.

I do resent the idea of suggesting that we are here obstructing because we are asking for information as to where the money is coming from to pay those bills. You show us that you got your Gander legislation ready and give us the other information that we have asked for and treat us decently, and the business of the House will be facilitated with despatch.

MR. BROWNE—Would the honourable member for St. Barbe call it obstruction tactics, if a member stated that he was prepared to stay in the House until December next, unless a general election was promised for the Fall?

MR. SCAMMELL—The honourable member who has just sat down does not know any more than the merest schoolboy in this town where the Government is going to get the money to meet the Estimates for ten millions of dollars that we are asked to vote in this House. I think that I have an interest in the people of this country and I think I am entitled to ask for public information on behalf of the public.

MR. CASHIN—Now I would like to ask Mr. Browne to answer this question. Where are we going to get eleven mill on dollars to meet these Estimates?

MR. BROWNE—Ask the Finance Minister.

MR. CASHIN—I am tired asking the Finance Minister, so I thought I would ask you, you seem to know it all.

Mr. Chairman, the point has already been raised by Mr. Scammell and myself that the Government press have been hound ng us down regarding obstruction in this House. I want the Prime Minister to say whether we are obstructing or is it the reason of the House being open now because the Government did not see fit to open the House earlier in the season. If it can be proven to me that I am delaying any public work in this country because of my actions in this House I am prepared to stay away. I have lots of work of my own to attend to; but I want to get a fair show and I am going to have it. Now as a member of this House and as a member of the community I am not going to let the

Prime Minister snub me here this evening. I want to know from the Prime Minister before this House adjourns this evening if by my tactics I have obstructed the Government and kept the unemployed from going to work? If the Prime Minister can prove to me that such is the case, I will resign my seat in this House and give my sessional pay for next year to some charitable organization; but I want a square show and I am going to have it, and I am not going to allow anybody to call me an obstructionist. Now is it because of the tactics of the Opposition or is it because the House did not open in February last that we are now here? Before we adjourn I want the Prime Minister to answer this question of mine. If he wants to snub me, I will get out of here. The Prime Minister has sneered at me once too often and he has got to answer my question this evening.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, I do not see any reason for the pugilistic attitude taken by the honourable member for Ferryland. When the Address in Reply was being debated it appeared to me that the debate was carried on with such persistency that it looked to me like obstruction. I do say that in connection with these Estimates members have discussed matters that have nothing to do with these Estimates and have discussed matters that do not appear to me to be in the best interests of the country. As the Estimates come before the House for each particular department, we want to hear the various votes debated and if there is any strong objection to any particular vote let us hear from the Opposition on the subject, because I do believe that a good Opposition is the best thing that we can have and I believe that we have a right to hear what the Opposition have to say as we go through the Estimates; but I must confess that we have listened to long speeches that do not appear to me to have much bearing on the Estimates now before the House. That is the attitude I take and that is the reason, I presume, that the public newspapers have made certain criticisms. I might say, however, that I have nothing to do with newspapers, they can draw their own conclusions and they can make any remarks they like. I have no control over them. I never even suggested to any newspaper as to what they should or should not put in, nor have I ever dictated to any newspaper in this country in any shape or form as to what their policy should be; but in view of what was happening in the House they have evidently drawn their own conclusions and I do not think there is anything unnatural about it.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I accept the Prime Minister's reply to a certain extent, but he left out, conveniently so no doubt, the prime reason why the House was not opened earlier in the season. The main reason for this House being in session now is on account of the fact that Parliament was not called together when it should have been called to meet. That is the true position and it does not matter to me one iota what the daily papers say. It is not because of obstruction tactics on the part of the Opposition that we are now in session, it is because of the strife that was within the Government ranks. That is the absolute truth and the Prime Minister knows it is the truth.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —If the honourable member and his associates had not tried to persuade the Government to do certain things, the House would have been opened in February instead of in May.

MR. CASHIN—If the Prime Minister and his Government had done what they should have done two and half years ago, the House would be closed by now, but it suited them politically to do otherwise. They were too cow-

ardly to carry out the law until March of this year and then they attempted to do it on April 21st last. That is the truth and the Prime Minister knows it s the truth.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, July 12th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 12th, 1927.

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. M nister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, before we pass on there is one item I overlooked yesterday that I would like to say something on; in connect on with the Superintendent of the Penitentiary. Why was he fired? Is he getting a pension or is he going to get a pension?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is a matter for considerat on. That comes under the Justice Department.

MR. CASHIN—Now is the time to vote it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It would be in additional estimates.

MR. CASHIN—That was my main point ever since we started th.s. Additional Estimates should be in with these in order to do the thing right. They should not be brought in later and rushed through in some nine hours. I state now that :f we want to vote right we should have the additional Estimates here now. The whole thing is an absolute cod, pardon the expression Mr. Chairman. Vote any way you like now as far as I am concerned. There is being money voted here spent four months ago and I would like to know the reason why that was spent without the author.ty of the House; without ever Executive authority.

MR. CRAMM—I would like the honourable member to give the instances he refers to in the money now being voted.

MR. CASHIN—Some time ago in reply to a question directed to the M:nister of Public Works I was informed that in St. John's East there was spent during March and April monies that we are voting now. (Reads; Question and answer).

MR. CRAMM—I think that poss.bly is correct and I think the honourable member will find that has been the practice all through the years when the House of Assembly meets late. It has always been done. Those advances from the Public Works Department have always been made in such cases.

MR. CASHIN—That is where the House is asked to vote road money. These monies spent in March were for shovelling snow purely for pol - tical purposes. I have returns showing where some five thousand and odd dollars belonging to roads in St. John's E. was spent some time in March and April and we are voting for that money to be spent now.

MR. CRAMM—I would like to see those returns.

MR. CASHIN—I had them here. I will get them and let you have them.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would draw the attention of the Committee to the matter of granting pensions. Now every year we find that we have to take a vote in Supplementary Supply for pensions. A man pensioned at the time that the House was s tting or perhaps before the House met, or shortly after. The ol ject of the Government should l e to anticipate the pensions and other expenditure, and have them in the Estimates, and that would save a lot of troul le. And it would give us a better idea of what the expenditure is going to l e. The quest on has been raised by Mr. Cashin in connection with the late Superintendent of the Penitentiary. I don't suppose that the Government has peremptorily dismissed the Superintendent of the Penitentiary without g.ving him the usual retiring allowance. That l eing so I cannot see why he should not be included in these Estimates. I don't suppose that the Government anticipates or thinks that of any :njustice in connection with that official who has given such long and valuable service and possibly the minister of the Department under wh ch the vote comes will give me an explanation of his position with regard to the Superintendent. A lot of us are interested in that place down there. I would like to know what the conditions are down there. Is there a man appo nted?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Thompson.

MR. HALFYARD—I know that the Minister will tell us all that he knows al out it. Without joking I think that is due to the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, at the present moment Mr. Thompson is acting Superintendent of the Penitent ary, and as far as having anything about him in the Estimates, I think that that is an utter impossil ility. It is impossible to come into th s House with complete Estimates, l ecause the Deputy Minister of Finance has to go to every department first and send somebody around to collect all the data. And perhaps he will get from the Post and Telegraph Department the estimates for the year, and then to-morrow he will get a note dropped down, saying that th s has got to come yet, so that we will never l e without additional estimates in this House. It will be an utter impossibility to do it. That is where we are to-day.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Cha rman, the same thing has l een going on for years. The officials associated with the various departments get bonuses. We are shown in the Auditor General's Report that we vote the same salary every year, and then we give these people bonuses. I feel that if we are going to give it to them t would be just as well to increase their salary by that amount, and do the thing right. Take the Colonial Secretary's Department for instance. The Deputy Colonial Secretary got last year for extra work $370. His salary is $3,600. whereas he received exactly last yea $3,970. But f you are going to gi— him every year a l onus of $370 why not make his salary $3,970. Last —— you gave the Inspector General an increase of $400. He was not more entitled to it than any other deputy head. because he has a better job than any deputy head has got. He gets more money.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I support the argument brought forward by the member for Ferryand, that salaries be voted in the Estimates. Now it is a well known fact that during the time of the late administration there was a civil service deduction under the Civil Service Act. Because we voted the salaries in the Estimates in full and then we made the deduction. And we were criticized, and we were told that in future that act would be repealed when they came into power, and that salaries

as voted in the Estimates would be paid. And why go further. Why to-day if you are going on the principle that you are going to vote salaries for the various Government officials, why not give them their salaries and not be asking us every year to be paying extra money. I don't see to-day that if one Government official has the right to ask for extra remuneration for his services, you can lay down the precedent, and you cannot excuse yourselves, that any Government official, can come in and ask for it. I do think that this appears to be a very dangerous practice. I cannot see where it is going to end. Because one Government created it it is not any reason why you should continue it. As the clerk in any business firm is paid a salary and is expected to do certain work, and if he is wanted to go back to do some extra work, such as overhauling the stock, you don't expect that he is going to get extra pay for it. I feel that we are giving these Government officials very good salaries to-day. Why try then to justify the payment for extra services. If some honourable member in this House got to-morrow $280 or $300, for some purpose, I would feel like asking what he got it for. If the Prime Minister got $500 extra in his position of Prime Minister, somebody in this House would be asking about that, and nobody would feel it out of place to ask it. Now is there nobody prepared to stand up here and explain why these officials get these extra amounts. I feel to-day that we are voting these Government officials good salaries. A man in the public service, holding the position of status of Deputy Minister and getting a salary of $3,600 a year is very well paid. And if the Government find it necessary to call upon him, to do a little extra work, why should he be paid has not been my experience in my career. I have done extra work when called upon to do it, but I have not been paid extra for it. And there is no honourable member but finds himself in the same position. So I say vote the salaries and have done with it. They are very well paid and we expect them to do the work.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman: I will say that there is some justification for giving bonuses to certain officials. When I was in the Board of Works Department some years ago I made that a point to further encourage the officials especially those who had to work overtime up to 11 or 12 o'clock at night during the business season. The official in charge of the road grants for instance could not get through his work during the office hours, and he was obliged to come back and others also, to assist him in getting off the special and main line grants. When the season of the year comes around, May or June, for the sending out of these grants, they may have to be sent out in a hurry, and in order to encourage them to do that, we had to pay them and to put on extra staff sometimes. The men in charge of these grants were always obliged to work overtime. You cannot expect an official to work overtime up to midnight every night for a couple of weeks without extra pay, and I contend that he is entitled to the extra pay for that purpose, and I saw that they did get that bonus, and on that grounds but on these grounds only they are justifiable.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman: I am rather glad that this matter has come up, because this is a hardy annual as far as my department is concerned and I want to make a few statements in reference to it. There has not been a dollar taken out of the grant for the Colonial Secretary's Department for bonuses. But the Auditor-General in his wisdom has already made spe-

cial reference to the fact that certain bonuses were granted to the officials of the Colonial Secretary's Department. We have in that department a position known as the fourth clerk. That position has not been filled for three or four years, ever since I came into that office. I have been endeavouring to carry out the work of that office with the vote at our disposal; and I want to say now that I do not any longer intend to continue on the lines that I have been going on for the last three years. As Colonial Secretary I have no special official in that office to assist me. The Deputy head is of course the permanent head of that department. But practically every other minister has a secretary who is devoted entirely to him, in the carrying out of his duties either official or otherwise. I submit to this House that the position of Colonial Secretary is as serious and as responsible a position as any in the Government. It is the position from which everything from the Government should radiate. If the Government is properly carried out every action should come through the Colonial Secretary who is the responsible mouthpiece of the Government. I have been endeavouring to carry out the duties of my office without the assistance of a secretary. I have no man in that office to file away a letter for me. And I am just as much entitled to a salary for a secretary as any other minister of the Crown. So I want to take this opportunity to refute this insinuation that there is anything wrong being done in my department, because there is not a dollar being spent in our office in excess of what is granted by this Legislature. Now I do not think that any member would find fault with me, if I asked the Government to give me the same consideration as other ministers. I am not anxious for it but I see that I get very little thanks for endeavouring to economise, and if I ask the officials in the department to assist me sometimes and pay them extra that is caused by the fact that I have not direct assistance. There is nothing improper or wrong about that. But I want to say that as far as I am concerned I cannot refrain from doing that and if I have to get a competent secretary I cannot expect to get one for $750 a year.

DR. MOSDELL—The Minister of Posts and Telegraph must remember that the Civil Service Act of last year put a specific stop to the payment of bonuses to officials of any department solely at the discretion of the head of that department. The only exceptions cited are the cases of the Department of Posts and Telegraph and also work that is performed by any official when such work is not in line with the ordinary discharge of his duty. Section 2 of the Act is very definite on this point. It reads: "No extra salary or remuneration of any kind whatsoever shall be paid to a member of the Civil Service as defined herein ,except (a) for overtime to a member of the postal or telegraph service; (b) to a person employed in headquarters office in a department, who has, at the direction of the head or deputy head of a department, performed, out of office hours, work of a kind not within the ordinary routine work of the department in which he is employed. Provided: that in either exception extra payment shall not be made unless the head or deputy head of the department for which the work was done recommends such payment and it is ordered by the Governor-in-Council." That is the law on the matter and my inquiry is as to whether or not its provisions have been complied with in connection with the extra payments now under discussion. The Auditor-General's report answers my query in the negative. What, then, have honourable ministers opposite to

say in answer to the charge of this official?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman: I presume that the same routine work is performed in the Board of Works Department to-day. Of course in the Post Office overtime is accounted for and provided for. Sometimes when trains are not on time we have to work overtime and then we have to pay for that extra work or else the staff will object. But I still contend that the same custom prevails in the Board of Works Department in connection with the getting off of the road grants. Just for a short space of time, they will want to get the grants out in a hurry and everybody will be shouting for them. That is my experience there. I do not understand about the local grants but I presume that the same custom prevails there. And I contend that when a man is called upon to do extra work that he should receive extra remuneration. But of course that matter is left in the hands of the head of the department. But I still contend that if the honourable member for St. Barbe, who some day may occupy a very important position in the postal service, if he had the experience that I have had during my time he will see the necessity, and the responsibleness, of that position. You cannot expect a man to work for forty-eight hours without sleeping. And the matter of bonus is left to the discretion of the head of the department, provided that there is not graft or anything like that. But we would have to go to the Labrador territory for that. We would have to sell a big slice of that before we could have any graft.

DR. MOSDELL—In reply to the honourable member who has just sat down, who has had a great deal more experience in this House than I have had, and who is thoroughly conversant with departmental affairs, I beg to point out that, by the provisions of the Civil Service Act of last year, only the Minister or the Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraph is permitted any wide latitude in the matter of extra payments to officials, that is in respect to overtime. In no other departments are officials permitted to be paid or to receive any amounts additional to their voted salaries, except it can be shown that they have done work not in their regular line of duty. In no other cases are such extra payments to be made. Now the Auditor-General asserts in his report that this law has not been observed. It may, as the honourable minister has just observed, have been the "custom of the country" to make these payments aforetime, but it is not now legal to make them; it has been illegal to continue the practice ever since the Statute of 1926 enacted to the contrary. Can honourable gentlemen of the other side who function as heads of departments conscientiously declare that the extra payments cited by the Auditor-General in respect to their various departments have been made in strict compliance with the Civil Service Act which was supposed to put a stop to such practices?

MR. HALFYARD—In confirmation of what the honourable member for the District of Fortune has said, the Auditor-General, in his report under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, is still complaining that the Act referred to has not been complied with.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That may be, but generally speaking, the Auditor-General insists on the carrying out of that last Act.

DR. MOSDELL—Referring now to the Tourist Publicity question, so thoroughly aired when that particular Bill was recently before the House, I beg to be permitted to ask the Honourable the Colonial Secretary once more if the Government, as such, now

intends to abandon the former practice of contracting and paying for advertisements in outside publications. My reason for this inquiry is that, of recent days, there has appeared in the local press the announcement that The Financial Post, a Toronto journal, is about to pubish a special Newfoundland number and that the Government of Newfoundland have contracted for two full pages of advertising in that issue. Seeing that this House has just voted for an enactment whereunder the Tourist Bureau is to be enabled to secure finances for giving due publicity to Newfoundland and its attractions, I am of opinion that the Bureau and not the Government should now and for the future undertake and pay for such advertisements. Otherwise, the advertising efforts will be but duplicated and so, unfortunately, will the cost thereof. Perhaps the Honourable the Colonial Secretary has some remarks to make in this connection.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I thought I explained this matter fully when the Bill came up for discussion. There is a certain amount of advertising done by the Government that cannot possibly come under the Tourist Bureau. For instance, the Crown Lands Office may want to advertise mineral lands. That would be in accordance with the policy of the Government and a great deal more money than what was voted has been spent by all Governments for this kind of advertising. There are several periodicals in England in which the Government carried advertisements, and I think I have already informed the House that I instructed the High Commissioner to reduce such advertising. Several of those periodicals gave Newfoundland prominence and assistance and they naturally felt aggrieved because the advertising was being cut out. It was one of those cases when you got to treat matters on their merits and we were determined to cut down the cost of advertising by one-half. But this vote of $1,500.00 that we take every year does not cover the amount spent for advertising each year. Now newspaper advertising is not the kind of advertising that the Tourist Bureau intends to pursue for the purpose of advertising the attractions and to facilitate visitors to this country in getting about. A great deal of the advertising that was formerly done by the Government will in the future be handled by the Tourist Bureau.

DR. MOSDELL—Do I understand that although the Tourist Bureau have their own Act through which they can raise funds to do their advertising that the Government will continue its policy of advertising outside the country independently of the Tourist Bureau?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—We are advertising outside the country, but we are curtailing the extent of such advertising.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the "Financial Post" advertisement of Newfoundland, I think they also give a write-up in connection therewith. In the last issue of that journal there appeared many erroneous statements in that the write-up performed by the editorial staff contained incorrect and misleading statements with regard to several of our industries. I submit that the Colonial Secretary or whoever is responsible for this advertisement should have the copy of the "AD" corrected.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Only last night a statement in the "Financial Post" was brought to my attention that we had one million votes in our Estimates or a total vote of five hundred million dollars.

MR. HICKMAN—I would like to know from the Finance Minister if the Government within the past three years paid a bonus on exported fresh

fish and if so to whom was the bonus paid?

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE —I think Job Brothers principally, but I will have a complete answer shortly.

MR. CASHIN—I would like to know from the Minister of Justice if he will inform us how much per lb. was paid on this fresh frozen fish, if there is any limit as to the amount of fish that this bonus applies to and what kind of fish does this thing refer to?

THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—One cent a pound. There is no limit as to the amount exported and I think it applied to only a certain kind of fish.

DR. MOSDELL—Does that law apply only to parties who have large plants, such as the Hudson Bay Company and Job Brothers and Co? The reason I ask the question is that there were between 150,000 and 200,000 pounds of fresh frozen fish and halibut exported from the South West Coast last year and I know that the exporters did not get any bonus.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —This is a general act and an open act that anybody can take advantage of. These people on the South West Coast referred to by the honourable member for Fortune Bay could not have taken advantage of the Act.

MR. LAKE—I might say that most of the halibut exported from the South West Coast was exported by an American concern.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I do not think the Act covers halibut.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Act provides that in order to get the advantage of the Act a contract has to be made. The Act is an open one which gives the Executive Council the right to enter into a contract with any parties for that condition. Under the 1918 Act, which is an amendment to the 1910 Act, the particulars are probably covered under what I will read now.

(Quotes from Act)

The whole scheme contemplates cold storage plants. An individual or company have five years to construct a plant. Fish packed in ice does not come under the Act.

MR. LAKE—I think this Act is altogether wrong. I think it is out of touch with the fishermen of the South West Coast. I think people fishing there should be given some protection. They export fish in boxes and should be given the same protection as the Hudson's Bay Company or any other Company. I think they should get it even if they haven't the means to put up cold storage plants. I think the Government might take the matter up; to encourage the South West Coast. I trust that the Government of the day will see their way clear to see if they can get a bait depot placed on the South West Coast somewhere to assist the bank fishermen to get fish. They are not coming to St. John's to get bait; the charges and expenses are too high; they want to keep to their own fishing grounds.

MR. HALFYARD—There is another aspect of this matter. Last year I think it will be remembered the Hudson's Bay Company I understand paid on the average five cents a pound. Of course it is their own business what they pay for fish, but the point is with a fresh fish bonus of a cent it will be seen that the Government is paying back to them one fifth. I feel sure the Prime Minister will agree with me, as one particularly interested in fish, that when the persons operating in this company pay a small price for fish and then get 20 per cent. of it back from the Government as a bonus, something should be done.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We are powerless. While the Act is there we have got to pay them the bonus.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What happens is that the Governor in Council makes a contract for one or more years, not exceeding fifteen.

I think in this case it is fifteen years and until that contract expires we are bound by it. The second position is this that if we cancelled the Act tomorrow it wouldn't affect contracts outstanding.

MR. HICKMAN—Have you a contract with the Hudson's Bay Company?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It is with them as successors to the North Atlantic Fisheries.

MR. HICKMAN—Is a contract of that kind transferable?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It must have been.

MR. CASHIN—You transferred it in the House last year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The words of the Original Act, that is a special Act, of course, merely provide that they shall reserve space to the extent of ten per cent. when requested to do so by the Governor in Council, free of charge when the fishermen bring the bait in.

MR. BROWNE—I notice, looking through the Act, that it is half a cent a pound; the agreement is for ten years; they have to keep ten per cent. of their space for bait; and they must sell bait to the fishermen engaged in the Bank fishery at a reasonable price.

(Reads)

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I was not present in the early part of the afternoon, and I wish to ask what has been done about the library, this year. We have a vote here for the salary of a librarian.

(Reads)

The library is becoming very useful to a great many people in town and particularly those connected with the various debating societies. They look to the librarian there to furnish them with books and magazines which help them for any debate that they may be taking part in. I understand that the lady there in charge has been very courteous in supplying them with all the information that she has at her disposal. And further that there is a lot of historical material around the city, which she has been endeavouring to get but which she is unable to purchase on account of the amount of money placed at her disposal. We have nothing whatever to tell us except what we are able to pick up in a scattered magazine, about the origin of the names in the different settlements in the island. Miss Morris the Librarian, had an opportunity about a year ago of purchasing a Newfoundland magazine for a number of years back which contained the history of the origin of the names of all the places in Newfoundland, written by the Late Archbishop Howley. Unfortunately she lost that valuable contribution, which could have been placed in the library for the use of anyone that wanted to take up that matter at any time. She could have got that for a small sum but now she is unable to obtain it. Then there has been some other records of places in different parts of the country which are accounted for in various letters that belong to people that have preserved them from one generation to the other. These could be got at a very small sum. I think that the legislature ought to place due regard upon all historical records alluding to Newfoundland. I don't think that you will find a more capable person than Miss Morris for getting hold of information throughout the Island. She has been collecting information on the West Coast, the benefit of which we are getting in the Daily News from day to day for the past fortnight. I think that one hundred dollars should be put at her disposal to buy records available at the present time. I would like for the Finance Minister before he puts through these estimates, to allow an extra hundred dollars, for her to be able to use during the next few months, to obtain that material. And if we cannot get it all we may be able to get some of it.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, with

regard to the Fire Department and the Police Department, I understand that some of the head constables and the sergeants have been pensioned off. I wonder could the Hon. the Minister of Justice give us their names.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I anticipated that quest.on and so I have the names here now.

(Reads)

All these men are probably the oldest in the force. I know myself that Sergeant Peet is fifty years in the force. And then on Page 33 you will find a number of changes there, but these only arise out of the retirements just referred to.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, the reason I have for asking that question is that in all the promotions in the Pol ce Department and in the Fire Department, they have seen fit to overlook the man that has been in the Fire Department for forty years. That man is Sergeant McGinn. Recently a man was brought from the West End Department and placed over him. Now he is a great friend of mine and there is no fault to be found with him, and I do not know what the Inspector General or the Justice Department have against this gentleman.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —He was junior to the other man that is all.

MR. MOORE—And this man applied for a weeks leave and they could not afford to give him but two days. He is a most capable man, but still the Inspector General could not see his way clear to do anything at all for him. And now to-day we find that there are a lot of men after being pensioned off, and he has got to stay there yet.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Cha rman, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister and members of the Board of Works, to the matter of uniform material, and other material, that is got for the various Departments, in which is included the Department of Justice of course. I was endeavouring to point out yesterday that materials are down in price and before any contracts are given and before any purchases are made that they make enquiries as to the actual cost, and you will find that if you make that investigation that at least $50,000 can be saved. There is no doubt whatever but that you can save that sum, if you purchase according to the quality with the lower prices that prevail to-day. And $50,000 is something towards reduction of expenditure. And this doesn't refer to uniforms only, but clothes for the Police Department, the Penitentiary and the Asylum and other public institutions.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not Professor Paton has anything to do with the Normal School and if not why not.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—He is principal of the Memorial College.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Then I gather from the answer of the Prime Minister that he has nothing to do with the Normal School. Now there is a vote in this Department:

(Reads)

That is the reason why I want to find out whether or not, because the majority of teachers that come in here from the outports, come in and attend the Normal School, and not the Memorial College, and I want to know whether or not Mr. Paton has anything to do with those teachers, or if his time is devoted entirely to the Memorial College. I think that it would be very beneficial to have those teachers come in contact with Professor Paton, a man of outstanding ability and who can train these teachers to go out and train the people of Newfoundland. I have met him and I have been greatly impressed by him. I think that the Minister of Education might go into

that matter and something might be done for the benefit of Newfoundland in general.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman: I may say that Mr. Paton has taken such a keen interest in everything educational that I am sure that there is nobody that goes to the Normal School but comes in contact with him. Of course the Normal School is directly under Mr. Whiteway.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: Can the Minister of Education inform the House if Professor Paton does give lectures to the students at the Normal School.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I cannot tell you that.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: I think that the Minister might find that out. I expect that a man of his ability is only too willing to do anything that he can in that regard.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: Before the Committee passes the vote covering the salaries of the Relieving Officers, will the Colonial Secretary please inform me if there has been any regard paid to the suggestion of the Auditor-General that competent inspectors be appointed to check up on the work of the various relieving officers. The idea of this suggestion, as explained by the Auditor-General was to make certain that the money of the Public Charities Department was not spent unnecessarily, and to avoid affording assistance to cases that were not actually deserving of Government relief. It strikes me as a most practical suggestion and one that the administration should not hesitate to act upon.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I may say that the matter has been receiving a good deal of consideration from the Finance Commission that has been sitting for some months. But that commission has not been functioning of late, particularly since the illness of Mr. Morine. He is the Chairman of that Commission. But the thing that was gone into fairly thoroughly was the question of poor relief. They have the report I believe pretty nearly completed, which will be revolutionary in its character, in regard to the outport relieving officers. It was considered inadvisable to leave the administration of the poor relief in the hands of men who were sometimes not responsible and incapable of performing the work properly. It has also been suggested that there should be a coupling up of officials in certain localities, such as the Collector of Customs and the Postmasters and other officials that are paid salaries, that a small amount in addition to their salaries may be considered sufficient compensation for the work that may be done in that connection.

There is also to be a system of inspection of relieving officers all over the country whereby inspectors will go around and without warning will drop into a section where there is a relieving officer and generally ascertain what relief was given out, getting the names of the individuals and the amounts given them and the circumstances under which they were given. In that way a more correct idea will be obtained of the amount of poor relief that will be distributed throughout the country; instead of following the custom of heretofore and allowing some people, as is well known, to obtain poor relief by surreptitious methods. I believe that a great waste of money has been made in the past throughout the length and breadth of this country on account of a number of people getting poor relief who were not entitled to it. But the great difficulty was to get responsible persons to take charge of that kind of work, as certainly the relieving officers were paid very inadequate salaries. Now the report of that Commission is not yet final-

ized for the reason I have already stated, but I feel sure that the other two members of that Commission will be able to make that report in the very near future. But I think the strong point in this whole matter is that a regular inspection of relieving officers will take place and which will mean a better linking up of the affairs of the civil service than there is to-day in connection with poor relief.

MR. MOORE — Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary if it is possible for us to get a synopsis of the report of that Commission before proceeding further with the Estimates. I thought we would have a report here from that Finance Commission before this time. I was hoping to see that report before we come to the Finance Department and that is why I now ask the Colonial Secretary the question. I understand that Commission has been working for a considerable time and I certainly think it is time we had a copy of that report. Is it possible to have a digest of that report here before we get through with the Estimates?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman: In reply to the query of the honourable member for Ferryland, I will endeavour to find out if it is possible to get for him the information he desires. I have no doubt that the Commission were working on the right lines. I have not seen the report myself, but I understand it is in course of preparation. At any rate I will endeavour to get a digest of that report before this Committee rises.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: The total of the public funds expended on public health and on permanent and casual poor relief aggregates the astounding sum of over one million dollars per year. It is my personal opinion that this huge amount can be considerably curtailed without hardship being caused to anybody. What steps have the Government taken to ascertain what economics can be effected in this connection and to what extent? The Auditor-General in the report now in the hands of Honourable members urges the necessity for stricter control and more careful expenditure of public health and poor relief votes, but I note that the Estimates with which we are now concerned provides for a considerable increase in these votes. It is perfectly obvious to the least discerning that there must presently be a limit reached to the extent of such expenditures. I contend that we have reached such a time in the financial history of the country. We cannot possibly afford to spend so much money in such a connection, seeing that a great deal of the huge amount involved is spent to no good effect, is wasted in fact.

At last session of the Legislature a Commission was appointed to inquire into the expenditure of public monies, to devise ways and means of effecting economies and to make recommendations to the House of Assembly. Between sessions we heard a great deal of the activities of that Commission which consisted, I think, of Hon. A. B. Morine, Hon. M. S. Sullivan and Hon. R. Cramm, all members of His Majesty's Executive Government. But since this session began, not a mention has been made here of their activities, no report has been submitted to honourable members and no recommendations are before us as to the manner and extent to which economies can be applied to the Estimates for the expenditures of the public monies. I, personally, was led to believe that the investigations of that Finance Commission were particularly concerned with the activities of the Department of Public Charities and with those of the Board of Health, in respect to relief of permanent and casual poor and treatment of the sick poor of this

country. If this be the case, why do not the Estimates show signs of some remodelling in connection with this vote? Why are all the evidences of economy or any attempt at economy absent? Surely, now is the time for this Finance Commission to make itself heard and to display evidence of the public value of its activities and its investigations. I notice that the senior member of the Commission is about to make an extended trip abroad. Will the Commission function in his absence? Has the Commission reported to the Government at all? Will honourable members be afforded an opportunity of examining any such report during this present session? Surely such a report should have been tabled in this House long before this stage of proceedings was reached.

Perhaps the Honourable the Colonial Secretary will be good enough to explain to this Committee why so many new appointments as District Surgeons appear in these Estimates. Three such are referred to in the Auditor-General's report. They function at Bell Island, at Burgeo and at Trinity East and each is referred to as having been paid a salary of $480 under authority of Order-in-Council. My understanding was that, by virtue of a modus vivendi arranged as between the Medical Association, on the one hand, and the Government Departments of Public Health and Public Charities on the other hand, registered medical practitioners, as and when called on by the proper officials, were to place their services at the disposal of the sick poor, being paid therefor according to a fixed scale for attendance and for travelling expenses. That arrangement, apparently, has broken down. Why ? Was there any breach of agreement by the medical men? Did the Government find the new arrangement more expensive than the older order of things? As a mater of fact, I understand the latter explanation to be the cause. At any rate, District Surgeons are again being appointed and I have no doubt that at the proper time the Honourable the Colonial Secretary will explain to this Committee this reversal of Government policy.

As proof of the inadequacy of the present system of relieving officers either to cope properly with really deserving cases of destitution or to exercise due supervision over the expenditure of monies of the Department of Charities, I beg to call attention to the situation in the District which I have the honour to represent. That district includes a great many miles of the southwest coastline and a large number of small settlements. In all the district there are but four relieving officers. It is practically impossible, without undue delay and very considerable expense, for these officials to investigate all cases appealed to them. Obviously, to ensure proper and economical expenditure of the funds entrusted to their control, they must so treat every such case on its merits. I merely cite this instance to illustrate the shortcomings in practice of a system which, throughout Newfoundland controls and is in large measure responsible for the extent of that huge expenditure of over a million dollars now voted annually for public health and poor relief cases. Obviously, it is a system very much in need of sweeping reforms in the interest of economy.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—

Mr. Chairman: the doctors are not getting any travelling expenses now. They get a specific sum in the dirtrict in which they live and they have to provide their own travelling expenses. We found this new arrangement a more economical one because doctors used to send in their bills from different parts of the country and it was very difficult to check. In

fact there was hardly any check on them. Disputes were frequently happening and after viewing the matter from various angles it was decided by the Government to nail them down to specific salaries. This is why a new system of district surgeons was appointed and doctors now have to pay for their own travelling expenses. This it was thought would solve the hospital problem of St. John's, but I think when the time comes, and it must come because our experience of the last 50 years that the conditions that prevailed were absolutely intolerable. We are not getting efficient service, the doctors are not fairly cooperative in some cases with regard to these patients. The time has come when I have no hesitation of saying what I think or feel about this matter. Last year we increased the doctors' fees for travelling, the result has been, no improvement. They have travelled more, that is the usual thing now, because they get more money. We should get greater co-operation than we do from the Medical Association. I have every respect for them, but they ought to see that as citizens of this country they should co-operate, and try to help the Government to cut down this expenditure. It is a perfectly impossible situation, and I can appreciate the information that the honourable member is seeking in regard to this matter, but it is impossible to explain how it can be handled until we have some organization, until we have some man thoroughly capable with executive and administrative ability to take charge and become Director of the Medical Service. If we can get the right man that is the only way of solving the trouble.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: Quite a number of most deserving institutions appear in the list now before us as in receipt of annual subsidies from the Government, but none appeals to me as deserving of more support than that situated at Grand Bank. Unfortunately, that hospital receives but the niggardly sum of $850 per year. Yet it is the only institution of the kind situated between the General Hospital at St. John's and the hospital at Corner Brook, going by way of the Southwest Coast. The Grand Bank Hospital was founded through the charity and the enterprise of the progressive town in which it is situated. It has done considerable good and might be made to fill a much-felt want were it as well supported by the Government as are many institutions outside the country itself. Located at the headquarters of our banking fleet it might be made to do magnificent and well-timed service for the men who man the bankers. It should be equipped and staffed that it could cope satisfactorily with emergency cases that from time to time arise on a section of our coastline so remote from the hospital institutions in St. John's. It could be made a very efficient and very accessible adjunct to the Nonia nursing service operated in many places around Fortune Bay. The amount of support given the devoted band of nurses by the people to whom they minister shows to what an extent the Grand Bank Hospital might be expected to be self-supporting, were it in condition to treat the many cases that from time to time require hospitalisation. The Southwest Coast is to a great extent self-contained, it prides itself on its independence and Nonia has fostered that very creditable spirit, one so lamentably lacking in so many other sections of the country. For this really splendid movement we have, in large measure, to thank such leaders in public life as Rev. Mr. MacDermott, of Pool's Cove. Surely, the least we can do to assist men of such noble endeavours

is to facilitate their efforts to encourage our people to rely on themselves, when there are so many tendencies of a contrary nature at work. I do not cla m that the Grand Bank Hospital, even under the most favorable auspices, would be an ideal arrangement, but its financial assistance, on a much larger scale than is the case at present, would be a very graceful gesture from the Government to the people of the South West Coast who have been so long and so notably neglected by various Government in connection with many public affairs.

I hold, too, Mr. Chairman, that an increased subsidy to the Grand Bank Hospital would not of necess ty entail a larger expenditure on public health. On the contrary, it would spell considerable economy and would, beside, ol viate unnecessary inconvenience actual suffering for sick persons who have now to be transported from their homes to St. John's by steamship and ra lroad. Patients could be treated much nearer home and the expense of their transportation would be much reduced. The cost of treatment and maintenance would be much less at Grand Bank than at St. John's. Then, too, they would be spared the very demoralising influences that prevail here under a system which induces people to regard the Government as ol ligated to provide them with medical and surg cal facilities at the expense of the general body of taxpayers of the country. Hospitalisation for the people of the South West Coast is a prol lem of a very real and very pressing nature. It cannot, in justice to a body of self-respecting and independent taxpayers, be longer neglected. An increased sul sidy for Grand Bank Hospital, enabling a b gger staff and a better equipment for that institution may not represent an ideal solution or a completely satisfactory arrangement, but it would at least be a step in the right direct on. It could, at any rate, be interpreted as the display of some little intelligent interest in the vital welfare of the industrious and independent fishermen of the South West Coast generally and of Fortune Bay particularly.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I th nk that during the past couple of years I have been advocating an increase in the grant for that hospital at Grand Bank. That institution, as I have stated l efore in this House, was originally started by the late Samuel Harris of Grand Bank and he got a small grant to pay the nurse and the doctor there, but the doctor has s nce retired from professional services. He gave his services when he was active free of charge. Now the most of our sick fishermen of the Banks have to go to that hospital and I think the Government would be well advised if they would increase that grant for Grand Bank Hospital and thereby save t me and expense for the authorities of St. John's. In support of this request I might say that the Secretary of the Board of Governors of the General Hospital, Mr. Rennie, says that if the Grand Bank Hospital was properly equipped it would mean a tremendous saving for the General Hospital of St. John's. The grant of $850.00 per year is entirely insufficient for this institution at Grand Bank, and when you consider that this is a relay stat on, so to speak, for so many of our Bank fishermen and their families and when you take into consideration that the sanitary arrangements in that institution are not at all what they should be I think that the grant should l e increased.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Cha rman, following on the remarks of the last two speakers, I think it is al solutely ridiculous to take any other view of the situation, but I think the honourable members will remember that last year or the year previous there was an extra amount paid by the Government, and I think that there were some bills

outstanding that were liquidated on Mr. Lake's representation. After the death of Mr. Harris the hospital lost its best friend and, as is well known. It was the pride of the people of that place that they would maintain their own hospital. I am quite in accord with what has been expressed by the honourable member for Fortune Bay that very often an emergency case or cases come on to the St. John's Hospital that would not come if the facilities were afforded them at the Grand Bank Hospital; but the question arises, like everything else in a public institution, it is a matter of finance and have we the money to do it? but I feel sure that the Government will be only too glad and willing to consider seriously the ideas and requests advanced by the members for Burin and Fortune Bay.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the benefit of this House that I feel sure that the people of Grand Bank would be only too willing to do anything they can for the maintenance and unkeep of that hospital, but at the present time the Grand Bank people are over-burdened with a heavy debt on their new school building which cost from sixty to seventy thousand dollars. At the same time I think that at some future date the people of Grand Bank will build an hospital for themselves with the assistance of the Government. I am very pleased to hear that the expenses of Grand Bank Hospital will receive the sympatheic consideration of the Government. But that is not enough. At present there is only one nurse there, who is underpaid. The main doctor of the place does not receive anything for his services, and then you have no sanitary arrangements whatever in that institution. Consequently I think the Govt., as has already been suggested, would be well advised if they would increase the grant towards the upkeep of that institution at Grand Bank.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary for an explanation of the three or four votes there included under the heading of charitable societies. They appear to have reference entirely to one institution.

(Reads)

According to the matron they get only the one vote. Whether it was the intention of the Government to double that vote or not I do not know.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Before the Grace Hospital was built we had the Maternity Hospital and the Rest Cure Home. Then the two votes were paid to the one institution.

DR. MOSDELL—But at the Rest Cure Home there is done a great deal of Medical Service apart from the Rest Cure Home, and yet they are not getting the benefit of that grant, according to the matron. Then there is a vote there in respect to the Grace Hospital. What is the arrangement regarding the matter of the training of nurses.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —They get a subsidy for the training of the nurses. They give training to nurses at the General Hospital and that is provided for in this vote. Now I am not finding fault with the amount given to the hospital. But take the preceding vote. Why is that there? That was given as a subsidy to the Hospital.

DR. MOSDELL—But the Hospital was paid extra by the Government. Last year the Grace Hospital got more than the General Hospital, there was something like $90,000 paid by the Government in connection with cases not able to pay for themselves.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, that amount paid out of the Public Charities to the General Hospital represents the portion of the one dollar a day fee that is not collected from patients who enter the General Hospital. The balance of three or four

dollars is paid by the Government in any case. But in the case of the Grace Hospital that three or four dollars must be charged up to the Government in case the patient cannot pay.

DR. MOSDELL—Then the Government pays one rate in respect to one hospital and another in respect to another hospital.

HON. MR. CRAMM—In connection with the General Hospital there is a rate of one dollar a day. That in a great many cases is not paid by the patient but by the Government. But the honourable member knows very well that the balance of four dollars which it costs the General Hospital for every patient is made up in the Estimates in the votes for salaries and general maintenance. The Government pays that no matter how well the patient may be able to pay. Now if the gentleman goes into St. Clare's Hospital or the Grace Hospital then there is a different situation. There is no amount voted by this House for those institutions and the Government pays there whatever is charged, if the patient is not able to pay, whether it be three or four dollars a day. That is why the vote may be larger for the Grace Hospital than for the General.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, in the General Hospital there are eight beds at three dollars a day. Now that vote in itself is ridiculous. As the honourable member knows that $24.00 that is three hundred dollars for each bed cannot begin to maintain a bed in the General Hospital. This vote if it had been put down at two beds at twenty four dollars would have been more reasonable. But it has always appeared in the Estimates in this way.

Mr. Chairman, this of course brings up a very far-reaching point and is one of the discrepancies that is occuring in the medical service, that we cannot explain. No honourable member present knows more of the situation than the honourable member for Fortune Bay with regard to the complicated conditions which all the medical service is drifting into. This particular vote I think was started as a kind of retainer for eight beds in the Grace Maternity Hospital. We merely endowed eight beds at three hundred dollars a year. The idea was merely to provide for pauper patients there. But the trouble has been that the General Hospital treat people for $1.00 per day and gives them all the advantages of all their scientific equipment as well as the medical services of the entire staff of eight doctors, to people who can well afford to pay for it, while the other hospitals charge three or four dollars a day. That is where the anomaly comes in. And I don't think that we will ever get clear of that position unless we bring in a bill that the General Hospital will have to be run on its own. It is impossible to unravel the tangle under the present conditions.

Take the Southcott Hospital for instance. Miss Southcott is running that hospital as a business proposition. If a Government patient goes in there he has got to get a certificate from the poor Relief Officer to enter that hospital. And if that patient is not able to pay more than a dollar a day the Government have got to give the balance to make it up. This is how things are going on. There are all kinds of improper practices. We have people coming from this city and from all parts of the country, who have lost all their pride and have no hesitation in going to the Charity Commissioner and getting a certificate to go to the General Hospital, and this Government has to pay for it. But the time will come when we will have to discriminate. In Halfax there is a case in point. They have there the Victoria General Hospital which is serving all the counties of Nova Scotia. Each county contributes so much to this General Hospital. But in addition they have a private pavilion, and this takes

the private patients and each private patient pays the amount of the hospital charges in full with the result that that pavilion more than pays for itself by the fees collected and can contribute somewhat to the General Hospital that is used for the non-paying patients. Unless we can obtain similar conditions here, confusion is only going to be worse confounded. I would suggest that that is a very fair proposition to put up to the people of this country. We have here public spirited men, take the case the other day of Mr. Baird, who gave a building to be used as a hospital. It was not accepted because the upkeep of the building would be so serious that we did not see our way clear to accept it. Now I want to know what is wrong with this proposition. You have a General Hospital down there, fully capable of taking care of all the pauper cases in this country, If you can take out the patients that can afford to pay. Let us say that we put up a pavilion. Let it cost half a million. Now, let us raise a loan and float it in the city or in this country. It would only mean $25,000 a year interest. You could raise that on Government security for 5 per cent., and I am sure that would save $100,000 by doing that, because it would take all the paying patients out of the General Hospital. On the other hand it will obviate the necessity of any of those outside hospitals. There is a large amount of money spent on outside hospitals; the patients are scattered and they cannot get the advantage of the treatment that they would otherwise get. Therefore, I say a tremendous sum can be saved in that respect. Surely there are enough public spirited men in St. John's to raise a sum such as this. I feel that it would be subscribed to inside of two hours.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, the Colonial Secretary recognises that the proper establishment of outport hospitals means a considerable saving on people coming to the city and in that connection I may say that the vote of $15,000.00 for Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital does not cover the needs of the people of Twillingate and Fogo districts. From time to time I have a number of my constituents coming to the city and they come into the city and put up here for over a week or more before getting to the General Hospital. Now I do not think that if the Government added another $5,000.00 to that grant they would be going out of their way because there are patients in these two districts who are able to pay their proportion of hospital expenses so that the Government would not stand to lose anything by making an extra grant, such as I suggested. You would save money in the way of fees, transportation and boarding expenses so that I think the Colonial Secretary would be well advised if he made the vote in the Estimates $20,000.00 instead of $15,000.00.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I fully endorse the remarks of Mr. Grimes regarding the vote for the Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital, and for the purpose of saving expense for the Government I think it would be much better to increase that vote of $15,000.-00 to $20,000.00. Furthermore it would be an economic step on the part of the Government to increase that vote because, in accordance with the suggestion of Mr. Grimes, we do not want the patients of Fogo and Twillingate districts to be coming to St. John's because I do not think it is the right and proper thing. We have a fine hospital in Twillingate and it is only a matter that some provision be made for those who cannot afford to pay. I think that if the Government will view this matter from an economical standpoint, apart from the humanitarian side of the question, they will see that by acting on the suggestion made by Mr. Grimes they will not be increasing

expenditure by enlarging the vote, but rather will they be reducing expenditure.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, with regard to that vote of $15,000.00 for that Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hosp tal, I would like to point out that if a patient comes into that hospital a pauper the pul lic charities department makes no further contribution for the expense and that is why I consider it rather hard to expect that hospital to accommodate all the pat ents coming to its doors from two districts and get no returns for treating them, except the amount of $15,000.00 voted annually here. Only yesterday afternoon I received a letter from Magistrate Wornell of Twillingate in relation to a sick man at Moreton's Harl our who was coming here to enter the Sanitarium. Th s morning I got in touch with Dr. Rendell of the Sanitarium and I find that he cannot take care of this patient at the present time and I have wired Magistrate Wornell accordingly. This man is now probably at Twillingate Hospital and is unable to pay for his upkeep. Therefore, I say that if Twillingate Hospital gets a lot of such patients it w ll not be long before their grant of $15,000.00 is consumed, and I do not see why the Government, through the Charities Department, would not pay a certain amount towards Twillingate Hospital with regard to pauper patients, or otherwise increase the grant another five thousand dollars.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say how much we appreciate, as a Government, what the people of Twillingate have done themselves in connection with that Hospital. Dr. Parsons has worked very assiduously in respect to the whole thing and he deserves much cred t for it. Also the people of Twillingate sacrificed themselves and subsidized the hospital to the utmost of their means and when we were asked to give an extra $5,000.00 towards the grant of that hospital we gave it because we felt that every person who could, even in the digging of potatoes, contributed towards the upkeep of that institution in Twillingate. That I am sure is very commendable and I wish that our St. John's hospitals were carried on along similar lines; but the fact remains that when you have not got the cloth you cannot make the garment and I cannot see how you are going to increase expenses unless we get a bigger revenue. However, without saying anything more, Twillingate hospital has my entire support.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate what the Prime Minister has said. Like him I do not think that the Government to-day is in a position to increase expenditure. When I expressed my opinion on this hospital at Twillingate it was not with the idea of making any increase in the expenditure of that institution because, after all, you will have spent easily more than the extra $5,000.00 asked for in this vote by the amount of overhead expenses that the Government will be called upon to pay for patients coming to the St. John's General Hospital for treatment. That is my opinion.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have not seen any decrease in the number of patients as a result of that building.

MR. HIBBS—I have seen quite a number. Of course, the Prime Minister representing a distr ct further south, and the number of patients coming from that District have got to go to St. John's any way, but there is quite a difference in the number coming from Fogo. At this very moment we have perhaps six that would be here in St. John's.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice and by unanimous consent it was resolved that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to make the following amendment in and upon the bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Holyrood Pond Fisheries Limited":—

7. Section 5 of the Agreement forming the Schedule to this Act shall read as if the words "to the rivers flowing into" were struck out and the word "to" substituted for them.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn and with your permission I would like to direct the attention of the House to the very serious fact that in the District of Fogo in Sections around the Gander there is a very serious forest fire. No doubt the House has already had some knowledge of it. Before speaking further I would very sincerely thank the Minister of Agriculture and Mines for his very commendable action in acting so promptly and doing everything possible to fight this great menace. I have a certain number of messages here which show clearly that the Minister did act promptly, but I am afraid that it is not under control. It is in the wooded section of the country, and this is the most alarming feature to my mind. I have just received a message from Mr. Saunders who is a merchant in Gander Bay. I have already had a few other messages saying that the fire was moving in the direction of Gander Bay. Now we have been talking a lot about the Gander, and the possibility of a big enterprise there, and while we are talking about it the chances are that if we get the wind in a particular direction and we are not able to cope with the fire, that we will have no Gander to talk about forty-eight hours from now. This is a very serious matter, as that is a very wooded section, where we have quite a number of saw-mills, but apart from that that fire has already devastated that section and destroyed three homes. I do not know how many more. The Clergyman there sent in a message as follows:

(Reads)

Another message from the Justice of the Peace says:

(Reads)

Now I am sure that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines who has been so active in this matter will give the House some information on this point. I ask on behalf of the people in that section beside the valuable property, that the Government will do everything in their power to grapple with the situation. But it is difficult to get a sufficient number of men down there because the men are fishing at the present time, and they do not like to leave off the fishery to engage in fighting forest fire, nor can we expect them to do it for nothing. I think that the Govt. would act wisely, to take immediate steps to support the Minister of Agriculture in the commendable steps that he took to grapple with this menace. I feel sure that it is only necessary to call the attention of the Government to the matter.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE—Mr. Chairman, I wish first of all to thank the member for the complimentary remarks that he has made about myself. I also beg to point out to the House the desirability of having as little publication as possible under the present circumstances. We have been negotiating with important companies. The area referred to in the vicinity of Gander

Bay is one of the attractions for the Companies coming here to establish an industry, and I think that it would be very wise to have newspapers refrain from making comment with regard to the serious danger that may be menacing this forest. We have done all that could be possibly done under the circumstances but we find it very disappointing when we get to a town with a settlement where there are only a couple of men available. I wired messages to people whose names were given by Mr. Grimes and Mr. Hibbs, and some replies have been very disappointing. One reply said that there were twenty men but that before they would go to combat the fire they wanted to know what wages they were going to get. I had a message from the Magistrate at Fogo and it said that the men were at the fisheries and that it was hard to get men. At the scene of the fire at the present time there are about one hundred men. I wrote to the chief fire ranger at Port Blandford, to organise the fighters and to go to the scene of the fire himself. He pointed out to me that the proper place for him to be at that time was in his office where he could keep in touch with the particular sections of the country, in case of fire breaking out in other sections.

He is a very reliable man; an employee of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. Mr. James happened to be in the vicinity of Clarenville doing survey work and he has been authorised to employ all the men available in that section. The "Home" may be here to-morrow and may be rushed there and it may be possible to pick up some men on the North Side of Bonavista Bay if conditions are still serious and have them brought to Clarenville. I assure you anything that can be done by the Government will be done. It is not we know an easy matter to put out a forest fire once started. It might perhaps be an easy matter to save the settlement but as regards the forest fire it is no easy matter and I don't think it matters much whether we have a hundred or a thousand men to fight it; it depends largely on weather conditions. One hour of rain will do more damage to the fire than a hundred men. Meantime, however, we are doing the best possible and will do everything to get the fire under control in the interests of the lives and property of the people up there. I would ask the reporters of the House and the newspaper reporters to be very careful with regard to any comments made on this matter in connection with the Gander.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, July 13, 1927.

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

A petition was presented by:

Mr. Bradley, from Clarke's Beach and South River, re employment.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting Patents.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions, which were read a first time, as follows:

Department of Finance ..	$4,201,917.22
Department of Colonial Secretary	128,409.00
Department of Justice ..	368,513.42
Department of Public Charities	489,083.26

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Chairman: While we are on this lobster vote I would like to make a few observations. A few days ago I tabled a question asking the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when the prosecution of the lobster fishery will again be permitted; if it was correct that he Government proposes to allow that fishery to be prosecuted this fall in certain sections of the Island, and if it is correct that it is the intention of the Government, when prosecution is again permitted, to limit, by some means, the number of factories in each district to merchants and such others, who alone are in a position to operate large factories. Now honourable members will remember that at the time legislation was brought in here for a close season on lobster fishing I opposed it, not that I was so much opposed to it on principle, although I had some doubt in my mind as to whether a close season would really conserve or enhance the lobster fishing industry. I did not oppose it on that point, but I did oppose it on the ground that sufficient notice had not been given to lobster packers as to what the intention of the Government was and consequently a great many lobster factories and fishermen, who had spent considerable time and money in getting their gear ready for the following season's operations, and who would not have gone to such inconvenience and trouble if they had been notified, were put out of business on account of an act of this Legislature. It was chiefly on that ground that I opposed the act a couple of years ago although I had an open mind then as I have to-day as to whether a close season regarding lobsters is going to serve the ends that the Government had in view when they brought this legislation in here. During the past week I had some correspondence from my district and I had some personal conversations with men from my district and they seem to have got on to a rumour that the Government were contemplating opening the lobster fishing season again this fall and further that the Government proposed to take steps to limit the number of persons who should pack lobsters. Let me say frankly that I trust that the Government do not propose to do either of these two things. My reasons are, first, that if you decide this year to grant permission to people to prosecute the lobster fishery this fall you will find very many people ready to avail of that permission as regards having their factories put in order for next season whilst other fishermen are not prepared for it, as a great many lobster fishermen have gone to the codfishery or are engaged in some other avenue of employment, and to avoid confusion and to avoid discrimination I would suggest that the Government have nothing to do with such a proposition. Secondly, my reason is, as vigorously and strenuously as I opposed that act of yours, I would advise that you stick to that law until the three years are up, so that everybody will get an equal and a fair show and so that all will be treated alike. Thirdly, I would say, do not limit the number of packers. Give every man the same conditions as he had before. You can have inspection if you like to safeguard the welfare of the industry but do not discriminate as to who should or who should not be a packer of lobsters, outside of what the requirements of your department are. As there was a meeting of the Fishery Board last night, I trust that you have not decided to embark upon the policy

that I have referred to. I do not think that I can make any fairer comment on the position to-day, but I would like to hear from the Minister as to what was the result of their meeting last night with regard to the lobster subject.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the honourable member I might say that during the past year we had several applications from people all over the country asking to have the lobster fishery opened up again this fall, but the Fishery Board turned down the requests, as they had made up their minds to keep the close season until January next which is the expiration period, under the law. As far as the report of limiting the number of factories is concerned, the Board never made any such decision nor did the matter ever come before the Board. Last night a meeting of the Fishery Board was held and several communications were discussed. One was from the Board of Trade. Another was from a Nova Scotian who fished in St. Barbe district for ten or twelve years and several other letters were read relating to the lobster fishery. As this fishery is closed for three years, now is the time to make rules and regulations to safeguard that industry for the future, and the proposition was made and carried to have a committee appointed to go into the different correspondence and get all possible information for the Fishery Board before any recommendations are made to the Executive Government as to the conduct of that fishery when it opens up again next year. That Committee will consist of Mr. Barr, Mr. Hepburn, Mr. Templeton and two other members of the Board, including the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and we have also asked the Board of Trade to appoint a man for us from their body. We have received quite a lot of correspondence from people all over the Island in relation to the lobster fishery and people who were very much against the closing of the lobster fishery three years ago are glad to-day that the Fishery Board recommended to the Government a close season. We have also learned from responsible and reliable people that lobsters have increased considerably all round the coast, and I hope they have. Personally, I was under the same impression as Mr. Scammell when the act for a close season was first introduced. Within recent years very little lobster fishing has been done on the North Side of Bonavista Bay. Twenty-five years ago the settlements of Newtown and Valleyfield were the most industrious and thriving lobster settlements in the country, but within the past eight years or so very few people have been engaged in the prosecution of this industry. Nevertheless the reports we have to-day are that lobsters are increasing all over the country and I think it is a good sign for the benefit of all concerned.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I thank the Minister for the statement he has made, but I want to correct the impression that he seemed to have. The rumour I alluded to never came from the Board of his department but was merely a deduction that I got from an answer to a question of mine directed to him combined with information that I got outside concerning the lobster fishery. Now I do not like the look of the personnel of the Committee that you have appointed as it savours that the Government is at its old tricks again. By the appointment of Mr. Barr and Mr. Hepburn, etc., you are shifting responsibilities and you are going after the crowd on Water Street again. You know these people do not represent the views of the lobster fishing people of this country. If you want to regulate the lobster fishery, I am prepared to spend ten dollars on telegrams to-morrow whereby you

can get the opinions of representative lobster fishermen in the district of St. Barbe and from whom you will get more sane, sound and sensible advice in a half hour than you will get from Messrs. Barr, Templeton and Hepburn and others in two weeks. I hope that before this Committee finishes its work that you will be good enough to ask me to have the last word said about the regulations for the lobster fishery from men in my district who are well known to Captain Winsor and men who have been engaged in the lobster fishery all their lives. As I have already pointed out, I do not like the personnel of that sub-committee of the Fishery Board. Then again, what is the idea of putting in here in the Estimates a vote for a man called a lobster and herring inspector when the lobster fishery is now closed?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: That same vote was in last year. This man is not alone a lobster inspector, but he also inspects herring, oil and turbot. In other words he is a general inspector. I may say that I had a letter from a noted lobster fisherman of St. Barbe district in the person of Mr. Stephen Taylor in which he expressed his opinion as to the benefit of a close season on lobsters. The Board will be only too glad if members of other districts will get any information they can from their constituents that will help the sub-committee of the Board in coming to their conclusions in connection with the lobster fishery. Now with regard to what has been said by the honourable member for St. Barbe about the Water Street merchants. I have no more love for the Water Street merchants than has Mr. Scammell, but I am not going to run around saying "down with the merchants' when I know that we cannot do without them. Now Mr. Barr is a man who has had a lot to do with the lobster fishery in this country. In fact I do not know of any man who has taken more interest in the lobster fishery in Newfoundland for the past 20 years than has Mr. Barr nor do I know of any man who knows more about the lobster fishery than does Mr. Barr. Mr. Templeton is another business man who has been prominently identified with the lobster fishery of this country for very many years and a man who has taken very considerable interest in that industry. We asked to have a representative from the Board of Trade, one from the trade, one from Ferryland District, one from Burin District and one from Twillingate District. Therefore, I think that the sub-committee of the Board appointed to deal with this whole question is a very representative one and fairly well constituted as far as getting information is concerned. However, it was decided at a meeting of the Fishery Board last night to leave the number of the committee open so that we would be only too glad to receive anybody on that Board to give their opinion. As I said before, we have received letters from many lobster fishermen of the West Coast, notably from Mr. Stephen Taylor. Like Mr. Scammell, Mr. Taylor was opposed to a close season a few years ago, but now he thinks it is the best thing ever happened for the conservation of the lobster fishery and for the benefit of the country generally. Mr. Taylor stated in his letter—and I presume it was from the same source that Mr. Scammell got his information—that he heard that all cans in future were to be made by machinery and he intimated that he would very much like to have all cans made in the same old-fashioned way.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairman. — During the short time I was in the Marine and Fisheries Department there was some complaints made owing to the way some shippers pack-

ed their lobsters. I remember there was one shipper sent about a hundred cases of lobsters to Holland and when the shipment reached its destination the lobsters were unfit for consumption and the result was that the whole shipment was condemned and sent back to the shipper who lost the worth of the whole shipment. I know of a couple of other instances where shipments of lobsters going into New York were returned as unfit for consumption on account of the lobsters being badly packed. That shows the necessity there is for instituting new regulations with regard to the packing of lobsters. I think it right to have the number of factories limited, and that there should be an arrangement to have factories centralised and suitably located for the purpose of inspection because there are lots of times an inspector does not have an opportuinty of examining factories in far and remote places, nor can an inspector be expected to call and examine all factories during the short period in which he has to do his work. Consequently, I think that the right and proper way to overcome that difficulty is to limit the number of factories. I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Board will see the advisability of accepting this suggestion particularly regarding the limitation of factories. I think it would be a step in the right direction because it would ensure a better pack of lobsters and it would help to give Newfoundland lobsters a better name in the foreign markets. Only a few days ago we read in the newpaspers a strong article condemning a shipment of bake apples that were sent from this country to Boston and other places in the United States. All this was brought about through the goods being put up wrongly. I think it would also be a step in the proper direction if we took a leaf out of Canada's book and have all our canned foods carefully inspected before being allowed to be shipped abroad.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, —Before we pass on I would like to have a few words to say on this lobster fishery. This Department we are on now is, in my opinion, the most important department we have to vote money for, and if we spent a week or more discussing the money in the Fisheries Department I think it would be time well spent. Now, the lobster season is closed and the old order of things is past. We have had in the past lobster put up of a very inferior quality, and nobody by samples of lobster would ascertain what the tins contained. If we went to make up a shipment of lobster of fifty or a hundred cases for a buyer, we would have perhaps ten or twenty different numbers and different labels going to make up the shipment. Therefore the whole shipment would be more or less irregular and give great dissatisfaction in the markets. Now that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Government think of opening the lobster fishery again after the expiration of the three years, I think they should give great time and attention upon the best advice as to the packing of lobster, and not only that but as to protecting the industry. I claim, as I have stated before here, that if all the regulations required for the lobster fishery had been carried out in the past there would be no reason whatever for a close season. The reason for its being necessary is because of the scarcity of lobster and that has been caused through small lobsters being caught. There is a regulation that laths which lobster traps are made of should be a certain distance apart so the small lobsters can get out if trapped, but these regulations were not complied with, and as a result the small lob-

sters were caught, the fishery gradually declined and that is the reason we have had to have a close season. I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Government will have stringent regulations this time and see that they are carried out so that the lobster fishery will be some value to this country. Every time I am speaking in connection with the fisheries. I make reference to the value of our cod liver oil industry as brought about by the strict inspection in that industry. Great credit is due in respect of that. I think the inspectors are very efficient. Mr. Coyle and the others are very efficient. To them is due today the value of the cod liver oil industry. It has been increased by thousands of dollars, I might say hundreds of thousands, and I believe it will increase each year. The Government should take charge of the lobster industry and with good regulations, properly enforced, put it on a firm basis. When you have got an article to sell that people want you can make your price for it. With lobster put up in the form of food that people like and need, I don't think there would be any difficulty whatever about the price. If every man throughout Newfoundland is allowed to put out tinned lobster with no inspection of it or no means of identification of the packer, freuently badly packed and badly cooked, and packing ten or twelve tins a day until he gets up a case, and that goes on all through the country, I don't see how we can ever expect to have our lobster fishery of any value. We have got to have certain regular factories the same as we have go to have oil factories. It would have to be done in a way that is clean and the lobster would have to be put through certain processes which will be taught to the packer and will have to be complied with.

I have seen many tins of lobster opened as samples not fit for consumption; improperly cooked; badly put up and so on. When buyers of lobster depended on a sample of such shipments made up of all kinds they risked a great loss. I don't know whether the Government has to have any legislation or whether the Fishery Board have all the powers necessary to regulate the fishery.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Board has very extensive powers. I think it will be found it has power in this case. I would be inclined to say so off hand.

HON THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Because if any legislation is necessary it would have to be brought in this session, because if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries wants to go to the seal fishery next year, the lobster fishery will be over before we have time to put through the legislation. I suggest if it is going to be necessary to have legislation next session, that we put it through this session. I am sure we on this side of the House will help out all we possibly can by day or night sessions if necessary to get anything through in the interests of the fisheries. I would impress on the Government now in reference to the lobster fishery going slowly and putting it on a basis where it will be some value and as I said before any assistance with such legislation we can give you we are only too glad to do it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I am quite in accord with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition just now on the lobster fishery. There is one point and it applies also to salmon I would like to refer to. I don't know whether there is any law bearing on it now. Any man putting up canned lobster or salmon in this country ought be made put his own label on it, and his own name and then we know who packed it. I know a man who packs salmon, puts his own name

and label on it, and puts up a good article and he can get order after order. I think if this were made law it would be a good beginning. A man putting up a good article would have his name on it and get the credit of it and the same with poorly packed poorly got up salmon or lobster or other tinned fish, the man who packed it would have to have his name on it, the buyer knows where it came from, and that would go a good way towards remedying it in the future.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I am sure it gives us great pleasure to hear the Leader of the Opposition get up and speak so cheerfully on the lobster fishery, but I notice that he too has the misconception that I was the cause of the opening of the House so late. Now I am pleased to know somebody thinks I have got some big influence, but I may say they are altogether wrong, and they know they are wrong. They are just doing it to tantalise me, but I am too old a politician to be tantalised, even by the Leader of the Opposition. I have been called everything from a scoundrel to a blood-sucker during the last four or five years. I haven't said anything about it; but I notice during the last week or ten days during the debates on the floors of the House some of the honourable members got very heated because the papers said certain things about them, and apparently said what was right; but in my case I am no blood-sucker. If I understand the meaning of the "Blood-sucker," it is taking money from other people you don't earn yourself. Now I state right here what money I have earned in this country since I was eleven years old I have earned it right out of my bone and sinew; I have sucked it out of nobody; and I am prepared still to work my hardest for any money I am to receive. The members of the Opposition who have referred to the matter know I was not the one who caused the House not being open until the eleventh of May. I was back a month before the House opened; but If I had known or was told that the House was going to be opened on the first of March and I felt I was wanted here to hold the Monroe Government in power, I am man enough to resign my ship and stay here as I have done before. In the Morris Government in 1909 I resigned my ship on the 8th day of March and remained home for three years and I am prepared to do the same again for the Monroe Government, with all that is said against it. In reference to the lobster fishery, as I said before, I am sure I am prepared to take any suggestions from any member of the House or any of their constituents and I am sure the Board is prepared to take such and give them due consideration and then come to a conclusion after everything is gone through and the same deliberate and due consideration given to all.

I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and personally I make the statement here now, if I had the making of the regulations governing the lobster fishery I would not allow every solitary man in every district to pack lobster. If you went around the different outports you used to find every single handed man packing lobster who was not a packer at all. I have seen them packing them under what is called a bough-weapon. What I mean by a bough-weapon is a camp made out of boughs. I have seen the boughs falling off of the house into the can of lobsters being sealed, and I claim if every man is allowed to do packing on a small scale and incompetently like that we will have no better conditions than before. We think we are taking all precautions to get this thing right and possibly to see if it is not possible to suit all concerned.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman: The Fishery Board spent practically all last evening going into this matter of

the lobster fishery and in our opinions we did what we thought was the best possible in appointing a committee partly from the Water Street merchants, who while they may not be liked by all of us have their good points as well as bad. It was left open to appoint two members and I think one should come from the District of St. Barbe and one from Fortune Bay, two big packing districts. The district I have the honour to represent is not very much engaged in lobster packing except on a small scale, but our next door neighbour, Fortune, has much at stake because they have large packers there. I feel sure that the committee now in charge of this will bring the best possible suggestions to the Fishery Board and the Fishery Board will have the last say before the matter comes to the House of Assembly; then having come before the Government of the day and the Legislative Council no doubt what regulations have been drawn up will be the best possible.

Now in 1925 we brought a Bill into this House which was entitled "For the Inspection of Ships." Now I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what has been done with that inspection of ships? Is there no inspection? If you will refer to Hansard for that year I think it will be found that I am quoted there as saying that that was the end of that Bill. I think I have been borne out. In the presence of this House I stated that that Bill had been brought in and that was the last we would ever hear of it. I have travelled on steamships all over the country and I have never yet seen where a boat has been launched overboard for drill which is called for under this Act. I have also got on board a passenger boat a mail boat, and I went and told the captain that a boat on it was not fit to go aboard of. I said if it was on my wharf I would put a rock through it and sink it. We should have a competent man to see that that Act is carried out and it is not right that there should not be. What is the use of making laws if they are not carried out in their entirety.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have looked through these Estimates very carefully and I see by these Estimates that we are granting money from day to day, from year to year, and also according to the Auditor-General's report, bonus for bonus and now it is about time that this House got down to business and cut out extra bonuses and unearned salaries, while districts in the country are absolutely in need of public works and their representatives can't get a dollar to spend. I want money very badly to assist the town of Grand Bank and still we come in and vote money for men well paid and then they are paid more out of Additional Estimates; for what I would like to know. In the district of Burin there is the bridge east of Grand Bank at Lance au Loup that is absolutely impassable. Mr. Thomas estimated that bridge could be built for the sum of one thousand dollars. Again, the bridge at Lories can be built for a thousand dollars which would be for labour alone as the timber can be had from a bridge at Grand Bank. Now I would respectfully ask the Government if they would take that matter up and put a vote in these Estimates to cover these necessary improvements. I also want to refer to the bridge at Lamaline. That was inspected and surveyed last year by a member of the Highroads Department. That bridge is also in a dilapidated condition. It was estimated the cost of that bridge being put in condition would be between seven and ten thousand dollars. I trust that the Minister of Finance & Customs will see his way clear to get that vote in the Estimates so that something

will be done so that the people will be able to pass over it. With regard to the harbour in the town of Fortune, in which I live, I might say that unless something is done to it the fishermen will not be able to continue the fishery there another year. I don't know what is going to happen if they don't continue the fishery. We have no highroads, no timber, no mines and minerals. I trust that the Minister of Finance and Customs will see his way clear to get something in the Estimates to look after that. Looking through the Estimates I see that the $150,000 voted last year for Public Works is cut out. From what source are we to get money for repairs to roads and bridges and public works in the outports? I don't know whether the Minister of Finance intends to bring in a Bill to deal with the matter, or intends to bring in a loan into this House to provide for such matters or not, but I trust if he does that this will be taken care of, or else some money will be voted whereby these necessary improvements will be taken care of.

We have been called obstructionists, but as far as I am concerned I have done nothing I know of to obstruct the business of the House, and as I gathered from the Prime Minister's remarks of a couple of days ago, the Government is not ready to proceed with the business of the country, as they have not the necessary work done with the International Paper Company; so, if the business of the House is not ready to be proceeded with I don't see why we are to be called obstructionists. I have been called several names here, obstructionist and other names altogether uncalled for, but if I have done some little thing that will do some good in this country, I am satisfied. I don't know if I am out of order if I refer to Buchan's Mine again while we are on the Estimates, but I would like to say that I was very pleased to see by the morning News that some gentlemen had met together and had sent certain Resolutions to the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Government in the Upper House. Personally, I have not seen these Resolutions, but just from some statements in connection with them I feel they may be along the lines of some suggestions I made here, and I trust that the House will see fit to carry out the resolutions as laid down by these gentlemen if they are in accord with those statements of mine. I think in connection with this matter before I was insulted by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and I think the remarks made by him were altogether uncalled for. I state now that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines knows I was quite sincere in my remarks. I would like to be in a position to stay here until the 24th of Dec., if I could thereby keep Buchan's Mine from twenty years concessions. I say that that is an outrage. Talk about being obstructionists—that is what we are here for. The Opposition should do their best to see that Buchan's Mine and the International Paper Company are not allowed to get away with certain things they are trying to put over on the people of the country. I have heard it stated that because the Executive Government made a contract with Buchan's Mine, they have to carry it out. I don't presume to know all about these matters, but I understand that when an agreement is made between the Government of the day and some party, it must be approved by this House, and if the Government has made a contract this House may ratify it, but should cancel certain agreements if they are not in the best interests of this country. We hear talk about what we are going to get from Buchan's Mine. We are to get five per cent. on the nett

profits, but there are ways of getting out of that pretty well. I contend that we should have a schedule, and I stated that they probably should have free importation of certain articles for five years. To-day I am not of that opinion. In my opinion we should allow no importations free of duty whatever, absolutely none, and if I were a member of Government I wouldn't stand for any company coming in getting any concessions of any sort whatever. We have practically given away everything we have in the country and now we have nothing left. If they have a mine considered to be of such value as is stated by men who know, I think the A. N. D. Company or Buchan's Mine would be only too pleased to come and operate that mine in their own interests regardless of whether this country gives them free importation of materials or whether they do not. In any case I do think they should be bound down to schedule and that it should cover mining machinery. Another matter that I wish to refer to is that we have done nothing with the labor situation in regard to Buchan's Mine. I trust that before this House closes, and I am sorry to say that I do not expect to be here when it does close, that the Government and this House will see to it that something is done to protect the labouring man. Because it comes back to the labouring man to carry on the wheels of industry in this country. They will have to provide the policemen, the magistrates, the Post Office Clerks, the Telegraphs Clerks, and all the other officials out there, when this starts and this will have to be paid out of the accounts of the country. There is nothing to be expected back except from this labour for a few hundred men. Now I suppose that in a few days we shall be faced here with the International question. The Prime Minister has stated here that he expected to have the International Bill brought before this House somewhere in the latter part of the week. I trust Mr Chairman, that the Government of the day has seen fit to bring that company to book, and to see that they are not given what is left of this country, if there is anything of this country left at all. To see that they are not given free entry of everything from soup to nuts, that they want. I think as I said some time ago that we have given absolutely too much away, and that this country is suffering for it to-day. We may talk about rushing that legislation through but we have not got it here to rush through. But if it is in the best interest of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders we should delay this House as long as it is of any benefit to Newfoundland. I fail to see where we have been obstructing. Some of us made speeches of three or four hours in length, but it is only to be expected that we ought to voice our sentiments before this House, in the interests of the district that we have the honor to represent. And I trust that if I have done anything in any small way to obstruct Buchan's Mine or the International Paper Company from getting all that they wanted I am satisfied. I would be satisfied to remain on the floors of this House for another week to obstruct that company from obstructing Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. I trust that if that is what this House calls obstruction that we shall obstruct this House all that we possibly can. While we are on this fishing question there is another matter that I brought up last year. It was about a bait freezer for the district of Burin. Some $297,000 was voted last year for bait depots. And we have not yet seen 297 cents back. Now I was practically assured on the floors of this House that a bait freezer would be erected in the district of Burin. But so far I have not seen any. Perhaps it may be that was because I left the Monroe Admin-

istration. It was said that it was because I left the Monroe Administration that they did not get a pier in the town of Fortune. Evidently I may have been of some value to the Monroe administration. But I did not see my way clear to stick by them so I left them. But if Fortune had to lose by my leaving the Government I am glad that they lost. I am satisfied to be the sufferer. I am not prepared to make the sacrifice that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made. He claimed that he was satisfied to resign his ship. But Mr. Chairman, in the interests of the district of Burin, I trust that the Government of the day are not men small enough, and I feel that they are not, to let any action of mine militate against the least interests of that district, particularly the towns of Grand Bank and Burin. There is plenty of bait there all the year round, to warrant the erection of a bait depot. The people of Burin are anxious that a bait depot should be erected there, and I trust that before long this House will put through Estimates whereby a bait depot will be erected at Burin, a pier at Fortune, a bridge at Lamaline, and some other minor works. We do not expect to get the highroads. As stated by the member for St. Barbe, that the high roads are built for the sports of St. John's, and I agree with him. As one can see if he goes along LeMarchant Road in the dust this afternoon.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon I was absent when the Department of Justice came up, and I wanted to remind the Minister of Justice, and I have been doing it for three or four years, that there is no public building in Bonne Bay, and one there is essential. It is I know a matter for the Public Works Department, but I can't understand why the Minister of Justice keeps on forgetting the necessity of that building. It would not have to come out of the pockets of the Government. Because they collected the insurance on the old building when it was destroyed by fire. I don't see why you are keeping on forgetting. You have to put up a building there sometime or other, and you ought to have done it before, within the last three or four years. It is not necessary for me to explain why it is wanted. They do need it. In fact there is no Court House in that section of the district at all. We have got a shop rented there now for a Post Office, and the Custom House is in a private residence, and generally all the manipulation of the public service in Bonne Bay as regards official business, is due to the fact that there is no public building in Bonne Bay at all. If the building had been burnt down and you got no money then it would be a different matter, for you would be embarking on a precedent to build a public building in Bonne Bay. But you have the money that you got out of the fire insurance. Right down the coast from Fuller's Cove until you get to St. Shott's there is no Court House, because the Court House in Fuller's Cove after all is tumbling down and it will be only a matter of time when it will blow out on the street.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. member I may say to the credit of the people of Bonne Bay that there is hardly any occasion for a Court House The member is handicapped because of the class of people he represents, in the sense that it is difficult to impress upon the Government the necessity for the erection of a Court House. I think that the need of Bonne Bay is not so much for a Court House but for a public building for Custom purposes and for postal and telegraph work. I am glad to say that as a tribute to the good conduct of the people of Bonne Bay their magistrate has rarely to handle much in the sense of anything of a serious nature occurring there. And I will join with the hon. member

in now representing to the heads of the Departments that are more immediately interested, the Custom House Department and the Postal Department that a public building if it is erected, and it is necessary, at Bonne Bay, will be erected amongst people whose good conduct deserves at least a respectable public building.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, while we are on the Estimates for the department of the Mar.ne and Fisheries I feel that it is my duty being the representative of a fishing district, to make a few observations regarding the proposals of the administration now in power, dur.ng the last session of the legislature. And I trust that the few observations that I may make will not receive the same treatment from the Dept. to which they relate as did the Court House to which Mr. Scammell referred to, did receive at the hands of the Minister of Justice. It would be just as well if the Minister of Justice had gotten up and said "We are broke, and we have no money, and we cannot build the Court House." After all whilst I am not taking upon my shoulders the job of advocating for a Court House in the district of St. Barbe, I feel that when the hon. member makes any suggestion in view of the fact that the Government collected the insurance for the building when it was burnt, that the Government ought to replace it. But I would like to call the attention of the Government including the Minister of Justice, to the fact that last year, we voted $250,000 for the erection of bait depots in various parts of the Island to facilitate the catching of fish. And it would be a very interesting thing for the Minister of Justice to tell us that we don't need bait now to catch fish as they are caught with hooks. But this present administration agreed with a bill that we all gave our support to in this House for the erection of bait depots at various places in the Island. It will be found that I was a member of the Fishery Board, presumably because there was no money in it and it was communicated to the Executive Government and recommened to them that an experimental one be erected at Bay Bulls. This year if this matter comes up before the Fishery Board and I happen to be at that meeting I am going to recommend to the Fishery Board that an experimental one be erected in some other district, because evidently the district of Ferryland does not stand in with the present Government, and therefore it is just as well that any favour be directed somewhere else. Last year the Fishery Board recommended the experimental one to be erected at Bay Bulls, but the Government and their supporters, the few merchants on Water St. saw fit to hit Bay Bulls, in the person of Mr. Outerbridge who recommended to the Prime Minister that there would be no use of erecting a bait depot at Bay Bulls, and the Govt. acceded to his request. I also want to put myself on record as being in accord with the erection of a bait depot at Burin. Because I want to say that in Burin practically all the Nova Scotia fishermen come there in the Spring, and Newfoundland vessels bait there also. I think that the Fishery Board recommended to the Executive Government that a small depot be erected at Bay St. John.

I hope that the Government and the Department of Justice will not deal with that matter as foolishly as they dealt with the court house at Bonne Bay. I am one of these individuals who believes in the future of the codfishery of this country, and you can build your Humbers, your Ganders, your Buchan's Mine and your St. George's Coal Fields, but I want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to tell me here this evening what is going to take the place of the codfishery in this country within the next quarter of a century and I would like to know what the present

Government is doing or attempting to do for the benefit of this fishery? I feel that within the next five years we will have going from this country a considerable amount of fresh fish in cold storage to the American markets, but as I have already pointed out in this House on numerous occasions, neither this administration nor previous ones have ever raised a hand to foster and further the interests of this business. The present Government will say that the Fordney Tariff prevents them from doing anything, but we have no concrete evidence in this House showing that this Government has ever taken up the matter as they should with the American Government with respect to this dollar and quarter tax per quintal on our fish entering the United States. I feel that the people of Bonne Bay, who, as the Minister of Justice explained away, are too peaceful to have a court house, would be just as glad as I am to support any motion in this Assembly whereby the fishermen of this country would be benefitted, but I have yet to learn that any Minister of the Crown of the present administration has attempted to do anything except to play politics with the fishermen of this country. When the Monroe Government went to the country in 1924 they told the fishermen what great fellows they were and that if their candidates were elected all the ills and woes of the fishermen would be cured. That sort of stuff was preached like the Gospel by every individual in the Government ranks, and from the moment they got in power they never attempted to do anything, much less accomplish anything, in connection with the fisheries. Last year a quarter of a million dollars was provided out of the loan for the encouragement of the fisheries and the fishermen, but not one cent of it was spent for the purpose for which it was intended. Rather was the money misappropriated just like another $297,000.00 of that loan was misappropriated to pay a deficit made by the present administration. Your deficit on current account this year is two millions. You have squandered all last year's loan and never spent a dollar on the fisheries. You collected insurance on a public building in Bonne Bay and misappropriated the money to pay a deficit, as I understand the money went into the Exchequer Account. Furthermore I know of moneys that have been paid out and moneys that are going to be paid out and no mention of them is in the Estimates, and is not going to be put in them. All you got to do is to check over the Estimates with the Auditor-General's figures and you will find that they don't agree. Visitors to this Assembly can see the attitude of members with regard to legislation now before the House. The Government do not seem to care. They are trying to hold on to office until the last minute and they are prepared to sacrifice this country and its people to-morrow at any price so long as they can hold on. They are prepared to loot the Treasury again as they have done in the past in no uncertain manner in order to keep in office. I have not seen in the Estimates the $45,000.00 that went to pay law bills in connection with the Labrador Boundary within the past twelve months. This money was taken out of a loan and the Government will come in here and ask for it in Supplementary Supply. When members of the Opposition representing the greater portion of the people of this country talk in this strain they are ridiculed and laughed at by the members of the present Government. In fact one can hardly make any statement here now but he is sneered and jeered at by the members of the Government. Ask a direct question and nobody knows when you are going to get an answer. Then we are

called obstructionists and are holding up the House. Well I feel like holding up this House all this evening and I care not what the Government or their press talk. After barring this House last year they did not open it again until May 11th of this year in order to suit their own political purposes and I defy the Minister of Justice to deny that statement, even though he does not know about the court house at Bonne Bay. I would like to hear a pronouncement from the Leader of the Government if it is their intention when money is voted by this House for a specific purpose to use it in another direction like they did with the fisheries vote last year. Furthermore I would draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that we had a public wharf at Cape Broyle one time, but a schooner owned by the Prime Minister's firm took occasion to haul it down and I cannot get it put back. I feel that if my steamer put the Prime Minister's wharf out of commission I would be called upon to make good the damage. The people of Cape Broyle who owe this Government nothing cannot get what they are justly entitled to. I suppose the Minister of Justice will say that the people of Cape Broyle do not need a public wharf any more than the people of Bonne Bay don't need a court house. I have presented a number of petitions to this House asking for attention to public works in the District of Ferryland. I do not know where they went, but it would be just as well if I had presented them to the Poor House for what consideration they got. Last year one million dollars out of a loan was earmarked for public works. Most of that money was misappropriated and used to pay deficits; $100,000.00 of it was spent on able-bodied pauper relief and $150,000.00 was used to pay for what was not voted in the Estimates last year. Then I am told that Ferryland District got $60,000.00 last year for highroads. It was just as well the Government kept that money because it was wasted and one end of the road is now laughing at the other. Now I have to ask the Government for God's sake to fix a falling down bridge at Mobile and cannot get it done. At the same time we find bridges built in other sections of the country that cost as high as $20,000.00 each. This is done for political reasons, and I suppose I would be called narrow-minded, if I called it sectarianism.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman: I rise to a point of order. I want the honourable member for Ferryland to understand that there was no sectarianism used by me so far as his district is concerned. I am a Protestant and it is generally known in this country that I am one, and any other man has a perfect right to be of any other religion. I have no ill-feeling against the people of Ferryland because they happen to be of any other religion and I ask the honourable member to take back the charge he made.

MR. CASHIN—I made no charge that the Government or any member of the Government were using sectarianism. I never said that the present administration was carrying out their actual work on sectarian lines, consequently, I could not say that they were using sectarianism against Ferryland district. During the past two weeks in this House I have appealed to the Finance Minister and the Minister of Public Works to repair two small bridges, one at Mobile and the other at Gallows Cove. A deaf ear was given my appeal, although $20,000.00 of our money—money that was our proportionate share of the million dollars last year—was taken and spent in other districts. Now I was the greatest opponent the Government had to highroads, and if they had listened

to me three years ago the money that you spent on the highroads and tourist propositions you would have spent on the fisheries, but then there was heavier pressure than I could give brought to bear by people who could not be elected for any district. The district of Ferryland had $20,000.00 taken from us last year and whilst we did not get our share of the million dollars allocated for public works the Minister of Public works, who represents the district of Burgeo and LaPoile, saw to it that his district got more than its share. Let us see what each district did get out of that million dollars last year.

(Reads statement from Public Accounts).

Now there is still $257,000.00 of that loan last year somewhere and the Minister of Public Works tells us here he does not know where it went. Now there is nothing in the shape of public works to be done in the distr.ct of Ferryland it seems simply because Cashin happens to represent it. There is to be no cold storage plant or bait depot at Bay Bulls nor are bridges and wharves to be repaired on account of Cashin representing the distr.ct. That and nothing else is the reason for the attitude of the Government towards my district. They know that I am politically opposed to them and the members of the Executive Government in particular are do ng everything in their power to have me dropped out of Ferryland district in order to stop me from criticising their d rty low methods, but as long as I have breath in me and as long as I am permitted by the people of Ferryland to represent them in this Legislature I am going to see to the best of my ability and endeavours that they will get their rights. That is what they sent me here for and if I am not capable of performing that job it is their job to throw me out. When that loan bill was being debated last year the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister told us that our recommendations regarding public works would be seriously considered. Now I believe that if I wrote the present Government to the effect that it was unnecessary to construct a bridge at Mobile for the safety of the people; that it was unnecessary to erect a bait depot at Bay Bulls as the fishermen can catch fish without the use of bait, that these things would be attended to immediately. That has been the policy of the Government and then they call us obstructionists. I do not have to play politics to become a member of this House and that is more than any individual on the other side of the House can say. A district that had a Cashin representing them for about forty years uninterruptedly is proof positive that I do not have to play politics to hold a seat in this House, and while I am here I am going to see that the people of Ferryland district get their share of the public funds voted here and not have their share go to other districts like it did last year. I am prepared to take any member of the Executive over the road to-morrow and show him the disgraceful cond tion of our roads and the dangerous condition of Mobile bridge. In unproductive areas in this country highroads were attempted to be built and they cost $8,000.00 a mile and more and these same settlements will not produce $8,000 in 8 years. Then the members of the Opposition by the Gov't and their press accuse us for having the audacity and impertinence to demand that the Budget and Supplementary Supply and the Additional Estimates be brought in here and discussed contemporaneously with the original Estimates so that we can see and the country can see where we are going to get eleven millions of dollars for next year, as stated in the Estimates we have now before us. The Government says there is no precedent for bringing along these documents asked for. Well if I am running a bus-

ness along certain lines and suddenly I find that the business is not paying and I feel that someone is pilfering my money, why the first thing I will do is br ng in an auditor and have an investigation of my affairs, and goodness knows there is great need of a thorough audit of this country's affairs being made to-day. As far as the Auditor General's Department is concerned it 's a joke. Thousands of dollars are spent on it and the money is simply thrown away. We had an example of the work of these people a few months ago when it was found that $20,000.00 had been stolen from the Newfoundland Savings Bank. This had been going on for years and was carried on under the Auditor General's nose and he never reported it. Month by month the Auditor General and his staff are paid extra salaries for auditing anything outside their regular office duties. The Auditor General has been getting $500.00 each year for a considerable number of years for auditing the books of the Newfoundland Savings Bank and highway robbery has been carried on during all that time and the sum of $20,000.-00 stolen. We had another case a few years ago when a fellow got away with two thousand dollars from the Pilot Commission whilst we had also another case in which $12,000.00 was pilfered from the railway. These are the kind of things that have been going on despite the audits that were made by the Auditor General or any of his staff. That is the position this country is in, and then when an Opposition member hinted that we were on the verge of bankruptcy he was termed disloyal and the Minister of Justice intimated that he should not make such a statement. The country is bankrupt and who bankrupted it? The Monroe Government came into power in 1924 and for 1924-25 you stated you had a surplus of $300,000.-00 whereas as a matter of fact you had a deficit of $700,000.00. For 1925-26 you had two millions of a deficit and for 1926-27 you had another two millions. I will be told that a lot of that money was spent on capital expenditure, but when you came into power you found some very large balances remaining in various loan accounts and there was a surplus trust of $300,000.00. These amounts are all gone to-day and there are no balances remaining in connection with any of the old loans and on top of those deficits we are here to-day discussing a matter which may or may not affect very materially the future welfare of this country. I have read an account in this House to-day where money was taken out of that loan of last year and deliberately spent in the district of Burgeo and LaPoile for political purposes. Is it any wonder then that Ferryland did not get its rights and I feel that if I did right to-morrow that I would have the people of Ferryland turn out in mass and I would lead them in column formation to this House and I don't think I would be going too far in saying that I would cut the heart out of the man that would attempt to prevent them from demanding their rights which was filched from them last year. If we are poor and have no money to give out for public works why not treat every district alike. This evening I intend to wire the people of Mobile that the present Government refuse to repair their bridge and asking them to put up a placard on that bridge warning passersby to beware of their lives. My own mother may be the first one to go down through that bridge and if anything like that happens somebody in the Government is going to be sorry for it. The Government were too mean and too contemptible to repair it out of the loan of last year, but they could find $20,000.00 for blasting rocks in Burgeo Hr. Then we hear a lot of talk about Pro-American sentiment and being disloyal. Rather than

have to live under a Government as the one that exists at the present time here I would swear off my allegiance here and swear in my allegiance to an American sovereign, if such a person exists, because the present administration here got no interest in the welfare o f the common people of the country. Now I am raising my last speech on these Estimates and you can close the House as far as I am concerned because it is no use appealing on behalf of one's district when the appeal falls on deaf ears. I want to know this evening from the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to repair that bridge at Mobile and I want to know if the public moneys are to be allocated for the purposes for which they are voted in this House. All we got in Ferryland out of that million dollars last year was $500 for the repairing of a bridge at Witless Bay. Two and a half million dollars was spent by the Highroads Commission the past two years on roads and even out of that amount the district of Ferryland did not get its share. The highroads people and the Government told the country they were going to build roads for $5,000.-00 a mile. Why as a matter of fact it cost double that amount to repair old roads. It is disgusting the way a representative of the fishermen of this country is treated in his recommendations by an aggregation of political incompetents. Mr. Chairman, I am leaving this evening for my district and I am going to acquaint my constituents of the attitude of the Government towards the requests and recommendations that I made on their behalf. With regard to the broken down bridge at Mobile, I dare say the people can raise enough money through the holding of a Garden Party to fix the bridge.

Now, Mr. Chairman, they can build that bridge if they like. I have given my last notice, until we get a Minister of Public Works with sufficient knowledge of where his money is that he will be able to tell us where $275,-000 is gone that he doesn't know about. And if he doesn't know he is not fit to be a Minister. If I were Minister I would say that it had to be given to my department or I would know the reason why. I know my remarks are being received and ridiculed. I know that those are the only political manners they have, but the time is not far past when they did not ridicule me, and the time is not far distant when those same individuals may not ridicule me. On second thoughts I feel we ought not allow another vote to pass. I feel it is our duty until such time as we have an assurance that the monies we are voting will be spent as voted, and what was voted last year is accounted for, and you acknowledge that you found the country in such a condition that you found it necessary to rob, so to speak, the Loan Bill in order to pay your bills, and until such time as we have a frank statement as to the financial condition of this country, until such time, not to allow another vote to pass. Furthermore I owe it to the welfare of the community I represent to see to it that this Government wouldn't be so small as for political purposes to defraud those people of their proper rights, and at their expense give to other districts. and all for their own political aggrandisement. Twenty thousand odd supposed to be spent and Ferryland gets $500. That is unfair. You went to Burgeo, and used $20,000 and I am told that the Highroads went to Ferryland. It would be better, I am convinced, if the Highroads Commission never went to Ferryland. In this sense; they went in and built a road from here to Bay Bulls at eight thousand dollars a mile and the balance of the road is laughing at the other part, and they went in on Executive authority if I am informed correctly after taking $250,000 out of the one million which was not voted for that. I trust Mr.

Scammell has better success with the publ.c building or court house or whatever it may be called in Bonne Bay than I have had with a $250 bridge at Mobile. I would recommend him to get in touch with different members on the other side and he will probably have more influence with the present adm.nistration and then they will accede to their request, not his. I look like a fool here, coming in and voting for things I know nothing about, and I think that to-morrow or the next day some poor individual may lose his life on that bridge in Mobile. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars robbed out of Ferryland District and yet that bridge cannot be repaired. It would drive a man practically insane to think of it. But money can be found to spend in Government districts; in Bonav.sta Bay the Prime Minister's own district, twenty thousand in Placentia Bay, twenty thousand in Burgeo and LaPoile; every old place except Ferryland. I can see the Executive Government in solemn conclave saying we will take the blood out of that fellow Cashin and they try to do it by robbing the Treasury so to speak and taking money out of Ferryland and spending it in other districts. They say he is a hard fighter, and has opposed us with all his power, we'll put him down. I wouldn't mind myself so much, but for the people I represent. After all the people I represent voted for me as a member of the Monroe Party. I am quite prepared to go back to those people at any time. Now, Mr. Chairman if I could get an answer from the Prime Minister as to whether we are going to get that bridge in Mobile I am prepared to sit down. Life is something in this community and I have inspected that bridge myself and a responsible person inspected it yesterday again for me and I am not going to sit down until I know whether it is going to be fixed or not, and why you spent $20,000 in other districts and we cannot get two hundred, so you can rest assured until I get some sort of a decent answer there is not much legislation going through this House as far as I am concerned. What about it? I direct the question to the Prime Minister whether he is prepared to do it or not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, I would only like to say that I don't consider it is necessary for gentlemen on the opposite side of the House to throw out threats in order to get the Government to do certain little things for their districts. We have not refused so far as I know to fix the bridge he reports in such a bad condition. I have a good deal more to think of than these little bridges in districts. I take it some district money could be advanced to do the necessary repairs to the bridge if it is only the small amount of $250.00. There are any number of such requests that I have heard here in the House and from my own district and I say until we get money for public purposes we can't do the repairs that are being asked for. I have complaints of roads impassable and bridges breaking down from other districts through their representatives and from my own district, and my reply to every one is exactly the same as it would be to Mr. Cashin, until we get money to do it we cannot do any particular public works of any size for any district. That is my answer to every representative of every district and not a single district has been treated in a better way than another. The honourable member takes too much credit to himself when he thinks we have such great ideas of him as a political opponent as to sit round at Executive meetings and decide we won't do anything for that great political antagonist. We haven't given a thought in Executive Council as to what he thinks or doesn't think, or what his political ambitions may be.

And as Mobile Bridge is in a bad

condition and in need of repairs I dare say that the Min.ster of Public Works, somehow can manage to carry him over that little difficulty. It it perfect nonsense to get up here and to talk for hours about $250 repairs to a bridge. As far as the larger expenditure is concerned, for roads in various districts, and there is never a day passes but we get petitions for repairs to public works such as the honourable gentleman referred to, and I have simply told them that as soon as the House voted supply that the money would be portioned out for each district, which I think is only r.ght, and the expenditure should be spent in each district according to the population. That I think is the proper way to handle these things.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Cha.rman, I am glad that the Prime Minister has not wasted any time about Ferryland district, but would the Prime Minister only take the trouble to reiterate how that one million dollars was spent in connect.on with the loan last year. Now he will probably tell me that there was sixty thousand spent on high roads over there. But we do not want that. And he regrets not having any money and he asks us to let him vote some. But I cannot see any in the Estimates for this matter. Where are we going to get it. Why not bring it all in and let us vote for it in block. I agree with the Prime Minister that he has wasted no time and does not consider me. I am not seeking this for myself. But I understand that gentlemen who occupy seats now on the Justice benches, at one time held up the House on the Customs and surely if that individual who has since aspired to the Justice Bench can hold up the House on a fifty dollar expenditure, then a poor common little individual like me on a two hundred and fifty dollar one. If the Prime Minister will tell me now that I can go ahead and get it done, I will get it done on credit, provided that he assures me that the money will be forthcoming later. I would not be so arden after this bridge, but the Prime M.nister knows that this road through Ferryland district is one that is used every day by people going to different places along the shore, and if motor cars go.ng down there meet with an accident and the persons are killed you will do it right away then. It is like the case of wolf, wolf.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Public Works tells me that he suggested to the honourable member that he do as other members have done, and take it out of h.s main line grants. The minister represents to me that he sent up on the suggestion of the honourable member and had the bridge inspected, and then he made a suggestion to the honourable member to do as he is doing for his own district and take it out of the main l ne grants. The member said no that he was not going to do that.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, last year we were told in this House, and I think that it was the Minister of Marine and F.sheries who pointed it out, that it was felt that these things should be charged to capital account. If we took the trouble now we probably would find that it was told us then that bridges should be charged to capital account. I am only going on the suggestion of your own Government. But the Minister has more pull then I have, regarding rocks in harbours. There is a rock in Cape Broyle Harbour and I would like that moved out of it too. But it is useless to suggest anything to the present Government. The only way to get anything out of them is to knock them. Now I am going to try this method. That here as a member of th.s House and a representative in this House, that I do not consider that the bridge at Mobile is dangerous. That I do not consider that the people's lives should be looked after. That I have gone to such

depth that I do not care how many people are killed. That I do not care if my own people are killed on it tomorrow or if I am killed myself. Now will you build the bridge after doing that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You do not intend to take it out of the main line grants.

MR. CASHIN—That is all gone.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You had the spending of it.

MR. CASHIN—Yes. $17,000 on sixty miles of road. Divide that by sixty and see what is left.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—But there are other bridges badly in need of repairs also.

MR. CASHIN—Princ pally the one in Mobile, but there are two. I am only doing the job that I was sent here to do, and I am getting one thousand dollars to do it. But I cannot get any satisfaction, and I do not expect it from the present Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You cannot expect any as long as you throw out threats.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I have not threatened, but I said that if I do not get it it is my duty to stay here for a life time, but if you say that I can put up that bridge I will go out of here now, and think that I have done a good afternoon's work. Do I understand from the Prime Minister, that I can go ahead and get it put up.

THE CHAIRMAN—The Prime Minister asks that you make a statement that you did not mean to threaten.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to threaten, I said that it was my duty to stay here until I got those two bridges built. Then I understand from the Prime Minister that I can go ahead and do that. Alright I will get it done.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman: I have been sitting in this House since the Speech from the Throne came along, and I have allowed everything to pass because I felt that the easiest way to treat some things was with silent contempt. I have listened during the Speech from the Throne, and I have heard myself and my associates being called robbers, every merchant on Water Street including Mr. Hickman has been branded as a robber and a thief. A man who buys fish or looks at one is a thief. I was told here that I had not any interest in the fisheries. Now I want to tell the honourable member for Ferryland that I have as much interest in the fisheries as anyone in this House, and just as much interest as anybody else ever did have. Last year I spent my money purely in buying fish, and I passed out supplies to the fishermen. Besides, the Prime Minister today has no reason to hang his head down because your district did not help him along. Yet the Leader of the Opposition can sit here, and be branded with me as one of the robber merchants of this country. I think that we have now got to the point when human nature cannot stand too much of that sort of thing. I do not care about the bridge in Ferryland. I am not worrying about it. But you are not going to get up here and say things about me, and be allowed to get away with it. I am not going to stand it any longer, and if there is going to be a show-down we will have that show-down. I want to serve notice on the honourable member and the members of the Opposition, that as far as my position as Finance Minister is concerned, I have tried to do my best and I defy any man to say anything to the contrary. One minute we are told in this House that we are extravagant, and the next somebody gets up, and wants us to build a court house or something else. We are also told that we bankrupted the country. We bankrupted nothing. If it is bankrupt, then it was bankrupt long before we arrived. Now

I just want to serve notice, and I do not want to delay the House, but it does not worry me one bit whether we put the estimates through or not. I can stop here until next May if I am wanted to. We have been told about loans and how the money was expended. You would imagine that somebody went down and took the money out of the Treasury and threw it away and that was the end of it. The honourable member forgets that we paid out $80,000 to the Lobelia and the Watchful, and there were other debts that we had to face on that loan. Now what I object to is the words that were used by the honourable member. You tell us that we are dirty and low-down, and you did not stop at that. If you tell us that you were excited and that you did not know what you were saying, I might be prepared to listen to you. And then you say that we are called hood-winks. You could not get a dictionary to tell us the first thing about that term. But I think that after all the nicest and the most polite way to treat such language is with silent contempt. It is more effective than anything I know.

MR. CASHIN — Mr. Chairman: I have no doubt but that the Prime Minister's firm supplied liberally for the fishery and no doubt I would too if I was in the business. I think the Finance Minister will agree with me that there is no one in the supplying business for the love of it. They are simply in business that's all. There is none of the supplying merchants throwing it up for scrambles. We all have a few of those accounts. With regard to the loan, my remarks were directed to the appropriation of that money as voted by this House at the last session and the manner in which it was spent. I hope the Finance Minister does not think that I directed any personal remark at him. I directed my remarks at the Government and he was one of them. It appears to me that when one goes to Rome he has got to do as the Romans do, consequently, in using the languade I did, I would more effectively instil into the evil political minds of the present administration the representations of my constituency. However, if I have done nothing else this evening I have succeeded in getting the repairs to Mobile bridge started to-morrow morning. After all, it is results that count and I do not believe in pawning off my constituents and not being able to hold up my head in Ferryland again. My aim is to go back and be re-elected and even if I have abused the Government I will be able to get the confidence of my constituents again. I am sorry that the Finance Minister got offended but I did not direct my remarks at him, but rather at the Government as a whole.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I don't want to be butting in on these votes too much but there are a number of votes I don't quite understand. For instance on page 55:

(Reads)

That makes thirteen thousand on that page and then on the next page:

(Reads)

I would like to have a general idea of what that is going for.

MON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The cod liver oil inspection is done in connection with the herring inspection, that is by the same men. Last year if I could send a herring inspector every time we were asked for them instead of its costing seven thousand it would cost fourteen thousand. Down in my office there have been telegrams coming in as high as twenty a day asking for herring inspectors.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask if that isn't the result of your herring laws?

MON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I never introduced any

herring laws on the Statute Book. There was herring inspection before I ever was Minister.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Split herring I was referring to.

MON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—No regulations since I came in. That vote, Mr. Chairman, is not enough. If you want to cut out inspection, Government inspection, I am quite satisfied, but it appears to me as Minister of Fisheries that each year one of you gets up and upbraids us for not doing anything for the fisheries and when anything is tried to be done you get up and oppose it after. It appears to me it is just a matter of wanting something to say.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Is an inspector of cod liver oil also an inspector of herring?

MON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes. At the present time we have three cod liver oil people, Baine Johnstone and Company, Patch and Company or Munn and Company and Squibb Company. Coyell, Morgan and Watson are the three inspectors, one of which usually goes to the same one of those firms when they ask for an inspector. This year we have had to put another one on on the north coast who has been a herring inspector for the last number of years.

He is doing herring inspection and cod liver oil inspection.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Mr. Hickman gave notice of Question.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 14th, 1927.

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

Mr. Cashin gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted the Hon. Minister of Justice introduced a Bill entitled "An Act respecting Crown Royalties."

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted the Hon. Minister of Justice introduced a Bill entitled "An Act respecting Patents."

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: Without attempting to delay the Committee unduly, I would like to ask the Honourable the Colonial Secretary to explain what particular policy the Government had in mind when it created the Board of Health and what relationship that board bears to his department. I am not quite clear as to how that board functions. There seems to be some confusion. A man belonging to Fortune Bay was drowned and his remains had to be sent home. The Board of Health were communicated with, and they claimed it was none of their busi-

ness. The Colonial Secretary's Department referred me back to the Board of Health. Eventually the Department did arrange the matter for me, and I thank the minister very much for the courtesy with which he treated me in this connection. I am however, a bit mystified as to the exact position occupied by the Board of Health. What is its relationship to the Colonial Secretary's Department on the one hand and to the Public Charities office on the other, and in what respect do relieving officers come under its jurisdiction? Perhaps, too, the minister would not mind explaining why the medical member resigned from the Board of Health some weeks ago.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the honourable member I might say that two years ago the Board of Health was organized under the Chairmanship of Mr. Joseph O'Rielly, the Assessor, as the Income Tax was then abolished and there was no more work for him to do in that department. The object of appointing that Board of Health was primarily to find a solution of certain difficulties and discrepancies in connection with public health matters and which are now being discussed in this House. It was thought at the time that if we had an active and efficient Board of Health that a great deal of the misunderstandings and discrepancies would be overcome. To emphasize that position the Government asked the Medical Association if they would nominate a man to sit on that Board. The Medical Association agreed and they nominated Dr. Roberts. At first the board functioned very satisfactorily, but, unfortunately, complications set in and a certain amount of overlapping occurred between the Board of Health and the Charities Department. Some time last year when the Finance Commission were enquiring into the Charities Department the Commission took up the matter of hospital fees and in which connection the Board of Health were somewhat implicated. Recommendations were made that created a somewhat untenable position and I do not think that the honourable member for Fortune Bay would appreciate what that untenable position really was.

Because I discovered that occasions had arisen when either the Poor Comm ssioner or the Board of Health had authority to act in certain emergencies. For that reason after consulting the Government I had a change made so that in case of emergencies the Colonial Secretary would have the right to adjust matters that came up that would not be otherwise adjusted. With regard to its relat onship to the Charities Department, Mr. Rennie, the Secretary of the Board of Health, and Mr. Brownrigg have acted together. An understanding has been arrived at, and I think so far as possible satisfactory results have been achieved, but they are not by any means ideal and I do not think that we will have them ideal under the system or until we will have some men who will be in supervision of these matters with authority and give advice concerning matters pertaining to public health. The resignation of Dr. Roberts was brought about in the first place by Dr. Roberts being medical Supervisor of the Grace Maternity Hospital, which has been receiving a considerable amount of patronage through Government sources, and there were certain criticisms made. Dr. Roberts did not give that as a reason for disassociating himself with the Board of Health, but came to the conclusion that as the Board of Health was constituted it was impossible to reach the ideal they set out to reach. Therefore, he thought it better to resign and he was compensated for his services for some period of time, about a year and eight months. Recently Mr. O'Reilly has re-

signed the chairmanship, and there is no Chairman at the present time. I don't think the Board is functioning as a Board at the present time. Dr. Brehm, the Medical Health Officer, of course, is there to perform the duties in connection with that office and is always available. Mr. Rennie is always available; he spends most of his time at the Board of Health. The honourable member, I think, is aware that it is the intention of the Government to look around at the earliest possible day to try and find some efficient medical man to take charge of administering the health affairs of this Colony. I believe if we can get the right man and give him powers, not alone to be an adviser and have to do with the admission of patients to the Hospital, Sanitarium or Lunatic Asylum, but a man who will have fuller powers than those and have to do with everything with respect to medical supervision in the Colony and supervision over all the hospitals. Such a man might perhaps require an advisory board to give assistance and advice from time to time, but he would actually have charge of the matter. The only solution, as I see it, is to have a first class man to take hold of a job of this kind and not alone supervise it but direct it, not alone to be an official to do duties but an official to interpret what duties there are and to treat the demands of people according to the merits in which the demands are made. We have had, too frequently, cases of people coming in and receiving free medical treatment who are well able to afford to pay for it, and I think thousands could be saved if we can get a proper organizer prepared to take charge of that. I can't give any further information with regard to the Board of Health, but I hope that, in the very near future considerable improvement which is very desirable will be made in that direction.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, has the Government any exact knowledge of the necessity, or otherwise of the fairly large sums of money they are spending to subsidise as hospitals institutions in the city to take care of a large number of patients who are not very sick, who are convalescent, in fact? Is the Government in a position to state that it would not be cheaper and more satisfactory to send these people home and let the Charities Department look after them there? Instances have occurred where patients have been removed from regular hospitals, have gone into the subsidiary institutions and have apparently been lost sight of, remaining there for weeks. It occurs to me that there would be a considerable saving effected, were these people to be sent home for convalescence, even if the Government allowed something towards their maintenance. The expense, in my opinion, would be nothing like as great as it is under the present system. The total expenditure in connection with these institutions runs into very large figures. The Field Hospital, which is simply an ordinary dwelling house, converted to hospital purposes, received almost ten thousand dollars from the Government last year; the Southcott Hospital received over seven thousand dollars, and another institution, the name of which I cannot recall just now, received about the same amount. There are three amounts which total over twenty thousand dollars, spent on convalescense alone. Some of these cases, certainly, require and receive hospital treatment, but many do not, and the expense in connection with their complete recovery could, in my opinion, be materially reduced.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I might say that was one of the very points expected to be covered by the Board of Health when it was appointed. The Board found two or three places in town that constituted as rest houses for patients who were kept

there prior to their entering into some of the hosp.tals, and they very soon found it was caused by doctors in the outports sending patients on here to the Hospital without possible accommodation being ready for them, and they did rectify that. They cleaned that matter up pretty well. The trouble now is that instead of go ng to their homes they are going to places called hospitals, and they are costing us a considerable sum of money, and I think, as I said before that the whole thing seems to revolve around the procuring of the services of a medical man competent to superv.se this thing and preventing these people being kept here unnecessarily in various institutions which could be done if we had such a man with authority to send them home whether the doctor or anybody else thinks otherw se. When that is brought about I think these things will be rectified, and that is the remedy, I am convinced of that, and I have never heard anything to the contrary, and I think that is what the Government will carry out.

DR. MOSDELL—At the last Medical Convent.on the Executive of the Association was asked to get in touch with the Government with respect to some recommendations made by Dr. Forbes with regard to Health Supervision of the country. I wonder if the Executive has done that or not and with what results.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —No; we didn't hear anyth:ng from them since.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, before we proceed further with these Estimates, permit me to mention the fact that, yesterday afternoon, when we were on the votes for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I asked the honourable the minister a question or two. Now, although he was inclined to get cross with me and with some of his other questioners on this side of the House, he must remember that we were simply asking for information which we have a perfect right to get. There are a number of votes set down here and rather scattered about providing for herring inspectors and lobster inspectors and other similar officials. I am led to suppose that the different votes signify difference of dut.es and of activities. If not, why are not all these votes assembled together under one head? The nature of the services performed is what I want the minister to explain, if he will be good enough to do so. Even if he has to explain the A.B.C. of the matter, he must remember that the Hon. the Minister of Justice has frequently had to act as a legal school master to honourable members. Some of us confess to ignorance of the services to which some of these votes are applied. The minister knows his subject and it may be that, after hearing his explanat.on, we will be prepared to see eye to eye with him. Why, then, Mr. Minister, the separate items for salaries and the differences in these salaries?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—One is an inspector of herr.ng and oil combined and the other has not been in the service so long. I may say that a man by the name of Morgan is recommended for this position. With regard to the other two votes, this is the explanation. For instance if a man is sent to Fortune Bay to inspect herring there, his expenses are paid out of that vote of $7,000. If a man is sent out to Ferryland, or White Bay or any other place, his passage money, and his board and lodging comes out of that vote, of $5,000. I may say for the information of the hon. member that with regard to the herring inspect on, the ten cents that is paid for inspectors goes into the coffers of the country and we do not get any of it at all. It goes into the exchequer. These inspectors also show the people how to pack the herring. That is their duty as well.

MR. LAKE—Do they get paid for that by the manufacturer of herring

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—No.

MR. LAKE—Well I understand that last year they got so much a barrel for packing herring. Capt. Lawrence paid one inspector twenty five cents a barrel. He told me that he paid for five hundred barrels to the inspector.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, could the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell me how he accounts for the shortage of ten thousand barrels of pickled herring.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, because there was not as many packed of course and perhaps another reason may be because there was not sufficient demand to encourage people to pack them. I don't think that anybody knows as well as the hon. member why there were not as many herring packed last year. It was only the man that could make his own barrels that could afford to pack them at all. Any man that had to buy barrels in St. John's could not afford to pack them. That is the only sensible reason why there were not as many packed last year as the year before.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, as the hon. minister thinks that I know the reason I will tell him the reason, and that is the regulations that were put in force by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There are a great many people particularly around Notre Dame Bay, in the remote settlements of that Bay, who in their leisure time make up their own herring barrels. And then when the Spring comes, they put their nets out and catch the herring and pack them. But under the rules and regulations by the present Minister of Fisheries every man that packs up herring has to get a license from the Department for that purpose. He has also got to buy a branding iron. Now these people living up around the remote parts of Notre Dame Bay, find it impossible to purchase a branding iron or to get a certificate. The trouble and the expense that they have to go to have driven them out of the business. That is the reason why there is a shortage of ten thousand barrels of split herring in one year. Now there is no necessity for any such regulations, with regard to the packing of herring. There are firms in Notre Dame Bay like the one that Mr. Ashbourne conducts, and they gather in the herring from the people that put them up. Perhaps one man puts up five barrels and another man ten, and another twenty. The herring is inspected by the merchant that gathers them in. If the minister had confined his regulations to the merchants that gather them in ready for export, there would not be this shortage of ten thousand barrels. Another regulation which he made was that no herrings were to be put up in pork or beef barrels. If a man during the winter time can gather in a few pork or beef barrels, strong hard wood barrels bound with iron hoops, and put up herring to offer for sale in the Spring nobody would buy them for the simple reason that the Government inspector would not pass them put up in these splendid hard wood packages. Therefore the fishermen have been prevented from using those hard wood packages. Now I know that in the regulations hard wood barrels are permitted provided they are cut down to a certain size. But there are very few men that are able to do that. And I have often said on the floors of this House since these regulations came into force that they should be looked into. I agree with the inspection of herring to a certain extent. But I believe that the people of Notre Dame Bay who get the herring and offer them for sale in St. John's and for export should be subject to inspection, and a branding iron should be neces-

sary. But these regulations which prevent the smaller people in the bottom of the bay from putting up herring should be rescinded.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: Will the twenty thousand dollar vote cover the salaries of statisticians

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes; all fishery purposes.

MR. GRIMES—It is unfortunate we have not got available statistics with regard to the catch of codfish in the various districts in the report because as I stated here a few days ago there is a big discrepancy between the report given by the Customs Department and the report given by the Fisheries Department. I am speaking of the report read at the Board of Trade from the Fisheries Department of the total catch.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I think it will be found our report was pretty near correct.

MR. GRIMES — Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Minister if he is not convinced that when these statisticians go round to collect information they do not get correct information; that the fishermen look upon those individuals as interfering in a business in which they have no concern; that they don't want to tell the country and don't want to tell the Government; and don't want to tell the wardens what fish they actually have in every instance. I have heard men express that. I have heard men say that they are not prepared to give information that is going to affect the price of fish. I was informed that a certain statistician who went to a certain settlement was given such a hot reception that he didn't trouble about it a second time.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Give the name of the place.

MR. GRIMES—No; I don't wish to do that, but I state that the Minister is convinced that these statistics cannot be reliable.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I am no such thing, and I think when a statement is made such as you have made that you ought be prepared to give the name of the official who because he didn't get a nice reception didn't go back. I think it is unfair for you to say that and not give the name. It is unfair to the country and unfair to the department.

MR. GRIMES—I don't want to injure anyone, but I will in the future if anyone comes to me with such stories suggest to them that they see you and report the cases. I have no doubt, however, about the truth of it, because I went so far as to ask every person I spoke to coming from that place if it was true and they all said it was. As I stated before there is no question in my mind that the expenditure in so far as it relates to the gathering of statistics is absolute waste of money and is no value to the country and no value to the trade.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES — The Board of Trade don't say so.

MR. GRIMES—Some don't, but I did hear an exporter say just this week that he looked upon it as an absolute waste of money. He compared the statistics himself with what was furnished by the Customs Department. This vote is twenty thousand and a large portion of it goes towards this statistics compiling.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Not a third of it.

MR. GRIMES—There is about eight thousand paid out in salaries and it takes something to pay the expenses of these men travelling.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—If we cut out the statistics part the work would cost the same as it costs now.

MR. GRIMES—Previous to the appointment of statisticians, statistics with regard to the catch were given by the collectors of customs. In every district there are two or three collectors of customs and to my mind these men with fifty or sixty dollars additional to their salaries could do the work just as well.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—They couldn't do it at all.

MR. GRIMES—Why not? In no case would they have too much trade. In the spring and fall would be their busiest time. In case of their being absent in various cases it would not mean any more than thirty-six hours at a time away from the office. These statisticians don't go round to collect information every day or every week. Perhaps in some cases they go round once a month. The collectors of customs could be very well employed to do that work. They could go round and take the same information as is being got by these statisticians, with a considerable saving to the country. You might perhaps spend a thousand and save several thousands, and you would have information as valuable. In fact when the information was furnished by the collectors it was more likely to be depended on better than that furnished by the statisticians. I don't think we ought to allow this vote to go through to provide for expenditure of money for the payment of statisticians the same as last year. I would not have any objections to certain amounts being put in additional, say, in the Customs Collectors' salaries for any extra time that the work might take. In fact some of these collectors have very little to do and I don't see why they couldn't be required to do it for the same salary as they are paid for the collection of duties. Some don't collect half their salaries in duty and they might be very well earning what they get by carrying on this additional work in connection with fishery statistics. The Minister stated yesterday that he found there is quite a demand made in connection with inspectors for herring and oil and turbot by various people resident in the outports. I would like to ask the Minister if he has been able to satisfy the demands of all people making requests for inspectors.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Pretty well, I think after a few days.

MR. GRIMES—Was the staff adequate for the demands?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Well, we had to appoint a few extra men last fall. They were just temporarily employed.

MR. GRIMES—I would like also to ask the Minister if he has any information as to the extent of the refined cod oil industry this year being ahead of last year.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—No; any more than I can say that there are 120 more factories than last year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I can give you that information:

(Reads)

MR. GRIMES—I am very pleased to have that information and to hear what the Minister says about the number of factories.

It certainly shows the value of inspection in that it has enhanced the value of our refined cod oil both in the United States and Canada where it is being used extensively to-day. Now, I asked as to whether the present inspection staff was adequate to meet demands. I understand there is a considerable increase this year in the number of factories and in order to insure the high standard that we have already established being maintained I would like the Minister to say definitely whether the present staff would carry on inspec-

tion of these factories. Does he think it would be able to handle all that extra work?

I would like to ask the Minister the question with regard to the different fishing banks. They did not evidently get the information at the meeting held in the Newfoundland Hotel, because they have not been able to locate all the fishing banks within thirty or forty miles all along the coast. I would like to ask the Minister whether he attaches very much value to a suggestion of that kind. If so, can he give us the reason.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I certainly do think it beneficial, but I submit that if you went to work and spent $5,000 where the banks were it would be a waste of money.

MR. GRIMES—If you could locate the banks where the fish could be caught more cheaply than at the present time it would be beneficial, but of course unless you find that out you will never know. If it is the determination of the Government to put through this twenty thousand dollar vote I think it would be well applied for the purposes of locating these banks. I mention this for this reason, that three years ago when I was in Fogo District and perhaps the honourable member for Burin is able to bear out all I say, the number of fishing residents of that place were anxious to find out exactly where the fish was located within thirty or forty miles from Cape Fogo. They took this position that when the whaler was operating from there that she was out in a certain locality and had put down a line one hundred and fifty fathoms and had caught quite a lot of fish there. They asked for the information as to where these banks were situated but they could not get that information either from the captain or the crew. I was very much interested in being able to get the Government to send down a steamer to try around there within a certain radius to see if that statement of the whaling captain and the crew were correct. The following year the whaler went out again and repeated the same story again without giving information, because he thought as he said that he should be paid for giving that information.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—He was not a British subject. Well these are matters concerning the fisheries, and while we may be producing all the fish that the demand calls for at the present time, yet people are interested to find out, and fishermen particularly, if there are places where they can get to enable them to get the fish easier and in larger quantities, than they are getting at present. Of course the more places that are known, where the fish are allocated, the better chance there is of getting a voyage before the season is over.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, I have found in the district of Fortune Bay a lot of opposition to these regulations and it has been complained that they are a waste of money. I can quite see how the Government official in certain circumstances is going to find it difficult to get statistics. I wonder does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries think that generally the statistics of these officials are reliable.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—As reliable as we can get them.

DR. MOSDELL—I have met a great many fishermen, Mr. Chairman, who boasted of how they have mislead the statisticians. They objected to giving him the information, as they contended as it was a matter in their own private business, they did not see why they should. And then there are other people who have expressed the opinion that in most instances they get an exaggerated idea of the catch, and that

because it is diseminated world wide it has a tendency to decrease the price.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, we have a Fishery Board down there that consists of as good a specimen of Newfoundland men as there are in the country, as I see it, leaving myself out of it altogether. And in connection with that $20,000 voted by this House I was man enough to ask the Government to place it under the control of the Fishery Board and not the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. And every dollar of that $20,000 that has been spent during the last three years has been spent with the knowledge of the whole Fishery Board. That Fishery Board has done its best and is trying to do its best, and I believe sir, that it has done as much in the interest of this country as any man that has stood up here to-day and given it a black eye. I know what Dr. Mosdell has been saying about some of the fishermen not wanting to report the amount of fish that they caught is true. But there are always two ways of choking a dog. I may say for these fish inspectors that some of them are very clever men. And if they do not get the quantity of fish that are caught in one way they will get it in another way. Now to discover whether these inspectors are as near to the quantity of fish caught in the different settlements as they can possibly be, we would have to send another man to check them up. Take the case of the man on Labrador. Last year when it was reported that there was two hundred and thirty three thousand quintals of fish caught on the Labrador, the Board of Trade the next day came out and said that there was over three hundred thousand caught. Well we got the fishery officers to check up with that, one in Holton and one in Indian Harbour. And I will say here to-day that the man on Labrador was not 7,000 out of the whole catch on the Labrador last summer. We get some of the Customs officials and some of the merchants in the different outports to check up and we find that they are within five per cent. practically in every place that they go. But to come back to the statistics. We have heard honourable members of parliament get up here and refer to statistics.

Every country under the sun keeps a record of the statistics of what is going on in connection with their products. Two years ago the Norwegian Government took the trouble to send out a man to Newfoundland and he came to my office and thanked me for my reports, adding that it was the first time they ever got such detailed reports. He claimed that such statistics were beneficial to Newfoundland and beneficial to Norway so far as the fisheries are concerned. Last year a gentleman came to this country by the name of Bookless and he called on His Excellency the Governor. His Excellency asked me to see the man and I did. We had a conversation, at which Sir John Crosbie was present, about the amount of fish that was in this country and out of this country in the different foreign markets. Mr. Bookless, who was a big fish buyer from Aberdeen, claimed that there was far more fish being sent to the foreign markets last year from Newfoundland than there was the year previous. I said "that was not so" and I argued that the price of Labrador fish should not have been less than $5 per quintal locally last fall and I think I pointed out to Sir John Crosbie at one time that I thought the price of Labrador fish should have been maintained at $5 per quintal. Mr. Bookless took the trouble to wire to his principals as to the correctness or otherwise of my statement and two days afterwards he told me that I was right and that there was 120,000 quintals of Labrador slop less in the foreign markets last

year than the year previous. Therefore, I said why should not the price be better than it was. At that time the merchants of Water Street were talking $3 per quintal for Labrador fish. I heard that some people who are loudest in their protestations of the Monroe Government here this evening paid $3.50 per quintal for Labrador fish last year, with no possible result to any fisherman. But what happened? On account of us knowing pretty exactly the amount of Labrador fish the price went up to $5.50 whilst most of the fishermen got $4.50.

MR. HICKMAN—I wish the honourable member would name the party he is referring to as having paid $3.50 for Labrador fish.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I did not say I knew the party. I only heard of the transaction. However, Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the Opposition are doing their best to get after me. Let them do it. That is their job. I have heard here that the Marine and Fisheries was a most expensive department. Well, I want to say right here and now that what I am paid as head of that department I earn every cent of it, and I earn it more than any other man who ever sat there, because I spend twice the amount of time there. I know very well that the cry of the Opposition is that we are doing nothing for the fisheries. I say that is not correct and the man who makes that statement on the floors of this House cannot prove it conclusively to me or to 99 per cent. of the fishermen of this country that such a statement is correct.

MR. HALFYARD—Tell us what you have done for the fishermen?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Yes, I will. I have been told and so has every member of this Government been told that we promised a bonus on codfish. Yes, we did, but we promised it if the finances of the country allowed us to do it. There is quite an overflow of talk here from the Opposition about the poor fishermen. One would imagine that some Opposition members knew every fisherman in the country and that they come in daily contact with every fisherman in this country that is taking fish out of the water. Well my answer to that statement is that I have had within the past three years personal conversations with three times as many fishermen in this island as all the other members on both sides of this House put together. Quite a large number of the fishermen I interviewed were not in favor of a bonus. Seventy-five per cent. of the fishermen on the North Side of Bonavista Bay said they did not want to get a bonus because it would be unfair to the farmer, the mechanic, the clerk, etc., in other sections of the Island. It is sickening to hear members of the Opposition say that the Prime Minister and myself got elected in Bonavista Bay by promising a bonus on fish. Well, in spite of all the circulars and other propaganda issued by the Leader of the Opposition and his party and in spite of the efforts of clergymen, we were elected in the bye-election on "a bottle a day."

MR. HICKMAN—How much money was spent on roads and marine works at that time?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES — Nothing. I challenge the honourable member to prove that we spent a single dollar to buy a vote. We did not want to spend money to be re-elected. Now I claim that the Marine and Fisheries Department have done more for the fishermen of this Country than any previous Government have, and, in support of that assertion, over thirty lighthouses and fog alarms were erected throughout the country during the past twelve months, and, in spite of the creation

of these new public works, the Auditor-General states that there was a reduction in our department for the year 1926-27 of $74,000.00 as compared with the expenditure of the year previous. I have also heard in this House that the Monroe Government is a thing of the past. You can make that statement and I can make something else. Take the bye-elections that took place in Burgeo and LaPoile and Fortune Bay districts. Did not the Government candidates largely increase their votes over what they were the previous election?

MR. HALFYARD—How much did that cost the Colony and how did the fishermen benefit as a result of it?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Every dollar spent on public works in these districts benefitted the fishermen. I suppose you will say that the fishermen of Bonavista never got anything.

MR. HALFYARD—How much was given out last Fall?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I am glad you mentioned that. I was charged and vilified by that newspaper called the "Advocate" for throwing out money in galore on the North Side of Bonavista Bay last Fall to Party supporters. The individual who wrote that article I notice is "Toby B." If I should run across him and if he lives in St. John's he will want a fast motor car to get away from me because I intend to get hold of him pretty soon. Now the man responsible for that Catalina episode is a liar of the worst calibre, as the total bills at the present time will show that $10,500.00 was the amount spent altogether for the fishermen and their families who were in destitute circumstances and I did not spend half of that amount. This is the first time that any such relief was given out to our Bay in twenty years and every member on the other side of the House and their friends are shouting it from the hilltops, but what about the three quarters of a million dollars that was spent in Conception Bay and what about the amounts of similar size that were spent in all the other bays? This paper "Advocate" and their tooters would like to convey the impression that they represent the main body of fishermen of this country. Why, they do not represent the one-hundredth part of them.

Now, I want to tell the country what happened down on the North Side of Bonavista Bay through the reporter's box of this House. Last year we had a quarter of our ships come home from the Labrador without fish enough to pay for the supplies of the last year. We had practically two hundred families destitute in the month of October, with no means whatever at their disposal. They petitioned the Government, and called public meetings and sent up to ask the Acting Prime Minister and the Executive to give them some labor, that they were largely in want of to provide something for families in need. They didn't want pauper relief, like some in other sections of the country that are only too glad to get pauper relief and do nothing for it. The relieving officer was asked how much it would take to feed the people for the winter and the reply came back practically sixty thousand dollars in pauper relief would be required to feed those people for they were down and out and had nothing in their houses. They got enough to keep their families from starving and that was $10,500 when it would have cost sixty thousand in pauper relief to help them and we didn't get pauper relief. But what happened in St. John's East? Seventy or ninety thousand spent on pauper relief. I am not objecting to that if the people deserved it but I object to the people of Bonavista Bay being complained against for getting what they did. I say that the people that got that ten or twelve thousand on the North

Side of Bonavista Bay probably except three or four deserved it and it is the first they ever got, and now they are out fishing, not loafing round the streets of St. John's. They are out trying to keep three parts of this country that lives on the northern fishermen and south west fishermen of this island. Yet we are brought to book and everything said against us in this House because of what was given out because it was so badly needed. I think the greatest mess that was ever made of Government monies in this Colony was made of that ninety thousand by the City Council and I am sorry Mr. Brophy is not here this evening as he is a member of that Council. I think it is his duty as a member of the Council and of this House representing the East End of this city, to see that these men who got that money in addition to their salaries as officials are brought to task and the money is returned to the Department of Public Works. I think that affair is disgraceful.

This Government has paid out one hundred and twenty or one hundred and thirty thousand dollars in bonuses on fishing schooners in this country since it came into power and I say that we have one of the finest fleets of schooners for its number that we ever had in the country. We haven't so many, it is true, but what we have are a credit to the country and an asset to the country.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this country is run for certain sections and certain sections alone. I am saying that irrespective of who likes it because I can't help feeling slurs cast on me and the people on the north side of the bay for what they got to keep them from starvation, when I hear none of that with regard to other sections of the country that got help from the Government in large amounts. There was ten or fifteen thousand dollars spent to help the fishermen of Conception Bay on the Labrador. Did anyone come out in the paper about that? Has any member got up and spoke of it to Sir John Bennett in the same way? Certainly not. Why? Did they deserve it any more than the people on the North Side of Bonavista Bay? No ;not any more. But they deserved it. But why do the papers come out against me and the Government with regard to money, a few paltry thousands, spent on the North Side of Bonavista Bay and not a word about what is spent in Conception Bay. I don't know whether it is because we never got it and the southern sections of the country have been getting it all the time and the people of the country have got so used to it they dont say a word about them.

I had thought before this that somebody would raise the point of the Northern Labrador boat. Since this House was opened quite a lot of slurs have been thrown across the House to me in reference to the Labrador boat. All kinds of questions have been asked. I was the first man to suggest that Northern Labrador boat going down on that service, in the Morris Government, and I may say that as soon as I made the suggestion to the Prime Minister of that time he kindly conceded the request to put a boat down there. Now a boat has been going down every year for the past fifteen years except one. I have been at the Government for the last three months to send one this year. At the present I am not sure whether one is going or not. But I do want to make myself right with the fishermen on the northern part of the Labrador Coast. There is a great cry made about the few thousand dollars for a boat going down to Northern Labrador to attend to the sick and needs in any other way of the twelve hundred people down there on that coast but we do not hear one solitary word about the steamer run on the south

part of the coast and all the money that is paid out for taking these people down to the south part of the coast and bringing them back. Down there they have no medical officer, no hospital; no nothing. If a man gets sick he has to die like a dog. Why should we pay out forty thousand dollars to carry Conception Bay men to Labrador and bring them back? It is allowed I supposed because it is beneficial to the country. Why not spend then ten or twelve thousand to give those poor mortals that go down in July and are there till October a chance to get medical aid when it may be necessary to get to a hospital or anything else that may be required. Why the Portuguese Government with only three hundred odd banking vessels have a fully equipped man-of-war tending on them.

The Canadian Government do the same. Our people are 300 miles from civilization and 1000 miles from St. John's, and yet we can't get a boat to go down there. Mr. Chairman, any suggestion that comes from whom I care not, on the floors of this House, in reference to the fisheries or anything in connection with my department, I am only too glad to pay attention to it and to take it up with the Fishery Board. And any suggestion that the Fishery Board considers is right, I am only too glad to act on it if I can. But I do not understand why three quarters of the Opposition should be always trying to stick their daggers into me. I have never done them any injury. I have always treated them in the best possible way when they came down to my office on business in connection with the fisheries. I want to say right here that as long as the Fishery Board thinks that the vote is beneficial to this country, I am going to see that it is carried out. Why I told the Fishery Board that the Government intended cutting out the vote and what happened? Why there was a motion passed unanimously and sent up to the effect that they asked the Government to see that the money was still voted for that purpose.

MR. GRIMES—How many were present at that meeting?

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Cashin, Mr. Ashbourne, Mr. Chambers and myself. There was a quorum anyhow. Now, sir, there has been a great deal of talk about lines and twines. You would not know but lines and twines in this country were going to make the fishermen or break them. I have a different view of that than some other people have. I was just as much opposed to the duty going on lines and twines as any member of this House last year, but the Prime Minister gave me a guarantee that the price of lines and twines would not go up any more than it was at that time. I was satisfied. But you know that very few fishermen pay the duty on lines and twines, and it is only a very small portion of the people who feel the duty on lines and twines. But have we any guarantee, sir, if that particular duty had not been put on the lines and twines that they would have been any cheaper last year. I was also given to understand that it was the means of more labour to the people of this town, and therefore that that labour was of more account than the few cents that the fishermen might have to pay and which it was guaranteed that they would not have to pay. Therefore I took the word of the Prime Minister and I am glad to say that his word is correct, and that lines and twines are cheaper to-day than they have been for the past eight or nine years. Now during the speeches here there has been some talk about a boat on the West Coast for the benefit of the fisheries. Now it has been said before that I have always been a recognized friend of

the fishermen, but it seems to me that since I have come with the Monroe Party that I have side-tracked it somehow. I am just as good a supporter of the fishermen of the country to-day as I ever was. I have done as much during the last four years for the fishermen as any man on the opposite side ever did or ever will do. Now there is one thing that I am not going to do, and that is that I am not going to be abusive to any man. I have had a lot of dirt thrown at me by gentlemen on the other side, but I serve notice on them now that from this day forward, that any man on the Opposition that does so is going to get it back a hundred per cent. I have been trodden on many times on the floors of this House but no one has said that I cannot stand up and take my knocks. But I have been stabbed in the back. But if the people who are stabbing me in the back would only stand up and stab me to my face there would be a different story to tell in this country. But I leave it to the fishermen of Bonavista Bay, and I have been told from the Opposition side that if I went down there to-day that I would be defeated. Now I will make these gentlemen a sporty offer. Now there was only one place in Bonavista Bay that during the last election I could not get up and make a speech, and that was in Cape Freels. Now I will throw out the challenge here now. I don't care what side he comes from, or what party he belongs to, whether it is the Cashin crowd, the Lake crowd, the Mosdell crowd, I will go down and get a hearing there when they will not be allowed to speak. I have also been told on the floors of this House that I went on the West Coast last year for a picnic. I have had no picnic since I joined the Monroe Government. Now I have not been around the west coast of this country. I know nothing about it. But from Cape Race right round until you come to St. John's, I know as much about that part of the country as any man in this island. Now I have not had the information that I should have had about these districts, and therefore when I was asked by several members of that commission to go out and inspect some of the public works down there, I did go and I took the advantage to get acquainted with the different places in that section of the island to the benefit of the fishermen of the country, and yet I was told that it was a picnic. I did not want any picnic. But I tell you what I would like to see and that is that Rolls-Royce that the papers say that I was going around in. I have been here three years and practically four years, and I am not able to get a Rolls-Royce or any other car. I cannot even build a house in the city.

Now, sir, it was stated a little while ago that my department was very expensive. Here is the statement for any one to look at.

(Reads)

I think that I must be doing something down there. But there is one article at least and that is cod liver oil, that is turning in more money to this country than ever was turned in, and here we are abused every day because we have cod oil inspectors. I say that if you take the inspection off and go back to where you were five years ago you will not be able to sell it. At present we have four men on the inspection of cod liver oil. We have had up to this year very little enquiry from England or Canada for refined cod liver oil. But I am glad to say that this summer, we have met with a great deal of enquiries from the Old Country for refined cod liver oil. I hold in my hand now a book called "Dry Products." I see a long item in it by a man whose firm is situated in Montreal and he is speaking about Newfoundland refined cod liver oil and

he is boosting it for all it is worth. Now to-day I may say that one member of that company has become interested, and part of its business was to get the duty taken off cod liver oil coming from Newfoundland. I think that most of the members of this House are aware that most of the cod liver oil drank by the people of this country, is not bottled in this country, but the firm that gets it bottles it and then sends it back to this country. But there is one proposition that I would like to make and that is that every gallon of cod liver oil in this country should be bottled in this country. And I feel sure that before another six months pass over my head that you will see cod liver oil bottled in this country as well as refined in this country. Some time ago a certain Bill was brought into this House, and I was amused to sit here and listen to the various members of the Opposition criticising this Government. I could have got up here and defended the Government and in future I am going to have a go at any man that opposes me. But if I was on that side I would no more have got to my feet and said what they said about lines and twines, than I would go down on the wharf and drown myself. Now there is a question that I would like to clear up with Mr. Cashin. I notice here that he made a statement one evening that every minister of every department is prostituting his office. Now I am going to ask him if he would tell us what that means, here on the floors of this Assembly. Personally as far as my office is concerned I try to do my best down there. But this much I do say and I say the same for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and that is that there is not any roguery going on down there. I wish that every Minister of the Crown for the last twenty years could stand up here and say that and prove it, not that I blame the ministers for it. But we are all doing out duty down there and working. We are forced to work because I have at least one-third always sick, crippled and dying and all as they are. I am down there to-day with no Deputy, and with no Harbour Master. And three of the herring and oil inspectors have been home for the last six or eight months. Then I am abused every day. I have heard nothing else from Mr. Grimes or Mr. Halfyard for the last two years, except about inspectors. I say that it is only right that the members of the Fishery Board should get here and defend their share of it. One member of the Opposition says "You turn out Government officials." We did not turn out half enough. If the Prime Minister listened to me half of them would be turned out long ago and they deserved it. Because they have been doing nothing but talking politics. I say that any man that is in a Government office and talks politics should be turned out of it the very next day. Let him go to the booth and record his vote for whatever party he pleases, but why should he be talking politics every day. Now this Government has been attacked during this session in respect to the bottle a day. I notice here that Capt. Randell said that there was not half so much drank when he was going to sea as at the present time. Well, now, I dont know how old he is, but I don't think that there is much difference between his age and mine, but I will ask him to undertake to go down to the wharves when the sealers are going away or the sailing vessels are leaving, and he will see a difference between the drunkenness of to-day and twenty-five years ago. You don't see very many men drunk in St. John's. As regards the outport; I can only say what I know. I say that there was more drunkeness in Wesleyville, in twelve

months during Prohibition, than there has been for the last four years. Captain Kean spent thirty or forty years in the little settlement of Brookfield and a few years ago he was asked by a clergyman to go to Wesleyville and he went there, and I will say that he saw more drunkeness there at that time, during Prohibition, than he did for the whole time that he was in Brookfield. I notice that one gentleman since this House opened asked me what I paid for oil. I suppose the honourable gentleman must think who ever he is, that I made a sideline out of oil.

Now I do not ask the Opposition to accept my statement, but if they will go down to the department and turn up the books and the files they will find a marked difference in the prices that I paid for kerosene, lumber and paint than what they bought them for, and they will find that I purchased these articles a great deal cheaper and the department and the country got the benefit. I was also charged with having some close connection with the new fishermen's movement in Bonavista Bay four years ago. I think I have already repudiated that charge and disposed of it effectively. I have had nothing to do with that movement, and, perhaps, not half as much as the crowd who did not want to give these fishermen what they were looking for. I suppose the next thing I will be blamed for is that I am responsible for getting up this new branch at Catalina. I was told when that petition was brought forward by Mr. Halfyard that I should say something in favor of that petition. I have read the prospectus of that movement within the past twelve months and I might say that I was the first man who was asked to take the chairmanship, and I refused. But I know that the men who started this movement are straightforward fishermen and some of the finest fishermen in this country. Take a man like John Blackmore. You cannot get his superior inside or outside of this Island. The intentions of these men are good and I believe they are making a move in the right direction. They ask that fifty cents extra be paid for good made fish, and I contend that if fifty cents per quintal had been paid on fish culled in this town long ago there would have been less starvation than we have had in the past. Now with regard to this Fishery Commission that was apopinted last year in this House to study the problems of the fisheries. I was one of those appointed but I never asked to be appointed; but I am sorry to say that Mr. Hickman and Mr. Scammell who were appointed did not accept their appointments, and personally I do not think that they acted right and proper in the interests of their constituents. They may get up and say they did, but I do not think that the fishermen of this coutnry will believe them. I attended the first meeting of that Commission and that was the last one, and I will not sit on any Commission to make a cull on fish unless the fish is culled when it is being prepared for market. We cannot, in my opinion, better the conditions regarding fish in this country by culling it from the fishermen and then shipping it afterwards as the exporter pleases. I have also stated my opinion in this regard before the Fishery Board. As a representative for Bonavista Bay I was prepared to see that fish culled from the fishermen should be culled in the same fashion before it went abroad, because I know that fish is shipped out of this country to different markets that is not fit to go there. Now I think it was Mr. Lake, the member for Burin, who asked me here about the inspection on ships, and I think he said that the boats on one of our coastal steamers were unsafe to carry passengers in. Every steamer before

going out of this port on her usual summer route is inspected by Mr. McGrath, Registrar of Shipping, and by Captain English, the Harbour Master, and I feel sure that every steamer that leaves this harbour in the spring of the year is in as good a condition as it is possible to put them in. What happens after they go on their different routes I do not know; but any official appointed by my department can go on board a boat and demand from the captain his log, can see lifeboats put down in the sea and can see whether they are in fit condition to carry passengers. That is a law that was made in this House and I think it is right that such a law should be strictly carried out. Captains have been notified by my department that, under this law, they were liable to a fine of a thousand dollars if they carried more passengers than they had boat accommodation for, but they claim that on many occasions going around this coast they were powerless to prevent passengers from forcing their way on board of already overcrowded ships. However, in justice to the captains of the steamers of the S. W. Coast, the northern route and the Labrador, they have drills on board these boats once a fortnight so far as the safety for lifeboats are concerned. With regard to the overcrowding of ships I will be much obliged if in the future the law is not carried out in that respect that somebody will report the matter to my department. These are matters, Mr. Chairman, I do not hear until I hear them on the floors of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—As a member of the Railway Commission I would like to say a few words on the matter of these boats. I would like to know if it is a fact that these boats are not in fit condition. I think it is a very important point and the matter ought to be taken up.

MR. LAKE—I made a statement here yesterday that that Act for the Inspection of Ships should be put into force and that I had seen a boat on the Portia not fit to take passengers, and I said if I had known it was in that condition I would have put a ballast rock through it so as it could not carry passengers. During the past three years, since the Bill is in effect, I have travelled on the boats many times and I have yet to see the boat drill once. My contention is that we have no inspection of ships and there should be according to the Act.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—While we are discussing this matter I would like to bring to the attention of the House and the Railway Commission, since the Colonial Secretary, who is on that Commission, has referred to the inspection of boats, a more serious matter than the one we are speaking about. Last session I asked for information of the number of passengers on boats going north. I have that information with me.

(Reads.)

It had four boats and forty or fifty of a crew, making four hundred people. With only room in the boats for one hundred and twenty people, what chance would the rest have if anything had happened?

(Reads.)

Now, with those number of passengers and such boat accommodation it is a very serious position. If an accident happened, as is likely on this coast of Newfoundland, I think the Railway Commission, or whoever is in charge of these boats, would be in a very serious position. I just want to bring that matter before the House.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES—These boats have to be inspected by Captain English or the man in his place, now that he is sick, but they are not supposed to inspect the boats except once a year. The boat is given a certificate for a certain number of

passengers. They have to be inspected and certified for that number. As far as the northern boats are concerned, I have been on board of them and they do carry out the regulations; they have boat dr.ll every fortnight. The Leader of the Opposition referred to the boats carrying too many passengers. I expect it was the Kyle or one of them he referred to. I went up on the Prospero the year before last, and I saw Captain Kean, and he told me he had a great number of passengers and did not know what to do. I said "you are responsible for a $1,000 fine if you bring more passengers than your certificate allows. All that you have got to do is protect yourself. Your part is to not.fy the Railway Commission; if they don't take a hand, that isn't your affair, you are clear. If you can't get them out it is your place to notify the Commission." I know of a case where Captain Kean told me that he hadn't room for anybody, and people cl.mbed over the sides and got in somehow, got aboard at different places and came on to St. John's. I was surprised to hear that the boat of the Portia is in that condition, because I am perfectly sure these boats were tested. They were put in the water with eight or ten men to weigh them down to see that they were t'ght, top and bottom.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot said about the loan we got last year. I have as much reason to kick over that as anybody, because we never got one solitary dollar in my district. With regard to that loan I feel the Prime Minister and Executive Government did the best they knew how. I feel that it was spent just as well and in as right and proper a way as if spent by the Opposition.

I may be wrong and I may not, but I hope the people of my district can get some this year. I think Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay and St. Barbe and Burin and Fortune Bay should get it all now this year, because they have been absolutely neglected. I claim there is not a section in Newfoundland where the people are so badly off for roads as on the north side of Bonav.sta Bay Only a few days ago we saw roads built where you can drive a horse and cart. We would be very thankful to have them so as we can walk over them. I don't want my people to say I have come up here and not tried to get anything for the district or what it should get.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit aga n on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker read a message from the Legislative Counc l acquainting the House that the Legislative Council had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for obtain ng Statistics of Tourist Traffic and for other purposes" without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Friday, July 15th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 15th, 1927.

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

Petit ons were presented by

Mr. Scammell from St. Anthony re roads.

Mr. Scammell from Bonne Bay re roads.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES —Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the work of this House very much longer. I just want to see if it is possible to rightify the minds of the people of this country in reference to certa n statements made in a certain paper called the Advocate in this country by a gentleman commonly called "Toby B." The statement was made that ten thousand and some odd dollars were paid out in relief work on the north side of Bonavista Bay and the money was stolen by me from the south side, when ten thousand dollars was allocated for Bonavista in Bonavista Bay. Not that I care where that money came from, but I am not going to allow anyone to say that k.nd of thing and let it go as long as I have breath enough to defend myself. I have no other place in this country, no other way, to protect myself except on the floors of the House of Assembly. The person who made that statement knows as well as I do that he was lying. He never did anything else but lie. I challenge any member to say I ever knew where that money came from to pay those bills, but the Advocate or some people in this country believe I actually stole the money from the people of Bonavista Town. I worked hard to get that money for the people of Bonavista as hard as any man, and I may say that it was no fault of the Government that it wasn't spent, but the time of the year when that money was given it was utterly impossible to do anything at Bonavista Harbor. I have just as much interest in the people of Bonavista Harbor as I have in the people of any other part of the district of Bonavista Bay. That has been proved during the last three weeks when I had a chance to send so many men to the whale factory, and scores on my side, as they call it, were looking for work, but I divided it up. And I only succeeded in getting five men on the railroad laying ra:ls through that section of the country that they are now laying rails in this year. I know that it is only written for political purposes to try to down me in politics. But I care not what they do as far as I am concerned. If I want to be elected I will be elected, among the fishermen of this country too, in spite of all that has been said on the floors of this House. I want it to be broadcasted now that I have nothing to do with taking the monies that were voted for Bonavista harbour improvement and granting their transference to the north side. Nor did I know where the money came from until I saw it in that paper. It was also stated that it was given to Tory leaders. Now I do not want to make any distinction between the different politicians in my district. I have not done so. I have done as much for the Unionists, as I term them, in Bonavista Bay as I have ever done for the Tories, as you call them. But I must say in fairness to these Tories that not twenty per cent. of them got these monies, and they d:d not want it, some of them. Those people had gone to the fisheries and their vessels came home with no fish. Ten dollars some of them made for four or five months' work. Could these people be anything else but hungry? It did not make any difference to me what side they were on if they were hungry. I only used what influence I had with the Government to try and get something done for them. It was also said I went down north without authority. Well I think that in fairness to me the Executive Government will be man enough to say that I did not go down there without authority. Any

further remarks that I may have to make will be made later, but I don't want to hear any more dirty insinuations thrown across the floors of this House about monies that have been spent to tide the people of Bonavista Bay over a hard period. I have never stood upon the floors of this House and asked for relief in the summer months for the people of Bonavista Bay, but it has been done during the summer in regard to people who went down to the Labrador to try and do something for those who right from the Canadian coast to Chidley are trying to seek a living for themselves and to help to try and keep this country afloat, if that is possible.

MR. LAKE—Mr. Chairman: Yesterday afternoon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made certain statements here regarding that $20,000 of a grant received by that department, to provide statistics with regard to the fisheries. Now I was a member of the Government at the time and I was also a member of the Fishery Board. I have never been requested to get off that board and I still remain a member of it. I agree with him that there should be statisticians provided by his department. I want to state here further that I will agree for trade commissioners, to be placed in foreign countries, to assist the merchants here to market their codfish and give reports about the supplies. But what I want to state here is this that while I was a member of that Fishery Board and perhaps was mainly instrumental in getting that $20,000 to provide statisticians, after I went home and left the city of St. John's I was advised that the granting of the monies had taken place. Therefore I do not hold myself responsible for the expenditure of the money. I did not know that Captain Winsor stated that I was responsible. But when I was called upon to attend a meeting, I tried to do so, even though it is without money. Now as I may not have the opportunity to be on the floors of this House for a little while, I want to call the attention of the Minister to a grant just below this $20,000 one. "Storage for bait." I would like him to answer me what that is for. How is it spent? The reason why I ask that question is because two years ago I was assured by the Monroe administration that the town of Burin would receive a bait depot. Now under the redistribution the chances are that I shall not be a representative of the eastern part of the district of Burin. Now while I am a representative of that district I feel that I owe allegiance to the east as well as to the west. So I would like to urge upon the Government the necessity of a bait depot, for that section. I am in receipt of a telegram from one of the vessels which arrived in Caplin Bay the day before yesterday.

(Reads)

Now can anyone that is interested in the fisheries and knows anything about the fisheries that as far as the Grand Banks are concerned caplin is of little use at this time of the year. Now is the time when the Monroe Government should wake up and provide a bait depot somewhere on the southern shore. I do not care where. But the natural place on the Southwest Coast in my opinion is Burin. I am not stating that here because I represent the district of Burin. But because I think that it is the most reasonable place. But I do not stop there and say that one depot is all that is necessary. I think that there should be at least two, as my friend Major Cashin states here. No doubt Cape Broyle is the most natural place on the Southern Shore. But although this House voted last year $297,000 in the Loan Bill, part of which was to provide for a bait depot, yet it seems to me that the Government did not intend to erect a bait depot

anywhere. Now here is a telegram coming from one of the best fishermen in this country, who made the statement to me that he was unable to get squid on the Banks and that he had to try and see if he could get any in Caplin Bay. Now the bank fishery as most members in this House will agree, is one of the mainstays of the Southwest Coast. They don't want pauper relief up there. I am very pleased to state that the bank fishery business up to this year has been a great success. While in other fisheries the work is continued up to the end of July we have to continue up to the end of October, in order to try and pay our bills. I will again urge upon the Government of the day to try its best to see what they can do as regards giving a bait depot in the town of Burin. In my opinion if you had a bait depot along the coast, the fall fisheries could be provided with bait, whereby they could continue until the end of December. Not like the people of the north side of the island, not that the northern fishermen would not fish up to that time but they are unable to do so, as the ice conditions will not allow. I trust that the Government will listen to me when I am urging them to build a bait depot in the district of Burin. Also the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, made some reference the other day to the members who had been in the Monroe administration, of which I was one of those unfortunates I should say, who were in that administration. I now sit as an independent member in this House. He issued the challenge that there was none as interested in the fisheries as he was. I would like to send back the challenge to him now that there is not another member in this House to-day that has more interest in the fishermen of this country than your humble servant, even including the Minister himself. I know that he is interested in his own district and that he is a man with a great deal of practical experience, but he is not alone. Others have had experience in the fisheries as well as he has. I do not take off by cap to the Captain in that respect.

Now some few days ago Major Cashin got up in this House and made a furore about a bridge at Mobile, and asked the Minister of Public Works that it would be built. I trust that the Minister will see to it that the bridge which is now impassable three miles east of Grand Bank in the district of Burin will be built. We have the timber there, which was taken from the old bridge at Grand Bank, and unless it is used in the near future, in some way it may be too late. Now I want to state here that I am quite satisfied for the Minister of Public Works to take any monies out of any grant that I may have to the credit of my district, and out of the special grant which I presume I will have this year, if we are to take care of the roads, I am satisfied for the Hon. Minister to take the monies out of those and provide a sum of one thousand to build that bridge east of Grand Bank. Now is the opportunity as Mr. Thomas the bridge-builder is now in that district, and he will be finished working in a few days' time in Fortune.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Will the member put that in writing?

MR. LAKE—I will sir. Now I would like to state here that Mr. Thomas built a bridge in the town of Fortune, which is a part of my district, from the public funds of the Colony, and out of the Marine Grant that was left last year, and which the Colonial Secretary kindly allowed me to spend on that bridge. Now this is a very important bridge, east of Grand Bank, and I trust that the Minister of Public Works will see to it that that bridge is built in the very near future. I do not intend to hold up the House this afternoon,

for a bridge or anything else, but I trust that during my absence from the country that the Minister will see fit in justice to the people of the town of Grand Bank which is a producing settlement, that that bridge is built. I trust that over the signature of the Hon. the Minister that it will be done upon my authority when I write him that letter. I also want to say to the Minister of Agrciulture and Mines that I do not want to leave this country under his disapproval. If I made any remarks that were unkind, in reference to that hon. gentleman I am sorry, and I trust that the hon. gentleman will say the same to me for the remarks that were made by him. But I want to congratulate him for the manner in which he handled the fire at the Gander. I think that credit is due him and it should be given him. Now the Government press sometime ago said that I was throwing brickbats at him. I have no desire to throw them at any one. I merely made the statement that I had in mind at the time, and which I was absolutely serious about in regard to Buchan's Mine. I did not intend to make any further statement about it. But I want to place myself on record as being absolutely opposed to the Bill as regards Buchan's, as regards the schedule which they did not provide. I do not think that this country should give them a twenty years' guarantee of free entry of all goods that they wish. My idea is that the utmost that they should be given is five years, and that they should be bound by sections 204 and 205 of the Revenue Act. I just want to make a personal reference to the Minister. If I made the statement that he had an axe to grind, it was not intentional, but it looked like it. I don't think that is was right of me to make that statement. But I think as I said a minute ago, that the congratulation of the House should be given to him for the efficiency in which he handled the fire, which might have been a great menace to this country. It would be worth while if other ministers of the Crown, would take a leaf out of the book of the Hon. Minister and I refer now to the Minister of Public Works, if I may. He is here this afternoon and while he has given me the assurance and if he is sincere, which I do not think that he is, he would get up on the floors of this House this afternoon, and demand that a bridge be built that is not fit for traffic, and which has been proven to be out of repair.

We have now been in this House over two months, and we have done practically nothing. We have spent two days on a twenty thousand dollar grant for the improvement of the fisheries. But I would like to ask the Chairman, who held up the House on this. In all sincerity he cannot accuse us of holding up the House when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries held the floors himself for the last two days. Maybe he did not do it intentionally but perhaps he felt that in the dying hours of the administration to which he belongs, that he wanted to be placed on record, and wanted his obituary notice printed in the Government press. We cannot get ours printed there now and I am not sorry. Any remarks that I have made nobody has seen fit to print, and I am not sorry for it. Now I asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few minutes ago about a grant of one thousand dollars. I have not yet received an answer from him. But one last effort before I take my seat. I trust that the Government will see their way clear to build a bait depot in the town of Burin, and that they will do all that they can to build the bridge at Lamaline, a breakwater at Fortune and to repair that bridge that will cost a thousand dollars three miles east of Grand Bank.

MIN. OF AGRICULTURE & MINES —Mr. Chairman, I may say that the compliments that have just been paid me by the hon. member for Burin may be after getting me in wrong. During the past couple of weeks I have occasionally received black looks from my colleagues. The Prime Minister has been wondering what is happening, hearing so many compliments being poured upon a member of his party I am afraid that this is the last straw this afternoon. I am going to be a marked man. My colleagues are probably wondering now what party I am going to join, or what party I am in league with. But seriously, I appreciate the kind remarks of the hon. member that has just taken his seat. I can assure him that a kind word always finds its proper place in the heart of a proper individual. But it is not all plain sailing for a man that has a departmental office under his control, consequently we get such an overdose of adverse criticism that a kind word goes a long way to make up for the many disadvantages that we have to labour under. However that was not the purpose that brought me to my feet. I wish to join with the member for Burin in his advocacy for a bait depot. And this is not the first occasion when I spoke in favour of that. Ever since I had a seat in this House, and on every occasion that this matter was brought before this House I always gave it my hearty support, in spite of the fact that the history of bait depots is anything but encouraging. We had one established some years ago in the district of Fogo and the results were anything but encouraging. We had another at Petty Harbour, and that was also a failure more or less. But even though they have not been as great a success as we wished them to be, yet there is no doubt but that a large number of the fishermen of this country are seriously handicapped by not being able to secure bait at the proper season. Every year there are scores of men lying around idle because they are unable to obtain bait. I support this, not only because Mr. Lake made the plea on behalf of the bank fishermen, but what applies to the bank fishermen applies also to the other fisheries. As a matter of fact I will express the opinion that there is going to be a serious attempt made for the erection of one bait depot at least. I give my hearty support to the proposition. I am prepared to support it for Burin because I agree that it is a good place for it. For around Burin seems to be the place where you can keep a lot of squid, and how could we better spend a few thousand dollars than in trying out a proposition that is going to have a good effect on a large number of people. If that bait depot proves to be a success, then you could go ahead and establish others in other parts of the island. And I will support the Government in any attempt that they may feel that they should make to establish one depot on the South Coast to give the idea a try out. I do not wish to delay the House further.

MR MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I would also like to add my support to the contention of the member for Burin with regard to the erection of a bait depot. I thought that last year we had it within our grasp. We went and selected the ground to put it on. We did all in our power to have that depot erected, and then some member of the Executive Government thought fit to turn it down. Now it is just as well to have a show down here this evening. We ought to have a few words from the Minister of Public Works as to whether it will be erected or not. Let us erect one at Burin anyway. But the reason why we were to erect it at Bay Bulls was because we thought we could have a test there as to whether it

would be a success or not before we would erect one anywhere else. I give every credit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He treated me with the utmost courtesy when I approached him in connection with the bait depot. And it is through no fault of his that we have not got it at Bay Bulls to-day. I think that we ought to have a pronouncement with regard to this from the Minister of Public Works. If you erect it in Burin then I am satisfied, but at least let us make a start. But the people of the Southern Shore are anxious to have one erected in some portion of that district, just as well as in the district of Burin. I give my hearty support to the proposition.

I want to congratulate the Minister on his stand in this matter. Eighteen years ago I was a member of the Morris administration when the Minister made a speech that impressed me very much with regard to the fisheries and the fishermen, and I am glad to be able to say that in his effort of yesterday he has lost none of his old vim. It seems to me that there is going to be a general election this fall and that the Minister will be running for the north side of Bonavista Bay. I have no doubt but that he will come back and I have no doubt but that he is going to give the fishermen at Bay Bulls that bait depot He is a man who has done a great deal for the fishermen of this country, and any time I had occasion to see him with respect to Ferryland district he always treated me with the utmost courtesy. I trust, however, that the Minister will see to the establishment of that bait depot in Ferryland district this year.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES —Mr. Chairman, just a few words in reply to Mr. Lake's question as to the meaning of that vote of $1,000 for bait purposes. Some years ago Sir Edward Morris took up the question of bait depots and made a promise that any one who built bait depots that they would be paid one-third of the cost of the upkeep of such depots. Up to the time I took charge of the Department several people had been receiving money, and wrongly so. One man in Conception Bay, the year before I came in, was paid six or seven hundred dollars. When I came in I wanted to know how much bait was put up at that depot and how much bait was supplied the fishermen. I enquired from a friend at Holyrood how much bait was in that freezer and I got a reply that there had been no bait in it for five or six years before that. That is why that vote for bait purposes is still running in the Estimates.

Another matter Mr. Lake referred to was a boat for the South West Coast in winter time. I have made a claim on the Government that there should always be a steamer available in St. John's for going after distressed fishermen. Now I know that the Monroe Government have always sent out boats to rescue people in distress whenever I asked them, but at the same time, under present conditions, there is often a delay of a couple of days after a call comes for assistance. Now I quite agree that the same applies to the South West Coast in winter time. We have the revenue cruiser Daisy lying up in St. John's every winter and I understand the captain and engineer are kept under pay. Well I think that she could be kept laying up at Channel as well because she could be despatched to the assistance of distressed fishermen and seamen within a couple of hours, and if that ship had been there a couple of years ago some of those people who lost their lives might have been rescued. With regard to bait depots, I am still of the opinion that bait depots can be a success in this country. When I was coming from the Labrador last year I was in a settlement called Batteau

and we brought up from there 90 men who caught no fish, but one man named Hiscock said he would not come and that he was going to stay to try and get enough fish to buy his winter supplies. Well, that man got some bait from the bankers which enabled him to catch a good deal of fish. It appears that he and others used go aboard the bankers each morning and get a few squid for bait and this is how they caught their fish. Now I contend that if there had been a bait depot at Batteau last year another five thousand quintals of fish would have been caught by the Conception Bay people and that would mean another twenty thousand dollars wealth to this Colony. Still on the other hand we are told that there was already too much fish caught last year. I do not believe a word of it and I think I gave proof of that yesterday. The Department is charged with having done nothing. We got the Hudson Bay Company interested in our fisheries and we encouraged them to take up the proposition of freezing our salmon and shipping it out of the country, and I know from correspondence as well as from personal conversation that the Hudson Bay Company can do a great deal towards solving the problems of the codfishing industry of this country. As to bait depots, I agitated to have a bait depot established at Bay Bulls and in doing so it did not matter to me whether it was Cashin's district or whose district it was. The reason was that I have had occasion to go to Bay Bulls within the past three years more so than to any other place because that is where Mead Johnson and Company a few years ago built the most up-to-date codliver oil factory in this country. While at Bay Bulls I saw the necessity for a bait depot at that place. Two years ago for a period of ten days the fishermen there were, as we fishermen call it "laying on their oars" waiting for bait to catch fish and they were losing from two to six quintals a boat per day. I told the fishermen personally that I was in favor of having a bait depot at Bay Bulls. Last year there was a vote for that purpose, but as I stated yesterday, the revenue of the country fell short and the money had to go to other purposes, but I am going to say now that if there is any one place in the country where a bait depot is badly needed that place is at Bay Bulls and I am going to suggest to the Fishery Board to put it there. Now I think I have satisfied the members for Ferryland and anyone else in this House that I am in favor of anything that is beneficial to the fishermen who are the mainstay of the country. This town of St. John's is dying out fast because the fishermen in the outports are not coming here these days with their fish like they used to come in the past, and as sure as the codfishery dies away so sure will this town be covered with grass. Hundreds and hundreds of schooners used to come to St. John's before now with their fish cargoes and this used to give lots of labour. But such is not the case to-day. Every quintal of fish brought here gives the laboring men two dollars. Therefore, as a fisherman, I hope that every possible encouragement that can be given the fishermen will be given them. I know that the Government are anxious to do all they can for the fishermen, but they have been handicapped. Last year was a poor one and the two previous years we had to pay for the sins of the crowd that were in office before us. We got over that now and this Fall we hope that the price of fish will be $7 for shore and $5 for Labrador so that the Opposition will have the greatest task they ever had to defeat the Monroe Government in 1928.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, with references to some remarks made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries yesterday, I might say that, as a member of the Fshery Board, I

want to re terate my stand as regards the inspection of split herring. Speaking to the Address in Reply this year I intimated that I hoped the salaries for the inspectors of split herring would he removed from the Est mates this year. Now it does not necessarily follow that every individual member of the Fishery Board is in accord with what the majority decides to do because the majority of any Board car- r es the day. I have gone on record at meetings of the Fishery Board that it it not necessary to inspect split herring. Other members of the Board and who are mem ers of this House maintain that inspection is necessary. I cla m that the five cents charge when split herring are l eing exported from Newfoundland should go into the pockets of the fishermen who catch those herring and not into the general funds of the Colony to defray expenses which inspectors get for going around inspecting those herring. Only this morn ng I was told that $3.50 per barrel was all that the merchants of Halifax were prepared to pay now for split herring delivered in Halifax. I notice in the annual report of the Marine and Fisheries Department that last year there were 41,264 l arrels of pickled herring put up and t says there was a decrease of 10 000 barrels from the previous year, l ut on looking into the report further I find that the numl er of l arrels for the previous year was 40,437, so that last year there was really an increase l y nearly 1,000 barrels. I would like to l ring these figures to the attention of the Minister, as he may l e able to explain them. Now as regards th s vote of $20,000.00 for fishery improvements and the insinuation that I was in accord with it, I want to say that that money was voted l y this House shortly before the House closed last year. When the Legislature closed and I had gone to my home a meeting of the Fishery Board was held, but I received no notification of that meeting taking place nor was I asked to make any suggestion as to how that $20,000.00 was to be spent. I just want to make my position clear as regards these two matters and particularly l ecause the Minister is reported in the "Daily News" to have said here that I had taken part in the spending of that money. As a member of the Fishery Board I was not asked as to how that money should be spent. Now I understand that the Government s going to send a steamer on the Northern Lal rador service this year. I am interested in the lower Labrador fishery in that we have a number of floaters from Twillingate district who go down there to fish and at consideral le expense, and it does not cost the stationers who fish from the shore anything near the expense to fit out as t do the floaters, and I think that their conditions and their welfare should l e considered l y the Government. I would like to go on record as suggesting that the Government would send a large motor l oat there.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE —The Government have decided to put a steamer on the lower Labrador.

MR. ASHBOURNE—There is just one other matter that I want to bring to the attention of the Finance M nister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and that is a matter of a gallon and a half extra allowance which is allowed on all imported oil barrels to the fishermen when they ship cod oil, but which is not allowed on l arrels which are manufactured in this country and which are known as the Dawe barrels. I think if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would take this matter up with the Government w th a view to having the gallon and a half allowance apply to local made l arrels as well as to imported ones that it would l e of great benefit to the fishermen throughout the country.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE —I have always got the same guage on all cod oil barrels. I don't know what other firms do.

THE HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES — Mr. Chairman, when I made the statement yesterday that the Fishery Board was in favor as to how the vote of $20,000.00 should be spent. I did not mean anybody personally, but, as Mr. Ashbourne stated, the majority rules. I must also say that I always heard Mr. Ashbourne expressing himself as against split herring being inspected. But split herring is like other things. If a man goes to inspect Scotch cured herring he also inspects split herring.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it would not be good politics on my part to oppose the service on the Northern Labrador, but it is passing strange that during the first few days of the 1924 session of Parliament of the present administration we were told by them that there was to be no steamship service on the lower Labrador, but after a little while the Government sent a steamer there. This year the Prime Minister told us in this House that he was opposed to such a service and that no steamer would be sent there this year. Whether conditions down there are so pressing as to make it necessary for the Government to change their opinion with regard to that service, I do not know, but, evidently heavy pressure has been brought to bear from within or from without the membership of this House that the S.S. Susu has been awarded the contract for the Northern Labrador service this year.

Feeling that I may he reported in the newspapers to-morrow as obstructing the business of this House, I will take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House what I regard as hypocritical misrepresentation by the daily newspapers of the work of the Opposition in this House. For one reason or another I have not taken an active part in the debates of this House during the last week, but I have been reading the newspapers as an outsider as if I were not a member of this Legislature, and forming my opinions as one not sufficiently informed of what is actually taking place in this House. I think, therefore, it is only fair to the members of this House that this matter be cleared up as to their obstructing the business of this House and if the country is suffering as a result of this House being in session at this day of the year and going on from day to day with apparently very little progress. I refer to the "Daily News" of July 14th, and in the editorial columns there is the following :

(Reads)

I am not interested in that. What I want to draw the attention of the House to is this; where it goes on to say:

(Reads)

Now, there is a whole world of meaning in that to those that don't understand the workings of this Legislature and the duty we have to perform as members of the opposition. I contend that we need not have spent three weeks on the Address in Reply but we might have spent four weeks on the Estimates on the Marine and Fisheries and other Departments, necessarily and justly, and my experience is now that if I had anything to do with Government procedure or Opposition procedure, in the future I would devote the attention of the House to the Estimates and Ways and Means and let those be debated fully, freely and fearlessly. Anyhow, we can't help that, but the point I want to make now is, after all it might appear as obstruction to outsiders, it might appear so to members of the Government, having to sit down and listen to long-winded speeches and addresses and it may be trying on the nervous system and

all that kind of thing, but up to the present time what legislation has been brought before this House which is of such pressing need that it should be put through without debate. Men of Trinity District are coming to believe that I am a party to holding up the business of the country by making speeches in the House. They regret the absence of work on highroads and the want of labor-giving industries. They say our roads and bridges are in a state of disrepair; in fact some of the bridges have to be barred off. We can get no money. In some places there is very little fish and they are looking for the Government to give them something to do. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to have a show-down on this business before we proceed any further; and an explanation from the Prime Minister in connection with some remarks he made when I was not here in which he indicated to the House that we were delaying the passing of votes that would help the Minister of Public Works or of Marine and Fisheries to repair wharves and bridges in Trinity District. If there is any vote in these Estimates as submitted here that will do that, turn to that vote now wherever it is and let us pass it. We are not confined to any one part of these Estimates and if the Prime Minister thinks he can affect repairs to bridges in Trinity District by passing some section of those Estimates now, let us do so. I don't want to have to do lobbying with heads of departments and take the trouble to use personal persuasion and influence to get decent treatment for my district. I make my statements on the floors of the House here whether they be made in the most perfect English or most forceful way possible or not, and all I want is a square deal. Now, Mr. Chairman; fearing that I may through a surplusage of words defeat my own purpose I will ask the Primee Minister if he will explain his statement. I quote his words as taken from the "Daily News" report of the House of Assembly of July 13th. He says in referring to certain remarks made by Mr. Cashin:

(Reads)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and ask the Prime Minister if he will be good enough to refer to any vote in those Estimates by passing same will give employment or provide money to build bridges, or if he is going to introduce resolutions that will provide ways and means to fix roads and bridges in Trinity District or any other, and if so then will we proceed to that business and put it through. I protest against the press, the hypocritical press, representing me as a member of the House, or any other member of the House as being obstructionists and going so far as to say that at this season of the year we are holding up things when men should be earning something to provide for themselves. That is the inference, that we are keeping people from earning something to provide for themselves during the coming winter. It is not good enough and I won't stand for it any longer and I will not consider another vote or allow another vote to be read until a pronouncement is made by the Prime Minister as to what he means by that statement.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Trinity is a bit disturbed this afternoon by the misrepresentation of the daily papers, and I am glad really that he is feeling a little bit of it to-day because we have been getting it ever since we came into power from a paper he is largely associated with. I mean the Fishermen's Advocate.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman That is a personal reference "in which I am largely interested." I would like the Prime Minister to take

that back. I have no more interest in the Fishermen's Advocate than you have.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Probably you haven't personally; but you are associated.

MR. HALFYARD—I am not associated with it in any one particular. never write to it. I may send a speech of mine down to them when they ask me. That is a personal reference to me as being largely interested in a paper, I state I have nothing to do with what is written in that paper, and when such a statement is made by the Prime Minister I will ask him to take it back and apologise as an honourable man hould do.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, The Honourable gentleman has just asked about a vote. I am not going to make any reference or take anything back with respect to newspapers. I am just going to say in connection with the Estimates, my statement was the other day that if we had only got down to business on those Estimates and the discussion of every particular vote instead of spending three weeks discussing the Speech from the Throne which everybody said had nothing in it; if instead of doing that we had got the Estimates tabled and discussed them I claim we would have gone through the Estimates by this time and be down to the discusion of a Loan Bill which the Government would bring into provide money for the various works concerned. If we are to do anything with the work required in various districts my claim is that we have got to vote money for this particular purpose. We know the state of the country to-day and we know employment is badly wanted and while we hate to borrow any more money it appears that until we get the Gander and Humber and various other industries working full capacity we have to provide some other kind of labor for the people of the country and that in my opinion can only provided by the construction of roads and bridges in places where that work is so essential. My idea was that that money should be mainly devoted to districts that had not received anything through the Highroads Commission. We have to bring in a loan for purposes of building roads in other than "Highroads" districts. I claim that money should be very largely proportioned to districts that haven't got any benefit from the Highroads Commission and those districts to a large extent should get the assistance of that money to complete public works and build bridges and roads that are entirely out of condition. Some districts seem to have been neglected and it is very hard to treat all in a manner that all will consider equitable. That I have refused to give Bonavista District what I know is needed. I have not got the same ideas about being elected in Bonavista Bay as Captain Winsor has, because I feel I have neglected the district as far as its roads and other things are concerned. My claim in answer to the Honorable Member for Trinity is, that, if we had got these Estimates put through; I am not saying that since the Estimates were put on the Table there has been any obstruction but I do claim that we spent four or five weeks wasting time over the Address in Reply; when the Estimates are on the Table and I agree with the Honourable Member for Trinity in that respect; I say, if we had got these Estimates put through we could have had our loan bill in here, and if we kept to the exact details on the various matters we would get very quickly on to the loan bill and put through our necessary legislation and it wouldn't take very long, to get business completed.

MR. HALFYARD,—Mr. Chairman, I thank the Prime Minister for the explanation. It clears up the matter somewhat. He told us that he knows there is nothing in the Estimates to

provide for employment or special works. The only thing that can be done is to introduce a loan bill. I asked the Finance Minister ten days ago to introduce his loan bill. It does not follow that we have to pass the estimates first. It could be introduced two days after the House opened. That is the trouble with the Government. They have no money to spend. But what I am inclined to believe is that the Government having, no money and having to meet the interest on the public debt, have had to get a temporary loan. They are putting off the evil day of borrowing money as long as they can, and the spending of money to a large extent as long as they can. If people can live during the summer months they should try to get something to do besides working on the roads. I can read the mind of the Government as clearly as I can read a book. We have been spending money largely. We have spent ten and a half million dollars and we are no better off than we were when we started to spend. The people are clamoring for employment. If we open up road work in one place we have to open up work in many places. And the Opposition is being made the goat for it all, and has been accused of holding up this House. We have to borrow money before we can undertake road building of any extent. In fact we cannot get money to-day to rebuild a bridge that is falling down. But some of the members of the government are successful in their appeals, and some of the members of the Opposition too, but Trinity District can get nothing done at all. There are three bridges falling down in Trinity District on the main line and I cannot get the money. The only hope that I have is after you raise a loan. That being so we know where we are. We have not any money to spend. I would, therefore, say to the Minister of Finance to introduce his loan bill and let us put it through. It is just as well to meet it first as last. And by hesitating and waiting until we get the actual conditions of the country by the Budget Speech is not going to help us one iota. Now I would like for the Prime Minister to be present as I am dealing with his department. I had intended to refer to a statement made by him, which I claim is unjust. I had no connection with the Fishermen's Advocate. I do not know any more about its management than the Prime Minister himself. I had nothing to do with its editorial contributions, and I think that it is unkind of the Prime Minister to say that he reiterates what he said about my interest in the Fishermen's Advocate. Yesterday in going through the votes for the herring inspectors, the question was asked the Minister as to the difference in the salaries, and in reply the Minister said that those who were in the service the longest get the biggest salaries. Is that so?

THE MINISTER OF FISHERIES - There are two or three of the older officials that get larger salaries.

MR, HALFYARD—Now personally I have the best of friendship for the Minister or anybody else whether inside the House or outside. But it is my duty to criticise what I think should be criticised, from the public standpoint, and sometimes I may have to mention names of officials but if they are mentioned then I hope that they will be taken in the spirit in which they are meant. Now I looked through the fisheries vote in the public accounts and I notice that:

(Reads)

Now then I do not know when these men were appointed. But Mr. Winsor gets a hundred dollars more than Mr. Fitzgerald and also more than Mr. Dunphy. I think that Mr. Dunphy and Mr. Fitzgerald were employees of the Department years longer than Mr. Winsor, so it does not follow that salaries are given in the ratio of the length of the service. Men have been

appointed for political reasons and perhaps they are given as much as two hundred dollars more than the man doing the same service for years. Is not that the history of every department, Mr. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Last year I made the recommendation to the Government that all inspectors be paid the same salaries. If they are not getting the same salaries it is not my fault. I made the recommendation that all herring inspectors be given the same salaries of $1500 because I do not think that a man could live in this town on less than that.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I shall look into that and see what is wrong with it.

MR. HALFYARD—The trouble is that the Minister has got to come in here to find out things about his own Department. There are lots of Ministers like that. The trouble is that we are too great politicians, and we have to attend to other matters every minute of the day instead of the vital things in connection with the affairs of our Departments. Now I am asked to vote for a twenty thousand dollar vote for the improvement of the fisheries. It is a mis-nomer. And I am sure that 95% of the members of this House do not know how that vote was spent. I ask the page to bring up the public Accounts and we will have an idea of how that was spent and what great benefits came from it. While waiting for that I would refer the Minister to the report of the Department that has been presented to the House. It is only a skeleton report. There is nothing worth while in it, if we leave out Sleggs report which is scientific, and of no great interest to the ordinary man. There is no information in the rest of it. Here we take the cod-total catch up to Nov. 10, 1925.

(Reads)

In the report for 1926 there was some attempt made to give some statistics and information. It gave the total catch up to Nov. 10, 1925.

(Reads)

Now this is a matter of vital importance. The printers are being paid for the publishing of the report. It is of no value, absolutely of no value because it is incorrect, in several particulars. In last year's report we got some idea anyhow whether it was correct or not of the quantity of fish caught on Labrador, some idea of the quantity caught in the Straits. But from this report we get onthing.

(Reads)

That is all the information that we get with regard to the prosecution of the Labrador Fishery from this report. We spent twenty thousand dollars trying to get statistics in regard to the quantities of fish caught. Whether your department got them or not I do not know, but evidently nobody thought it worth while to put it in the report of the Fishery Department, this year. It would be appreciated by outsiders coming in here, that are interested in the fisheries, because referring to the North American Fisheries i nv e s t i g ation which was held last year.

(Reads)

We have nothing like that at all. And still we spent twenty thouasnd dollars. This House has got no more information as to the quantities of fish caught here than they know about Iceland.

I want to draw the attention of the country and the Minister to the importance of the report in giving us all the information that is possible. And if there are any statistics put them in. Now turning to the vote for the improvement of the fisheries. We have spent $20,000, and we anticipate spending another $20,000. I fail to see where the fishery has been improved by the expenditure of that money. We know that the fishermen

of the country when the time came for the prosecution of the fishery this year never anticipated the prosecution with such a gloomy outlook. There has been disappointment over the results of the previous year. And nothing bright has happened to encourage them to operate the fishery. And the spending of that twenty thousand had no more to do with encouraging the men to prosecute the fishery, than if it had not been spent at all. But in some places where the money was spent and paid to supervisors, it had only caused a feeling of dissatisfaction and disgust in the minds of the fishermen who are trying to catch fish and cannot, and then having men sent around to see the amount of fish caught and to send in a report. This often had an adverse effect. Cut it out. Do not put improvement of the fisheries there. Say that the vote is to give certain people a job during the summer season, men who were working for the Government. Their ordinary work is talking politics, and making trouble for the man who is supposed to be interested in the country. They are going around talking to people in this way. "Here is a bridge falling down." What about repairs. Why do not your members see that that bridge is repaired? Why do they not see that something is done so that you can haul up your motor boats That is what they are doing in Trinity district. Political propaganda. They are trying to poison the minds of the people against the men who are trying to do their best, in their own peculiar way. I do not know whether these inspectors are better received than they were the first time that they went down there. But it was dangerous for them to visit some places the second time last year.

(Reads)

The fellows I am sure down on the Labrador will be encouraged to jig a few more codfish when they hear that the Pope Furniture Factory is getting $89 for a desk charged to the $20,000 vote for the encouragement of Fisheries.

I do not think there is much need for further comment to show the House that this vote of $20,000 by getting an army of people going around to find out the number of quintals of fish caught in the different settlements in the country is not going to improve the fisheries any, and if you want to get statistics on the fisheries you can get as good a service as you are getting now by spending half of the money and giving the work to people in the different outports who are already in the employ of the Government. There is no need of any new appointments. If the Prime Minister has the courage of his convictions—and I feel sure he is convinced already—why does he not have that vote cut in two, and I move this afternoon that that vote be reduced to $10,000. During the last session of the Legislature, Mr. Duff, the member for Carbonear, appealed to the Government to do something to assist those who had suffered losses on Southern Labrador as a result of storms that had occurred the year previous, The Government undertook to give certain people supplies of lumber, nails and felt. I asked the question shortly after this House opened this year as to the value of the material supplied to repair the damaged property and I was supplied with a list of names and the amounts paid certain individuals and firms for those supplies and the total amount of the supplies given out was $9,763.73, according to this list. But I also asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give the names of those who had received the supplies. I thought the accounts were kept in some department of the Govern:ment and I did not think that any deparment was so

lax that it did not know to whom this $9,000 worth of supplies went. Any how I was told that the accounts were not kept in the Marine and Fisheries Department and evidently were not kept in any department of the Government. The people who supplied the material were paid out of contingencies account and the bills were transferred from the Finance Department to the Colonial Secretary's Dept. and it was through the Colonial Secretary's Department that I got the details I have. Now the question arises as to whether those supplies were distributed properly or not and did the people whom the Government intended to supply for the losses they sustained receive the benefit they should have received or not? I do not know, but I hope that information will be furnished the House in that connection. I have a list here giving the number of rolls of felt, the number of bags and pounds of nails and the amount of lumber in feet; also the names of places on the Labrador, delivered from the S.S. Meigle in August 1? Who was on the Meigle as Purser when that stuff was delivered

THE MIN. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—Mr. Serrick.

MR. HALFYARD.— Well, here is another list of material delivered by the S.S. Ranger in June and July 1926.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.—That was Mr. Serrick also who was Purser on that ship.

MR. HALFYARD. — I got another showing that Edgar Hann, Purser of the S.S. Meigle, delivered material in July 1926. I got another list of names, but the places are not mentioned, showing that there was a total of 1065 feet of lumber, 25 bags of nails and 223 rolls of felt delivered and the most illuminating part of this is a foot note to the effect that owing to crews being late in getting to the Labrador they made temporary arrangements aboard the ship by putting off the deliverey of the material to the fisehrmen who need it until this year. In other words, through the non-delivery those supplies last year many poor fishermen were unable to build their fishing rooms that had been destroyed the previous year, but the firms who supplied that material were not stopped from collecting their bills last year. Is not that a lovely spectacle? Now I want to know whether or not I got a complete answer to my question.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The S.S. Viking took down a thousand feet of lumber and I have not got the Purser's report yet.

MR. HALFYARD—I have taken the trouble to add up the number of feet of lumber which is 78,458; 6,643 pieces of scantling, 576 rolls of felt, 21 bags of nails and 2443 pounds of nails, which were supplied, according to the reply I got, and for the life of me I cannot see how it cost $9,-000.00. This is a scandal and somebody should know something about it. In the first place there was no account kept in the department responsible for those supplies and that expenditure of money, and I venture to say that if the list of names were published that some of those for whom the supplies were intended never received anything. I dare say some of the people may be dead and lumber, etc. were delivered for them, and I hazard the statement that some people got supplies who never owned a stick or a stone on the Labrador, I know men who received supplies and who never lost anything in the storms and I think Mr. Duff can bear me out in this.

HON. MR. DUFF—I know of people who lost everything and got nothing.

MR. HALFYARD—Those people were encouraged to get those supplies and the dishonesty began with those who did not keep a proper account

of what they were doing. It appears that the Government are getting very paternal and the whole community is getting demoralised, fishermen as well as everybody else, and members of this Legislature are helping to demoralise it. People in the outports say we must get our share because St. John's people are getting poor relief galore. That is the condition we have come to and then we have members in this House trying to defend such a condition of affairs. The Government sent a steamer to the Labrador last year to bring home fishermen, who had caught little or no fish. At Indian Tickle one man remained and caught between forty and fifty quintals of fish before he came home. The other men who came home appealed to the Government and got fifty dollars a man to spend on roads and the man who had the pluck and the industry to stay fishing got nothing from the Government. Now if the Government think they must spend money on highroads and lowroads and to relieve destitution, why not do it now and bring in a loan bill to-morrow, as there is nothing left for the Opposiltion to do but to vote for it, for the purpose of relieving unemployment throughout the country. At all events, it is essential now to have money spent on roads and bridges, as only yesterday I had a letter from a constituent saying that his horse fell through a bridge at British Harbour and was killed. That man is claiming compensation for $65. The same may happen in any other district. I trust that the Government will bring in their loan bill immediately and have all necessary public works attended to and not have us called obstructionists. It is sickening to read the Government press stating that the Government had created a labor giving industry and that all it means was to get the man to go ahead to work, and that the panacea for all our ills is to get the obstructionists from delaying the Estimates. We are going along here now like a crowd of irresponsibles playing the part of a crowd of humbugs and I feel like leaving the House now for the balance of the session, but that would be cowardly, so I have to stay here and take part in the farce that is being enacted and do a bit of acting. It has been rumoured that if the Opposition were promised a General Election in the Fall that the House would close within a week. As far as I am personally concerned the General Election has nothing to do with my speaking in the House of Assembly nor will it even if there is to be a General Election to-morrow. It is a wrong idea so far as some of us are concerned.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: On yesterday afternoon I rose in my seat for the purpose of asking some information in regard to statiticians. Since then considerable verbal warfare has passed, and I still have not got that information I was interested in knowing how these particular officials came to be appointed. Who demanded those appointments, whom these people are serving and who is paying for them. Why is the expenditure of $10,000 or $9,000 being paid for these statiticians. And who is paying for them the Government or the Minister.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The Government is paying for them of course.

DR. MOSDELL—I wish the Hon. Minister would take things in the spirit in which they are said. He is rather inclined to take things as directed to him personally. Now I was not intending to rake the Minister in his personal but in his official capacity . Now when I ask a question about officials as statiticians, I ask it because I do not regard the expenditure on these of value, and in doing so I am not making any reflection of any personal charge

against the Minister, just the same as when I am criticising that vote I am not making any reflection on the policy of the inspectors. I asked some questions regarding the expenditure on inspectors, and the Minister got up and used these questions for an argument in favour of inspectors. I know that inspection is necessary but the amount of expenditure was the question that I raised. I know that the inspection of codliver oil has made it something worth while in Newfoundland. It helps to put our own products on the markets. As far as inspection is concerned it has not gone far enough in connection with the fishery products. If there was more inspection, we perhaps would have a different tale to tell about the fisheries, and a stable industry such as this would be a great deal more valuable than it is at the present time. The point that I had in mind in asking as to who was paying those statiticians, is whether we are obtaining information valuable to the fishermen commensurate with the expenditure. What value can the Hon. Minister show, from the obtaining the use of these statistics. I wish that he would give me that information.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: I have stated about a dozen times that these men are not statiticians, and still you will contend that they are. Now you know and I know and the country knows that 90 per cent. of the cod traps sold in St. John's were three and a half size mesh, and quantities of small fish were destroyed through the small mesh trap. Now I am speaking of these statiticians as actual fishery officers. I was told that there was scarcely a trap on the S.W. Coast fishery that was not small mesh. Written instructions were sent to the statiticians as you call them that every time they went around to see if there was any infrigement of the Fishery Rules. As far as possible these people are paid from the Department of Marine and Fisheries and particularly from the vote of $20,000. And as I said before I have a Board down there, that consists of several of the members of this House, and part of the Board are not in this House, and I trust that those who are on that board have the confidence of the members of this House.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I thank the Hon. Minister for the explanation as far as it has gone. I may say that although he has given an answer and as far as his knowledge goes I presume, still it does not go far enough. This statitician matter interests me very much because I remember that a few years ago, demands were made by the trade for more information as to the fish caught around the shores of Newfoundland and Labrador. What I wanted to know was whether these men were employed and paid at the demands of the trade, and for the benefit of the trade. Is that the case. Were these appointments made because of demands from that source and of that sort.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES — Mr. Chairman, they were not paid expressly for that purpose, to my knowledge. The principle reason for appoint'ng these men was to see that the lobster fishery rules were carried out to the letter. The lobster fishery was closed down for three years. Then of course when they were appointed for that purpose they could take statistics as well. It is only to-day that four members from the Board of trade of this country said that these men were not of any benefit to the country. They did not know what they were talking about. But sir, we may stay here until dooms day, before ever we expect to get honourable members to agree with what we are doing, because it is their duty, and they take it for granted that

it is their duty to criticise everything that the Government is doing. Therefore I think that I have given all the information that it is possible for one to give, and yet the honourable member for Fortune Bay is not satisfied.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable member for one bit of information more, that these statistics that are compiled by these officials are of value mainly to the trade. Is not that so. What does the trade pay.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Nothing. Do you wish to bring in a Bill to make them pay.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister is in charge of the herring inspectors. They go to a section of my district say, and inspect the packing of the herring. The packer has to pay for the services of that inspector. So much a barrel. Now these officials also go around and collect information as to the catch of fish and other matters of value to the trade. They pay nothing. They make no contribution in respect to that. Whereas the man actually on the job in the handling of the fish if he employs the services of an official from some department, well then he has got to make a payment in respect to these. There may be justifiable reason, and that is why I am asking the Minister those questions and I ask them in all sincerity. Why not make your system reasonable. Why should you discriminate between these gentlemen who get the services of these statiticians for nothing and the men who catch the herring and who have to pay for the services of the official from some department.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, anything that is beneficial to the trade of the country is beneficial to the fishermen of the country. And personally I do not see why the trade of the country should pay for the information that is obtained through these statiticians. Why the fishermen get the benefit of these statitic.ans just as much as the trade of the country does.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, there was another matter of considerable interest to the section of the country that I have the honour to represent that I want to put up to the Minister. There is a close season in connection with that industry to wh'ch the Hon. Minister has just referred. I presume that these statiticians and inspectors that the Department sends out provided evidence to show the necessity of closing down that :ndustry, in order to give the lobsters a chance to propagate, and in order to build the industry up to something like its former value. Can the Minister inform me and this Committee, what the value of that industry was when it was closed down to those engaged in it. How many people were engaged in it. How many lobster traps and packages were rendered useless and how many people were thrown out of employment, when that policy was embarked upon and when the close season wlil be over.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, the honourable member has made the statement that by clos.ng down the lobster fishery, that it puts people out of employment. Well last year that lobster fishery that was carried on in Fortune Bay, there were 82,000 lobsters caught and they filled the large number of 340 cases. Was it not time to close down the fishery then.

It took 82 thousand lobsters to fill 340 cases and I heard Mr. Templeton say to-day that he actually counted 62 lobsters claws that were placed in one can. He made that statement at a meeting of the Board this morning. If the people of Fortune Bay went hungry through the fishery being closed down for a few years, it is a very easy matter to starve the people of any dis-tr'ct, but I make the statement now that ninety per cent. of the lobster

fishermen of Fortune Bay or of any other Bay will say that a close season was the right and proper thing to do with the lobster fishery. Take Mr. Stephen Taylor, of Bonne Bay, who was against the idea of a close season at first, but to-day he admits that it was the best thing to do for his section. We have no axe to grind in having a close season for lobsters, but we thought it was time for some one to take action to protect this industry and the Government had backbone to endorse the action of the Fishery Board in enforcing the law and to make the best rules and regulations for the benefit of all concerned when the lobster fishery opens again next year. If we make mistakes we will only have to suffer.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I don't want to delay the House but before the Committee rises I want to make reference to a report of the House of Assembly in to-day's paper. it says:

(Reads)

Now I want to say I don't think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made any such statement and I would like the honourable minister to get up and say whether or not he made that statement; whether his statement was not rather as reported in the other paper the Daily News which was in my opinion what he did say:

(Reads)

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—With regard to the report of my statements that Mr. Ashbourne refers to what I meant was of course that a decision was reached by the majority of the Fishery Board of course I didn't mean that the whole Board was in accord. Mr. Ashbourne of course is prepared to be governed by the majority and is not going to get out of the Board because the majority wants something else from what he considers best. I don't mean to say of course that he or any member subscribed to every vote what I meant was that that was done by the Board on the decision of the majority.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, on moving the adjournment of the House I would like to say that I promised the House I would have legislation down this week in connection with the Corner Brook and Gander properties. I said I hoped and so I did hope, but we found a good deal of difficulty in getting small matters adjusted more than we anticipated and these Bills have got to be gone over and over again and thoroughly thrashed out in every particular. All I can say is that I hope now that we shall have that legislation next week.

I beg to move that the House now rising do adjourn until to-morrow Monday at three of the clock.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, July 18th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 18th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by:

Mr. Scammell from LaScie, and 106 other places in the Districts of St. Barbe, Twillingate, Fogo, Bonavista, Trinity and Burin, re the subject of: The Export and Standardisation of Codfish.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, might I be permitted to ask when we might expect the report of the Finance Committee appointed two years ago, or if they have reported already to the Colonial Secretary or the Finance Minister?

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, as a member of that Commission, I want to say first of all that it is wrong that the Commission has been in existence for two years. That Commission was appointed less than a year ago. In the second place, the members of that Commission do not represent any department of the Government, and, from the standpoint of procedure, if we made a report, we would make it to a departmental head and it would be up to that Minister to give it or not to this House. It is not the duty of the Commission, neither is it their privilege, to report direct to the House. Honourable members opposite know this, but persist in asking individual members of the Commission for reports.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, might I ask if the Commission that were appointed by the Government made a report to the Minister of Finance and Customs?

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE —No.

MR. CASHIN—I take it that they made no report to any Minister and to use vulgar language the Commission is a cod.

HON. MR. CRAMM—I rise to a point of order. I am a member of that Commission and I do not want to be called by you a cod, and if the Commission is a cod I am a cod. I have tolerated your language long enough and I request that that epithet be taken back immediately.

MR. CASHIN—I will take back the epithet cod and put in the epithet farce. Now I do not want to delay the Estimates but I contend that that Commission dealing with the finances of this country should have reported to someone. From information I gathered in connection with the work of that Commission the only thing they did was to send policemen around the country for the purpose of cutting down widows mites. Yes, certainly the Commission is a farce. I regret that the committee ended to disastrously and I regret that they made no progress whatever. As a matter of fact since they took that job instead of decreasing expenditure they increased it by $750,000.00.

MR. SCAMMELL— Mr. Chairman. Arising out of this discussion about the economy commission, I may say that last year two commissions were appointed — a fisheries commission a finance commission or ecenomy commission. The Government did come in with the excuse because the fisheries commission did nothing was that Mr. Hickman and myself had refused to act on that commission. At that time of our refusal we did not anticipate that there would be such disastrous consequences. But from the standpoint of the economy commission they have not even that leg to stand on because they were appointed exclusively from members within their own ranks. We are here now discussing Estimates involving an expenditure of over ten millions of dollars and we do not know where we are going to get eight millions, and, therefore, it is only right and proper that we should know whether the economy commission functioned and whether they have brought in any report or whether they have made any report to bring in. I fail to see why any honourable member should get into a heat because he is asked what that commission did. Despite all that has been said from the other

side, I feel that if they met and made any recommendations we should have them here, and, further I would like to ask if any member who served on that commision has been paid for his service, and if the members who served on that commission are able to bring in a report to show this country where a half mililon dollars can be saved, then they are entitled to be paid for their services, The Government is up against it today. I do not know what the Budget will contain, but I know the Government are considering the idea of putting on a business profits tax and an income tax again and which the whole business community is opposed to and they want, if possible, not to have to pay such extra taxes; but if your finance commision will show here where a half million dollars can be saved in the public expenditure there would be no necessity for a business profits tax or an income tax. You are going to find that before you are through with this proposition that you are going to be up against public opinion like you were in connection with the Buchan's Mine proposition. So why not face the issue now? We were here opposing the Buchan's Mine propcsition because of the concessions given. No consideration was given to the people so far as the representatives on this side of the House were concerned and you forced public opinion to the extent where people organized and made their views be felt and you got them in shape to day in the Resolutions that were presented to you, and you are now runinng a similar risk in connection with your business profits tax and your income tax. Therefore, if the business people of the community feel that they cannot carry these taxes and it is not in the best interests of the country—my own perscnal opinion notwithstanding—I agree with public opinion. I think really Mr. Cramm, as a member of that economy commission, would do well to make a frank statement as to the work of that commission.

HON. MR. CRAMM.—It is not my business to do so.

Mr. SCAMMELL. — Well, has the commission reported and to whom has it reported? And who is chairman might I ask?

HON. MR. CRAMM.—Mr. Morine.

MR. SCAMMELL. — He is away. Who functions while he is away?

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SCAMMELL.—Even if Mr. Morine was in the country he would not be able to speak for himself in this Chamber. Well, then, surely it is not too much to ask Mr. Sullivan whether the commission made a report and to whom the report was made?

THE HON. MR. SULLIVAN.— Mr. Chairman.—With reference to the Finance Commission which was appointed to carry on certain work, I might say that the Commission have done considerable work and they have been preparing and intend to bring in a full and final report. Whether the Government will accept and carry out the recomendations of the Commission is another matter. They did not seem inclined to put in any curtailment until the whole subject matter was enquired into and dealt with. Two or three interim or progress reports have been put in and another one is ready to be submitted now. It is true that policemen were sent out by the Commission, but not, as Mr. Cashin stated, to cut down widows salaries. I think the honourable member knows his statement is incorrect. It was a case of somebody having to be sent around the country to find out what was going on. There were no records held in the Public Charities Department here which made it impossible to trace permanent and casual poor relief expenditure with any degree of accuracy. We sent policemen around to

enquire generally into this matter and we have found that in some cases it was very necessary to get statistics. As a result of getting these statistics, we have a system completed and a system that will be a benefit and a help to the Public Charities Department in controlling public expenditure. We found that some people of independent means were getting help from the Charities Department. The real intention of the Commission was to find out the most deserving cases and give them larger amounts than they were getting—because ,for instance, what is $24 a year for a widow and several children to look after—and to cut out the undeserving cases who are not in need. We have completed a graded scale. There are four grades and all applicants now will be treated on their merits. We have a mass of information that has taken a great deal of time to collect and prepare. I think that when the final report goes in you will find that the Commission have done a considerable amount of work, not only in that matter of sending policemen around, but in many other respects as well. As I have already stated, we have sent in a few progress reports and put in some recommendations and it is up to the Government to decide what action they will take as to the recommendations made. I am prepared to pledge my political record on what we have done because I realise that some one has got to take a firm stand. This Government or the Government that comes after it must start to curtail in the strictest manner and it was on these lines that the Commission gave much consideration to the problem. I am going to recommend that the Postal Telegraph service be handed over to the management of the railway. You have telegraph offices costing six and eight hundred dollars a year scattered all over the country and the yearly revenue of many offices is not more than sixty or one hundred dollars. The ordinary taxpayers have to pay up the deficits. We have recommended already that the Postal Telegraph system from St. John's to Trepassey be closed up. That alone will save about seven thousand dollars a year. The Anglo wanted to discontinue their offices in that section but the Government will not allow them to abandon their lines, as under the old contract they have to keep their lines open to Cape Race. But without competition, the Anglo can make it pay and they are welcome to get the benefit derived as far as I am concerned. The taking over of the Postal Telegraphs system across the country where there was overlapping was also a matter of serious consideration of the Commission. At present we are keeping up two sets of telegraph poles and the cost of maintenance could be done much cheaper under the railway management by operating a single line of poles. Things are done differently now than what they have been. Every official of the railway now is a civil servant. In almost every settlement now across the railway track there is an operator and an assistant, whilst there are many other places asking for telegraph offices or telephone. There should be a re-organization of the civil service in order to get greater efficiency.

MR. CASHIN.—Were those suggestions in writing?

HON. MR .SULLIVAN. — It was about the southern shore line and I think about the Postal Telegraphs system being taken over by the Railway. We have also dealt with the doubling up of Government officials in the outports, where one man should do the work instead of having a sub-collector, a poor commissioner, and a magistrate, one man should do the whole thing. There are too many officials; too many altogether. That suggestion hasn't

been sent in yet. That also is part of our work. We have also taken up the question of house telephones parties have in different departments and I think that will be a recommendation of the Commission, and any one wanting a telephone because he is in a department will have to pay for it. There are other matters too that will be dealt with in the reports. Furthermore it was asked what was paid the Commission. Up to the present no payment has been made to Mr. Cramm or myself.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, Evidently then that Commission has made a report in some form, has made two or three probably, which reports we are entitled to as members of the House. True as the Honorable Member states considerable saving could have been effected if some of the suggestions which he mentioned had been attempted. The remark that I made, then, that the Commission is farcical is borne out because the Estimates now before us do not show any material direct benefit from their work in the form of a reduction of expenditure. We had to try pretty hard to get information before we discovered that the Commission had made a report. We were first told that a report was not received and now we find from a Member of the Commission that a report has been sent in some form, and the Government refuses to table it for the information of the Opposition. That is the conclusion we have got to come to and his Commission was farcical because the Government didn't attempt to put into effect any suggestions this Commission made. The members of this Commission no doubt have put in some time working on it. Mr. Sullivan spent some time and Mr. Cramm and Mr. Morine and their time is spent fruitlessly. There is nothing to show for their work. I think Mr. Chairman, we owe it to the House that any reports the Commission sent in requesting a reduction in expenditure, whatever form they are in, should be tabled for the information of the Opposition and other members of the Government. You can't expect us to be courteous if the Government is not prepared to do its share. I might say a proof of some of the ineffectiveness of this Commission is contained in the reply to a question the Colonial Secretary gave me to-day, to a question I asked the other day.

(Reads)

HON. MR. CRAMM—That was the previous year; money spent last year. That money was spent before the Commission was appointed.

MR. CASHIN—It was taken out of the million dollars. I know it was spent in July last. It was taken out of the million dollars and paid for able bodied and pauper relief.

MR. CRAMM—It is the subject of investigation.

MR. CASHIN—I agree it needs investigation. Another thing I notice, we have got to amend the Redistribution Bill; have to put in Labrador now, because I notice it is getting a great bodied pauper relief.

MR SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in connection with that matter. Labrador is very near St. Barbe. It has always been a puzzle to me just now how the Government determined the giving out of relief on the Labrador. Does the relieving officer have power entirely to say where they should have relief and where they shouldn't? Every year we are giving out a tremendous amount down there; quite sufficient to keep the population down there without doing a day's work.

HON, THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman: In answer to the Honorable Member, I might say there is a tremendous amount of relief given out on the Labrador proportionately and there has been, as every one who has the opportunity of knowing what was done in the past is aware. When this Government came into power in

1924 there was an amount of pauper relief on the Labrador of over twenty-seven thousand dollars for the year 1923; for one year; when I went in the Colonial Secretary's office I determined to try and get at the root of the trouble. There has been an improvement as may be seen by the figures tabled today, the amount for 1926. I am not sure that includes one year. I think there are two winters included in that. Sometimes there is an overlapping when bills don't come in time and are held over and go in with the next winter. There was no relieving officer at Battle Harbor and relief was given out during the winter there and that was the cause of the large amount to some extent. It was left largely to the discretion of people doing business down there. I had a relieving officer appointed a resident of Battle Harbor and found very little improvement after he had been there for two winters. Last fall I determined to make a special effort to stop this thing and I sent Mr. Neil the R. O. on the Labrador boat down at a small salary, fifty dollars a month, and placed him in Battle Hr. for the winter and no relief was given except on his order and why he was sent was because he knew the conditions of the people better than anybody on the coast. The result was that relief was cut twenty-five per cent. of what it originally was. I have no hesitation in saying that sending that man down there last fall has saved eight or ten thousand dollars. Tremendous amounts have been spent in the past and when I came into the Colonial Secretary's office I knew what the Labrador relief was because of being Colonial Secretary on a previous occasion and knowing the relief spent in those years. There were thousands being spent and money spent without any regard to the absolute necessity of it or otherwise. I say the reason people are hunry there is that they don't care whether they work in the summer, because they know the Government will feed them in the winter. I don't wish to say it is the fault of past administrations, but I say that it has been an absolute disgrace the amount of waste that has gone on on the Labrador in pauper relief. By proper supervision it has been got down to one quarter and I think it can be further reduced; if once the people get to understand they are not going to get relief, they will work. However I have no hesitation in saying that it will be a good deal less this year.

I was going to refer to Harbor Grace also, I very much regret to find there is a very large expenditure in Hr. Grace. There is one point about expenditure there that some $9,000.00 was spent by a man named Young, relieving officer at Upper Is. Cove, when he was there. He has now been out of the position over a year. This man was absolutely without any control. He had to be relieved of the job because he had no control over the people at all; whatever they asked for he gave them and as a result we had to retire him and we have put in his place Mr. Squires. As soon as we found these discrepancies we applied the remedy and since this man has gone the figure hasn't reached anything like what it was before.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: It is said that cows a long way off have horns. We can all agree talking about the Labrador and console ourselves with the thought that the relief there is less than before. But let us come nearer home and find what progress backwards the Government has made in connection with public charities since it assumed power. A new Board was established and they were going to do wonderful things and with all the good intention we find this:

(Reads From Auditor General's Report)

New salaries, a new board; and with all the determination of the Government of effecting a reform we find an

increase instead of a decrease.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I rise to say a few words on the Estimates now before the Chair in reference to the Marine and Fisheries Department. Despite all the blustering, threatening and hard knocks that we have got from the Government side of the House telling us that we were obstructing and have been very bad in what we have said and done and written; all these things notwithstanding; I feel it is my duty to stand up this afternoon on the reading of the most important estimates this House has to consider and say what I have to say in connection with the fisheries aspect of our administration.

Mr. Chairman: I want to say I am sick and tired of hearing insinuations thrown out by Government members and through the Government press that the Opposition is down here obstructing the business of the House. If we were not down here discussing these estimates, asking questions and obtaining information and discussing various details of them I want to ask what we would be discussing. If Supply was not before the House it would have to be adjourned until such time as they could bring down legislation in connection with the Gander and Humber properties, or the Finance Minister has the Budget ready or his loan resolutions. When he finds it politically and personally convenient he will bring in his loan resolutions and Budget and not before. And if he makes up his mind that he is not going to introduce the Budget or loan resolutions until after we have discussed all legislation of the Government they won't be introduced in here. It is useless for you to get up and say that as soon as the Estimates go through we are going to get the Budget and Loan Bill. The whole truth of the position is that as far as the Opposition is concerned it is just as well we are here discussing these Estimates in detail and questioning every item as anything else because you are not prepared to go on with your work. On the day the House opened the Prime Minister gave as one of the substantial reasons that the House was so long delayed in opening that they were waiting for the Gander deal. As far as that is concerned the House need not have been opened yet for you are not prepared to come forward with the Gander legislation or any other thing. We asked for the Loan Resolutions and suggested if the Loan Resolutions and Budget were brought in, the passage of these Estimates would be facilitated and they would be put through with despatch. If we could make any fairer proposition, that is it? The pronouncement that no special money can be sent out to repair bridges and roads in the outports and deal with various necessities in the line of public works and it does not hold water as clearly shown in the remarks of Mr. Halfyard yesterday afternoon. For such money as is wanted for repairs to roads and bridges, special repairs, you would have to ask for a loan. We make the suggestion, if you bring the loan resolutions down, we are prepared to get down to business and consider these loan resolutions; in view of the fact that money is wanted for various necessities. So, while you are not ready with your Gander and Humber legislation and refuse to bring in your loan resolutions and Budget, where does your contention hold water that we are holding up the House and we are obstructionists. It does not hold water and therefore all your blustering, all your display of ill temper and all your talk about obstructing is not in the least going to deter me from what I have to say on what I consider the most important estimates this Legislature is going to be called upon to vote. If your loan resolutions were presented and

you had given notice of your Budget and your Gander legislation were ready to be proceeded with, then there would be no object in going further and going straight through with the Estimates but we could discuss them from time to time; but at the time there is not one piece of legislation waiting for our consideration and how can you argue that we are obstructing by discussing these Estimates. We are here with the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries Department. I would be more satisfied if the word "Fisheries" were taken out of the name of the Department altogether because what this department named "Marine and Fisheries" has got to do with fisheries I am at a loss to discover. There was one time in the history of the country that the department could be called "The Department of Marine and Fisheries," in name and at the same time be acting in a way to justify its name, and that was at the time when the whole office staff, from the Minister down were concentrating on doing something in a particular way to try and improve the fisheries in Newfoundland. If this farce is to continue, as we see it before us in the estimates to-day, strike out the word "Fisheries" and make it a Department of Marine Works, and I am satisfied to let the vote go through, but as it is I consider it a ridiculous farce. Let us see what is the total vote. A recapitulation of the Department of Marine and Fisheries shows you are asking for half a million dollars by the time you bring in Additional Estimates.

You are asking for half a million dollars to-day for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and then the utmost that you have in this department in these estimates, which at all make any pretence of doing anything for the fisheries, is a vote of $20,000, which you have put in here as a vote for the improvement of the fisheries. It is a misnomer, which has caused me to rise to my feet this afternoon. $20,000 out of $500,000 is all that the Department that calls itself the Department of Marine and Fisheries is able to find for the actual improvement of the fisheries. Why is it a misnomer? Because $20,000 is not spent for the encouragement of the fisheries, or for the improvement of the fisheries. And in despite of the pugilistic attitude of the Minister who after all is prepared to come in here and stand up and defend his estimates, despite his attitude not one hon. member on the other side, is able to stand up and defend that vote, as in any way encouraging or improving the codfishery or any other fishery in Newfoundland. How in the name of fortune can you argue, how can you begin to argue that $20,000 paid to half a dozen men around the island, spent in taxi cab travelling expenses and various ridiculous items, is a vote spent for the encouragement of the fisheries. I go back to the time, and this country goes back and recollects that you went to this country pledged to an outstanding fishery policy and it was the big emblem emblazoned upon your breast, and then we come in here and find that after three or four years in office that instead of that broad fishery policy you only expend $20,000 in this respect, how can we but help feeling incensed, and stand up here and say to you that you have betrayed the people. The least item and the most contemptuous item in your Marine and Fisheries Department is one item that you presume to call an item for the improvement of the fisheries. And even that paltry $20,000 you are not prepared to spend in any way that will have a practical effect for the improvement of the fisheries.

Sometime since in this House I commented upon the fact that last year you spent some money in sending Professor Sleggs around Trinity

Bay dropping bottles overboard from a boat, in July and August in order to test the temperature of the water, and later you sent him abroad in order to attend a fisheries commission that was held either at Halifax or Washington. That commission produced a report to the effect that as far as the codfishery was concerned, that in Newfoundland waters there was nothing to fear as to supply. You have missed the point. There is no doubt in the minds of the fishermen of this country as to the fish being there. That is not what is worrying the fishermen to-day. You do not want to spend money to send Professor Sleggs to Trinity Bay in the summer to take the temperature of the water in order to improve conditions for the fishermen. You do not want to send him to Halifax to attend the North Atlantic Fishery Commission in order to bring down a report that there is still an enormous amount of fish in the water. You do not want to spend $20,000 to send men around this country to collect statistics to tell us how much fish is caught. You are doing none of the things that you should be doing to-day in order to improve the conditions of the fisheries in Newfoundland. The Captain said here the other day that not only were these statisticians collecting information as regards the codfishery but were wardens as well. He referred to the practise which he considered to be a growing practise to put smaller mesh in the cod traps. I told him last year here that I did not agree with him. He knows that is not the tendency. He rather knows that the tendency is to put large mesh for the very good reason because it makes the traps lighter to handle and less expensive to build. It would be interesting to know how many of these inspectors that were sent around last year reported to the Department that they found the mesh under regulation size, as laid down by the fishery regulations. Now I do not intend to labor this point, but I am insisting that you went to the country in 1924 on an encouragement of the fisheries policy and you led the country to believe and think that you were going to develop an outstanding fishery policy, and then after three years of practice you have made that subject the most contemptible that you have dealt with by the inclusion of a paltry $20,000, out of a half a million that was voted for the administration of the Fishery Department.

This afternoon we laid upon the table of this House one hundred and ten petitions signed by seven thous--and or ten thousand men, asking you to do something in a really big way to improve the conditions under which the fishermen have to work to-day. I have repeatedly stressed the point that the fishermen are disheartened. and have lost hope and that I think that the fisheries are not sufficiently remunerative to allow them to prosecute it with any degree of security or safety. I have time and again stressed the various ways of encouraging the fisheries, such as a reduction of taxation, or the taking of steps to bring about a system of co-operation with regard to exportation, and by putting into effect standardisation. None of these things that really matter are for one minute considered. But you are prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder and man to man to vote for twenty thousand dollars to be spent in such a trivial way as this. I said this afternoon that you are now considering putting on the business profits tax and income tax. Shortly public opinion as it did through Buchan's Mine, will develop itself in connection with that taxation. Would it be better for you to-day to go down to the business community and to say to them: "We will try and discover ways and means of saving for you instead of making your profits less," in-

tead of having to place upon the Statute Book the income tax and the business profit tax, which you contemplate doing. Right here in this vote you are able to save $20,000 because from the standpoint of what practical benefit it is going to be to the fisheries, and their Improvement in Newfoundland I fail to see it. If Captain Winsor were to-day in the Straits of Belle Isle instead of being a member of this House and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and if he were to-day commanding his own schooner outside of the realms of practical politics altogether and if somebody came up and told him that the Government proposed to encourage the fisheries by sending around fish inspectors to find out how much fish was caught, he would be the first man in the whole fishing fleet to laugh such a proposition to scorn. $20,000 for the improvement of the fisheries, spent in salaries to a dozen individuals for the summer months for taxi-cab hire, telegrams and other items that Mr. Halfyard read from the public accounts the other afternoon. I appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to cut this farce out. For if ever there was a farce enacted upon the floors of this House or going to be enacted, the voting of $20,000 in this way and call it for improvement of the fisheries, is certainlly a farce of the highest order. Now the Minister himself is a practical fisherman. He knows a great deal about the fisheries. And probably there are other members opposite that also know a great deal about the fisheries. But I wonder how they are going to be able to get up here and defend this vote on the grounds that by voting this $20,000 they are doing something for the improvement of the fisheries. If the trade of the country wants statistics, let them get the statistics. They have always got a great deal more statistics than they are prepared to give out, and to my mind the gathering of statistics through this medium is not beneficial to the fishermen or the trade. We are only broadcasting a whole lot of information to our competitors in the foreign markets, which these competitors in their turn can take stock of and use to the disadvantage of the trade and consequently to the disadvantage of the fishermen who are dealing with them in connection with the purchase of fish. I am opposed to this vote of $20,000 under the name that it is under now. If you would put it into these estimates under another name, I might not be so strongly incensed against it. But when you put in here a vote of $20,000 and name it for the improvement of the fisheries, I am opposed to it as I consider it ridiculous, and I ask how much longer is this to continue. If this is the extent of your ability to develop a fishery policy, and at this present juncture it is granted that a fishery policy is the pressing need of Newfoundland, then it is your duty to admit that you are not big enough to tackle the job, then get out and give the job to men who are big enough and will tackle the job if they are given a chance so to do. Is this vote of $20,000 going to reduce the price of fishing nets? Is it going to enhance the value of one solitary quintal by as much as ten cents a quintal? If you want to improve and encourage the fisheries, why not come down here, and give a bonus to help to improve the conditions of the fisheries, and the men who are earning a livelihood in that direction. You would be doing something if you gave a bonus to the man who makes the best fish. But to take $20,000 after standing up here and saying that you have the interest of the fishermen as much at heart as any man inside or outside of the House, and then to vote that $20,000 to give an opportunity to men to go picnicing all the Summer and then to call it for the improvement of the fisheries. I fail to see how you are able to justify the position that you

take. If he had his way to-day I believe that he would be doing more to get a bonus on fish instead of coming down here and fighting for this $20,000. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is the Prime Minister of Newfoundland. It seems to be that he is in a position to get whatever he wants from the present Government. I believe that there are times when he gets things done without the knowledge of his colleagues. I suppose that it would be uncharitable to call him a political gunman. If I were to take the trouble to look up the speech of the Prime Minister, we would find that he stood up here and said that there was going to be no lower Labrador service this year. I believe that Mr. Sullivan said that as far as he was concerned there would be no Labrador Service. However the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine & Fisheries fought it out, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries won. If we were to look into the history of the Monroe Government particularly during the last twelve months we would find that when the Captain points his gun, they all put their hands up and then surrender, and the Captain gets what he wants, and as long as he asks for something for the improvement of the fisheries of the country we have no quarrel with him. But I fail to see how he is able to contend to-day that this $20,000 vote here, is in the main in the interest of the fisheries of Newfoundland. Now it was not my intention this afternoon to discuss these estimates at length. What I had to say mainly I have already said, namely that the fisheries are in this condition to-day ought to be more serious about the whole matter, and ought to try and adopt some proposals from a bigger standpoint than this idea of voting $20,000 for the improvement of the fisheries as we are asked to do in these estimates. Now I want to pass on to consideration of the Labrador Fisheries. Since the House last met through the courtesy of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have been given a copy of the rules and regulations governing the lobster fishery previous to the closing of the season, and I have also been handed the suggestions from the Committee of the Council of the Board of Trade in connection with the regulation of the lobster and the canning industry, aproved by the Council. I would like to ask the Minister if these regulations are being considered by the Fishery Board.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—They have not been considered by it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Well I am inclined to think that as long as this House is going to be in session for a considerable time, that I would urge upon the Minister now to try and get whatever regulations have been suggested to the Governor-in-Council drafted before this House closes, so that we could be in a position to know what he proposes to do. There is a very great difference I notice between the proposals of the Committee and the regulations that were in effect at the time that the Lobster fishery was closed down. For instance there is a suggestion here:

(Reads)

In the original regulation no fee was charged. That is a very radical difference. It seems to me that taking these regulations as a whole, they are so different from the original regulations that obtained, that I feel that if you are going to make such a drastic change in the regulations that obtained originally, and what are going to obtain in the future, that you ought to get the regulations in shape before this House closes so that we might know what to be prepared for in this connection. I feel obliged to take the position that I took here the other day in connection with the lobster fisheries, and that is that you ought to carry out the law as it stands at the present time. Now I am inclined to

agree with Mr. Halfyard that this report is something of a joke. Now I do not for one minute mean to underestimate the value of scientific investigat on in connection with the fisheries. if it were the pressing necessity of the fisheries. But it is not the pressing necessity of the fisheries now. The pressing necessity is to d scover ways and means, as to the best methods of exportation and marketing and getting means to enhance the value of the fisheries to the fishermen. It might be interesting to the House to know that after my remarks on the Address in Reply, I rece.ved a letter from Mr. Paton the president of the Memorial College. I have nothing to say about that gentleman, but he wrote me to the effect that as regards Professor Slegg's lecture that all the men who attended that lecture were men interested directly in the fisheries. Very good. I think that Mr. Grimes was one of those. But that was not the point that I was trying to make when I spoke to the Address in Reply. The po nt was that if Professor Sleggs or any other man had anything of value to communicate in connection with the codfishery, that the information should have been communicated to the fishermen of Newfoundland direct. I think that it will be remembered that I said that he d.d not go down to Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay and the other sections of the island and deliver these lectures for the fishermen who had to do with the curing and making of fish, but that he talked to a crowd of students in the Memorial College in St. John's. The point that I was stress ng was that if you had distinguished gentlemen who were able to give the fishermen of this country information with regard to the handling of fish, then the right thing to do was to have these men down to give their information to the fishermen directly, and not to confine their remarks within the four walls of a building in St. John's. At the same time it is ridiculous in the effect that it is going to have on the fishermen in the outports, yet at the same time I do not entirely dismiss the proposition. That if as I sa:d just now you have a man who has ability in that direction, he ought to be given the chance to educate the fishermen in a way that must be considered necessary. It seems from my remarks that Mr. Paton thought fit to write me about it. I do not owe an apology to anyone for anything that I may say in th s Chamber, unless it is to this Chamber itself, but certainly to no one outside. When you grow up in the school where the cry was that the more information the people got about the catch of fish, the less good it is go ng to be for the fishermen. I still believe that the less outsiders know about how much fish is caught the better it is for Newfoundland.

This idea of paying men to travel around the country to get information as to how much fish s caught and then having such information broadcast to the world, as we are not able to keep it to ourselves, is not going to do the trade or the fishermen any good, but, on the contrary, a lot of harm as regards prices in the foreign markets. But the time the fiscal year, for which you are providing these Est mates, comes round you will have the lobster season open again. That is why I urge upon you to bring down what regulations you propose to frame governing the lobster fishery because there is nothing in the Estimates now before us for inspection or protection service in connect on with the lobster fishery. With the main body of your Estimates I have not a great deal to say. My chief point is that your department is not a department for the protection of the fisheries. It is true you have erected a number of lighthouses and fog alarms for the gu dance of mariners and seamen generally and it is true that they are very necessary public works, but that is no encourage-

ment for the fisheries and the Minister is not bringing the pressure to bear upon the Government that he ought to. You think you are doing enough by having votes for lighthouses and fog alarms, special grants for your district and to have this $20,000.00 vote for statisticians, but you want to have a higher conception of the responsibilities reposed in you by the fishermen of the country. You occupy to-day the most responsible office in the country and for a man who has fishermen's blood in him like you have, I cannot understand why you have not got a better outlook upon the whole problem of the fisheries. If this vote of $20,000.00 to pay people to go around and find out how much fish is caught is your conception of trying to resuscitate the codfishery and on which you base your outlook for the future of this country, then I am afraid your ideas do not fill the bill. You have disappointed the fishermen of this country and I think we have ample grounds to say that you have disappointed them. Three years ago they were promised bonuses on the fish they would catch and they were promised all sorts of encouragement for the codfishery if they would mark their ballots for you. You are now on the fourth year of your office and we find that you have increased taxation, increased expenditure and the sum total of what you have done for the fisheries is that you have voted $20,000.00 for a number of men to go around the different districts and find out how much fish is caught. Is not that enough for any Government to justify our contention that you have broken faith with the people. You will do nothing different, except I suppose you will give consideration to the petitions we presented on behalf of the fishermen of several districts. I think that the Minister should have got up and not alone supported these petitions, but fought for them for the benefit of the fishermen. I want to see the codfishery resuscitated. As I said two months ago in this House, you may have your Buchan's Mine and your Gander and other industries, but, to my mind, there is nothing to bring prosperity to Newfoundland and its people like the successful prosecution of the codfishery. Now I cannot see the reason of going on with this farce of voting $20,000.00 for statisticians. I think this money would be better spent if it was given for the encouragement of making good fish, say an extra fifteen cents on a quintal. Therefore, cut out this vote for statisticians and call it a $20,000.00 vote for the encouragement of making good fish. In conclusion I would ask the Minister if he will include in the Estimates a couple of Lighthouses for St. Barbe District.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.—Mr. Chairman,—It appears to me that since the fisheries vote has been before the Chair for discussion every member of the Opposition who spoke repeated each other practically word for word. I think that the one speech must have been made up and learned off by heart by them in regard to this $20,000 vote. In the first place the member for St. Barbe said I was a gunman and that is a remark that I take strong exception to. I am not a gunman at present, never was one and never intend to be one. As far as holding up a gun to the Government's head is concerned, I suppose I am one of the members that never attempted to do such a thing. Mr. Scammell also said that the Government had done nothing for the fishermen. Well, I would like to ask him what the Government that he was associated with did, except to ruin thousands of fishermen. As to this vote of $20,000 I can tell Mr. Scammell that not a solitary warden ever asked for a job and never even asked for a dollar for collecting statistics the past two years. It is very unfair to these men to say that they

had looked for the job or that I tried to make a job for them. They were all appointed without a request from one of them. One would imagine to hear some people talk that the $20,000 was all spent in salaries for these wardens for collecting statistics. Now, I would like to tell the Opposition that, if statistics were never being collected, this $20,000 would be spent this year for wardens in connection with safeguarding the lobster fishery and to see that the law respecting small mesh traps is carried out. Mr. Scammell stated that I knew as well as anybody else that no small mesh traps were used. I know of no such thing. I know to the contrary. Are they not making small mesh traps in the district Mr. Scammell represents? Ninety-five per cent. of the cod traps used on the West Coast and in other sections the past ten years were small mesh ones, and it is due to the work of the wardens that this practice is being prevented from recurring. If you had no $20,000 vote where are you going to get the money to pay the wardens. There are lots of cases besides collecting statistics, in which wardens are used by the department. During the past few days there was a big dispute amongst the fishermen at Petty Harbour and wardens were sent out from here to settle it as amicable as possible in order to keep the matter out of the lawyers hands and save expense for the fishermen. You could not have these fishermen fighting amongst themselves. Some one had to try and clear up the trouble and I am glad to say that the wardens did it satisfactorily to all concerned. If we had to send to Salmonier for wardens and bring them in to Petty Harbor it would cost a lot of money. Further I think the game wardens at Salmonier would have a poor chance at Petty Harbour, because it appears that they cannot keep people from St. John's from jigging salmon there. As time goes on we will get this vote cut down considerably, and I may say that already we have reduced the expenditure by some four thousand dollars. Now, with regard to this $5,000 vote in conection with Professor Sleggs, last year when the House was in session every member was singing out for this man Sleggs and the Opposition were continually urging that the Government give him an appointment. He was engaged and went around Trinity and Bonavista Bays and made some scientific investigations as an experiment. This year in the House the Opposition is against Professor Sleggs for doing what they had asked to be done last year. I may tell the Opposition that I am a firm believer in getting scientific knowledge in reference to the fisheries. I have been a fisherman almost all my lifetime, but during the past three years I have been living in St. John's and everybody in the Opposition seems to begrudge me the relaxation. But I might tell them that they were the worst three years I have ever spent, and the quicker I get back to my own avocation the better I like it. Of this vote for $20,000 I have never had a word to say about it nor did I ever spent a cent of it during the past three years. It was all expended on the recommendations of the Fishery Board, and, as I stated before, I am just as well satisfied to be governed by the Fishery Board at the present time as I am by anybody else. If the members of the Board were all outside this House, then perhaps there may be some reason for me to take all the responsibility, but we have them from both sides of this House and they probably have been long eonugh identified with the fisheries of the country to know as much about them as the people that are abusing them. Now I have been called everything else, but this new one—a gunman—will not deter me from upholding the

policy and recommendations of the Board. I was man enough three years ago to ask that that vote of $20,000 be distributed according to the opinion of the majority of the Board. It was done so and I am sure that thousands of fishermen in this country are of the same opinion. Mr. Scammell says that the idea of getting statistics was absurd. Norway gives weekly reports to the exact fish that is caught, and the United States and Canada gives the number of pounds of fish that is in their markets. I have heard it said that Newfoundland is a hundred years behind the times. The great nations think they must have statistics regularly and we must keep behind everybody else in the Opposition's opinion. I know one thing for certain that the Newfoundland legislature is not behind in and that is abuse. Ever since this House has been open this year I might say that I would not, as an ordinary fisherman, utter such language as has been thrown across from the Opposition to me, and I could hardly think that a person could get down so low as to call a member a gunman. Take the poor fishermen who go down on the northern Labrador every year and allowed to die like dogs for want of medical aid and nobody there to help them; by Mr. Ashbourne and myself, if pleading for help for them makes one being called a gunman, well, then, I do not care whether I hold a gun to a Govt.'s head or to anybody else's head in that case. It is all very well for some people to talk about being the fishermen's friend, but what I saw on the northern Labrador last year would make one's heart bleed. Men were seriously ill and with no one to render them medical assistance who knew more about it than I did myself; whereas here in St. John's if somebody gets a corn broken off his toe you have the Inspector General running around in a motor car and rushing the man or woman off for the best medical treatment possible. Yet we hear a lot of hot air and abuse in this Chamber because a few thousand dollars was spent to relieve and succour those poor fishermen on the northern Labrador. We should do as Sir Edward Morris said, forget about the thousands and talk in millions. I had in mind when these Estimates came on that all the Opposition were going to get after me and that I was going to get after them. If the majority of the Opposition members had never been in this House before they might worry me a bit and tell me what to do to encourage the fisheries, but most of them were in office so long and did nothing themselves that I know how they would encourage the fisheries. Mr. Scammell said that the department at present was only a marine department. There was no time it should be called a fisheries department I suppose except when the fish regulations were put in force, and I will leave it to the fishermen and the country at large to decide as to how the fish regulations benefitted this country. H. wever, I do not condemn the fish regulations on the whole. There were good and bad points in them and the man responsible for them I suppose did his best, because I take it for granted that no man or no Government is going to bring in legislation here for the purpose of injuring the country and its people. Any how this vote for $20,000 will be spent to the best of our ability this year and that is all anyone can do.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: There are a couple of points in the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I would like to clear up. He rather strained the fact of the Northern Labrador service. I suppose that is why I referred to him as a political gunman. Now I do not know that I said anything disgraceful to him and I do not know but that I

paid him a compliment. He is well able to do it. As far as the lower Labrador service is concerned, I cannot tell you anything about its efficiency because I have not been there. Today I have no opinion to offer as to the efficiency of that service, but I do say that it appeared general to this House that the Prime Minister and Hon. Mr. Sullivan, both members of the Railway Commission and Executive Government, did not favor it, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries evidently thought the service should go on and it did and nothing more was said about it. Before taking my seat I would like to ask the Minister if he would include in his estimates two lighthouses, one to be erected at the entrance to Flower's Cove and the other on the northwest side of Hooping Harbour.

I would like to get from the Minister some kind of an assurance with regard to those two lights; in Flower's Cove where it is badly needed and Grate's Cove which is a very hard place to get in, and the Minister knows the state of the shore outside. We have not been very fortunate with regard to public monies being spent on various necessities in St. Barbe although I have done my best to have my constituents given a square deal in that respect; and now this is badly needed and I would ask the Minister particularly if it cannot be given them.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: With reference to those two lights the Honourable Member for St. Barbe is asking about; I took up the question some years ago with Captain G. Norman the captain of the steamer going into Flower's Cove with regard to the light there and he did not seem very much inclined to having a light put there at the time. However if the honourable member will come down to my office I will see if I cannot give these two lights to those places.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman: Being a member of the Fishery Board I suppose it would be in order to have a word to say. It seems to be hard for the Opposition to understand, or else they don't want to understand, some things in connection with this vote. Now I want to defend the action of the Board. As regards these wardens being appointed there seems to be a good deal of contention about that; a good deal of misapprehension. I don't suppose there would have been any wardens appointed if it had not been for the fact of the trap law needing enforcement. What was the use of making a law unless there is some one to carry it out? And there was great abuse of the cod trap law going on. Nobody seemed to pay any attention to what was going on with small meshed traps insofar as enforcing the law was concerned and that law was being broken in several places; in Placentia Bay, Fortune Bay and round the Southwest Coast; hundreds and hundreds of cod traps with small mesh. That law was never attended to, only abused, though on the Statute Book 14 years and it seemed to be winked at by the Department and those previous to Captain Winsor in that office. There is a great justification for having wardens to look after the fishery and I say the matters they have charge of are most important. Mr. Scammell said not one of the Board could get up and defend the action of the Board with regard to statisticians or wardens and they were doing no good, but in the last two years they have sent in reports continually and have stopped breaches of the lobster law and also the cod trap law. Statistics were only a part of their work. With regard to the claim that twenty thousand dollars in great part goes for that work it is untrue. There wasn't half that amount spent for these wardens and their expenses. We were big enough to bring in that

lobster law and Mr. Grimes, you were the man who said it should have been in force three years before it was, because if it was allowed to go on as it was going to such an extent that it never would have recovered. The cod trap law was badly in need of being enforced also. Hundreds and hundreds of cod traps were being used illegally and that was allowed to go on. Now we were big enough to remedy those things as best we could and you abuse.

While I am on my feet and have the patience of the House I am going to refer back. I do not wish to delay the House but I have not had much to say this session. I do not need to be reminded by certain members opposite that I am representing a fishing district. I am perfectly aware of it and I have tried to attend to the best interests of that district in that direction. Mr. Lake has spoken of the matter of having a steamer on the Coast in winter-time for the protection of life and property. I may say that the same subject came to my mind after the disaster of January 23rd, 1925. I said at the time it would be a great thing if a steamer were held in readiness for a few months in the winter season. Such was not asked for by the people but it was entirely my own thought and suggestion.

This winter I almost succeeded in having one placed there, as I put a proposition before the Government regarding the exporting of fresh fish to Canada and a small steamer was necessary to collect it and carry it to the point of shipping, Port aux Basques. The project would have succeeded had it not been for the fact that fish was unusually plentiful owing to the mild weather on the Nova Scotia Shores and the National Fish Co. of Halifax would not handle it. A few small shipments were made, however, to Sydney and turned out quite satisfactorily, but if this business grew a small steamer could very well be placed there without a very great cost as she would be earning and could be available for calls of distress. Those disasters will happen, however, as often when the storm is raging it is impossible to render assistance and too late when the storm abates. The two coastal boats, "Portia' 'and "Glencoe" have been notified to render immediate assistance at all times, also the Gulf boat, but as I say, it is often too late when those sudden and sad affairs happen and it is not in the power of men to prevent it. The whole matter has given me grave concern and I wish it was in my power to eliminate or overcome the dangers.

The district is a fishing district and will always be so and it is a great pity that there is not a better reward for their hard and hazardous work. The low price of fish must naturally seriously affect them. They did well on that coast this winter, as will be seen by the following figures:

Catch of cod fish, January month, 8,920 qtls.

Catch of cod fish, February month, 4,120 qtls.

Catch of cod fish, March month, 5,-310 qtls.

Catch of cod fish, April month, 16,-140 qtls.

Catch of cod fish, May month, 8,-200 qtls.

Halibut about $150,000.00

Seals 2,500.00

This must be admitted as a good showing for the people of that district as scarcely any other part of the country was engaged at cod fish catching at these months of the year. The salmon fishery is now beginning and quite an amount will be earned at that also. We hear quite a lot of talk from Opposition members about improvement of Fisheries, encouragement of the fisheries, etc., etc. It is become a parrot cry and the meaning behind it all is politics and nothing more nor less than to incite the Electorate

against the present Government. As regards promoting a sound policy to overcome the difficulties or even to improve conditions, I have yet to hear it expressed from that side of the House. Mr. Scammell says it is our job entirely and not theirs and he clearly shows that by refusing to act on the commission to which he was appointed last year. He takes up a lot of time in the House stating the importance, the urgent necessity and the seriousness of such a vital matter as the fisheries are to the Country, but he refuses to put forward any suggestion that would help the situation. Is that what his district sent him here for? Is that his duty as a member of this House? I think not. The trouble with him is he cannot put forward any scheme of a sound business-like nature on the fisheries. It is far easier for him to criticise and blame the Government both here and around throughout the people whom he dictates to in his F.P.U. and others. Every one who knows the truth, knows that conditions with the fish business are bad, not only in this country, but in every country that is catching fish, and if we go on preaching a doctrine and inculcating into the minds of the fishermen of this country that they must depend wholly on the Government to make matters better, in my opinion we are preparing a way to destroy the industry. The fishermen will have no initiation whatever. Are our memories so short that we forget what was done a few years ago by Government interference. I don't think so. It is the effects of that tradgedy that we have been trying to overcome ever since and I for one do not want to see such repeated.

If conditions are bad as we must admit they are in the matter of low prices, and both fishermen and exporter find it hard to make ends meet and sometimes meet losses and heavy ones, they cannot blame the Government for it. The Government has given them a free hand. It is admitted that the exporting of fish is more or less a gamble, but the Government has not put any restraint whatever on those who wish to engage in it. I always held the opinion that the exporting of fish was a matter for business people and like most businesse in most cases would be the outcome and result of his brain and energy he puts in it, whether it be success or failure.

It is the Governments duty to undertake to negotiate and try and effect the best terms and treaties possible with those countries we find a market in. Any representative for classification of qualities of the product should come from the exporters in my opinion, through the Board of Trade, that body is representative of all classes of Merchants and others throughout the Country and surely it is only what should be expected that they could promote some sound suggestions to our knowledge and it just goes to show that they find it very difficult or next to impossible to do so. Mr. Russell said a few evenings ago that it may be possible that no improvements can be made in the situation. I contend as far as the salt dried article is concerned, he is very nearly right.

Mr. Lake referring to the Halibut industry on the S.W. Coast, asked what was the Government doing about it. I say let the Government leave it alone. It is a commercial enterprise and let the business people develop it as they are doing. I forsaw the possibilities of that industry in 1923 and it is developing just as I anticipated. I am in favour of the cull on fish and I always made it a rule to cull when I purchased it. Whether we need legislation to make it law and whether that law can be practically carried out in a question. May be it can. I contend the Halifax buyers or their agents did more to lessen the incentive to better cure than anything else during the past few years. They

adopted a system of tal qual; did away with the culling board and fishermen found it easier to dispose of his fish in that way. I presume their several markets throughout the West Indies warranted them doing this. It has been stated repeatedly from the other side that the Government has done noth ng for the fishermen and such a statement I say is made for no other purpose than to incite the fishermen against the Government. In my opinion the Government has given the fishermen as a class due consideration. Take the articles on the free list which are necessities of the fisheries. They come to about $470,000.00 per year. In four years that amounts to $1,880,000.00 which, I think, is due consideration, also ship building is encouraged right down to twelve tons. If now a man who built a boat for Cape St. Mary's last year—33 tons—his bounty amounted to $1,000.00 and drawback on art cles as equipment and used in building amount to $300.00 more, which made $1,300.00. He was paid cash.

Is not that encouragement and due consideration? In what other line of business is there the same or equal encouragement? The other classes in the country are not supposed to have to pay all the duties to keep up the country. I admit the taxes are high and they must be high while we continue to give and are continually requested to give grants for roads and public improvements and all expenditures which are quite nececssary. If the coastal boats have to be kept on to give the necessary service and take the S. W. Coast "Glencoe" and "Portia" going continually. Is it expected that the fishermen are to be exempt from taxation if that service is to be continued. It would be ridiculous to hold such a contention. All classes in the country must be expected to pay their proportional part. As regards the small duty on lines and twines when we can purchase as cheap in Nova Scotia, I don't think there is any reason for complaint. Speaking about duties and prices of goods, an item came to my notice a few days ago. A man, a Canadian, purchased an article used in the farming and gardening business seventy-five per cent cheaper here than he could either in Halifax or North Sydney and that shows that the farmers are not getting implements in a farming country free of taxes. I have every faith in our executive that they will continue to execute the affairs of the country in an honest and business like manner and that if a deal with Americans in the fish business is possible they will accomplish it. In my opinion it will be our only salvation for the fishery. We want men with capital to come in here and venture on the fish business on new lines, particularly with a view to the American market. The fish products such as fish meal plants should be a side line or auxilary with any big concern as the markets are good and will continue to grow for the product.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, It is not my intention to unduly delay the time of the House this evening, but I want to say a few words with regard to that vote of $20,000.00 for the encouragement of the fisheries. I heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say that he did not even have a chance to vote for that amount and that it was voted entirely by the Fishery Board. Now without being in any way critical, I want to say that, in my opinion, that money is not being spent in the right way. I have heard what the Minister of Public Works said and I have to disagree with him in a lot that he has said. These statisticians, as I see it, are supposed to go around to each settlement around the Island and find out the number of quintals of fish caught and send in the information they collect as a correct report. Now many of these statisticians never see a fisherman to ask him what fish he caught. I know of a statistician go-

ing around a part of the district I live in and who never has been in a fisherman's stage since he had the job. He simply goes around and gets the information he asks from Customs Officers and Telegraph operators. He does not come in contact with the fishermen at all. Now it takes him three or four days out of a month to get this information and still he gets his monthly salary besides his travelling expenses. Therefore, I say the vote of $20,000.00 is a waste of money. The Fishery Board could give a Postal Clerk or Telegraph operator ten or fifteen dollars a year extra and they could easily get, and with a greater degree of accuracy than the statisticians, all the information necessary for the season, and, altogether this way of expenditure would not cost hardly five thousand dollars. For the reason stated, I am opposed to this vote of $20,000.00 I also want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will give consideration to the placing of a fog alarm at Western Point of Keels. The need of this necessary aid to mariners was brought closely to my attention this year and particularly so last fall when the Wesleyville schooners were caught in a snow storm in that vicinity. Captain Waterman and his crew came near being lost but for the fact that one of the schooners anchored in the harbour kept her horn blowing and enabled him to make harbour safely. The "Prospero" coming from north last year might have gone ashore but for the horn at King's Cove was kept blowing. Now as a livier of that neighborhood I would ask that a vote be put in the estimates for a fog alarm or some kind of horn to guide shipping in foggy or stormy weather. I feel sure that this request will have the fullest support of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read to the House a message I received from the residents of Botwood three days ago.

(Reads Message)

This message is signed by practically every business man in Botwood as well as by other residents in connection with this bridge, and to-day I have received the following letter concerning that message:

(Reads Letter)

Now I have asked to have that bridge repaired in 1924, 1925 and 1926 and I ask now that the matter be taken into consideration immediately. The Prime Minister might come back and say that no money is voted and we are holding up the Estimates; but that is no answer for this request has been asked for three years and when your highroads work was going ahead that bridge could have been built because the money was available. This is a manufacturing centre and forty cars go over that bridge at danger to the lives of their occupants every day. Now Grand Falls pays into the revenue of this country between three and four hundred thousand dollars a year and we can't get a bridge built in spite of that, at this manufacturing centre, so motor cars can pass over without endangering life. This is the fourth time I have asked and nothing has been done. Everything can be built out around here. Take Manuels, the new bridge there. I want to ask the Prime Minister now if something cannot be done to make that bridge safe and if so I would like to ask when a start can be made and if not I will be forced to make a speech in connection with this bridge and if I do it won't be very short.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Chairman, I have already answered a similar request in the same way. If a loan is raised for public purposes Mr. Brown can get his share and if the bridge he mentions is regarded as the most important thing wanted it will be for him to say whether it is built or not.

MR. BROWN.—The point is things

have come to such a point that it is dangerous for cars to go over it, and thirty or forty cars a day go over the bridge and something must be done immediately to render it safe. It has got to be put in passable condition right away.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House that they had passed the following amendement requested by this House in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and Holyrood Pond Fisheries Limited."

1. Section 5 of the Agreement forming the schedule to this Act shall be read as if the words "The rivers flowing into" were stricken out.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, July 19th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 19th, 1927

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

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

DR. MOSDELL.—Mr. Chairman,—A couple of days ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in his extended remarks intimated that there was more economy practised in his department than ever before and I think I understood him to say that as a result of such economy he turned in money to the Treasury. In page 14 of the Auditor General's Report this year there are some statements made towards the Department conducted by the honourable Minister and statements that are not in accord with the Minister's statements. The Auditor General refers to the fact that as the financial year passed it became evident that the vote was greatly over-expended and that certain moneys were transferred from loan and that it was on this balance that money was turned into the Treasury. There are certain other references on page 14 of the report and in which the Auditor General has drawn attention to in connection with district grants being appropriated by persons other than the head of the department and protests against such procedure being continued. He states that the procedure is irregular and that, according to rule 10 of the Audit Act, representatives of districts cannot give out district grants without authority from the head of a department or through an Order-in-Council. Has the Minister taken any steps in connection with that?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the honourable member I might say that I do not know of any grave breach of the law having been committed. I dare say that a member of a district might have given out an order for something for his district and the department was not responsible for it. I know of only a couple of instances in which this was done

and it has not gone over a couple of hundred dollars. There is a lot that the Auditor-General says is misleading in a way. I stated that before on the floors of this House and I state it again now.

MR. SCAMMELL—May I ask in what connection that statement was made ?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—That was in relation to a thousand dollars worth of gasoline drums and oil barrels.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: The attitude just taken by a Minister of the Crown to justify his position also justifies the position taken by the Opposition all along. After all, it is refreshing to know that there is a Minister of the Crown who is frank enough to make a statement that the members of the Opposition have been sincere, and if a Minister of the Crown disputes the statement of the Auditor-General in this instance, is it not sufficient ground that other statements of the Auditor-General are not correct? I think our position, through the criticisms that have been directed from here and particularly by the figures produced by Mr. Cashin, seems to me to be absolutely justified now. The stand taken by a responsible Minister of the Crown this afternoon is to be taken at face value, and I want to congratulate the member for Ferryland on the original stand taken by him and which appears to me, after all, to hold water.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I take it from what the Minister has said that if the Auditor-General's report is not to be depended on that the Government should take some steps to put a new man in the job. The Auditor-Generals Department is just as big a farce as the Finance Commission. If the Auditor-General is reporting false statements to this House, it is the Government's duty to take steps to remedy it. Whether we are Government or whether we are Opposition, if the Auditor-General's report is incorrect he should be brought to book and I think that as a whole House we should take the necessary steps to have him brought before the Bar of this House to either repudiate or otherwise what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said. He is the guardian of public moneys and controls all public expenditure and recent events in this House go to show that there is something in what the Minister has said, and if the Auditor-General cannot be depended upon for a correct report I would like to know what we are here for. I know he has not given correct information to this House and I say now that he can be used by any Government that comes in power to fix or stow away figures and to suit the purposes of any Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I wish to take strong exception to the uncalled for and unwarrented allegation made by the honourable member for Ferryland. There may have been some little misunderstanding in which the Auditor-General may have been wrong, but for the honourable member to say the Auditor-General can be used by any political party is, I think, a very severe accusation and very unjustifiable against a man who holds such an important and responsible position. Any statement the Auditor-General made about some oil barrels is altogether different about his summing up of the financial affairs of the country.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: On the point raised; the Minister talks about the remark in the Auditor-General's report about gasoline tanks coming back. What check are you keeping on these gasoline tanks? Are you keeping any check on these tanks? You made a broad statement that the Auditor-General didn't know

what he was talking about.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I did not. I made no such statement.

MR. SCAMMELL—In effect you did. Tell us what you are doing to check up gasoline tanks going out to various lighthouses. If you get up and tell us that we will be prepared to take your word and take off our hats to you as doing your duty as Minister in respect of that and you will go out of the House with honors and the Auditor-General's statement will fall flat.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: This section of page 15 says:

(Reads from Auditor-General's Report)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I explained what happened when I went down in the department as far as those are concerned. Some three years ago I went down there, there was $7,200 due for lost steel drums, I asked the Government, one of the first things when I went down there, to send an inspector around to inspect the lighthouses. Nobody had inspected them for the last ten years. We had a hundred and sixty lighthouses or so and I argued that any firm that has one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty business propositions around at different places should have somebody to go round yearly and see what was going on. When it was found that $7,200 was owed to the Imperial Oil Company for lost steel drums I did send an inspector round. I sent him round because I was told that these drums were still on the islands; around at the different lighthouses. I didn't believe it. I found as I thought that there were very few, something like seventy-two or seventy-three. Since that every steel drum or every wooden cask is charged up to the lighthouse-keeper and if it is not returned the lighthouse-keeper pays for it; if he returns it he gets credit for it. Now I think a question was asked by some member on the other side how many drums were missing and he got the reply that eleven steel drums are missing at the present time and some of those may not be said to be missing because they are accountable for at some lighthouses. Some keep one cask there all the time to keep the gasoline in. Therefore we have a system and there were only eleven steel drums missing about a week ago. Since my three years in charge down there, I have made the statement that not a thousand dollars was lost on steel drums, and not one hundred dollars was lost during the last twelve months, but when I went down to the department $7,200 was owed to the Imperial Oil Company for them, and I think about 1925 we got it all paid up, making part payments to them until it was all paid. A person reading this report however, would think that our department lost something like a thousand dollars' worth of steel drums during the last twelve months, and that, I say, is not correct. There are not half or quarter as many steel drums to go out at the present time as when I went to the department; these cost ten dollars; more wooden casks are used now. I said that this report is misleading. If the Auditor-General has figured out that we have paid out on the average about $1000, I say that the only payments to this amount that we have made were for gasoline casks lost before I went down. Whoever caused that to be put there has put it in such a way that it looks as if we had lost gasoline tanks in twelve months to that amount while I was in charge of that department, and I say it is unfair to me.

DR. MOSDELL—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries how that $1,550 on page 57 is paid out —whether it is a whole salary or paid

in part to different people. It is in respect to instructions to Masters and Mates. How long has such a salary been paid?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Before I came there.

DR. MOSRELL—Why I ask is this, in going over the report of that much criticised official, the Auditor General, I find this on page 6, Section 33 B, under the heading of "Payments to Officials Permanently Employed but not confirmed by the Governor-in-Council:"

(Reads)

Now this $1,550 must have been included in the Estimates long before the Minister took charge of the Department and why then this additional $1,300? It must be additional, surely, when listed here by the Auditor General. If a salary is included in the Estimates why has such a payment been made? Under such circumstances as the Auditor General has had to call attention to, remarking that it was paid not even by Order in Council.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I don't know if he has got his appointment from the Government.

DR. MOSDELL—Perhaps the Minister will be able to tell me whether that amount is additional to the voted salary or not.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I will find out to-morrow.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting to see someone on the Government side of the House stand up and have something to say in reference to the Auditor General. Nobody has spoken excepting the Prime Minister who took exception to statements made by the honorable member for Ferryland. I think that it is a very grave charge made here on the floors of the House by a Minister of the Crown that the Auditor General's statement is incorrect with reference to his Department. It is either correct or incorrect. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is correct, then the Auditor General is incorrect, and some steps should be taken to protect the Auditor General or to protect the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Since this House opened this session, we have had several instances brought before the House. We first had an instance where the Auditor General had put his name to a statement published in the daily newspaper certifying that the deficit of the Colony was $81,000, and the Minister of Finance and Customs proved to us afterwards that the deficit was really $112,000. We then had the instance where the Newfoundland Savings Bank was pilfered of over $20,000 during the last four or five years, during which time the books of the Savings Bank had been audited by the Auditor General and the discrepancies were not discovered; not until independent auditors were brought in to audit the books of the Savings Bank was it discovered the Bank had been pilfered of $20,000. I think it is a matter of much more importance than members of the House seem to think. If we have to depend upon a man who makes such blunders to give a financial statement, how can we depend on him and know whether that is the financial statement of the Colony or not. I think the matter is a very serious one and something should be done immediately to clear this thing up in the interests of the country and the interests of the House of Assembly and also the interests of the Auditor General. I don't see what use it is to us to have reports brought in to the House that we are supposed to depend on and then find what the reports contain are altogether incorrect, and I suggest that some movement be made immediately to have this matter cleared up because the country certainly cannot go along if it has no confidence in the Auditor General's Department.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND

CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, In reference to the Auditor General, firstly, as Captain Winsor has explained, I don't think there is any doubt whatever but that the matter of gasoline tanks is a mere misunderstanding arising from those payments for gasoline barrels that were out when Captain Winsor took charge, and that some of the clerks whom the Auditor General depends on did not know all the circumstances and made a mistake. I think that it is quite clear from Capt. Winsor's explanation. I don't think anyone need fear the Auditor's General's putting in false reports here or anything false whatever. The statement the Auditor General makes is pretty nearly about right, as right as one possibly can get it. With regard to the Auditor General's reference to the one hundred and fifty two thousand from loan account for roads and bridges, last year I believed absolutely that money had been spent on capital account. And if I recollect when I was in a Government and there was a deficit at the time and all the surplus trust fund was taken to assist the Government tide the deficit over. I have a very strong recollection of that matter. With regard to the audit on the Savings Bank, I think the Honorable Member will agree with me that if a man in his own office or in mine should be intent on misappropiation of funds it will take some time possibly to catch him and the Auditor General in this case is not the only example of that because we find it every day on Water Street. If a man makes up his mind to theft I think it is going to be hard to catch him and I don't think the Auditor General is to be blamed for that kind of thing. As far as concerns the suggestion that I would use or had used the Auditor General to fix up any statement I may say that I don't know whether that has ever been done in the past in any Government but I don't think it could be done and in any case I don't want to use him and I have not tried and the only statement I would want him to bring in would be that which is absolutely correct. But I don't think anybody is going to accuse Mr. Berteau of intentionally bringing in false reports or making any statement that he is not quite clear is correct and from my own personal experience of the Auditor General I want this country to understand that I have implicit confidence in him.

MR. CASHIN.—I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Minister of Finance and Customs. He refers to that amount in connection with roads and bridges which the Auditor General makes some statement about in his report. The Minister I think will agree with me that before the Loan Bill was introduced last year we voted that one hundred and fifty thousand in ordinary estimates. It was spent out of Estimates and after the loan was raised the Estimates were recouped so to speak by that one hundred and fifty thousand taken from the loan and put into the general revenue for current expenditure to offset the money that was spent out of the exchequer which was rightly done because we voted for it here and it should have been spent out of there. I think, too, if the Minister recollects when that one million apropriation was being made in the House last year he made a statement that roads and bridges should be fixed up from capital account. He made the statement. I agreed with him. He probably believes it now. But when that one million was put through every member was given to understand this one million was in addition to the one hundred and fifty thousand in the Estimates. If you had left out the one hundred and fifty thousand voted in the Estimates and allowed the one million appropriation to go through as it should have gone through then you would have been

much better off to a certain extent inasmuch as we would know what we are voting for. In regard to the Auditor General's Report what the Minister says leads us to believe that if the Auditor General's Report was brought in as he wanted it it would have shown the true state of affairs.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I said nothing of the kind. The remark I made was that as to the charge that had been made that the Auditor General could be used by the Government that it was not so. I said that he could not be used and that there was no advantage to be gained by it. This is his report and I have not interfered with it or asked the Auditor General anything about it until it was tabled here. I did not make any such statement or anything to denote that I would want to change his statement. I only said that it was not interefered with and it is tabled just as it is; as he finds it that is it.

MR. CASHIN —When the Auditor General's report is published to the country a lot of people in this country possibly do not see the actual position we are in. The Minister of Finance has stated that there is no question but a man might be working for you and rob you and you wouldn't find it out for some time. Possibly that may be correct but it appears to me that reports are submitted by the Auditor General along these lines because the Auditor General's report appears so to the ordinary man on the street unless he has studied the political and economic situation that he wouldn't but believe that we hadn't any more of a deficit than (————————) whereas one who has made a special study of the situation suddenly realises that we are up against it. Mention of a "drop balance" of $312,000 may not convey very much to the ordinary man on the street. I think a great number of people don't understand what the meaning of that is, that it is a debit amount, that we are in debt that amount, according to the Auditor General. I contend that when a report is submitted it should be explicit. It should be such that every one can understand it. I don't know about any previous Government appropriating the surplus trust fund but I know the present administration apropriated this year three hundred thousand dollars from Loan. According to the Auditor General's report three hundred thousand, and it has disappeared. I don't know whether Sir John means his own Government had done away with the Surplus Trust, following some other Government's example. I say in all seriousness that it doesn't mattter what other Governments have done. Forget that. What are you doing? Are you doing the right thing or are you doing the wrong thing? It doesn't follow that if I should go to the devil that you should go with me. We are told the deficit will be a mililon six hundred thousand but you will find it will amount to three times that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—That is your idea of it.

MR. CASHIN.—Well give me the Auditor General's report. Last year 1924-25 it is stated there was a surplus of $312,000. I claim there was no such surplus. For this reason, the railway lost over that which consequently wiped it out.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.— A surplus independent of railway.

MR. CASHIN.— But some one has got to pay the deficit on the railway. That money then voted in the House was taken from the loan and spent for roads and bridges. The Finance Minister knows the deficit on current account for 1925-26 was over a million.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUS-

TOMS.—Not at all.

MR. CASHIN.—I don't pretend to know it all but I have a right to my opinion and I claim the deficit on current account was over a million and all I have got to do to prove it is to read the Auditor General's report.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE and CUSTOMS.—You read it upside down.

MR. CASHIN—It is evident here that the members of the Government have been reading it backwards. Undoubtedly so. I do not want to hold up anything, but I hate to let people get away with anything, and think they are shoving it across us. Because it is evident here that the Government is putting it all over us and then they go outside and they laugh up their sleeve. I have as much interest in the financial conditions of the country as they have because I have to live in it as well as they have. But I want to say that the Auditor General's statement is incorrect and the Finance Minister knows it. Because the report here is contradictory of the one that was put in the press during the bye-election in St. John's East. I do not know him personally but I do say that he is accustomed to change his mind, because he told us in that report that we had so much revenue, that we spent so much and that we have a difference of $81,000 which is a deficit. We sadly find now that when it was submitted to the House it was $112,000. Where is the difference when he signed that report that was put in the public press of the time. He knew about it then as well as now and if he did not he should have as that is his job, and if he is going to be Auditor General let him do his job. Why give him a salary and two or three sidelines. It would take a lot of water to wash him clean. I do not care who he is.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, is it possible that this committee is voting that $20,000 this year under the name of improvement of the fisheries. Is there not going to be some attempt made to reduce expenditure, and in my opinion and in the opinion of a great many members of this House, a saving can be affected with regard to that vote of $20,000 which will not in any way interfere with the fisheries. In fact it would have nothing whatever to do with the fisheries, or the future of the industry in connection with this country. That vote can be reduced in my opinion. It is a pure waste of money. When I left the House yesterday the Minister of Public Works was speaking, and I think that he referred to wardens. He was referring to small mesh traps. I would gather from his remarks, that for the duties of these men that they were receiving salaries under this vote. One of their duties was to inspect codtraps, and to see that the mesh conformed to the regulation. I understand that the Fishery Board or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the past, I know have employed men to inspect the codfishery, and report to the Fishery Department but they never got the salaries of a hundred dollars a month, or anywhere near it. Talking about the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat. The weight is still increasing and you are not attempting to curtail it. I may be criticised or misrepresented while I am saying this, that the member for Trinity District would not vote a dollar for the improvement of the fisheries. It may be hypocritical, farcical and all the rest of it. That improvement of the fisheries is a mis-nomer. It should be reduced. I would ask the Finance Minister and the members of the Executive Government who are chiefly responsible, certainly to reduce that vote or to see that the money is spent differently; anyway. I would appeal to the latest addition to the Executive Government, Mr. Duff, who was honest or I suppose that he was, in regard to his statement with regard to the accepting of his position of re-

sponsibility that he holds at the present time. Still it may be the voice of one cry.ng in the wilderness, with regard to the showing being made. But I do given him credit for the good intentions in connection with expenditure. Can he not raise his vo!ce in preaching against the expenditure of money, wrongly expended. Vote for the fisheries is not too much. I wish that it was ten times as much. We have the outrageous exhibit:on of the wrong expenditure of money, in connection with this vote for the fisheries and in connection with the vote for the Northern Labrador service. I once got an express on of opinion from a man who prosecuted the Labrador Fishery for years. He was purser and mail clerk on the Northern Labrador service for one year. He was a colleague of mine, being a member of Trinity District. I asked him for his opin:on as to the great service of this steamer, and he told me to cut it out, or to use what influence I had to cut it out. If it is necessary and it 's questionable whether it is or not then you can send down there a boat that will give the people the service that they only expect, and possibly what they require, an auxiliary boat of about seventy or one hundred tons. Such a boat can do that service, g ve all the necessary information with regard to the movements of the codfish, all the information with regard to the bait matters, and if anyone gets sick as the minister has just said, I th:nk that we would be very hard-hearted if we could not find a way of sending a boat down there to take the patient off of Northern Labrador. There is no attempt made, Mr. Chairman, in these Estimates, to reduce expenditure in any possible way. The m:nister said that the dredge paid for itself last year. Well if you have got a service that is paying for itself why vote anything for it in the estimates. Operations were made last year :n dredging the dock, that service will not be needed this year. The necessity for dredging is no more pressing this year than last year, even if the lack of funds is more pressing. Let us curtail on someth.ng. I would like for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not to take my criticisms too seriously. This not only happens in dealing with the Fishery Department. There are other Departments where an attempt should be made to affect a saving. Where are we and w.ther tending? Mr. Moore, the representative for Ferryland asked if any report had been made by the Finance Commission. The honourable member for Bay de Verde, Mr. Cramm tried to sidetrack that question by using words. He is the master of phrasing, and he tried to bluff the question one s.de. But his colleague on that Finance Committee was honest enough to tell the House what had been done. We find that the Committee did meet, and make some investigation, and some recommendations. It was absolutely true, what the member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin said. although objection was taken against the phrase yesterday. He sa d that it was a cod. The phrase used to deceive or camouflage. If there is any word euphonious enough to tickle the aesthetic taste of certain members of the House, we have to modifyf it and call it a farce instead. The Government like a great many other governments had good intentions, :n forming a financial commission to investigate the financial departments of the Government, and to try and make recommendations with regard to reduction of expenditure. But when they tried to put these recommendat ons into effect, some influence was brought to bear, and it became null and void. That is the history of Governments in every particular. These estimates are only another proof of the lack of determination to do something which everybody knows should be done, ye! it makes no d fference to the Executive Government what recommendations

may be made, the intention evidently it to do nothing but vote monies and to spend them. I presume that at this stage in the session, and at this date in the life of the present Government, when they may have work of a more important nature, and bigger propositions to consider, at the present time, they have made up their minds that they are going to vote the estimates the same as last year, with increases to cover the interest on the public debt, and a few other items making up an extra expenditure of over $300,000. Now with regard to that vote of $20,000, I asked the question of the Minister the other day . . . .

(Reads)

The Minister gave me a reply, and we can only take the figures as they were given me. But why were they not put in the annual report I do not know. I also asked the question . . .

(Reads)

And the reply that I got was this.

(Reads)

Therefore there can be no statistics even though we have men who are supposed to give us statistics in every particular.

(Reads)

It is a pure waste of money and I would ask the Government to reduce it, or ask the Fisheries Board to see if they cannot find another way to spend that money that would be off greater advantage to the country.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: Before turning over to the other page I have a few more questions to ask. First I wish to draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that I have had to table a number of questions regarding the prosecution of the herring fishery on the Southwest Coast. Now I would like to know if there is sufficient consideration being given to investigating the whole status of the herring fishery all along the Southwest Coast of the island.

Another matter on which there seems to be doubt along the Southwest Coast and particularly in Fortune Bay is the relation in which the herring fishermen stand in respect to American and other outsiders buying herring for comercial purposes. American vessels go to Bonne Bay and Bay of Islands to buy herring but they do not resort in Fortune Bay and have not gone there for a number of years to purchase herring and the people think that it is because of some unnecessary legal restriction they are deprived of very considerable revenue which they could get from the prosecution of the herring fishery if they were allowed to sell to Americans and others on the same basis as sales are made in Bay of Islands and Bonne Bay. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would give a pronouncement it would be a matter of vital information that might clear up some misunderstanding in respect to the sale of herring to outsiders in Fortune Bay for commercial purposes.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman:—I have no doubt that the honourable member is aware that two American vessels bought two loads of herring last winter in Fortune Bay. During the month of October last year a man named Pine and Capt. McCleod came to see me on the subject of herring. Capt. McCleod said he was late in going to Bay of Islands and he asked me why it was he could not go to Fortune Bay or Trinity districts for herring as well as Bay of Islands. I told him that there was nothing to debar American vessels from going to any part of the Newfoundland coast to buy herring as long as they bought for food purposes from Newfoundland. Capt. McCleod said that the Customs officer at Gloucester had told him that the only place he could buy herring was on the Treaty Coast. I directed him to Mr. LeMessurier, the Deputy Minister of Customs here, who confirmed what I had told Capt.

McCleod. Consequently, those two vessels went to Fortune Bay last winter and took two loads of herring and Messrs. Pine and McCleod expected that they would take at least a half dozen loads of herring from Fortune Bay this year and they also purpose to go much earlier this year to get herring at Bay of Islands. So I think as far as Gloucester herring men are concerned they are fully aware that they can go to any other part of the Newfoundland coast to purchase herring for food purposes from Newfoundland fishermen as well as to Bay of Islands or Bonne Bay.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I wish to thank the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for that information and for that official pronouncement and I wish to express my appreciation, on behalf of my constituents, for the lucid manner in which he has given it. I am sure that it will not alone be encouragement to the fisher folk of Fortune Bay, but to people on other sections of the coast as well. I was very anxious to have a statement made in an official manner so that it could be made generally known to American herring dealers and others outside. I shall be extremely glad to have the people of Fortune Bay know of the official stand of the departments of Customs and Marine and Fisheries, regarding the buying and selling of herring for commercial purpose in Fortune Bay and other sections.

(Department of Education Supply.)

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I suppose I should say a word with regard to Education. It is an important subject.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Bill will be up soon, Mr. Halfyard.

MR. HALFYARD—I was hoping the Bill would not come up, and I think it would be better if it did not come up this year. However that is a matter for the House; that is only my opinion. In reference to the Educational Report of this year I find that the compilers of the Educational Report, I really do not know who is responsible for it, have evidently made a mistake. In the annual report of the Department of Education for 1925-26 in the general summary of public schools of Newfoundland for the year ending June 30, 1927 showing the total number of teachers I find that a mistake has been made in addition. Here they have as the total number of teachers 1571. I don't suppose anyone has taken the trouble to look over the Educational Report.

(Reads)

We add up and get a total horizontally and we have here 784 and the addition of it makes 285. Then of course in adding that column to get the total the same mistake is made and the total teachers should be 1572 instead of 1571. That is a poor example to show to teachers by the Department ,that it didn't take the trouble to correct the addition. Anyhow we don't know how many teachers we have in the island whether 1572 or 1571. That is a technical error and we never expected that from the Education Department. The first thing that strikes my attention in the report is the number of third grade and the number of ungraded teachers. Males, we have one hundred and two, third grades and females 271. That is 373 third grade teachers. Ungraded, worse again; we have 69 males and 184 females. That is 253 ungraded teachers. That is 726 in third grade and ungraded that we have in the island and the standard of education in this country is not what it should be while we have so many schools with ungraded teachers. If I had known that this vote would be going through this afternoon I would have come prepared with some notes which I have home. However just glancing through the report I can't help but notice the few things I re-

mark and the number of third grade and ungraded teachers. I also find in this report on page 20:

(Reads)

This is a deplorable condition of affairs when we have 119 schools in one denomination not visited. Having in mind 184 schools with ungraded teachers and 373 third grade it would be interesting to know what schools were not visited. Did the Superintendent visit the associate grade schools, first and second grades and leave third and ungraded not visited? If any should be visited and should get supervision and instruction from a superintendent it certainly should be the schools that are ungraded that should get that benefit.

From the reports of the superintendents of the R. C. and United Church Schools we may gather that they could not have visited all the schools but they do not say how many schools were not visited.

What was particularly in the mind of the introducer of the Education Act of 1920, the ex-Minister of Education was supervision. He looked upon that as more important than anything else; the supervision or inspection of elementary schools. Why the supervisors were sent away to take courses in the methods of supervision and teaching and science of education was with that object, to try to give teachers throughout the country who had not had the opportunity of coming to St. John's and attending a college, the advantage of instruction from those supervisors who would go round to the various schools. That has fallen through. Supervisors were not sent out. Only two or three supervisors are being used. We cannot estimate the value of proper supervision of men who know their business and are thoroughly trained giving to teachers the advantage of advice and instruction when they have not had the advantage of a college course or normal school training course. And we will never be any better off in general, unless we can have all all our schools through the country, our elementary schools, under proper supervision, and if we have to employ ungraded teachers then they should get the advantage of supervisors, who would spend once or twice during the year a week or two at a time with them. It would do an enormous amount of good. It may mean money, but we are voting here $900,000 for education and if our system of supervision and inspection is no better than when I taught school, three-fourths of that money is wasted. Inspection was a farce when I was teaching school. I understand that in some cases now there is very little difference. Then when we find that there are 19 schools in one section that have not the benefit of supervision at all, it is calamitous. We are voting away now $23,000 for inspection. I wish that that vote was doubled. Even if the votes in other directions were reduced, because I look upon it as a most important vote so as to have properly qualified inspection or supervision. The idea of superintendents of education arriving at the school house about a quarter to four in the afternoon and saying to the driver who brought him there in a waggon "I am going here to inspect the school. I have to reach a certain place by six o'clock. Turn around the horse and by that time I will be out again." Is there anything more ridiculous than that? He reaches the school in October about four o'clock when the teacher is about to dismiss the scholars, and he says, "I am going to inspect this school. Get some lights;" and the poor tired individual with the youngsters has got to sit down and try to get them to read or to spell a few words. Well, I hope things are a little different now. Now, I do not know what the inspectors or the superintendents do, but it seems that if you ask them about work in other departments, they will say that their work

is such that they cannot leave it—clerical work that requires all their time. Even seven or eight years ago they had assistants to look after the schools. I think the time of superintendents, if not spent in their office, is spent on some church work, going to Canada or somewhere else for a trip. The Council of Higher Education is taking the place of inspection for some of the schools. If they had not that, which gives a certain standard to the different schools, they would be shouting out for that. It saves them a lot of trouble. That is the criterion of the standard of education. I know it as I have gone through the mill. Under the C.H.E. system it is cramm, cramm, cramm. The children are treated as so much material. And if one cannot keep up with the others he or she is called all kinds of nasty names. And after it is all over and we get better sense, and look back upon our own actions, in connection with the treatment of children we can only regret it. The C. H. E. examinations have had their day. They have been an impetus to education, but I think that it is time we had a new system. The poor school teacher could not help it, because if he does not put his pupils through the different grades, he is asked to get another school the next year. I know children who had passed through my school. Some of them were equal to any examination . They made good in after life as clergymen, doctors and lawyers. They happened to be bright. But there were some poor unfortunates who came under my supervision as a teacher. I was sorry for them. But they made very good men all the same ,although they were stupid in school with regard to passing examinations. I am only sorry that I did not treat them different when I was with them. I am interested in education because things have changed now, and whether we have to take a clerical job, or work of an industrial nature; no matter what our vocation may be; we should be well educated. And it should be the object of all Governments to see that all the children in this country get the advantage of an elementary education anyhow. I did not intend to make a speech this afternoon. All that I intended referring to is this matter of ungraded schools. A deplorable condition of affairs. So many schools in the outports in out of the way places that are neglected. The supervisor did not visit them. They are left to paddle their own canoe and get on as best they can. I referred to the report made by the Department. It should become more particular. Now there is another thing that I notice. On page 135 of the report we find that the number of teachers employed 97.

(Reads)

Now in the general summary the number of teachers employed was 90. There is a difference of seven. I cannot understand the discrepancy. Anyhow these are only small matters.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question in reference to the hours the men are employed at the penitentiary as keepers.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE — Mr. Chairman, In reply to the Hon. Member, I may say that I think that the hours are very bad. We should have more help. There should be more wardens and they should get better remuneration. Unfortunately it is the old story of getting it done. I have the greatest possible sympathy with the man who is warden. I would almost prefer to be a prisoner than a warden.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Chairmen, with reference to the hours that the men have to work at the Penitentiary, I thiuk it is an unwise enconomy on the part of the Government to permit of two or three men being employed working the long hours that they have. The Minister of Justice is in full agreement with me in that. No

wonder that these men are not able to perform their work efficiently. It seems to me that if any of these men get sick the other men will have to spend the whole of their time down there. That happens now every year. They have no time with their families at all. Instead of the Government being an easy master toward its employees, it is the hardest task master that I know of any employee in this country to-day. The Government would be well advised to accept the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, and employ another man or two in connection with that Department. They are pretty well occupied all the time and have more to do than they can attend to properly. And in justice to them we should give them a little shorter time, and regulate their working hours, and not expect them to be working for longer hours than any one else in the country. I trust that the Minister's suggestion will be accepted by the Government and that the extra one or two men will be employed in the country.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE.— Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment of the Hon. Member concerning the employees of the Penitentiary, who have got a hard job. You have to have a dependable man there, and really the hours are too long, and the confinement is of itself almost a penalty. And I go further and say that I hope that it will be found that conditions down there are such as to make it necessary that the suggestion should materialise.

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Chairman, there is a vote here for the fire department of $9,300, and in another department we find that there is a vote for $32,7000 for the fire departemnt.

(Reads)

which means that there is a total of over $50,000 for the fire departments of this city, and this money comes out of the general revenue of the country. I think that the Government should take up the matter with the Municipal Council, and insist on seeing that as the Council gets the benefit of having these fire appliances that we should be given the assurance that they will be prepared to pay a certain amount for that protection. I have brought up the matter before and I would like now to bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister to see whether he cannot get the Municipal Council to do something. Just a few years ago the people in the outports had their fire insurance rates increased from one and a half per cent to two per cent. To-day as a result there are quite a few men in the outports who are not in the position to have their buildings properly covered by insurance on account of the high rate, and here we find that a sum of over $50,000 is voted by this House to be spent in the city of St. John's on fire protection. Is it not reasonable to expect that the people in St. John's who get the benefit of this protection should be prepared to pay all or at any rate a certain proportion of this large expenditure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: In reply to the hon. member I may say that I am inclined to agree with him. But when a thing is going on for years it is pretty hard to change it. Another anomaly has also occurred to me. Why should the outports be called upon to light the city of St. John's, Port Union, and some other places whilst the other portions of the country remain in darkness. These things are wrong and we know that they are wrong, but there does not seem to me to be very much hope at the present time of altering them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Mr. Chairman: One of the arguments, I do not say that it is a good one, but I give it for what it is worth.

One of the arguments urged in defence of this vote out of the general revenue of the country for fire protection in St. John's is that after the Great Fire the revenue of the country benefited by the importations in St. John's. I merely state the argument that was urged in defence of this. But I think that it is only right to say that there should be a greater contribution for the protecеion of the place where most of the public buildings are. But I do not say that it should be as complete as it is. But we cannot get away from the fact that there is a certain amount of difference where you have got all the public buildings, the hospitals, and the different buildings that are a charge upon the country as a whole. There should be at least a substantial contribution to their protection by way of fire insurance.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: In connection with the Lunatic Asylum I understand that the Superintendent, Dr. Parsons, is out of the country now and another physician is acting in his place. What pay is this physician getting or is he keeping the appointment, may I ask the Finance Minister?

HON. FINANCE MINISTER—As far as I know he is temporary appointed.

MR. CASHIN—While we are on this Lunatic Asylum matter I would like to draw the attention of the Government that at the present time, unfortunately there are nine or ten applicants awaiting admission there. The other day one of my constituents, a woman, 45 years old, who is living with her father, who is 80 years old, at Cappahayden tried to get admission into the Asylum. I got in touch with Dr. Rendell, the Inspector General and everyone I thought could use any influence to try and get the woman into the institution, but all to no avail, as the reply I got was that the place was filled up. It is pretty tough when a man 90 years old got to look after an insane woman of 45. This is a peculiar case and you cannot expect the people of Cappahayden to look after this woman, especially now while the fishery is on. I would like to know what can be done in the matter?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: With regard to the situation at the Asylum, the trouble is that it is impossible to get any one in there to-day. Confirming what the member for Ferryland has said, I had a wire from Fr. McCarthy last night about the same case and I wired and told him the best that could be done. We have two or three cases in Conception Bay at the present time where people are in an almost inhuman condition having to be confined to gaol. I have in mind a case in Carbonear where there was nothing left to do but to keep the constable there continually guarding this unfortunate person. From my investigation and as far as I can see the only remedy and the only cure is more room. I have satisfied myself that from personal knowledge three or four days ago there were twelve applicants awaiting admission to the Asylum. There is really no place of detention to put them and I sympathize with them as any one must. I realize what a hardship it is on anybody having to abandon the fishery at this season to look after an insane woman. I would like to repeat that I confirm what the member for Ferryland has stated.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: As Cappahayden is some three or four miles away from Renews, the headquarters of the constable, I wonder if the Minister of Justice could arrange with the Inspector General to get the constable look after this woman at Renews. This girl's brother cannot give up the fishery entirely at Renews to look after her, although he has looked after her already.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I will have that matter arranged tomorrow morning.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I notice we have no reports from the Superintendents of the Penitentiary or the Lunatic Asylum showing the number of inmates in these institutions. In connection with the Lunatic Asylum the salary voted for Dr. Parsons is $3600.00 a year. Now Dr. Parsons is an excellent Superintendent and takes a great deal of interest in the affairs of the institution and in the inmates, but I want to urge this upon the Prime Minister and the Executive Government that with an institution the size of the Lunatic Asylum and with over four hundred patients to look after there is bound to be a lot of immediate medical, and particularly surgical, attendance to be done and it would keep the Superintendent busy for twenty-four hours a day to do the work alone. You have in the resident physician of the Lunatic Asylum a gentleman who has a number of other very important responsibilies and not the least of these is Chairman of the Board of Pensions that calls for a Service medical man, as the last word of a soldier's condition depends upon the Chairman regarding pensions, and I do not think the Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum can do justice to both jobs. I contend that the job at the Lunatic Asylum is a full time job for Dr. Parsons or any other Superintendent. It is really necessary to have more medical help there at the present time because just now it is merely a place of detention for many cases, as cases are kept there that, perhaps, need not be kept there. It has occurred to me looking through some votes that you are going on without increasing or altering votes in the Estimates and still you are getting more medical assistance in the shape of a visiting physician. Your Lunacy Commission has no authority, although paid $1100.00 They do not take part in the activities of the institution with a visiting physician or do they supplement the efforts of the resident physician who has more work than enough to attend to without looking after the duties of the Pensions Board; and I strongly urge now that some arrangement be made with the Lunacy Commission to try and have something done in order to make room for patients who are awaiting admission to the Lunatic Asylum.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, would the Prime Minister mind telling me what the policy of the Government is now in respect to the alteration or the increase of accommodation at the Sanatarium.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I may say that we had a plan made by the Board of Works Department for some addition to it, and we got an architect who was available to come down here. He knew a great deal about the laying out of institutions of that kind. Mr. Godden came down from New York and he looked over the situation and he showed us how that could be improved very much. He made a plan for the alteration of the interior of the building which would not be very costly as against the addition that was proposed by the Board of Works, and it would be a great improvement on the original proposition. That plan was sent along by him and now we are asking for tenders for the construction under this plan. Under his suggestion we will be able to take in quite an additional number of patients at the Sanatorium and relieve the tuberculosis at the General Hospital and give more room down there. And this will mean a very considerable saving of exppenditure.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one word or two in connection with the Hospital. I would like to draw the attention of the Gov-

ernment to the fact that we have a lot of hospitals all over the city at the present time, and to one that visits them quite frequently, it is evident that something should be done in the way of facility and accommodation. I realise that the only way to do that is by the addition of a wing to the General Hospital. But I feel that the money spent on occupants of the various houses in the city would more than pay for a new wing or two to the General Hospital. Bring them all under one head, because I feel that if the Prime Minister or any of the Government visited these institutions they would only call some of them dives. I just throw out that as a suggestion to the House and I trust that the matter will be taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. W. J. Browne gave notice of Question.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the Government had any connection whatever with the Payment of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company's instalment of interest? Has the Government granted a re-payment of the interest or is it a matter off their own bat? I would also like to know if any negotiations in connection with the railway are involved in the N. P. Company's proposition and if there is any proposition bound up with them to take over the management of the railway?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, last spring the Government asked the N. P. and P. Company to cut 25,000 cords of wood, which they undertook to pay for and get their money back as soon as they turned the wood into paper. They are asking us to pay for that wood now and we shall have to make some financial arrangement in connection with it; but we have the assurance from the International Paper Company that, if they put through this Bill, which may or may not materialize, they would refund the money. In that respect and in that respect only have we assisted towards the payment of the interest. As to any negotiations in connection with the railway being involved in the N. P. Company's proposition, I might say there is absolutely none. Of course, the N. P. Company have a proposition in connection with the Gander proposition in which they ask us to build thirty miles of railway to Gander Bay, but so far there has been nothing done in that direction.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Thursday, July 21st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 21st, 1927.

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

At five minutes past three the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the door 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 Door of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:

May it please Your Excellency:

In the name of the House of Assembly I present the following Bills for Your Excellency's assent:

"An Act respecting the ratification

of a Contract for St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service."

"An Act respecting the confirmation of an agreement between the Government and Holyrood Fisheries Limited."

"An Act to incorporate the Newfoundland Tourist and Publicity Commission and for obtaining statistics of Tourist Traffic and for other purposes."

And, Mr. Speaker and the House being returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that while in attendance on His Excellency in the Council Chamber His Excellency had been graciously pleased to assent to the foregoing Bills.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr Chairman, I don't wish to delay the estimates at this juncture but in reply to a question asked on the last day we were open regarding the reports of Finance Commission I have just received this information and I want to read it for the benefit of the House. I feel that I should read this reply for the benefit of the House and I feel we are entitled to more information than we have got.

(Reads)

This is the place in my opinion for these reports. We have asked in a decent proper manner and I feel that these reports should be tabled in the House in reply to the question of any honourable member. It shows, Mr. Chairman, that there is something peculiar about these reports. Now I am going to venture an opinion as to what is in them. It may be so and it may not. The only way I can see to get a look at these reports is to say something that is not in them and then they will say such is not the case and produce the reports to bear them out. I will make a statement that there are contained in these reports some practical recommendations concerning reductions in the civil service and they don't want to table them because they are afraid to table them. We are entitled to those reports. It shows they have something to hide. Why should I have to go down to the Colonial Secretary's office unless I go on private business or matters for my district. I contend that I am entitled to an answer to my question. I asked that any report or reports be tabled. I did not ask for copies of them. I asked:

(Reads)

And this is what I get and we are told now or it is insinuated abroad that we are holding up the business of the House. Why don't the Government be straight?

I suppose I would be an evil minded individual if I said they were crooked because that is what it is. I wanted any report or reports. The honourable Mr. Sullivan, member for Placentia and St. Mary's, told us the other day that there are reports; progress reports, or whatever else you may call them, and we are entitled to see them. We hear talk about Bolshvik Government. If this Assembly here is not run on Bolshevik lines, I don't know what is. We are here supposed to be trying to do something for the people of the country and when a Commission is appointed and makes certain reports you are ashamed to table them. I would like to know what the Prime Minister thinks about the matter; if he proposes to bring in the report and table it here. That is no reply to my question.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I want to make myself absolutely clear with regard to this matter. First there is no need for members to make nasty insinuations. There is nothing to hide in the reports. We are not crooks and we are not trying to conceal anything. I may say

to the honourable member that he will get these reports when we are good and ready to give them to him. I want to say there was no report. I repeat there was no report from the Finance Committee to the Government outside of a partial report with regard to some particular Department and recommendations with regard to what should be done in the future. The Government, however, or some in the Government are of the opinion that the whole report should not be tabled, should not be published and not considered until it is complete in every particular with regard to the public service, because you can't take this thing partially. You can't take the reorganisation of the public service and the cutting down of expenditure without taking every department into consideration at the one time. There is going to be trouble, charges of discrimination, perhaps injustice, if you start in to pare down one department without any set programme for the others. I say the Finance Commission should continue their work until their work is finished and they have completed a report before any action is taken. That is my idea of what the Commission is meant to do. It is absolutely impossible in my opinion to take this piece-meal. You have got to have a set programme for the future reorganisation of the public departments in every respect and every particular. The members of the Finance Commission have sent in recommendations, they have cited the procedure they found was being followed, they have suggested certain changes and certain curtailment, but nothing in the nature of a report that would have the effect of any drastic change. Now the honourable member got up this afternoon and was quite indignant over this matter. I don't know whether the holiday has disagreed with him; whether he has eaten something at the Garden Party that upset him. We don't always feel as good the day after a holiday as we would at other times. However we have nothing to conceal and the reply of the Hon. the Prime Minister is quite right. We haven't got a staff down there to taken every document in the Department and have a copy in twenty four hours. There is quite a lot of correspondence.

MR. CASHIN—I didn't ask to have them copied.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I am not going to table the original documents. If there is anything the Honorable Member wants to find out he may come down to my office and I will let him go through the files. At this time of the year the staff is short because they have to have their vacations, and some of the staff are on vacations now; and we have more than we can do in the Department at this moment and if the Honorable Member won't come and see the report he has to wait until it is ready; that's all.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, In reply to the Honorable the Colonial Secretary, I want to say that I would like to be understood that I asked a question and the reply to my question was anything but right. The reply would lead one to believe that a report or reports, long lengthy documents were in existence and I understand that a question was asked in the House a few days ago and we were told that there was no report at all.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —That wasn't said.

MR. CASHIN— Words to that effect. It was said the Finance Commission sent no report in yet and then we are told that they sent progress reports in. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to see where any progress has been made regarding the reports. I don't think that the garden party did me any injury yesterday neither has it affected my views with regard to the doings of the Government or the Finance Commission. I say that when a question is asked in the House the least we should get is a certain

amount of decency in an answer. From the tone of the Colonial Secretary's remarks it is evident that recommendations have been made by this Commission, farcical and all as it may be, with regard to the civil service and the reorganization of it. I gather that from the Colonial Secretary's remarks and when we are discussing Estimates is the proper time in my opinion to have all that information brought in here. I believe something drastic has to be done with regard to the Civil Service in this country. I am not afraid to say that there are 25% too many civil servants. It is a question of how many you have got to take off and pay the rest good wages. It is evident that we will either have to reduce the Civil Service or reduce their salaries, one or the other I don't know. I do recommend to the Government to reduce the salaries or reduce the number now in the employ of the Government. Mr. Chairman, the Colonial Secretary remarked that he didn't want this report to be broadcast because it would be setting one Department up against another. I am one of the last in the world who would want to put it in the paper. I have no paper; if I want to put it in a paper I have got to pay; and these journals going round will only put in what suits the Government. It shows the Government don't want to let us have a look at what this Finance Commission accomplished. They evidently accomplished a considerable amount of work in recommending various things to the Government and the Government doesn't want to show this House what they did do and they say to us when we ask a question if we are going to see them to go down in the Colonial Secretary's office and find out, and I am likely to go down and find I can't get them. We have just as much interest in this country what is being done just as much as any private individual in the Government. The chances are these private individuals don't know what is in these progress reports, only the Executive. That is all as far as I am concerned, I am not going down to the Colonial Secretary's office. The ineffectiveness and the farce of this Comission are well proved by the Estimates before us showing an increase over last year.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: Evidently the work of the Finance Commission has been fruitless in as far as it affects the expenditure of money to be voted in this House this year, therefore in that respect it is an absolute failure, although three men were appointed by the Government to inquire into the financial condition of the country with regard to expenditure and possibly the reduction of expenditure principally I presume. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the general remarks made by the hon. member for Ferryland, that we should as a responsible number of men now considering the Estimates for the year 1927-28 certainly find out what effort has been made by members of the Government to try and reduce expenditure. It was known that a Finance 'Commission had been appointed consisting of the Honourable Mr. Morine, the Honourable Mr. Sullivan and the Honourable Mr. Cramm; three very good men in responsible positions in the Government of the day. Therefore when these men were appointed there was a vertain degree of confidence established, and hope entertained, that a reduction in expenditure would be the outcome. But as far as the present Government is concerned, I repeat myself, it is absolutely worthless. The Estimates for next year are before us and evidently it is not the intention of the Government to interfere with the vote of last year. These progress reports will be filed I presume in the Colonial Secretary's office for consideration by the Government during the next year and I fear that nothing will be done by the pres-

ent Government on the recommendations of the F.nance Commission. They may not have the opportunity during their present term of office to put the recommendations of the Finance Commission into effect. Now I can't see for the life of me why the Government did not openly and fearlessly without any hesitation give an open and free reply to Major Cashin's question and I think it would have been better for the Government. What is there to hide? There is nothing to hide. If they tabled the recommendations it would show that the F.nance Commission did something anyhow. They performed their part, but where the Government showed their weakness and lack of determination to do something they knew should be done is in their not accepting the recommendations of the Finance Comm'ssion and trying to do something this year. I don't altogether agree with the remarks of the Colonial Secretary that nothing can be gained, or very little can be gained by considering one of the departments without consider.ng the whole. From the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Sullivan we gathered that recommendations had been made with regard to the Department of Public Charities and also with regard to the Dept. of Posts and Telegraphs. These are two large spending Departments and I am sure if we could bring about a reduction in expenditure without interfering with the efficiency of the service we would be accomplishing something even if we left out the others. On the whole these are the two Departments that occupied the attenion of the Commission and the Government are falling down on the job. They are following the line of least resistance. I have positive proof that the F nance Commission did make recommendation and I find that they have effected a saving in the expenditure of the country; quite a large saving on the recommendation of the Finance Comm'ssion and if the Executive Government allowed these men payment for the work and it had to be authorised by the Auditor General as an extra payment made on Executive authority I would be the first to say pay these men because they have done something for this country. They did something on September 25, 1926. Here is a minute-of-council dealing w.th a vote for the salary of the Relieving Officer at Cataline.

(Reads)

There is something the Finance Commission did; made recommendations with a sav.ng of seventeen dollars, but I can't see any other saving effected in the whole of the Estimates. We are voting away nine or ten millions and we take away seventeen dollars from a poor relieving office, an orphan girl, in Catal na. If there is any Relieving Office in the District of Trinity that should get a bonus it is the Relieving Officer at Catal na because I think you will find what is paid there for able-bodied relief is very very little and if we have relieving officers throughout the country who try to curta l expenditure, instead of reducing salaries we should give them a bonus. Anyhow I am thankful to the Finance Commission that they have effected a saving of seventeen dollars on a vote of between ten and eleven million and that was taken from the Relieving Officer down in Catalina and it is something to their credit, something to be proud of. I am sure that the Govt. if they have never done one thing to meet the recommendations of this House during their term of office, that saving that they have affected is commendable and they should be all granted K.C.M.G.'s for it. Still they told us that there was no report from the Finance Commission to the Government, but we find that upon the recommendations of the Finance Commission, they reduced the salary of the Relieving Office at Catalina from $117 to $100. That is the only solitary change. Any

further comment is unnecessary. The Government has fallen down on the job, from that date. That bit of paper shows that the Finance Commission was doing something. And they know how that happened. They simply picked o that unfortunate creature down at Catalina. Miss Bursey was doing the work while her father was ill. She d d it satisfactorily and reports that very little able-bodied relief has to be given out there. But unfortunate for her I must admit, the people there can get along independently. There may be one or two at little Catalina or Melrose. But there is certainly an independent spirit there and it should be fostered. I trust that if that is the only saving, that the Colonial Secretary will see how ridiculous it is. Forget about what I am saying. It is only my place to hold up to ridicule such an act. See the mistake that has been made and give the relieving officer the same as last year or the year before.

MR. SULLIVAN — Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Trinity is inclined to be a little sarcastic. There is a good reason why that salary is decreased. It is extraordinary, the different salaries received by different relieving officers in different parts of the country. In some cases people who had three times the number of people and twice the area to look after get one third or one fourth the salary given in other places. The Finance Commission tried to devise a system whereby the salaries could be fixed for the different relieving officers throughout the country. The salaries range from $26.50 to $660.00 a year. I may say that the poor commissioners in Conception Bay are the people that are getting all the plums. They get the largest salaries of any relieving officer in the country. Mr. Cramm says "not Bay de Verde district." That is the reason for making the change when this new appointment was made. Now I do not think that it is fair, or playing the game for the honourable member to sneer at us and to be sarcastic. We were sent there to do a certain work and when you see the Progress Report you will see why this lady's salary was cut down seventeen dollars. The Colonial Secretary says that it is going to take considerable time to gather all the correspondence.

MR. CASHIN—Why did not he say that in answer to the question. We asked for a report the other day and he said that there was none.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I said that there was no report.

MR. CASHIN—A Progressive Report is a report, and I say table it.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to hold back any report, but there is certain correspondence that comes into my department. I am not responsible for the Finance Commission's action. This question was addressed to the Prime Minister. He gave the answer and he gave it in good faith. If the Prime Minister instructs me to bring down the original document I am prepared to do it. I am not concerned with it. It does not make any difference to me. Most of the correspondence came when I was out of the country. Some of it I only saw this morning and did not know that it was in existence. It is not what you can call a final report. It is just as this House when it goes into committee on a bill. You may not get very far. The committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again. So did the Finance Commission.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Colonial Secretary to think that I was after him personally. I was after the Government. I state here now that if any commission appointed by the Government makes any report progressive or otherwise, that if any member asks for it in the House, that he should get it. I asked the question in the most intelligent

manner that I was capable of, and I was told that I could not get it but if I wanted to see it I could go down to the Colonial Secretary's Department.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY

Mr. Chairman, that is often put in answer to a quest on, and I may say that I do not believe in fooling people, and I think that if the member spent an hour or two in my office, a very pleasant hour discussing that, that he would be enlightened.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to get a bit of information. We are endebted to Major Sull van for the bit of information that we have got. He says that the reason why this salary was made one hundred instead of one hundred and seventeen was that it was a new appointment. Her father was ill and she was actually doing his work. It is a bit sarcastic I adm t. I feel quite sure that as far as Major Sullivan was concerned that in connection with this matter his intentions were good. But how rid culous that recommendation has been by simply confining it to one paltry vote of seventeen dollars. That is where you began and ended. If there was a thousand dollars cut off half a dozen individuals it would be alright.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—It was mainly done to systematise the d fferent jobs.

MR. HALFYARD—And that was the only example that came under your notice during the year.

MR. SULLIVAN—Not many relieving officers died.

MR. HALFYARD—If I had been a member of the Government or member of the Executive at the time that that matter was brought up it would never have happened. But because there was no one to check that up and see how ridiculous it was, it was put down there and it happened to get into the Estimates. That is always the way. If there is any reduction to be affected it is sure to be in connection with Trinity District, purely accidentally. I suppose that the girl will have to live without the seventeen dollars. But if she has to be sacrificed on the Cross of reduction of Expenditure, I hope that the poor g rl, who will have little enough, will at least have the conscious satisfaction of knowing that she was the first victim that caused a dollar of saving to this Island.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I notice that Conception Bay is still on the top in connection with the list of relieving officers.

(Reads)

He is the only good man in the country I suppose. It appears that the more relief that he hands out the more money he gets for it. You are putting it on a commission basis. When is this thing going to cease.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—These are all old appointments.

MR. BROWN—But you are the clean up crowd. The crowd of angels that were going to have wings. It is outrageous. Now I am going to speak of Grand Falls. You know that place. The relieving officer there is Mr. F tzgerald. It cannot be denied that he is one of the finest officials in this country. He is a good man. He is the Magistrate and the Relieving Officer and everything. And for the ministerial work that calls him to be in his office up to ten o'clock he gets the magnificent sum of forty-eight dollars a year. That is the big amount of money that is being paid the relieving officer, that is doing the work that Magistrate Fitzgerald is doing in Grand Falls.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is practically no relief given out there. What he has to do is in connection with people stranded out there from other d stricts.

MR. BROWN—What do you call that but relief. There are thousands of men around Grand Falls and the whole burden of looking after those men falls on him.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In view of the extra work that has been

put upon him this year he is entitled to something special.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear the Colonial Secretary make that statement. I think that it will l ear out what I have said, that he is doing all in his power, and that is part of my reason for rising this afternoon, to ask that a vote be placed in the Estimates to g ve him something for his troul le. Seeing that the Colonial Secretary has taken up the matter I believe that he will see that the right thing is done by Mr. Fitzgerald.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, the more contempt l le that action of the F'nance Commission appears to me the more we hear of it. It is enough to make one sick. One member of the Government gets up and connot tell me the progress made by the Finance Commission l ecause he wants to deal with the whole system in glol o. Some of the members of the Finance Cimm ssion gets up and says "Begin with the relieving officer at Catalina. Cut her pay down seventeen dollars, irrespective of what is being paid other reliev ng officers throughout the country, with regard to the numl er and their area.

(Reads)

The man there has to give out alms to a dozen places. If you are honest al out the whole matter and mean to do things decently, and al ove board, why not take into account the salary of the relieving officer at Hillview.

MR. SULLIVAN—What is the matter with that.

MR. HALFYARD—He s recommended for an increase prol al ly. But why is one recommendation acted upon. You have to take a poor orphan and make her the l eginning of your reduction scheme. And then to say that you are acting sincerely, and thinking seriously of what should be done in the right and proper manner. That was put there clearly l y acc dent. That is the only excuse that I can give for it. It so happened that there was a vacancy there and that was the recommendation. The other recommendations were not accepted and you know that they were not going to be accepted this year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have not refused to accept the recommendations. They were made last September.

MR. HALFYARD—Then it is time for them to l e acted upon. If they were made in January there might be some excuse for the Government. But these recommendat ons were made six or eight months ago. And the Government had time to consider them, and to try and effect a saving and to do something to relieve the country of the burden of taxation which is crushing it. Also to assist :f possible the Finance Minister to balance his bugget. But he will never do it. And most tragic part is that the recommendations were acted upon in only one solitary case which affects a poor orphan girl. These recommendations have l een l rought to the attention of the Government but for political expediency they have not been acted upon. Now I would appeal to the Finance Minister not to have these Est:mates disgraced with regard to the vote under consideration, by showing one decrease and that in the case of the Relieving Officer at Catalina.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, per- m t me to call the attention of the Minister of Pul lic Works to the extra allowances for motor car or horse keep paid to the Superintendents of the General Hospital, Sanitorium, Lunatic Asylum and Poor Asylum. Would the M nister please explain that allowance of $483.00 to the Superintendent of the General Hospital. He is already getting a salary of $3,220.00 l esides getting other allowances and perquisites. Now here is an additional amount of $483.00 and I would like to know what .t is for.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—

It may be for gasolene for motor car.

DR. MOSDELL—I wonder has the Finance Commission considered that from an economic standpoint. We have here also the Poor Asylum where the Government finds impossible to accommodate applicants who are really in need of admittance. The Super.ntendent of this institution is allowed $406.25 for horse hire. What is the necessity for this man having the use of a horse at the country's expense? And what just fication is there for giving the Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum $500.00 or $600.00 extra for motor car allowance when he is already paid a salary of an equivalent to $6,000.00 besides his salary as Chairman of the Pensions Board; and what justificat on is there for paying $483.00 for gasolene for the Superintendent of the General Hospital's motor car and pay a man to keep it clean? Pay the gentlemen in charge of these institutions a straight salary and cut out the camouflage. The Superintendent of the Sanitorium gets over three thousand dollars and allowances and here is an extra allowance of $690.00 for driving around in a car. What duties has he to conduct that calls for huge expenditure, although probably the doctor at the Sanitorium has some justification because he has to conduct a clinic in connection w.th tuberculosis cases in St. John's. Altogether there is over $2,100.00 paid out in respect of luxuries of motor cars when the Superintendents of these institutions are not on official business. I had occasion to vis t the Public Works Department a few weeks ago and the deputy minister informed me that the department was so seriously considering the matter of economy that they are cutting down the ferry service in Fortune Bay, and yet we have four superintendents of public inst tutions in St. John's getting over $2,100.00 extra between them for motor and coach driving and they get it whether they drive or not.

THE HON. MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—If you cut out one motor car allowance, you got to cut them all out.

DR. MOSDELL—That is why I ask the Finance Commission how they found such an expenditure as that?

THE HON. MR. SULLVIAN—We have not come to that yet.

DR. MOSDELL—In the districts represented by the Minister of Public Works and myself there is a lack of ordinary necessary facilities, and, consequently, I think the whole thing with regard to the subject I have dealt with is unbalanced, unfair and unjust.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member for Fortune Bay, I may say that I remember distinctly when Dr. Keegan was appointed in charge of the General Hospital his salary and emoluments then were practically on the same lines as what they are to-day. His present salary is $3,220.00, and I would like to know what other member in this House who is more competent to give an opinion on the value of Dr. Keegan's services for that amount than the member who has just sat down. Dr. Keegan's salary is absolutely out of all proportion to his worth, and if you were to remove his emoluments, which include house rent, allowance for motor car, etc., he would no longer remain Superintendent and you would never get a man any good to replace him for the salary he is getting. I agree with the idea of giving a straight salary vote, because I think the time is come when all superfic al votes should be consolidated in a straight salary. Ever since Dr. Keegan has been in the institution he has been getting these emoluments and we are only following what has been the practice and the procedure for many years past. Dr. Keegan cannot walk far, owing to being incapacitated and

has to have a vehicle at his disposal and that emphasizes the necessity of doing something for him in that direction. However, I feel quite sure that he would be prepared to forego the allowances, if he were given a straight salary, according to his ability and his value in that institution. As to the motor car allowance for the Superintendent of the Lunatic Asylum, I may say that includes bring ng the nurses back and forth to town from the institution. The salary of the Superintendent of the Poor Asylum is $1,200.-00 and he is allowed $400.00 for cab hire. I think this allowance began in the time of Mr. Pr.deaux, Mr. Miller's predecessor. Mr. Prideaux was somewhat of an invalid and could not walk and was allowed this amount for cab hire and when Mr. Miller was appointed he was allowed the same consideration. Consequently, these votes are not new. They have been going on for years and it is only a matter of readjustment. But w.th regard to cutting out these allowances and not replacing them in salaries, you will find that you will be up against it with the Superintendents of these institutions.

DR. MOSDELL—What does the honourable m:nister figure that the salaries of Doctors Keegan, Parsons and Rendell are equal to? These gentlemen, apart from motor car allowances, get certain other allowances in respect to house rent, fuel, etc., and I think you will find that their salaries are between six and seven thousand dollars each.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—How do you figure that out? Take the case of Dr. Keegan who was engaged by the Morris administration. His salary and emoluments then amounted to $4,250.00. Th s had not been increased in proportion to the work of the department, hence the additional allowance for motor car.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, the honourable minister has got to remember that you have Superintendents of public institutions engaged in professional business on this side, and more than that you have Superintendents who should provide their own outfits and who are using the outfits of the institutions they have charge of to increase their own personal revenues.

THE HON. THE FINANCE MINISTER—Name them?

DR. MOSDELL—Yes. The Superintendent of the General Hospital and practically every visiting physician at the General Hospital. Then there is Dr. Parsons of the Lunatic Asylum. He attends to calls in the Goulds and adjacent settlements.

THE HON. MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—I understand that Dr. Parsons when he was appointed had the permission from the Government of the day to visit people when called in the localities referred to, and I know that very often people were delighted to get his services.

DR. MOSDELL—That does not alter the force of the point I am making, rather does it emphasize it. The amounts set down in the Estimates do not represent the amounts these professional gentlemen are getting, particularly in the way of private fees. The doctors at the General Hospital and the resident physician at the Lunatic Asylum are supplementing their voted salaries through outside practice. The principle I have been trying to enunciate is that voted salaries should be made in respect to these doctors and voted salaries is all that they should get for performing the duties of their offices, and, if the doctors at the General Hospital perform any treatment that means revenue for that Hospital, then that revenue should go enirely to the Hospital and not to the men who are already paid for their services in connection with that institution. I object very strongly to this practice of Superintendents accepting private fees from

patients and also doing private work outside, especially in the light of the fact that districts like my own cannot get couriers and ferrymen to make communication, which is so absolutely necessary owing to the lack of main roads.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the General Hospital, if I am not mistaken, matters of this nature come within the scope of the Hospital Board to prevent the Superintendent and visiting physicians from using their positions and for which they are getting paid to enlarge their salaries or to increase their practices. Possibly the member for Fortune Bay can tell us what the Board did when he was a member of it to overcome that situation, because the situation to-day is that it has now come to be an established practice and a difficult thing to overcome, and, every year, if the situation is allowed to continue, it will be much more difficult to overcome it. To-day if Dr. Keegan got out or died and you had to appoint a new man he would consider that he was entitled to continue the practice that is now going on, and the same applies to the other institutions, simply because that practice has been allowed to go on from year to year by this and previous administrations. With respect to Dr. Mosdell's appeal to Hon. Mr. Sullivan because he was the only communicative member, let me say, so that the member for Fortune Bay will understand the position, that it is not my duty or my privilege as a member of the Finance Commission to get up here and talk on the various reports of the Commission. It is the duty of the Commission to report to the Colonial Secretary, who is the mouthpiece of the Government, and any communication that is to come to this House must come from the Colonial Secretary and not from the Commission. That is the position I take and I challenge attack on that position, but, generally speaking, as to the reports asked for, I may say there were no reports made and the Colonial Secretary was right in saying there were no reports submitted to him because what the Commisssion submitted to him were all in the nature of recommendations, and there was nothing submitted covering any one department entirely much less covering the entire civil service. We have an instance of to-day showing where a recommendation was made at an Executive meeting when the question of relieving officers came up. The recommendation which the Commission make to the Government was the grading of the salaries of relieving officers and asking that a scale of salaries be put into effect. As soon as that is attempted to be done an uproar is created here that some poor orphan girl who is the relieving officer at Catalina is affected to the extent of $17 per year Now the Government did not have to appoint that girl at all. The Government were not trying to be cruel to her, otherwise they would not have made that appointment at all. I venture to say that one-half of the civil servants throughout the country are orphans, but when you start to cut out useless officials or reduce salaries you are bound to meet with strong opposition. I am convinced of this, and this is why you have made no attempt at economy that, if the recommendations of the Finance Commission had been brought before the Government and adopted and had come into this Houes, you would have had the same uproar in connection with the recommendation in which the poor orphan girl at Catalina was held up by Mr. Halfyard as an exhibition of cruelty because her salary had been reduced by $17 a year. You are going to have nothing done in the way of economy in

the running of the Government of the country because every possible political advantage will be taken of the slightest attempt by this Government or any other Government to do anything that will be along the lines of economy. As long as that situation continues, honourable members need not fool themselves about economy. There is going to be nothing done; and because of that attitude existing I am not going to do anything calculated to injure myself politically, and I feel certain Mr. Halfyard is not either. The position taken by Mr. Halfyard in connection with this reduction of $17 is the very secret and the very crux of the whole situation, and is proof positive as to where you will get by making any reduction in the public expenditure of the Colony, because Mr. Halfyard wants to take advantage of this kind of thing to make political capital out of it and to enhance his chances of being elected again to this House.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I was not in the House when Mr. Cramm took it upon himself to try and justify this reduction in the salary of this orphan girl at Catalina by $17.00. All his legal phrasing of terms will not justify this reduction. All Governments are generally held up to ridicule on account of the big sums of money they paid out for lawyers' fees more than for anything else, perhaps. I have nothing to withdraw. Expenditures have been incurred and we are talking about expenditures and with regard to payments or expenditure, payments to this one and that and the other. I referred to the honourable member as one who had done work for the Government and got enormous fees, and that is public property. I am not questioning whether he gave returns, but lots of people ask where is the necessity for spending such large sums on lawyers. With regard to that reduction of seventeen dollars, I am not questioning the reduction, I am questioning the principle of that one individual reduction, and it so happens it applies to a girl, an orphan, who is the relieving officer at Catalina. Mr. Chairman, the Government had three of their supposed to be most influential Executive members as a Finance Commission and they made a certain recommendation with regard to reduction, but they were not strong enough to have these recommendations put into effect. If they were determined, sincere and honest in making the recommendations, and they knew that these recommendations would have enhanced the welfare of the country by a reduction in expenditure, and if they had acted as true statesmen, they would have said to the Government if these recommendations are not accepted and put into effect in the ensuing year, count us out of the Government. But they weren't men enough to do that. It does present a farcical attitude; a commission to be appointed to do something and the result is worthless and ridiculous in the extreme as exemplified here in the Estimates this afternoon. If the Government has to introduce drastic legislation with regard to the reduction of expenditure I don't know what any other member of the Government or Opposition will do, but it is necessary in the interests of the country, we all realise that, and the member for Bay de Verde can rest assured that personally I would support it to the last ditch in every instance which I thought was an honest attempt to reduce expenditure. With regard to expenditure in Trinity district in general; in the transportation service, if the Government had treated every other place in the country as it treated Trinity district there would be a saving effected of hundreds of thousands of dol-

lars. With regard to general transportation round the country, we know that our transportation service is our greatest trouble, more than we can bear, and I repeat if every place in the country had been treated as Trinity with regard to transportation service there would be a saving effected of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Prime Minister knows that himself, and Trinity district had to put up with it. The Malakoff was taken off the old service and has gone to Bonavista Bay. I did get very much exercised over the matter during one or two sessions of the Legislature as the same thing was evidently not being done in Government districts; no reduction in expenditure; no curtailment. If the people of Trinity district knew that the whole population of the country generally was being subjected to a reduction or curtailment of the service which woud reduce our expenditure they would submit to that treatment. Anyhow you should show the country that some attempt is made to reduce expenditure, but that has not been done. What gave rise to my remarks was this one particular case, and it must appear in the mind of every member present that it was ridiculous anyhow that here can only be effected a saving of seventeen dollars, and that so happens to be in the case of a girl whose father died last year and who has others dependent on her That is the reason I referred to the orphan girl. We like to help those who have others dependent on them. No one would support a reduction in expenditure stronger than I if it were introduced. I do not want to boast politically, but I think I can say that at the present time I am as independent as any politician with regard to securing election in Trinity district, no difference whether taxation is increased or reduced, and I am sure hundreds, perhaps thousands, in Trinity district would be only too delighted to see a policy of reduction introduced and I would be given credit for supporting it.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Bay de Verde has thrown out a challenge and he has a right to expect an answer and I am quite prepared with my answer as to what was done in connection with the illegal collection of fees while I was a member of the Board of Governors. On every occasion that the Board of Governors received notice of such instances the Board memorialised the Executive Government in connection with the practise and notified the doctors that they regarded it as absolutely improper and illegal. If the superintendents of these institutions are to be treated on the same basis as ordinary civil servants then we must apply the same comment with regard to money taken on the side as the Auditor General has to other offices. There are two classes. There are resident doctors permanently employed and visiting surgeons who are paid only in respect to visits to the hospital. The permanent official is paid a salary for full time and is expected to give full time to the institution. During the period I was one of the members of the General Hospital Board the subject came up also of the operating room which cost the country twenty or twenty-five thousand dollars to install that doctors belonging to the city were permitted to operate there and to collect fees amounting from fifty dollars to two hundred dollars and that the hospital was profiting only in respect of that by the proceeds for medical treatment, general treatment in the wards, or the use of private wards, and we set a fee for the use by any doctor of the operating room of five dollars per case. I don't think there was over five dollars collected because the Board of Governors hadn't authority and the hospital never profited and doesn't profit, as

it should from revenue derived in respect of that.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman. I feel partly responsible for a lot of the debate going on here this afternoon on account of my asking a question with regard to the Finance Commission. I can assure the honourable members, the members of that Commission that I had no such thing in my mind when I asked the question as casting any reflection on them. I merely wanted to get that information or report if a report were in existence. There was some kind of report in existence and for some reason or other the Government didn't feel inclined to bring it down. Now I am prepared to state why I asked that question. The man on the street is making certain remarks with regard to recommendations that went before the Government, that the Hon. Joseph Long went to the Government with certain recommendations with regard to the Civil Service and got no satisfaction whatever from the Government; that these recommendations were put forward by certain gentlemen on Water St. in their own offices. Whether that is correct or not I don't know, but I give that to the House for what it is worth. The Hon. Joseph Long went to the Executive Government with certain recommendations with regard to the Civil Service and the Government didn't think fit to put them into operation. Whether these reports are correct or not I do not know. But that is the way that the man in the street is talking about the Executive and Mr. Long. That is the reason that I asked that question. I thought to get something of a concrete nature from the Government with regard to that report. However we cannot get it. Now there is another matter that I would like to find out about. The matter was brought up by Dr. Mosdell when he was talking about the motor cars for public institutions. There is a gentleman that is seen very much in a motor car around this town. That is the Inspector General. I would like to find out from the Minister of Justice if these two motor cars are paid for by the Government. Neither of them appear in these Estimates.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I know of only one car.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman. If I put that in the form of a question would it be answered.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Certainly.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, the member for Placentia made the statement this afternoon that this Finance Commission had a secretary. Perhaps a member of that commission would tell us who that was.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Gushue was secretary.

MR. HICKMAN—Would the honourable gentleman tell us what he was paid and how.

MR. CRAMM—I am not sure. There was only one small amount paid to him and I am not sure what it was.

MR. HICKMAN—What date had you your last meeting of the commission.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, that calls for a reply with an explanation. This Commission was appointed, if I am not mistaken, in July of last year. It functioned almost daily for about three months, when the Chairman of the Commission went to the Imperial Conference. I think that there were only two meetings after that time, when the Attorney General was also gone to the Imperial Conference and the Deputy Minister of Justice had died, and I was asked to take up some work in connection with the Justice Department, which meant that this work had to be carried on in addition to work in my own office. Therefore none of my time could be given to the Finance Commission, and consequently no meetings were held after that time, and I don't think that I have attended any meeting since that

time. Consequently it may be only fair to say that, as far as I am concerned, the Finance Commission met for the last time about two weeks after the delegation went to the Imperial Conference last year. Under the Commission, however, any two members can function. Whether Mr. Morine or Major Sullivan had any meetings after that time I do not know.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I had not any intention of taking part in this debate this afternoon but I was called to my feet, as I felt in duty bound to support the position taken by Mr. Halfyard arising out of the action of the Finance Commission. I think that the appeal that he made not to have these estimates disgraced by this one reduction is after all a very fair appeal, and I trust that not only the Finance Commission but also the Executive Government will give heed to his suggestion. We have now discovered that the Finance Commission have made reports and that in effect certain of these reports have been acted upon. For instance it would appear from the discussion this afternoon, that we have at last got down to this point that they have outlined a schedule under which relieving officers are going to be appointed, and salaries denominated in future. If the Relieving Officer's salary is going to be in future on the basis of population and the amount of work that he has to do, than it would be interesting to know just what form the recommendation took, and what statistics the commission had at its disposal, when they decided to take that incident as the index of their conduct in this connection. You have got yourselves in a pickle this afternoon. You did'nt want to table the report, but it seems to me from the look of things, you are going to be required to present them now, for the simple reason that in some instances it appears that the Government have accepted recommendations and acted upon them Therefore that principle being admitted, we certainly expect you to tell us now what those reports were. After sitting down here and listening to the discussion this afternoon I think that you are only doing the right and proper thing, to get these reports along here, and lay them on the table of the House. If it is the wish of the Government that those reports be withheld from the public I do not think that anybody will break faith with them.

I presume there is still a secretary of the Commisssion. If, as the Colonial Secretary pointed out, his staff is short, I fel that the Secretary would be only too glad to make copies of any reports that the Commission has made. If you acted upon the recommendation of the Commission with the relieving officer in Catalina why not the same with the whole list of relieving officers Because if the recommendations are only going into effect as the civil servants die, it may be a period of twenty-five or thirty years before all the recommendations are given a practical trial. You have no other position to assume. I say now that the salaries of the relieving officers are both unfair, unjust, and they discriminate. They have been appointed without any justice whatever. It is refreshing to learn that there is going to be some change, but if you put it into effect in one instance why not do the same with the whole lot? There is no other conclusion to draw but that you are placing a premium upon the man that gives out the most relief. The large salaries that are voted for relieving officers are voted to the man that gives out the most relief. Now Mr. Halfyard has shown the ridiculousness of your position as regards this particular salary, and I would say here now that I join with him as a protest against what I consider a contemptible incident in

this part cular case. You had a Finance Commission functioning. But you wanted to hide your light under a tushel, and so you were not prepared to bring down their reports. But you wanted to try and effect a saving.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Commission did not object to the reports be ng brought down.

MR. SCAMMELL—But it would be interesting to know who has objected to bringing it down. You have got a Finance Commission and you have given them a big job, and evidently they tried to do someth ng. They made some reports and evidently those reports in gloto were not acceptable to their own Government. Evidently they were not acceptable to the individual members of the various constituencies. Still you should bring down those reports. You must adm t that you do lay yourselves open to criticism, censure and ridicule, when having such important members on that Commission, the result of their effort has been that you have been able to reduce one relieving officer's salary by the sum of seventeen dollars. If you brought down a report which showed that you were going to effect a saving of hundreds of dollars, you would be entitled to fair and reasonable remuneration for the service that you had given. But surely you are not going to begin and end there by cutting the salary of one reliev ng officer to the tune of $17. Reconsider it; and do not have these estimates ridiculed by the paltry reduction of seventeen dollars.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable member if a great deal of the mystery surrounding the members and the report of th s Commission is not due to the fact, for I have heard it said, that some of the heads of the departments refused to allow the Commission to go ahead and investiage certain votes in connection with expenditure in their department. If that is true, is not that one of the chief troubles which is hindering the Commission from doing all the work that it intended to do and from making the report which possibly they intended to make, after making their investigation.

HON. MR. CRAMM—Mr. Chairman, I may say that as far as I am aware, there has been no instance in which the Commission were refused by the head of any Department to go ahead and investigate any vote or expenditure in connection with any Department.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, I take it that the rumor is not correct, but it seems peculiar that one of the chief things that the Commission dealt with was the sub-department of Public Charities. I know that in my section of the country people generally resented the activities of fishermen and others sent around to begin the work of the Commission, by going into the homes of widows and other people. That is one big trouble as I see it. The man with the small salary, for example the case referred to this afternoon by some of the members on this side if they can save eight or ten dollars on him it is usually done, but the man getting the large salary s left alone. That is the great criticism throughout the country to-day. The same thing applies to pensions. Some men are given pensions of from one to two to three and even four thousand dollars a year, while in one case I know it is $6000. And the people getting salaries of one or two thousand dollars are cut to the bone. I want to call the attention of the Committee to the reduction of a salary at the Sanatorium. There is one thing in connecion with that matter and that is that these things are left to the Board of Governors, who have no spokesman in his House. The Minister of Public Works has got to be the spokesman. While I am on this subject I would like to refer to an incident that occured about a year or a year and a

half ago, when a man that was getting a small salary of $250, a man that did the rough and ready work of the institution such as pealing potatoes, etc., was dismissed by Doctor Rendell and his dismissal was approved of by the Board of Governors, and afterwards by the Executive Government. I know that man had the sympathy of several members of the Government and several members of the Executive. He was accused by the Superintendent in there of being a spy of the Minister of Public Works who at that time was myself. There was no truth in the report that he was a spy for me. And I am prepared to say that even if he were a spy to communicate to me certain things that his dismissal should not have been ratified even then. He should have been commended. Reports came to me and I started to investigate, and as soon as I did Doctor Rendell who was in charge of the institution made up his mind that that poor man, on one pretext and another caused this man to be dismissed and his action was approved by the Executive Government. My claim is that in connection with that matter that man was a pawn. Some salaries were increased and other decreased. It is all wrong. That same man is on the street to-day. I appealed to the Prime Minister at the time. He pointed out to me as the hon. gentleman well know, that the Sanatorium the General Hospital, and Sudbury are in charge of a Board of Governors, so far as dismissals, appointments and salaries are concerned. I claim that there was a great injustice done to that man at that time. He was a faithful worker, who could I know attend to the duties assigned to him by the Superintendent of the Institution. And yet it just happened at the time when I was invesigating certain matters that were reported to me and that lead me to believe that that man's statements and that the statements that I got from ohers were correct, because of that Doctor Rendell considered him a spy for me and he made up his mind to have him dismissed and as I said before that even if it was true that the man was a spy and reported certain things to me that in itself was not sufficient to cause the man's dismissal. But he was dismissed and that is a year and a half ago and that man is still on the street. I strongly objected to the action at the time and I wrote to the Board of Governors and the Prime Minister and I said "cannot that man be given an opportunity to appear before the Board of Governors and explain everything to them, and state his position but that privilege was never accorded him. If it was a doctor or a superintendent or a man getting three or four thousand a year his case would receive consideration, but this man could not get a hearing at all. I now ask the Prime Minister even at this late hour of the day, to look into the matter and see if justice cannot be done that gentleman. Now there is another matter that I wish to deal with in connection with the estimates for the Department of Public Works. That is the purchasing of supplies. I know that 99 per cent. of the purchasing of supplies for the various institutions must be purchased here in St. John's, but at the same time I claim that whenever possible the outports should be given a chance to supply what they can in the way of potatoes and eggs, etc. While I was in that Department I tried to carry out that idea as far as possible. It is true that at this time of the year a certain number of the eggs coming in would be bad, but considering the encouragement that is given the outport people to go in for poultry raising and the production of eggs, I think that the purchasing of these eggs were justified. I understand that there are a number of these things that to-day we could be purchasing from the outports. We talk about agriculture and the encouragement of agriculture. About en-

couraging our people to go into raising cattle, and eggs, and vegetables and so on. But we are purchasing eggs produced in Canada and Prince Edward Island. We are confining more or less except in a few instances our purchases in connection with publ c institutions to the city of St. John's, when certainly a share of these orders should be given to the outports as well. I would call the Prime Minister's attention to that matter because he is now a member of the Board of Works. These institutions require boots and shoes which are manufactured in my own district. We have in the town of Harbour Grace three boot and shoe factories, who find it difficult to keep things going, and an order for a hundred pairs of shoes would be appreciated very much. Then we have in that same town a gentleman over there who makes furniture and mattresses and so on and others who make clothing. As I said before in connection with eggs and vegetables we have a number of people producing things in that distr:ct. I claim that considering the small amount of patronage that can reasonably be sent outside the city, not one per cent. of the purchases for these institutions, which are supported by the people of that country generally. They are not St. John's institutions alone. Therefore when it comes to a matter of patronage I claim that wherever possible the outport people who can produce anything that is required from time to time should be given a reasonable share of the patronage. I don't think that any members representing St. John's district will have any objection to that. I have not a thing to say against anybody getting their share in St. John's, but I do say that in reference to this particular matter, I would like for the Department of public Works and the Board of Works, to consider the claims of the outport people in this respect and see that justice is done them.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether the Finance Commission went as far as to make any recommendations with reference to the adjustment of the Tariff?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The Finance Commiss on did nothing with reference to the Tariff. We were prepared to go ahead with it but we did not do so. We had arranged to interview every manufacturing concern in the country and we had intended to take evidence from every industry, but up to the present t me we have taken no evidence.

MR. HICKMAN—This Commission has been in existence since last July and the only thing you have done evidently is cut the salary of an orphan girl. It seems to me to be a long time w.thout having done anything practical. I would like to know if the Commission has held any meetings recently?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The Commission has not met since Mr. Morine took ill about three months ago.

MR. HICKMAN—Is the Commiss on going to wait for the return of Mr. Morine or will there be a new appointment made in his place?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I cannot say whether the Commission is going to cont nue or not or what the intention of the Government is. That is up to the Government to decide.

MR. HICKMAN—Has the honourable member for Placentia any objection to the recommendations sent to the Colonial Secretary being laid on the Table of the House?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I have not the slightest objection. In fact I would be only too glad to see them tabled, and I may say that I am prepared to make recommendations, whatever pos:tion it puts me in politically.

MR. HICKMAN—Would the honourable member be prepared to have copies of the recommendations made and submitted to the House? It strikes

me that, if the Commission was in earnest, the documents should be on the table by now, as no doubt you could get some good ideas and some help from the members on this side of the House.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Surely the honourable member w ll realise I have no power to table them, and I do not think there is the slightest objection on the part of the Government to table them provided there is time to have the copies made.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a suggestion thrown out by the honourable member for Ferryland that the Government has something to hide because we refused to bring down the correspondence n relation to the activities of the Finance Commission. I think the reply given to Mr. Cashin was simply to the effect that there was a large amount of correspondence and evidence in connection w th this matter and it was suggested that he drop into the Colonial Secretary's office, if if he cared so to do, to read it; but, as the Colonial Secretary stated here this afternoon, there is nothing to hide and to give us time to bring down a complete report here, as it is plainly evident that there would be a tremendous loss of time in discuss ng the thing in piecemeal. There are recommendations that came in from the Finance Commission. For instance, one is for the cutting out of dupl cation of telegraph poles. That suggestion was considered by the Government and the Government came to the conclusion that it was better to wait until the full report of the financial situation was looked into and the whole report was sent in for consideration, and while I may not have seen eye to eye with my colleagues on this point at first, I am now convinced that my colleagues were right and that I was wrong, because this afternoon we had the sorry spectacle that the moment you do something to somebody the representative for that particular district makes an outcry and harps on it for the purpose of making political capital out of it. This afternoon it was stated by several Opposition members that we cut a girl's salary. We d d no such thing. A relieving office at Catalina died and his daughter asked to carry on the work. Upon recommendation of the Finance Commission to the Executive when dealing w th the salaries of relieving officers it was decided that in the case of new appointments relieving officers were to get $100.00 a year, so that some one naturally came in under that new arrangement and some one who occupied a pos tion where $117.00 was paid last year. There was no such thing as reducing the salary. The appointment is a new one, and if the young lady objects to being paid $100.00. perhaps we can get somebody else to do the work for the same amount. That is the point brought out clearly here this afternoon. You cannot begin to economize n any one direction, but you are supposed to do it in all. Not only this afternoon has that been demonstrated, but in almost every debate since this session opened. On several occasions Mr. Brown, the member for Twillingate, considered it was wrong because the S.S. Prospero d d not call at Springdale, which is in his particular district, and some other place was not cut out, so we decided to let the steamer call at Springdale once every second trip. Then Mr. Hibbs came forward with the propos tion that Change Islands in the district of Fogo had been cut out, and we have now arranged that any trip the ship does not call at Springdale she will call at Change Islands. The debate over the salary of the relieving officer at Catalina illustrates the fact that the moment anyone's corns are stepped on, then the representative in the House immediately contends that one of his constituents is hurt and that it should not be done. It all goes to show that

whoever has charge of the affairs of this country in the near future has got to come in with a prepared policy of drast.c retrenchment beforehand if reforms are to be made and if economy in the public expenditure is to be expected. As to what Government or party is prepared to stand by a prepared policy of retrenchment and as to what will happen, I do not propose to express an opinion on at present; but I am perfectly satisfied that any report of the Finance Comm'ssion that we may bring down is going to be useless, and is not going to lead us anywhere. It has got to be a general policy for some Party coming before the country. However, I do think that the Finance Commission have done a great deal of good work, notw'thstanding the adverse criticism and the talk of our opponents that we sent around policemen for the purpose of cutting down allowances to widows and orphans. There was no such suggestion on the part of the Finance Commission that there was going to be any great sav'ng for the country in that respect; but there was a suggestion by the Finance Commission that there were a lot of irregularities going on in respect to that particular department. There were cases in which w:dows, who were getting payments year after year and who were independent and undeserving of that relief; whilst there were also widows who were get-ing only three or four dollars a month and who are really in dire distress, so that the whole idea of the Finance Commission in that connection was to regulate the dispensation of poor relief, and I believe there are statistics in possession of the Secretary of the Comm'ssion that would be invaluable, statistics that have taken an enormous amount of time to compile. Mr. Morine gave his time and his office staff to prepare these statistics and he tabulated a lot of detailed material wh'ch must be of use to anybody when considering the proper regulating of that department. We have received a very excellent recommendation from the Finance Commission in connection with the cutting out of the dupl.cation of the telegraph lines, and, I am perfectly satisfied, that if this suggested reform was carried out it would mean a saving of between a hundred and a hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year. But then somebody says that a few telegraph officials are going to be turned on the street and the same old difficulty crops up :n trying to bring about retrenchment; I am of the opinion that the country cannot go on as it is going and someone has got to exercise retrenchment and drastic retrenchment. It is a big policy and a big propos tion, but whether it is started by the present Government or any other Party I have my doubts as to whether it is going to be popular, as I think that a very large majority of the people of the civil service, if their salaries are go:ng to be reduced, are not going to be particularly anxious to support the party who reduced them. Yet something must be done in the way of reform financially irrespecive of poliical affil:ations.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, when the Estimates for the Department of Public Works were going through the other day and I asked a question as to why the salary of the relieving officer at Catalina was reduced, I asked that for the sake of information, and not to create any bad feeling between the opposite sides of the House. I could be pardoned if I had taken exception to the manner in which my question was treated. I asked if anyone could explain that reduction and the Colonial Secretary in his usual courteous manner said that he would look into it for me. Now I am surprised to find out that there is such a thing as a Finance Commission, and it was on the suggestion of that Comm'ssion that the reduction was made. But what I take exception to is that there was some of the members

of the Finance Commission in this House when I asked that question, and why did they not make the explanation at once. I came into the House on the following day and still no explanation was given to me. It was left to Mr. Halfyard to bring it up again. I do not as a rule make a fuss when I stand on my feet but I do take exception to the attitude of the Finance Commission in not answering the question that I asked at that time.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I do quite agree with the attitude that Mr. Godden has taken in this matter. I do not think that I was in the House at the time. I do not know whether the honourable member was here when I made the statement as to why the recommendation was made. It was because all new appointments were to be referred to the Finance Commission and they had adopted a system whereby, in connection with the payment of outport relieving officers, a hundred dollars was to be the maximum salary. It was fixed in accordance with the population and the size of the territory over which the relief was to be given. And when the vacancy occurred, if a new person had been appointed, his salary would have been cut, and so when we are making any new appointments, their salaries will be on the basis of the salaries of the future. Now in many cases the salaries are out of all proportion to the salaries paid in other parts of the country. These salaries have been there for sixteen or twenty years. And one of the recommendations of the Finance Commission was that as soon as the old relieving officer dropped out that the new appointment would be at a reduced salary. Furthermore it was recommended that in the event of a Magistrate being appointed in Brigus, that he would take over the duties of relieving officer also, and combine both duties. And furthermore that there should be combination of all the work of public officials in the outports. In connection with the telegraph system the position is that it costs the Government $600 to $800 to maintain certain telegraph offices and we get a hundred dollars revenue per annum. My opinion is that many offices not paying should be cut out altogether, all over the country, and the telephone exchange would be able to connect up with the other telegraph offices. Now that the railway is being operated by the Government, the station agent one in the day and anther in the night would be able to do the work. However it would mean cutting out a lot of officials if that suggestion was adopted by the Government. The taking over by the Railway of the Postal Telegraph system, would save a large amount to the Colony in operation and maintenance.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: If people were sent out to these districts to make investigations, I see no reason why this report should be concealed and I see no reason why this House should not have this report so that the members on both sides of the House could see what was done. The attitude in reference to this thing has not been very good at all. To begin with the report could not be had at all until the member for Ferryland put the question on the order paper. To-day he gets the question partly answered, which is the result of the investigation going on to-day all over the country. I think that we have discovered something well worth discovering.

I think the member for Ferryland was handled very roughly this afternoon in regard to his question about the Finance Commission's Report. The Colonial Secretary told him that he would get the report when the Government were good and ready to give it to him. Well then we will see you will not get the Estimates through until we get the information we want. Mr. Cashin had every reason for the stand he took as did also

other members, particularly Mr. Halfyard, who criticized the Finance Commission and the Government for cutting the salary of the relieving officer, an orphan girl, at Catalina. This was the only salary on the whole list of relieving officers that was reduced and if the Government wanted to be fair why did they not make the reduction a general thing. We have asked for several thing in this House and have not been able to get them. We have asked the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister to let the House have the Budget before we vote the money in the Estimates. We are here now asked to vote an increase in the public expenditure of $300,000.00 more than last year's Estimates called for. It is very evident that the revenue is short. The revenue at the present time must be short because people in the country have not the purchasing power and naturally they are not buying the goods nor are the importers bringing in any goods. We are asked to vote over ten millions of dollars and we do not know here now where the money is coming from, so the least the Finance Minister can do is to bring down the Budget, as it will only help him and the Government to get through the session quicker; also he could bring down his additional estimates and let us try and work together and dispose of the remaining business of the House. The Government will be bringing in another loan bill shortly and we will be asked to vote away more millions. This will further add to the public debt of the country and more revenue will have to be raised to pay the interest. In view of all these things I think it is only right that we should have the Budget here. May I ask the Finance Minister if we can expect to have the Budget to-morrow?

HON. FINANCE MINISTER—No.

MR. HICKMAN—We will have a chance to see the Budget some time. If that is the attitude of the Finance Minister and he is not prepared to work in unison with this side of the House I do not think he can expect any support from us whatever. There is important legislation yet to come before this House and if you have the interest of the country at heart you will bring in your Budget and additional estimates, and after that adjourn the House for a couple of months and deal with that important legislation in the fall. It strikes me that if we were not discussing the Estimates, seeing that the Finance Minister refuses to bring in the Budget and the additional estimates, the House would not have anything else to do. We have been promised that legislation would be brought down with reference to the Gander proposition, but I do not think it is possible for the Government to have this legislation ready in the immediate future. It is no pleasure to be sitting here doing practically nothing during this hot weather, and I would suggest to the Government to adjourn the House for two months after the Estimates are gone through, until the end of September next when the Budget, the Gander and other legislation can be dealt with.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition I may say that there has not been a day since the present session opened we have yet finished the Orders of the Day. Therefore, to say that there is no other business before the House but the Estimates is only a piece of absurdity. It is idle to talk of bringing in more bills when every other day sees three or four items of business on the Order Paper untouched, and how much better off would we be if we added another half dozen bills at the end of the present Order Paper

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: Considerable controversy has taken place as to the advisability of the Govern-

ment bringing in the Budget and Additional Estimates in order to show the Opposition how and where the Government proposes to get ten millions of dollars to meet the Estimates we are now discussing. Evidently, all the members of the Government know where this money is coming from and how all this expenditure is going to be met because they have studied economic conditions to such a large extent. We have heard the Finance Minister's reply to the question of the Leader of the Opposition, namely, that he will not bring in the Budget now. The Finance Minister a Minister of the Crown and he is a public servant and he has got to do the proper thing. I have yet to hear that the Finance Minister has conveyed anything to this Legislature that the smallest schoolboy could not follow. Now when the Budget does come in here I feel sure it will bear the autograph of some other person. Anyhow I regret that we have arrived at a stage in this House when the common courtesies of Government cannot be extended in decent fashion to members of the Opposition. If we ask a question about the report of the Finance Commission we are sneered at and jeered at; but I will say this that, if I were appointed on a commission to make a report, I would not be ashamed to table the report in this House. The Prime Minister stated here this afternoon that it would be necessary for some administration in the near future to retrench drastically and if necessary appeal to the country on a policy of retrenchment. Well I remember when the Monroe Party went to the country three years ago and one of the principal planks in the platform of that party was retrenchment and I am sorry I did not bring with me this evening a copy of that famous manifesto. We know and the country knows how that party has retrenched. All that is worrying the Government to-day is to create the impression abroad that the Opposition members are holding up legislation and trying to keep the people of the country from getting work. I was interviewed by a number of men today who told me that a paid agent of the Government was going around circulating that a fellow named Cashin was holding up the business of the House and was keeping the unemployed from getting work, while a member of the Government went into an extern district and told the people there that the Opposition were holding up the business of the House and stopping public works from being carried out. Now that the Prime Minister is back to the House again I would like to deal with this matter of retrenchment again. The Prime Minister stated here that the time was come for a future Government to go to the country on a policy of retrenchment. The Monroe party of which I was a component part went to the country on retrenchment three years ago and how did the present administration go ahead with it. Well has not the inauguration of the famous Finance Commission proved that the only thing the Government has accomplished in the way of retrenchment thus far is the cutting of an orphan girl's salary. Why I suppose the expenditure in connection with the formation of this Finance Commission has cost more than this poor girl's salary, which is $100.00 per year. There are a lot of votes in these Estimates that we are now considering that should not be there because they are wrong. Then we are told by the Government that they are going to bring in Additional Estimates. My experience has been that Additional Estimates and Supplementary Supply are usually brought in about twenty-four hours before the Governor closes the House and then God help you if you dare say a word, they are likely to have

you arrested. Will the Minister of Public Works get up and tell the House what became of that $150,-000.00? It was voted last year but never spent at all. Consequently, these Estimates here now are false. Why show that amount in these Estimates when the money was not used last year. The answer is that the revenue for the past year was short and that money was utilized to help out the revenue. The Finance Minister knows that to be correct but he has not been frank enough to tell it. Now with regard to this Finance report, I understand that there is a rule in this House to the effect that all reports are supposed to be tabled ten days after the House of Assembly opens. Now the least we expect from the Government is common decency, but on the contary the Government have acted indecently with the Opposition ever since they came in office and they will die indecently. I would also like to ask the Minister of Public Works on whose authority five thousand dollars was spent on snow shovelling in St. John's East last winter? With reference to the invitation extended to me to go to the Colonial Secretary's Office to read the report of the Finance Commission, I am not going down there because if such a report is in existence the country at large should know its contents and the whole thing only goes to prove what a farce the Finance Commission is. The Prime Minister stated here that in order to cut down expenditure in the civil service a strong Government would be necessary to do it. Well did not the present Government come back from the country twenty-six seats to ten in their favor and even then they were afraid to make any attempt at economy. On the contary they indulged in squandermania.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made same progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions, which were read a first time as follows:

Department of Marine and
Fisheries $432,152.39
Department of Education ..$898,503.53

The said resolution being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said resolutions were agreed to.

On motion the remaining orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to move that the House now rising do adjourn until to-morrow at three of the clock.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to adjourn I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to give an official welcome or any welcome to Captain Courtney the aviator due here in a day or two; to wish him success on his voyage and offer him any assistance.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The question hasn't come before the Government but undoubtedly when we know Captain Courtney is arriving here we will do our best as a Government and as a people I think to give him every assistance that can be given. I understand Captain Courtney is only going to stop for a short time because he is making arrangements to get fuel oil out to Topsail and have his supplies all ready there so he can immediately get away again. We shall be only too glad to do anything in that connection. I may say in connection with such matters that I have asked His Excellency the Governor to ex-

tend an invitation to the Prime Minister of England. When I saw by the paper this morn ng that he was going to visit North Sydney, I though that if he were there he certainly ought to come to Newfoundland and an invitation has been extended by the Governor to the Prime Minister of England to visit us.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, w.th regard to the arrival of Captain Courtney here I may say a great many people possibly authorities on the subject are somewhat concerned about the advisability of his landing at Topsail as it is proposed. There hasn't been any commun cation sent to the Government whatever. We have had communications before in other cases. We have had no official communication in this case from the other side with the exception of one or two messages sent by the High Commiss oner saying when he, Courtney, was to start. Now I had a discussion this afternoon with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I asked him what was his op n-ion with regard to the advisability of that aeroplane landing in Conception Bay in the vicin ty of Topsail and he was strongly of the opinion that it would be dangerous for a l oat of that kind. Most of us know there is quite a sea there with a north west wind. Accordingly I drafted a message to the High Comm ssioner stating what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had said and that the matter should be submitted to those promoting the flight on the other side, suggesting that either Trepassey or Bay Bulls B g Pond would be more advisable, as the waters are confined and there is very little sea as a rule on these waters. There is required at least two miles of water to take off and it wouldn't be possible to land in Quidi Vidi or the harbor here in St. John's. It would be only poss.ble to land and not get out. There would want to be water sufficient to take off and the hills surrounding not being too high. I think it will be agreed that we have taken proper precautions in respect of the flight. No request of any kind has been made of the Government or any body else outside of the people supplying fuel to take any interest in the flight. I am anticipating the High Commissioner's reply to-night.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to tomorrow Friday, July 22nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 22nd, 1927.

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

A Petition was presented by:

Mr. K. M. Brown, from Springdale, re Mail Service.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the attention of the Committee to that vote there under the heading of museum. Is that being paid to a gentleman that is already pensioned in respect to another department of the Government. There is not much justification for that sort of thing. What duty does he perform by the way. That is a very considerable salary in addition to his pension. Is their any particular advantage in retaining that office.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—There are certain services to be performed. I found him there when I assumed charge of the Department. With regard to his pen-

sion I know nothing at all about that.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, I have no particular objection to his holding that job, but I would like to see some evidence of that work that he is performing. If he is doing anything surely you can produce a report I understand that at the present time that gentleman is very busy compiling a history of his own.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member I may say that Mr. Howley was first in charge of that museum, and since his death, part of his work has been taken by Mr. Shortis. We have a large number of requests for articles to be placed in that museum, coming to the Government and they are placed there solely on the initiative of Mr. Shortis. Any official correspondence that came to the Department up to the time that Doctor Baker took charge, was handled by him. So that I say that in my opinion he gives good value for the money that he receives.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: I presume the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has had his attention drawn to the fact that there is quite a lot of berries canned in this country and some of them are put up very badly; the same applies to tinned rabbit which is put up in this country. There is a possibility of building up a good export trade in connection with both these articles, and I think that the Agriculture and Mines Department should have full control over the inspection of the packing and canning of berries and rabbit or any other article of food of that nature produced in this country. I have a letter here written by Messrs. Butler and Pulier of Boston and which appeared in the "Newfoundland Weekly" at Boston. It reads as follows:

(Reads)

I think that if a vote was put in the Estimates to cover inspection in connection with these two products mentioned it would be a move in the right direction. This is only an illustration, because there are three or four other parties in the United States who have bought some quantities of our bakeapples. The buyers were pleased with some cases, but in other cases they found blown tins in which these berries were packed. The condition of the goods did not attract the customers and some of them were returned to the shippers. It must be apparent I think to any one in this House that if we are to try and build up the country at all we got to pay attention to home productions. We have a large quantity of different kinds of wild berries in this country to-day and if some of our enterprising people would gather together the berries by paying a certain amount for them and then having them put up in tins in attractive fashion that quite an export trade and quite an industry could be started. It may be a matter of some years before the industry would reach respectable proportions, but one thing is certain that if the Agriculture and Mines Department would take an interest in the matter and take the advice of those who are interested in the buying of the berries that are in demand that they would furnish all the particulars necessary in order to satisfy the wants of the customers, such as the way the berries are to be packed and the kind required that much business would be done in that direction. I have had two or three letters from prospective purchasers of berries abroad asking me for information on the subject and I have to write to somebody picking these berries for information, whereas, if it was known that the Department of Agriculture and Mines was at their disposal they could communicate with the Department direct and get all the information they want. There are quite a few people in this town buy-

ing bakeapples in barrels and during the past couple of years some of them came in in good condition, but there were other vendors who did not care so long as they got clear of them and got their price for them. Some people put them up in barrels and the berries got burnt and the consequence is that the retailer here in St. John's loses money on the transaction and the result is that the buyer will not have anything more to do with that seller. That goes to show that somebody should be authorized to go around the country and inspect the packing of berries just as he would inspect salmon. If people are going to put up their food products the packages containing such products should bear the stamp of the department on them and if the packers do not carry out the regulations of the department they should pay the penalty. Berries, like salmon are food products and are for human consumption. If the Department of Agriculture and Mines would take this matter up seriously and get in touch with representative persons who are interested in this industry and see what form of regulations are required so that it may be fostered there are great possibilities ahead for the export of berries in this country. Take canned rabbit. It is common for retailers of this commodity in the city to find a number of tins blown. One retailer told me that he discovered 17 blown tins out of 48 and that it is common to find three or four blown tins in a single case. That shows that there is something necessary to be done by the Agriculture and Mines Department in order to encourage and foster this industry. Certain it is that if there was proper inspection of canned goods of all kinds going out of this country, particularly as regards tinned rabbit, we would not have to import so much tinned meats into this country as we have been doing, because the belief of the local trade is as well as from the trade outside that the local rabbit under proper supervision is far more palatable than the imported meats. When we got the opportunity ahead of us to foster the canned rabbit industry the Department of Agriculture and Mines should exercise its authority, and, as I said in the case of bake apples, they should call in people who have a thorough knowledge of packing and get to know the requirement in connection with the tinning of rabbit and have an inspector or two appointed, because I believe that after a few years you would have an industry worth while and one that would give employment to a large number of people in this country. Now take the matter of eggs. We have had some discussion already here upon the importation of eggs into this country and the discussion was brought about largely because purchasers have no instructions given them as to how they are able to tell a good egg from a bad egg. Shopkeepers in St. John's, Grand Falls and other places around the Island when buying eggs in the conduct of their businesses do not know a bad egg from a good one. The majority of shopkeepers when purchasing eggs do not know what they are like and the consequence is that when eggs are sent in here a lot of them are unfit for human consumption. Now what is the reason and what does this lead to? To-day we are having quite a large importation of eggs from Canada and the States because the retailers here will not trust themselves with local eggs at this season. If a shopkeeper goes to buy a quantity of eggs he prefers to pay 70c. a dozen for imported eggs in preference to paying 50c. a dozen for local eggs. That is a matter that could be also gotten over if the Department of Agriculture and Mines were to send out a circular to every retailer in the country or anybody

interested in the purchase of eggs informing them of the condition they are in when buying them.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES: Mr. Chairman: I agree entirely with remarks made by the honourable member for Twillingate with regard to the canning industry. There is no question about it but that serious injury must have been wrought to the various products that are reared in this country, that are exported from this country and that are sold in this country. Go into a store on one of our streets to-day and ask for a tin of salmon and when you open it you will find it is a tin of rabbit. I know of cases where cans of salmon and rabbit, many of them with the labels off them and marked wrongly with chalk and allowed to remain in stores until they got rusty and the look of the packages would take away one's appetite. But it is no use in the Government making rules and regulations unless they are prepared to stand by them. I know of men who packed lobster in a certain district and who put squids' heads in to fill up the cans. They may have been brought to justice and found guilty and sent to prison; but the delinquent may have pull with his member who gets busy and interferes with justice and the result is that the lawbreakers get off scot free. Then what happens is that their next-door neighbours do the same thing next year. Consequently, it is only a waste of time to pass laws regarding the protection of our products unless both sides of the House make up their minds to no longer play politics, but to get down to brass tacks and try and do something in the interests of the country as a whole. If public men continue to play party politics and the country generally has got to suffer then there is no hope for the fishermen, the farmer, the miner or the laborer until such time as men honestly get together and throw party politics to the winds and get down to business. Those of us who intend to spend the balance of our lives in this country; who have an honest desire to make this country fit for our children when we pass out from this sphere, altogether it is our bounden duty to see to it that all of our time at least is not wasted in playing politics. It would give me great pleasure to put my signature this afternoon to some documents to drive, for a few generations at least, party politics away from this House altogether. I would at least have the satisfaction of knowing some hours or some time were well spent in this House. I would like to be associated with some honourable member I felt had the same honest desire. There is no gainsaying the fact that Newfoundland today is confronted with very serious problems, and Newfoundland can only be saved by united action. I don't mind saying from my place in this House, it can only be saved by united action of public men, and I hope that united action won't be much longer staved off. There is no question about it that the fisheries are of all our industries the most important. It is the industry that is bound to play an important part in the future of Newfoundland and it is at present in a very hopeless position so far as our fisheries are concerned. The fishermen can no longer catch fish at six dollars and sell it at five. Somebody has got to go to the wall. Meantime the industry has, as I have said on several occasions, received no attention in the past. If we are to continue to play politics in the way we have been doing with the mining industry the fiisheries and other things it will be hard to get anything done. From what people outside are saying we are in this position, that if members of this House, Government and Opposition appear at a public meeting, they are presumed to be playing

party politics. I suppose because the country is small, everybody knows the other person; everybody knows the other one's business and politics are looked upon with a large amount of suspicion. Some people will suggest ninety-nine times out of a hundred the public acts of politicians are done with the intention of playing party politics and that they are trying to do something in the interests of self or party and not in the interests of country. I don't subscribe to such a position, neither do I find any great number who are the reverse of that. The Opposition are compelled to play politics because of the action of the Government, and the Government are compelled because of the action of the Opposition. No serious man inside or outside but will sanction that position. Here we are to-day and for one month we recommend stringent economy, because it is necessary in the interests of the people and now we ask to have voted ten and a half millions, and we can only show where we can make eight millions. This means we have to borrow two and one-half millions to square accounts and there are other propositions needing support and which mean extra expenditure, and which add to the burdens that are already too great. There is too much playing party politics; members so acting as to keep their party in power and the other out. Well, if we would make up our minds that we do not care for one instant which party is in power and if men would be big enough to rise to the occasion and put politics out of everything for at least four years, it is my honest conviction that if Newfound got a full four years clear of party politics it would be one of the most prosperous countries under the sun; our people the most contented in the British Empire. I did not intend this evening to make these remarks, because of my physical condition. I just came from home where I have been running a high temperature for three or four days, but I cannot allow the occasion to pass without going on record and I want to express these as my sentiments, and I want to be with any aggregation of men who are prepared to get up in their places and support the proposition that would put party politics a thousand miles away for at least four years, and give this country a chance to recover and get on her feet. I want to thank the honourable member for Twillingate and want to assure him his suggestions with regard to inspection of tinned berries and other produce is one that has my heartiest support. I will take the matter up with Mr. Bayly and see whether something cannot be done along these lines.

MR. GRIMES—I am sorry the Minister is not in better physical condition in order to be able to give full expression to his thoughts on the general financ al situation. A good deal that he has given expression to I have thought myself and a good deal of time might be spent on discussion along these lines, at the same time I do not intend to delay the House any longer on the subject any more than to say that I subscribe to a good deal of what he says, and I am thankful that the matter I referred to is going to be looked into. I trust that someth ng can be done along these lines to help along that industry.

MR. HIBBS—I would just like to direct a question or two to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. I am sorry too that he is not very well and that his throat is not well and do not wish to trouble him too much, I would just l ke to know if they have received those statistics which were complied last Spring. I wonder if there is any report to table.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—The report is not ready for the printer yet.

MR. HIBBS—Have you an Agricultural Report?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—No.

MR. HIBBS—I notice the vote for Agriculture has dropped from twenty thousand to fifteen thousand. I wonder if that is a gradual abandoning of agriculture altogether. I would also like to know what the Government intends doing with regard to the request of Sir Robert Bond.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—The Prime Minister has been in communication with the Executor Dr. Bond and I think asked him if he would continue the working of the farm this season to give the Government an opportunity to think the matter over.

MR. HIBBS—You have not refused it.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—No.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, that matter brought up by the honourable member for Twillingate seems to be a matter that the House should take notice of and see if the Agriculture and Mines Office could inspect every can of rabbits or berries leaving this country and going into the United States. I know a certain place in Boston, a short distance from Boston there is a man who supplies Newfoundlanders with canned lobster and salmon. They go there and look for it and I know that in that place they have received tins of food and tins of lobster that were not fit for consumption and it is a great pity if we can get a market for that commodity if the department cannot put an inspector on such as we have in the Fisheries Department. I think even if we have to pass another vote it would be something worth looking into. If people buy canned lobster and rabbit and salmon and find that they get rotton and are not fit for consumption they are not going to go back again and it is giving the country a black eye. The point taken by the member for Twillingate is a point I think the House should consider this evening and see if we could not improve on that. I do not know how it should be done but I think it should be done and if the Minister of Ariculture and Mines wants more help to carry out inspection I think this House should increase the vote.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I quite appreciate the attitude taken by honourable members with reference to canned food leaving this country. I remember some three years ago having a conversation with Mr. John Devine who is now in New York. Mr. Devine took the matter up, there, of the opening up of trade avenues on behalf of merchants in Newfoundland, and he wanted naturally to introduce products of Newfoundland in every possible way into New York and any part of the United States and he told me of the tremendous difficulties he had and these difficulties were in the line of what has been suggested. He went round to delicatessen stores and other places himself and got these people to buy certain commodities, Newfoundland salmon, lobster; I don't know about rabbit, but I do know these two articles were purchased from him and when he went round to try and get renewal orders he generally got the answer that the articles he had sold and recommended had turned out in many cases to be absolutely rotten and that is the way trade is lost and it was hopeless to go and look for orders if no improvement was made on that in Newfoundland. However some advance is made with regard to lobster. We haven't had any in the past three years but it was found that at some of the lobster factories, lobster was put up very badly as referred to this afternoon by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, putting in codsheads, packing the lobster badly and all that kind of thing. Of course if that con-

tinued the lobster fishery would become absolutely worthless, but the men sending out lobster found it in their interests to have it inspected. I have been in Mr. Harris' store and seen his methods. A tin is taken out of each case and opened and any suspicious looking tin, blown or dented. is taken out. The result was that our lobster got to a very high place in the markets of the world. It was no trouble to sell Newfoundland lobster. With that and with the other articles mentioned, berries and rabbit, it is only a matter of looking into the methods whereby we can put into effect the ideas and suggestions expressed in this debate and I feel sure that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whose departments are directly concerned can devise some means whereby we can assist the trade in this direction.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister, in respect to that twenty thousand dollar vote for the encouragement of agriculture that has been cut down to fifteen thousand whether that will necessitate the curtailment of the service. Why I am asking this is that I am getting a number of applications from the district of Fortune Bay appertaining to bulls, rams, etc, and I find the Department unable to meet the demands. I am wondering if that is the reason, that the curtailment of the vote means that you are not able to give the facilities that were formerly given. Is that the position.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Of course we won't be able to do as much with fifteen thousand as with twenty thousand.

DR. MOSDELL—Well then, I am safe in advising my constituents that the Department of Agriculture and Mines is gradually cutting down on that assistance, such as sending out Government bulls for instance

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—No, I think we have seventy five or eighty scattered around the country.

DR. MOSDELL—I have been unable to get that assistance for a place with thirty or forty head and I thought that reduction might explain the difficulty.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman: It might be that we will have to ask for that five thousand to be put back again and I have not played politics with this vote as every other district has received the same treatment as the district I have the honor to represent. I think we have done wonderfully well with the small amount at our disposal. We have done some practical work. But I don't want to claim credit for it. I want to give one hundred per cent. of the credit to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Bayly, who is most energetic and very well qualified in my opinion. Last year we found on the South Coast, along that section of the country right from Port aux Basques to Fortune Bay, we found a large number of barrels of potatoes were imported from Prince Edward Island and other sections of Canada year after year and very little if any local produce was sold there. About this time last year therefore we got in touch with Mr. Downey, the ex-Minister of Agriculture and Mines and we sent Mr. Downey to the South Coast as a commercial traveller to sell orders on behalf of local producers. Previously Mr. Bayly had gone to St. George's and gave illustrated lectures with regard to agricultural subjects. Mr. Bayly impressed upon the farmers of the West Coast that it was absolutely impossible to market their products unless they were graded properly, unless potatoes were put up properly in clean sacks not the very opposite as often happens; sometimes a farmer may receive a couple of tons of coal in sacks and dump the coal out and put potatoes in ,and until very recently no at-

tempt was made to grade potatoes. Potatoes the size of marbles were put in with big ones and you might find Irish Cobblers and Early Roses all in the one sack. It is an uphill fight to do anything for agriculture but we have been doing our best and as a result of Mr. Downey's going on the South Coast and Mr. Bayly on the West Coast we succeeded last year in marketing eight thousand barrels of potatoes and I am informed that quite a number of the people to whom potatoes were sent last year were perfectly satisfied and are going to give repeat orders, but I am sorry to say that that is not the case for one hundred per cent. of those supplied. Sections of the island it was found did not send the article that was wanted and for which people paid and some persons were dissatisfied and we are going to have some trouble. However I distinctly gave them to understand last year that all I was going to do or the Department was going to do was to give any definite assistance but we did not assume any responsibility, and if they did not want to put up the kind of article wanted the Department of Agriculture and Mines was not in any way responsible, the responsibility lay with themselves. The Department of Agriculture and Mines was not going into business. I think we are doing some real work with regard to the encouragement of agriculture in a small way, and perhaps if we are going to have any increased demands over last year that five thousand may be put back and after all if this country is going under that five thousand for the encouragement of agriculture is not going to save it. While I am prepared to submit to the ruling of the House that amount of fifteen thousand dollars is very small and all I can say is that I will do the best I can with the means at my disposal. I don't think we can be expected to work miracles. It must be considered to that for the last fifteen years that vote has been about fifty thousand.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I am sorry I led the Minister into any such extended remarks for I don't think he is in condition to talk at length. I am sorry particularly he is not in condition to give an address in connection with his Department, because if we have any one man more practical and useful than another in charge of a department it is the Honourable Minister who has just taken his seat. It was my intention only to ascertain whether or not the reduction of the vote from twenty thousand to fifteen thousand would curtail certain services. I know he is going to make the most of the vote whether it is fifteen thousand or twenty thousand, and going to see it expended impartially. I have to say that of him, for I found him very sympathetic and very obliging on every occasion that I had to make a request of him. I do hope if he has got to curtail because of this reduction it may be possible to restore that vote to the former amount.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I think the Government should take that suggestion. I do feel that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is very seriously handicapped by that small vote of fifteen thousand. When we make that suggestion of course we run the risk of being accused of trying to increase expenditure and of course that is what it amounts to, but still I think we should get some returns if that five thousand dollars be wisely and efficiently expended. I think the country will get good returns and I think it is economically unwise and foolish policy to cut down that small vote. I really think it would be a sound economical move on the part of the Government to restore that vote to the original amount of twenty thousand. I think it is a great mistake as the vote is too small altogether.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman. I would support the suggestion of the honourable member for Twillingate with regard to the advisability of the Department of Agr culture and Mines making an investigation and interesting itself in the matter of locally tinned foods, berries and so on. I have listened with great attention to the honourable M nister's remarks on the general situation of the country and general conditions and I trust that the sentiments he expressed will fasten themselves on the minds of the whole House and if it does terminate to any fruition no doubt the result will be satisfactory but it is almost too much to hope for. It is like speaking of the millenium. No doubt we all realize what we are up against, as members of this legislature and representatives of the country, and whether it is party government that all will be imbued with the idea of doing the best they can and that they will have the courage of their convictions, and try to put into effect what they think should be put into effect. Now with regard to that vote of $15,000, I know that the Min ster of Agriculture and Mines will allocate that vote impartially. That is from a political point of view. We all have that opinion of him. If any one district in the island requires allocations for agricultural propositions and does not get them it will not be his fault. But there is a shortage of funds and whether it is ten thousand or twenty thousand we will have to put up w.th it, and do the best that we can under the circumstances. It is impossible to ask for all the money that should be spent for agricultural purposes at the present time.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

MR. RUSSELL—In reference to the matter that has been referred to, I would like to ask the Minister if any steps have been taken to try and finalize this matter, the matter of a first clerk. It has been in slings now for about eighteen months. I think it is time the matter was finalized. There is some reason why the matter has been held up, perhaps the consideration of a purchasing agent, or something of that nature. But I must admit that I would like to know why the matter of an appointment of a first clerk has not been attended to. I know that about eighteen months ago I recommended the appointment of Mr. Eaton, but for some reason or other that was never confirmed. Possibly the Prime Minister can enlighten us as to why the matter has been delayed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the hon. member I may say that we have been giving consideration to some readjustment in some other departments, that may mean the transference of a clerk, and we proposed transferring him to that department. We have not decided on the matter yet. It is largely tied up in that proposition that I explained in connection with the Board of Health and the Charities Department, that has to be straightened out, and it has been largely held up until we see whether Doctor Parsons is able to take charge of that. That has been to some extent the reason for no readjustment in that direction.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, arising out of the remarks of the honourable member for Trinity, as to what is the policy of the Government now w.th regard to purchasing of supplies now for the various departments, if he had studied the last copy of the report by the Auditor General, and references that are made to the system under which orders are being placed for supplies, he would find, that in the last report but one the Auditor General called attention to the fact that the provisions of the Audit Act in respect to the placing of such supplies should be carried out. I notice that in the next report still further emphasis is laid on the matter. He called

attention to the necessity of placing such orders by contract. As a matter of fact he called any other procedure as illegal. He further advised that the Department should be supplied with monthly price lists so as to find out where best to place orders for supplies. I presume you scatter around the orders for supplies among the various business men without getting any contracts for food supplies in the number of items that are related. Would the Minister mind saying whether the recommendation of the Auditor General is being taken into account, or if the policy of the Board of Works is still to continue the old method.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, as I stated now that we intended to do that but we find it very hard to do that. We get monthly reports, and we follow those. We have on the board there a man to scrutinise all these accounts. If I noticed in those accounts 5 p.c. overcharge, we would send back those accounts regularly, and would not repeat the orders to those people. We made lots of enemies, by it. But until we know that things were got down to stable prices, and call for tenders we could not make any improvement. That may come in time. We may appoint a purchasing agent, if we find that we can get the right man. We may get a man but we will have to pay him a large salary, possibly two men may be needed.

DR. MOSDELL—Was there ever a purchasing agent there?

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I understand that there was. But I do not know what his duties were. But I can guarantee that since I took this over last year, I do not think that there could be one dollar saved on purchases.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, as member of the Board of Works I would like to have something to say about this. I was formerly convinced that the proper thing to do was to have a purchasing agent. I am not convinced now that it is good policy. Mr. Harris is an extremely efficient servant in that department. He has lots of experience and checks every bill that comes into that Department. He can make a comparative statement, as to what the various prices charged by the various grocers may be Somebody may say that by giving an order to Mr. Brophy on a back street, you are not getting as good value, as you would get from Ayre & Sons for instance, on Water Street. But the difference in price is infinitesimal. It is surprising how close the prices are for small articles. I was convinced, through that investigation that the department is buying as well as it possibly can. I mentioned here early in the Session that the paper that is opposed to us now and was in favor of Mr. Brophy in the last bye-election. That paper shouted out, when Mr. Brophy was on our side, that we were giving him patronage, and stated how much he got. I claimed when we came in here this year, that it did not matter to me how much patronage he got if his prices were right, and I claimed that they were. Not only would it be detrimental to the interests of Mr. Brophy to say that they were wrong, but it would be detrimental also to the interests of the Government that bought the goods, and I make the statement now that all goods bought by the Board of Works Department were bought as nearly right, as possible. But supposing we had a Purchasing Agent we would have to pay him a big salary, then you cannot be perfectly sure that we are going to get the proper co-operation from him. It is quite a difficult proposition and as the honourable member for St. John's E. has said there was for a time a purchasing agent appointed here to that department several years ago. Since then there has been a certain imputed blemish on

his character. I only mention that to show that you cannot be perfectly sure that if we do appoint a person that we will get somebody that we can reply on. Consequently if the prices are anyway near right, I cannot see how we can improve on the present system.

MR. RUSSELL—I would like to say a word in reference to the work of that Department. From the time I was Minister of Public Works until I terminated the duties of my office, during the time even before the Prime Minister became a member of the Board, we were purchasing all goods at the lowest possible price. We very often had to send back bills and demand that the prices be reduced before they were paid. That meant getting into trouble with the friends of the party and those that we were purchasing goods from. I would like to add a word of praise in respect to the work of Mr. Harris, the Deputy Minister, who has been a good official in that department in scrutinizing the bills and looking over them and sending them on to the other clerks. The bills pass through his hands before they reach the Minister's hands. I have this to say that the Department of Public Works at that time was doing all it possibly could, as well as some other Departments, to save a hundred dollars here and a thousand elsewhere. But my claim is, and I know that certain members of the Government will agree with me, that since the Monroe Party was elected to power in 1924 the chief part of that Government, the Executive Government, has not been as careful in looking after the expenditure of money over which they have had direct control and charge as they should have been. The Department of Public Works especially when I was in charge, was trying to save and economize, and I, as head of the Department, was doing this to my own political detriment. The Executive Government has very often sent letters to the heads of the Department asking them to practice retrenchment and economy when it has not itself done so in connection with the expenditure of millions of dollars. Some of the members of the Government are looking in my face now and I know that they agree with me in what I say. When I was Minister of Public Works I was told that letters were going to be sent by the Government to the heads of the Departments in reference to the practice of economy. I served notice verbally to the effect that it was time for the Executive Government to write letters to itself regarding retrenchment and economy. But I rose to add a word to what the Prime Minister said in reference to purchases and prices in that Department, and I do not think that very much better could be done. Certain it is that while you have the old system in vogue it will be very difficult to have a purchasing agent, and especially when you have on the Board certain members, and I do not say this disparagingly of anyone, who are interested in securing orders for themselves. It would be very difficult under these circumstances, for the members of the Board or of the Department to agree to have a purchasing agent, no matter how much it would save.

MR. GRIMES—Mr Chairman, in reference to the matter of institutions, and the supplying for them, I quite agree with what has been said as to the value of the services of Mr. Harris, particularly in the scrutinizing of the bills that come before him. A man with long experience can render good service in that way. But I disagree with the idea of giving patronage into the hands of three or four individuals. I think that the small grocer on the back street is entitled to some consideration provided that all things are equal. They carry over the labourers and working men all through the Winter season, on their books, and give

them time to get their bills paid up. If they were to go down on Water Street and ask for the same consideration they would be turned down. If we were to depend on the Water Street stores for the accommodation of the labourers and the working men during the winter season, we would have to distribute relief to some hundreds of men in this city. It is only fair therefore that when you are distributing your orders, and any of them come along and ask for consideration providing that they are giving fair prices, they ought to receive that consideration.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman when I made reference to the remarks of the Auditor General, and his recommendation in regard to the issuing of supplies in institutions, I was not concerned with Mr. Harris or anybody else. I have no reason for making an attack on that gentleman. Judging from what has been said, as a member of the Board of Works, there is no reason why anything but praise should be given to that gentleman. The Minister of Public Works has said and the Prime Minister has endorsed his claim that the system at present in vogue at the department in connection with the issuing of supplies, is the best, that can be adopted under the circumstances. Well I have no reason to doubt their word as to that. But the point that I wished to draw the attention of the Committee to is this that the Auditor General seems to have this matter of the method of issuing the orders for supplies on his mind. He claims that the present method is not strictly legal. He advocates a reversion to the old order. My claim is that if the gentleman in charge of the Board of Works finds that the most beneficial system, is the present one, that the only possible and and legal course is to abolish the procedure as at present stipulated by law. As I understand from the Auditor General's report, supplies of $500 or over should be given as a result of tender and contract. The honourable member in charge of the Department, and a member of the Board says that he finds it better to adopt another procedure, and he does not think it advisible to abandon procedure, and revert to the old order. If you find it to be of more benefit to the country, why not abolish the old procedure and regularize the new procedure and shut out the Auditor General from continually harping on this old system.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, with regard to main roads, I may say that a petition was presented here this session from the residents of Ireland's Eye in the District of Trinity, asking for the sum of $100 to repair the main line to Ivanhoe. Now it seems that the request of those petitioners is ignored. If there is one place in Newfoundland from which the people should get a good hearing it is from Ireland's Eye, whether it be a question of main lines or anything else. The people of Ireland's Eye are independent and never looked for or never got anything in the way of relief from any Government and their request in the present instance is a bona fide one. I would ask the Minister of Public Works to take a note of this and if there is no special vote whereby this necessary public work can be done I suppose we will only have to take it out of the ordinary grant. Roads and bridges that are falling down must be kept up and of course there are other places in the district where it is absolutely necessary for special grants to be made to repair railway connecting roads. Small grants cannot keep up the small bridges much less the roads, and that is why we have to take money from loans every year for the upkeep of roads and bridges, so it is just as well to face it now and have a re-adjustment of main line grants. I trust that the Government will not hesitate to give

the Minister of Public Works authority to allocate money to fix roads and bridges which are in a bad state of disrepair in Trinity District. The Minister of Public Works is a responsible, conservative, cautious official and all can rest assured that he will not unwisely or extravagantly spend public moneys.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I notice that the Government saw fit to allocate $1800.00 for repairs to Deer Lake—Bonne Bay road. I am very glad to see this vote in the Estimates, although I do not suppose that the vote will be anything like adequate to put that road in condition, if it is going to be used as a motor road. However, I am grateful to the Government for having made a beginning by putting in this vote. During the past two years a great deal of traffic went over this road and chiefly by tractors. I do not know whether Goodyears gave any help towards the road for the using they gave it, but I do know that Simpson and Company at Lomond have spent considerable money of their own repairing it and putting it in condition for motor car traffic. I had the pleasure of a motor car drive over that road last summer, and I feel sure that, if any other member of this House had the same opportunity of that drive and viewed the magnificent scenery as I saw it, and taking into consideration the connection that road has in the interior of the country in the way it has, he would subscribe to the proposition that the road must be taken care of. Now the next question is how is the Government going to spend that $1800.00. Personally, I do not want to see any of it wasted. I do not know whether the Minister has in mind any system at present of spending that money, as I would like for him to keep it in abeyance until we have a conversation with a view to having the vote spent to the best advantage. I have no political consideration in the matter. My chief reason is to see this road kept in good condition for the convenience of sportsmen and the public generally. Last year Simpson and Company did a lot of repairs to the road at their own expense and I think that the money voted this year should be utilized on the Lomond end of the road first, as that section needs the most attention at present.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if any consideration has been given the petition I presented in the House from the people of Belleoram with regard to a public building. They made a request in connection with a certain building that would be suitable for the purpose. Have you any idea of trying to accede to the request?

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—What exactly was done about that I really forget. I will see and let you know. We purchased one in Harbor Breton, I just forget about Belleoram.

DR. MOSDELL—In some discussion on that one hundred and fifty thousand dollars for roads, bridges and public works being cut out from the estimates some reference was made in the House to the effect that there might be a loan raised later on and an amount taken from the loan then to make up that one hundred and fifty thousand and not only that but I understood the Government would out of that loan pay more special attention to those districts in respect of their roads, bridges and other public works that had not received any benefit from highroads expenditure. Why I have called attention to that matter is because I think now is the proper time for the Prime Minister to make clear the intention of the Government and we may have some assurance with

regard to special moneys which are needed and be able to reassure the people who are asking us about them.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — The Finance Minister felt that it better not go in the Estimates as it would have to come out of a loan, but it will be used for the same purpose.

DR. MOSDELL—And it is the intention to give districts that did not benefit from the highroads policy preference in respect to the distribution of that one hundred and fifty thousand and in the various districts?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman; With reference to that amount of one hundred and fifty thousand I am of opinion that that is absolutely inadequate to meet the demands being made on representatives of districts and I do not think that districts having received the advantage from the highroads should on that account necessarily get a smaller proportion. Certain parts of districts in which other parts have benefitted from the highroads did not receive one cent and it would not be fair that they now should be cut out from this other money. There are bridges down and main roads out of repair hopelessly all over the country and one hundred and fifty thousand dollars would be far from sufficient and personally I am in favor of at least five hundred thousand.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I am sorry that vote of one hundred and fifty thousand is not in the estimates this year because if it were there even if it was taken from a loan that one hundred and fifty thousand would be divided per capita amongst the districts. Now of course we are at the mercy of the good-will of the Executive Government. I think the Prime Minister has been very cautious. I do not think that he gave any assurance with regard to preference to districts as suggested by Dr. Mosdell. There was some intimation of his ideas but not what would be called an assurance. I wish we had confidence in each other with regard to the necessary spending of money in the country whether it be Opposition or Government. Personally I would like to see money for these purposes spent by a commission and have it clear of politics. Let elected representatives give their opinions and recommendations with regard to the necessities of the district as they know them and let them give information to the commission. It is a pity that we can't keep all expenditure of money clear of politics altogether. Anyhow we only have to submit to things as they are and I don't suppose there will be any change. I trust that when the Government introduces a loan bill and we give authority to the Minister of Public Works to spend the money that there will be no discrimination with regard to any section of the country whether Opposition or Government districts. I think that the money should be spent, first where absolutely necessary for transportation no difference where it is, and then if there be any balance left after what is absolutely necessary has been properly attended to let that be distributed.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman: On the question now before the Chair I want to say that it affects me very materially, with regard to bridges, roads and other public works. The Prime Minister did not give an assurance. He only gave his own opinion as to the expenditure of that one hundred and fifty thousand dollars or five hundred thousand dollars as the case may be. Now I want to say this that I don't like the idea of certain members of this House taking it that because a district benefitted from the expenditure of money under the highroads policy that such district should be cut off then from all special monies to be granted for repairs to local

roads and bridges. That is not fair. You can't possibly get to Placentia and St. Mary's or Harbour Grace or Bay de Verde unless you go by water or build new roads unless you pass through the district of Harbour Main and is it because Harbour Main got the benefit of good roads passing through it that it should be deprived of any further moneys badly needed for other roads in the district. We should get our share of the local money too. There are bridges broken down and roads in need of repair all over the country and I have such bridges and roads in my district and I have this what many districts have not got and that is that while the main highway that passes through Harbour Main is a main highway for the general public we have branch roads known as local roads over every mile and these go in for miles. These have to be kept in repair. There are bridges that must be kept in repair, which are most invaluable to the residents of the locality, wherever the money comes from, unless you ask the people to repair their own bridges, and roads, which we are not in the position to do to-day because we are afraid to go to the country on that policy. So I say that if the $150,000 was voted and we were to get in on a per capita basis then of course I would be satisfied, and make the best we possibly can of it, but we must get the money this year for local roads. And I want to say that they have been totally neglected the last few years. Attention has been paid to the highroads but the local roads especially in the district of Harbour Main and between St. John's and Harbour Main have been neglected. And the people there must get their roads and their bridges kept up, because they make a living out of their farms and they need good roads to get their products to the markets. I do not intend to delay the House but I just wanted to put myself on record as saying that whatever else the Government does you must keep up your bridges, rebuild them and put the local roads in repair, and as one hon. member in this House has said, it is a pity that we have not more confidence in each other. We should have conferences on the matter and settle the matter to the satisfaction of every member of the House. I say spend a million if you can afford it on special roads. While I am prepared to fight for my own district I also want to say a word for the district of St. George's. Last year when on a visit to the West Coast, which is a big stretch of beautiful country, rich agricultural country, such roads I never saw in my life, to travel over. Rivers to try to pass, broken down bridges. Now there is a road from Stephenville which was built during my time as Minister of Public Works. It was surveyed and built by a man named Taylor. He made a really good job of building that road. Last year I am sorry to say the condition of that road was simply terrible. Of course at the time that that road was built there was very little traffic on it. I saw heavy loads drawn along that road by large teams of horses through slush and mud. I think it is unfair that special consideration is not given to the people living around there. I know that the hon. member has pleaded hard with the present Government, and it is no fault on the part of the present representative. But he requires really a special grant to take in that valuable country, if he wants to encourage agricultural settlement.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: May I ask the Minister what the Deputy head has to do.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the hon. member I may say, that he does the general work of the

whole department. He sees that the accountants are doing their work. He sees that the salaries are sent out. If there is any correspondence between the Government and ourselves in connection with the putting in of new offices around the country, I give instructions to the Deputy and he sees that the orders are carried out.

MR. GRIMES—Does not Mr. Campbell do a considerable portion of that work?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — He is secretary-treasurer, financial controller and everything that the Minister is not. Part of his duty is to look after the whole machinery. It is a big department. And as you are aware, all the heads of that department require to be looked after from the captain to the cook.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: with regard to this vote for overtime, I may say that I asked a question earlier in the session as to the amount of overtime paid by the department from January 1st, 1926, to December 31st, 1926, and the reply I got was that there were $5,241.53 paid for overtime within that period by the Postal Telegraph branch and $7,-644.19 by the Post Office branch, or a total of $12,885.72. I think that is a very large expenditure for overtime and really I thought that with your revised estimates of last year and in view of the special effort that was made by the Government to put this department in A-1 condition we would not be subjected to such a big amount for overtime. According to this list I have before me, nearly everyone in the Department of Posts and Telegraph shared in this overtime from a dollar to hundreds. At all events, I do not intend to delay the business of the House because I do not feel like saying anything further in this House fearing I would be misrepresented in the public press. The Government have played their game so well and the Opposition are so weak in regard to the publication of debates that we are at the mercy of newspapers and their reporters and they simply put in anything they like in the Government newspapers. A member may honestly make a remark or a statement and everything that precedes or comes after that statement is left out and a person is held up to public ridicule. Therefore, it is only adding insult to injury to have anything to say here now on any subject. Consequently, I think it is just as well for members of the Opposition generally to let the Estimates go through. Of course, this House has nothing to do with controlling newspaper reports, and, perhaps, I may be called thin-skinned regarding any remarks I made in this House. It seems that there are two codes of ethics, one for private life and one for political life so far as newspapers and their reports are concerned. I feel sure that if I were in argument in a personal way I would not be misrepresented, but when it comes down to politics it seems that some public men think it is alright to misrepresent a man for political purposes. When a report in the press would involve the Government that they support in difficulty or show up any weakness on their part it is considered alright on the part of that newspaper to keep back the truth, and you know that a lie that looks the truth is the worst kind of a lie. Therefore, I think it is only useless for me to say anything in this House. I made a few remarks the other day about education and if there is one subject more than another that should receive the serious attention of this House and this country it is education. I was speaking of my experience in connection with the teaching profession of many years ago. I was wrongly reported in the "Daily News" as stating what was happening at the present day

and I was brought to book. The "Evening Telegram" is out this afternoon holding me up to ridicule and contempt because I spoke about the inspection of schools. Here is what it says:

(Reads)

Well did you ever hear such bunkum? We are voting away here one million dollars for education and the people who administer education in this country are public servants just the same as the men who are employed to sweep the streets are. But it appears that these educationalists are above suspicion and above criticism, according to the Government press. We dare not ask questions as to what work they perform and what schools they inspected unless we are prepared to be held up to public opprobrium and ridicule. However, I trust that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will cut down the vote for overtime and make it less than what it was last year. I would like to know who is doing Mr. Stott's work since he was pensioned, because it seems that Mr. Veitch, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Small, Mr. Crocker, and Mr. Armstrong are engaged in doing the same work now that Mr. Stott and Mr. Veitch did. Mr. Curtis does no operating now; Mr. Small is confined to repair work and Mr. Crocker spends most of his time assisting Mr. Veitch and Mr. Armstrong's is a new appointment looking after the telephone work.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman: I am sorry that my friend Mr. Halfyard does not seem to be in good fettle this evening. I am sure I have listened to him with the greatest attention and respect. With regard to his question, I may say that when Mr. Stott was Superintendent of the Postal Telegraphs Department, Mr. Veitch was his assistant. Then, Mr. Stott was pensioned and Mr. Veitch was appointed in his place and Mr. Curtis, who was then operator and assistant to Mr. Veitch has been appointed in Mr. Veitch's place and is acting in the same capacity to Mr. Veitch as Mr. Veitch acted to Mr. Stott. With the establishment of cables and wireless stations around the coast Mr. Crocker was placed in charge of that particular work and a clever chap he is. As to Mr. Armstrong, with the extension of the telephone lines he was appointed, as it was found necessary to have a man in charge of that service and keep it in order and also to see that rentals are paid regularly and to keep after the operators and see that they do their work. This telephone service may not pay for itself right away, but it will eventually. With regard to the running of the Post Office department. It was stated here recently that there were eight more officials in our department since we took office. Now I want to point out that there are 12 officials less in the General Post Office and East End Post office since we took charge, so I think that is a pretty good showing in pursuance of our policy of "clean up, keep clean, and a square deal to all."

The point then that I wish to call your attention to is the fact that the Audtior General in his report states that for the first year in the history of the Posts and Telegraphs Department since the Telegraph system was introduced in 1898 that

(Reads)

For the first time in the history of the Posts and Telegraphs Department we kept within our income, so I think we are doing very well, and I will repeat in my case what has been said in another connection that if there is any man in the House who can do better, alright, I am prepared to hand over the control of that department at a moment's notice. It must be considered too that it is only a public utility. It is not like other departments. It must veer and haul

and get along as best it can with the money at its disposal. Now we are economising. We have a system and a very good staff. I have heard no complaints. I get no complaints apart from that it has happened that officials have not had their work up to date, have not had their returns in for stamps, duty and such things, and the rule has been made that until returns are sent in salaries will not be sent out and there have been complaints on that account. Our accountant will not send out salaries while those returns are outstanding for stamps and duty and so on. We have been having some difficulty on that account and complaints have been made and letters written, I have been told, to the Prime Minister because of salaries being held back. However I don't care whether it is the King or the Prime Minister I am prepared to do my duty, and I know the Prime Minister will clap me on the back for doing what is right and honest. I want to emphasise this matter because when once the officials get into that system and realise that they are not going to get their salaries whilst returns are not in, the matter will be much more satisfactory. Now I want to read out this statement. It will show you that we are economising.

(Reads)

Now I would like to ask the honourable member to read the report of the Department of Posts and Telegraphs. Of course I know that they may not consider it very interesting reading. Perhaps they would much prefer another book and find it much more interesting, for instance that little book "Up along down under," but I would advise them to read our report for this year.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Russell gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, July 25th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 25th, 1927.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reported certain resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Department of Agriculture
and Mines $112,160.66
Department of Public
Works $962,093.04

The said resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs, it is not my intention to make any extended remarks because, as I have previously stated here, that nothing would be gained by speaking to the votes as long as public newspapers go out of their way to misrepresent anything that I say in this House. I think I am only doing what I consider my

duty to call attention to an incorrect and erroneous statement that appeared in the press and which misrepresents things as they really are. Now I have no fault to find with the head of the Department of Posts and Telegraphs for presenting his case for the Department he superintends. It is part of his business to try and make as good a showing as possible, and if he thinks he is going to get any credit for his management by making comparisons he is welcome to it so far as I am concerned. I will let that slide because the Minister is a very genial person and, no doubt, is managing his Department as best he knows how, and if the Department is not being run properly, if I were in his place, I would censure some of the clerks because certainly you have appointed a number of officials who are supposed to have the necessary qualifications for their jobs, and altogether you have engaged a considerable amount of help over and above what was in the Department three years ago, as all you have to do is to go through the departmental votes to find it out, and if there is any Department in the civil service from an administrative point of view that should be managed properly and right it is the Department of Posts and Telegraphs; but when a newspaper goes out of its way to give misleading information and convey erroneous impressions it is my place as a public man to take notice of it. Sometimes statements are made on matters, perhaps, legislative matters, through ignorance or for the want of knowing better and sometimes statements are inadvertently, though not intentionally, made, and we can overlook anything of that nature; but when we have an editorial column in the "Daily News" written by persons we imagine know or should know what they are writing about then we are inclined to criticise the motives behind that statement.

Mr. Chairman, it will be remembered that since this House has been in session, a paper called "The Daily Tribune" published what is generally known as the Buchan's Mine Act, and I understand an important clause in that act was not printed, and I understand since then it was the fault of a person handling the linotype at the time who inadvertently, not intentionally, left it out, and the Minister of Finance and Customs was very much exercised at the time over what he naturally considered as misrepresentation. If any paper is going to publish an Act they certainly should publish all the clauses of the Act. I agree with that. Then he asked a question from two or three members on this side of the House, "Who is the editor of the Daily Tribune?" Now I may just as reasonably ask the Minister who is the editor of the Daily News? I feel quite sure that no Member of this House would intentionally give any editor of a newspaper whether it be the Daily News or Telegram, or Tribune or Fishermen's Advocate, any credit for misrepresentation. I might very pointedly, Mr. Chairman, ask the Prime Minister whether he was interested in the Daily News or not because he thought I was interested in the paper on that other occasion, and I told him I was not. I know the Prime Minister is not interested in the Daily News in any way and I am not interested in the other paper in any way, and I told that to the Prime Minister and I asked him to take back his statement. I know certain statements have been made, accusations, if you like, charges, or insinuations, have been made from one side to the other and Members have got up to a point of order and asked the person making the statement to take it back when they denied its correctness. But I am not to get that courtesy.

With regard to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs asked the House

to read the report of his Department for the year ending June 30, 1926. I became interested and succeeded in getting a copy of the report. On page six of the report the revenue and expenditure is given for 1918, 1919 and 1925, 1926. Now the Daily News paper went out of its way to make a comparison of the years 1923-24 and 1926-27.

(Reads)

I don't question the correctness of that. It may be alright.

(Reads)

Alright; stop at that. Now they go back to 1918-19.

(Reads)

Here is where it comes in and gives your humble servant a rub the wrong way.

(Reads)

"The expenditure in the Posts and Telegraphs jumped amazingly as soon as it became a Department." The person who wrote that knows that expenditure in connection with every department jumped amazingly 1918-19 and 1920-21.

(Reads)

The person who wrote that was either ignorant or went out of his way to misrepresent matters. Either one or the other, viciousness or ignorance caused these statements to be made. Take the estimates 1919-20 what do we find there? If we take the trouble to compare them with the estimates for 1920-21 we find:

(Reads)

What was the cause of that? Take the salaries that were voted in 1918-19 and 1920-21, in the Posts and Telegraphs Department there was a 10% per cent. increase in 1919-20, and the next year 1920-21 there was a further increase, and in September, 1919, previous to the general election of October, 1919, the Posts and Telegraphs Association made a request to the Government of the day for an increase, which meant about one hundred per cent. increase, over a hundred per cent. for operators' salaries, and the Government promised them the increase. When the other government came in power of course that government granted the increase. But everything went up. 1920-21 was the peak of expenditure in every Department. Our expenditure was away above anything before. Not only in this country, but everywhere else.

(Reads)

In 1918, that was mostly salaries:

(Reads)

The next year:

(Reads)

The cost of living had gone up fifty to a hundred per cent and the salaries had to be increased.

(Reads)

I defy anyone to say anything to me or those associated with me with regard to the economical running of that Department, but people want to give a wrong impression even though one may have done the best he could when having the responsibility of being the head of a Department.

I would ask the Minister to compare his ordinary expenditure with the ordinary expenditure of 1921-22 and 1922-23 and 23-24. For 1924-25 the ordinary expenditure was:

(Reads)

And if they want to make a comparison why not compare with 1921-22, the ordinary expenditure.

It doesn't suit those people to make comparisons unless they can make it appear that everybody else who had anything to do with Government were robbers and spendthrifts. I have tried to show the misrepresentation with regard to the expenditure for the years 1918-19 compared with 1920-21. That is misleading in every respect. Now let us come down to present day expenditure. The comparison of 1918-19 and 1920-21 shows:

(Reads)

The comparison of steam subsidies and salaries shows:

(Reads)

Everything had to be increased. Now get down to present day and see how we are getting on. Now this paper goes on to say:

(Reads)

'Economical administration has resumed its throne." It was dethroned when your humble servant went there as head of the Department and now it is set on its throne again.

In 1923-24 and 1925-26, outport postmasters, couriers, departmental salaries:—

(Reads)

The total post office vote showed an increase.

(Reads)

But subsidies showed a decrease. Let the amount that would be paid for subisidies be added, and I need not delay the work of the committee any further in pointing out that while there is a decrease in the estimates appearing to one who does not know what actually transpires there is really an increase.

You will find no doubt a reduction in the construction and maintenance vote, but that is explained by its being taken out of loan.

I am not criticising the management of the Posts and Telegraphs. I am only pointing out facts and if I was not misrepresented I would not take the time and trouble to speak of the matter because there is nothing to be gained by it. Now the Minister asked us to read the report and I did what I was told, and I would refer the committee to page twelve of the report. It says:

(Reads)

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister who is the travelling superintendent of mail clerks.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—We haven't any.

MR. HALFYARD—Why put in this recommendation? Evidently the Minister looks upon a travelling superintendent of mail clerks as a very valuable official, that a travelling superintendent is absolutely necessary. If that is so and I know the Minister is quite honest in the statement in this report, the strange thing is that the Minister will not be able to put that recommendation into effect. He is in charge of the department. He has a good man there now who has had twenty or thirty years experience, and it is a pity he wasn't allowed to continue doing that work. Mr. Bradbury is still there, I don't know why he wasn't allowed to continue superintendent of mail clerks. I suggest that the Minister would be well advised in this respect if he would do that. There is a hint in this report as to the possibility of the Telegraph Department being run under some other management, I presume the intimation that was given by one of the members of the Finance Commission, that they had made a report and had made certain recommendations with regard to the combining of the telegraph offices under the railway management. I quite agree with the remarks made in this respect that you will find it very difficult to effect the wonderful saving that some people think with the efficiency that now obtains. I know that some telegraph offices can be changed to telephone offices. I know that perhaps on the Southern Shore you could give the Anglo the work to do. But may I ask the Hon. Minister whether his department allows the Avalon Telephone Company to use his telegraph wires for bringing the wires into their office in competition with his own.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Not to my knowledge.

MR. HALFYARD—Perhaps the Minister will investigate that because God knows it is costing us enough now without giving further facilities to other people to increase their powers in competition with the tele-

graph offices. It should receive serious consideration, and the Government should have done something in connection with the Postal Telegraph Department. But it is no good making recommendations, Mr. Chairman. The Finance Commission made recommendations, and there the matter rests, and you are waiting for some other administration to assume the responsibility of making the change. That is where you have fallen down on the job by not tackling the problems and doing the best that you could with them. The Finance Commission should have confined their efforts to the Postal Telegraph Department and then they might have been able to bring in some recommendations to this legislature for their approval, which would effect the saving of a few thousand dollars. I do not want to be saying what I did or did not do while I was in the Post Office. But an attempt was made to cut out some telegraph offices and change them to telephone offices. That applied to Trinity District. And the people kicked against it first. They said that they would canvas against me. Now it happened from a question asked in this House to give the names of the telegraph offices in the country that show an excess of expenditure over revenue and also the combined telegraph and postal offices which show a deficit every year. And I was pleased to see that as far as Trinity District is concerned, there are only four that have not paid, and in the combined offices they lose $12.74, while in the other they only lose $1,369.22, so the deficit with regard to Trinity District for the Postal Telegraph offices combined or otherwise is only $2.643. I was surprised to find that the showing was so good. But in other places there are many offices that should be closed up. I do not know anything about the offices in the district of Harbour Main, that the Hon. Minister of Posts represents. But I notice that at Kelligrews there is an expenditure of $969.60, and the revenue is $80.43. Certainly there is something radically wrong there. I wonder if something could not be done with that office. You have the information at your hand, Mr. Minister, and it would be worth your while to give that to the Finance Commission. They certainly have been working on that, but they do not see their way clear to effect any saving this year. We have to go on for a little while longer without seeing any saving from that wonderful Finance Commission, which managed to save through their efforts seventeen dollars on relieving officers salary down there at Catalina, which is a beginning, and of course they may congratulate themselves on having done something.

Where does Mr. Bradbury fit in?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—He has some particular work to do looking after records of the Department. He does it very well.

MR. HALFYARD—What salary does he get now?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—Eleven hundred and some odd dollars.

MR. HALFYARD—That is a crying shame.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—I take a stand again on that point for the reason that when I lose confidence in a man he goes out of my mind, as a trustworthy official, and I want to say that I am not going to be a friend of his any longer. I caught Mr. Bradbury in the act of reading my private correspondence, after that I could not trust him, although he is probably as a good an official as any. I make that statement here now. It was fortunate for myself that I did catch him reading my private letters, a very important one at that. It may have been a little bit political. It concerned a man inquiring for a position and there was a lot of private correspondence between myself and the

gentleman who was then residing in Boston. I did not want the world to know what was going on between myself and this man who held a seat in this House, a nobleman I call him, and he proved himself a splendid type of man. For Mr. Bradbury to open my letter and to look over the stenographer's back and read it out word for word, after that I could not trust him, and the other man was doing the same thing I claim, though he said that he did not pay much attention to it. They were scrutinizing my private letters and I happened to look through my office door and I saw them. That is all I am going to say about the matter.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, what brought me to my feet is the fact that the Minister has mentioned the man's name. The Minister of course has his own opinion with regard to the work of the Department, but I think Mr. Bradbury made an affidavit to the effect that he did not read his correspondence. However, in a semi-public office like the Minister's there is an excuse for the clerks who hang around, and if in passing they looked over the shoulder of a typist they might not do it intentionally. I am sorry the Minister has that opinion of Mr. Bradbury. I knew Mr. Bradbury when I was in the Department. He was a most capable and efficient official. He knows thoroughly the job he was appointed for and a job that does not altogether give him the good will of those whom he had to deal with, because whoever takes a civil servant's position he will not please everybody. Mr. Bradbury took a deep interest in the service and from point of experience he had no superior.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we will have to abandon all hope of getting a steam service in Trinity Bay again, as I notice there is no vote in the Estimates for such a service. Now I would like to ask the Prime Minister to give us an expression of his opinion on the question of steam sudsidies, and if he has any idea that Trinity Bay is ever going to get a steam service again?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have no doubt but some steam ship service would be very useful to Trinity Bay if we could find some way to be able to provide it. Every year as far as I can see we are getting less like providing it.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether any saving has been effected by confining the service of the Malakoff to Bonavista Bay only; not going to Trinity Bay?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The main point about the old service was that the Malakoff called at Port Union and our feeling was that Port Union being connected with the railway didn't require a boat as badly as other parts of Bonavista Bay, and all we could do was get the advice of the people at Port Union who were most concerned, and it was agreed that the old route the steamer had gone on was preferable in the general interests of the public, and we merely went back to the old route in existence before the alteration was made.

MR. HALFYARD—It is only natural for the people of Bonavista to demand the service they were accustomed to get. They had the "Dundee" on Bonavista Bay and the "Ethie" on Trinity Bay. The Prime Minister has said some objection was made by people in Bonavista Bay to making Port Union headquarters. Now the service could have been given to Trinity Bay and you could have made Clarenville headquarters. If you had Clarenville as headquarters you could have arranged the service so not to penalise the whole district of Trinity. There are certain sections of the district suffering inconvenience and no doubt some financial loss. At

different places, especially South W. Arm, they have no means of shipping herring or anything else without taking their freight to Clarenville by water or in a motor boat to Hillview and then take it three miles over the road to Northern Bight station to connect with the railway. Certain sections of the district are disappointed over the treatment they have received. Now Port Union happens to be an industrial centre and a distributing centre to places north, and at the present time it doesn't get that facility the bay boat gave. It was a great convenience and it gave some earning power to the steam ship when it called there. Now the unfortunate part of it is that Trinity Bay has been cut off altogether. I have on occasions held forth at length on the steam ship serv.ce in Trinity Bay and I don't feel inclined to say much more al out it because I don't suppose the Government is going to do anything in this respect now. Nevertheless, it is only my duty to draw to the attention of the Government what a good many consider unfa r treatment in comparison to other places, that is certain sections of the district. At Trinity proper and Port Rexton they get freight on the train and by the "Prospero" and are satisfactorily served, l ut there are other other large sections of the Distr ct greatly handicapped l y the need of some steam transportation and evidently we have to get along the l est way we can for the time being.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to recommend to the mem-l ers of the Railway Commission the claims of two or three places on the South West Coast to have the steamboat call ng there every alternate trip. None of those places would take the steamer off its route very much, or cause it to lose, perhaps, more than half an hour, and there would l e very little expense for the whole three places. It so happens that these are three places not situated on the main road, not served by any motor l oat or ferry service, and that has no telephone or telegraph connection with other parts of the country, and are very much inconvenienced by their isolated posit on. I strongly urge on the Railway Commission the request of the people to have these places made ports of call, if only for alternate trips. I am referring now to English Harl or East, Boxey and Mose Ambrose. English Harl or East would serve a considerable number of small settlements from which people now have to go a long d stance at considerable inconvenience, and altogether it would l e of great advantage and a great convenience to these places.

MR. HICKMAN—How do you get returns from these outport telephones?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—They all pay rentals for their phones. We charge them $20.00 a year.

MR. HICKMAN—Can you tell us what the cost of the upkeep of the telephones is?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is one thing that we have been trying to get Mr. Armstrong to do ever since he took charge of that Department, to make out an absolute statement of what revenue we are getting from the public telephones. I have had applicat ons from a numl er of places in my district for telephone communications to l e put in there, and my reply is, that we are not going to put in any new telephones until we get that report from Mr. Armstrong, that will show us the revenue from the different telephone services. If people are not paying for that service it should l e cut out, if it is not bringing in revenue it cannot l e worth the money that one claims it to be, consequently I have been quite recently ask ng the Minister of Posts if that report is ready, and he tells me it is not. I think it should l e the policy of the Government to cut out those telephones that are not bringing in a rea-

sonable revenue for the serv.ce they are giving.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS—Mr. Chairman, I may explain the matter and throw some light on it. When the telephone system was inaugurated throughout the country I was told by people whom I wrote to demanding payment that they were given to understand by the candidate during the election time that telephones were free, and that they never would be called upon to pay for them. That day I sent out c rculars to all those enjoying the telephone that they must send in their rentals or else they would find that the telephone would be cut out. Last week a gentleman came into my office from Gambo. He does a large business there, and he is a very decent and honourable man alright. He said "I have been billed for a rental of telephone that was placed in my store a few years ago. I thought I never would be called upon, in fact I was told by a member of the district that I never would be called upon to pay it. How much is the bill?" I said I would find out and I got Mr. Smith the accountant in. We talked over the matter and he told me he owed $60.00 or three and a half year's rental. He said "I am sorry, I am going to pay it, but I did not think I would be charged," and there and then he took out $60.00 and paid it. Mr. Armstrong has great difficulty under those circumstances, but he is collecting the arrears gradually for the past three or four years, so that is why he has not got his report completed yet, but he is doing his best to get the arrears, and when he does get them complete then he will make his report.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, in going through the votes here for outport telephones I was struck by the fact that there is a reduction of $2500 in respect to salar.es, upkeep and installation. Now if there is one service more than another that should be considered it is the service which is got from outport telephones, from the standpoint of the interests of people who are cont nually sending in requests, and requests that they can substantiate with good reason. I would like to see this vote remaining at normal. I am forwarding to the Hon. Minister from the District of Fortune, several requests in regard to telephone offices where the cost of installat on is $120 or $150. These people are residing at settlements in similar circumstances to these people whom I mentioned just now when referring to subsidy. People who have not regular summer mail service, no telegraph serv ce. They have to work under tremendous disadvantages in connection with their ordinary avocations. I would earnestly impress upon the Government, and the Minister the necessity of increasing this vote to give these people to whom I have referred the form of service which after all is very necessary. It is hardly fair to cut down a facility of this sort, and allow other provisions that can only be classed as extravagances .things not usually necessary, and allowing them to continue at the expense of the ordinary man who has to work under great difficulties. Now with regard to the general policy of the Government in connection with telephones. I do not understand the explanation that the Minister of Posts gave regard ng the procedure. As I understand it if application comes from some small settlement, and the telephone is installed that some party has to guarantee the rental. Does that go to the general revenue or must it be turned into the Department of Posts. I do not mean the tolls for telephones, but the use of that service.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—It goes into the General Revenue.

DR. MOSDELL—In other words one particular indiv dual has to undertake the responsibility of paying up the rental of that phone. Now what is

your policy in this respect. I am all at sea regarding it. I know of one or two settlements in the district of Fortune where phones are installed, and the holders of the phones are all at sea. They were not given to understand by an unscripulous politician, that they were to be free. I do not understand who is responsible for the initial installation of the phone and its upkeep. I would like to have an explanation from the Minister.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member I may say that the Department is responsible for the installation and the upkeep of the phones. So that is why Mr. Armstrong is given this provision here. Let us take for example such a locality as Seal Cove. If anyone in that district sent in a request to the Government to have a phone installed there, a phone is installed by this Department. That phone may be connected with the Post Office or the Telegraph Office as the case may be. The person who is given charge of that phone to look after the operation of it, is paid one dollar a month. Then the public or whoever wants to use that phone has got to pay to connect with the telegraph office for the use of that phone. The fees are collected by the person in charge, and they are sent direct to the Department. In some cases they are handed over to the Telegraph operator or the Postmaster in that locality. Now when a private telephone is installed by the Department, it is on the understanding that the person in whose house or private store or residence it is, must pay a rental of twenty dollars a year. That is what I referred to in particular when I spoke of that man Prichett who was told that he would never be called upon to pay at all. There are numbers of phones all around the country and when I took charge of the Dept., there was neither head nor tail to anything. There was no system, no person in charge and only a small amount of rentals. Now we have a man in charge and the system is growing, and because of conditions in the country people are asking for an extension of telephones in some places. Take for instance Stevenville Crossing. There is a Telegraph and Post Office there. There are twelve phones connected with that office. Some half dozen gentlemen went out to farm along the railway. They wanted telephone connection. They are some six or eight miles from Stevenville. We had to put in a new phone to connect them with the Telegraph Office. They wanted to know when the trains are likely to arrive, they wanted to make enquiries about their freight, and lots of other matters. The Postmaster is the operator and he has besides doing his Telepgraph and Postal work, to attend to these twelve phones. Now we have groups around the country that are continually asking the Government for the installation of phones. Each of those people pay separate rentals. The Postmaster collects them and he sends them into the Post Office and he is reminded by this Department if he does not send them in in time. We expect that these phones will increase and that in time we will have more revenue than we are paying out.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject of outport telephones I would like to remind the Minister that last year when these estimates were before the House I asked him if he would put a telephone at the South End of Change Islands. I think that he kindly promised at that time to attend to it. The reason why we want the telephone there is because quite a number of persons in that vicinity shelter there. I am sure that he is in sympathy with the fact that when people come ashore there they want some means of recording their whereabouts. It is very necessary that a telephone should be

put there. In addition to the fact that schooners like to report through the medium of the telephone there, the lighthouse on the south end of Change Islands is really a kind of half-way house for the people travelling from Change Islands to the Ma n Land. Very often they are caught in a storm and they have to put up there. As a matter of fact they had to erect a little house by the lighthouse to accommodate the travellers. So many men realize how important it is, and I would really like to have the opinion of the Minister of Marine and F.sheries as to whether it is necessary or not.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word or two on this subject. I think that the question of a telephone on the South End of Change Islands came up last year. I strongly supported it. I must agree with the member that it s as badly needed there, as any place in the country, as the place is far north and it is most necessary in the winter time and in the fall of the year. I think that if the Hon. Min ster of Posts did nothing else for Newfoundland but put through that telephone there, I think we would all give him a great deal of credit for it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know from the Min'ster of Posts and Telegraphs what the policy of the Government is with regard to further telephone extension around the country. The Minister will remember that he has had on his desk for about two years an estimate for placing a telephone at Comfort Cove in Tw llingate district? What is necessary or what is the policy in regard to this or is the Government going to make any further outlays? The people of Comfort Cove were promised a telephone two years ago and they are continually writing to me about it. I spoke to the Min ster about the matter several times and I want some sort of a definite statement from him this afternoon because Comfort Cove in the winter season is a meeting place for mail couriers and a very important place for the nstallation of a telephone. Those people in the outports cannot understand why they are not permitted a telephone when the work can l e done at very little cost and which would not only l e a convenience to them but would l e a great help to them and others in time of necessity.

THE MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Chairman, I may say that we have scores of applications from people all over the country for telephone connection and telephone pay stations. Wh le we have no special vote for the purpose of extending the lines, my duty is to make recommendations or a report of the cost of the construction of a telephone line and the cost of installation. When a request comes to me in writing for a telephone I first send it to the Superintendent of Postal Telegraphs who gives me an estimate of the cost of installation, as per the request of any member. Then I send in a recommendation to the Executive who may or may not grant all requests. If there was a special vote, I have no doubt the Government would grant all requests for telephones; but I would like to point out that in most cases I always asked the representatives of districts to give me allocations out of their special grants to meet the cost of installing telephones and they have been readily granted by several members on both sides of the House. I remember Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Power gave me allocations out of their special grants and a few days ago Mr. Scammell and Mr. Hibbs promised me allocations, if they get any special grants, for the purpose of getting them telephone connection in parts of their districts. So that if the honourable member for Twill ngate will give me an allocation out of his special grant.

I will have the telephone installed at Comfort Cove. Give me the money, that is all I want to have the work done.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman before we finally dispense with these votes there is a great deal I would like to say in connection with the installation of telephones. Personally, I am a great believer in the extension of the telephone system and from the standpoint of the district of St. Barbe I would much prefer it as a public utility to the matter of telegraph extension, because we all know the burden of expense the telegraph offices entail upon the Government and upon the country and what it means regarding upkeep and very often, as we found out the other day from statements tabled here by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, not more than twenty-five per cent. of the telegraph offices are paying. Telephones on the other hand are very cheap as to operating cost and to my mind give as good a service as telegraph offices. I only wish I had a vote of ten thousand dollars for St. Barbe district and I would spend it all on telephone extension. I can quite understand the Minister's position when he says he is unable to meet the various requests for telephones unless he gets a substantial vote for that purpose. In my opinion he ought to have a substantial vote for that purpose because there are votes passed through here by this Committee that could very well be done without and the money devoted towards telephone extension whereby the Government would get better returns and give better service to the people of the country. What is the use, after all, for me to get up here and plead for telephone extension for the district of St. Barbe when the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs says that he has no money with which to do the work of installing telephones. Later on in the sesion we will be asked to vote on a loan bill and then we will be led to believe that large appropriations will be made for the carrying on of public works throughout the country in various ways. I hope and trust that the story in connection with the 1926 loan is not going to be repeated and that each and every district in the country will be treated fairly and squarely. I do not propose to waste further time on the subject at this juncture but I am hoping when the Loan Resolutions are brought down here that all districts will be treated on an equal footing. We were told by the Prime Minister that those districts that did not get the benefit of the Highroads work would receive the best attention this year. When the Loan Resolutions are introduced, if I find that the district I represent is not going to get a square deal I am going to have something to say on the matter. In conclusion I want to support the request of the member for Fogo that telephone connection be established at South End Change Islands. Very often the bulk of the fishing fleet and the coasting fleet going north and coming south put in at South End to report and they have to walk a distance of six miles to get to the nearest telegraph office. In addition it is a kind of hold-up place in winter time. I arrived there last winter at seven o'clock one evening and I would have been only too pleased, if a telephone connection was there, to tell my people of my whereabouts.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Minister what it costs the Government when it has telephones installed in houses?

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—They charge $1.00 a month and they collect the tolls and send them in.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—It strikes me the telephone service should be self-supporting; anybody using the telephone service

certainly should be prepared to pay for it and if it only costs $1.00 a month for looking after a phone in a store or residence, it would seem it would be hardly necessary to have a phone if it were so little used as not to pay for the cost of operation. I wonder if the Minister has gone into the matter to find out the cost of telegraph service for communication between points where there is already a telephone. After all I suppose all that is wanted is to serve the public, and if the public can be served by some utility privately, that should be satisfactory, and where is the necessity of the Government spending a lot of money on telegraph service if the people are getting service otherwise. I wonder if the Minister could let us have a statement of what actually are the out-of-pocket expenses of the Government for the operation of telegraph offices for points in Conception Bay?

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I would like to explain that in some cases where there is telegrah and telephone service, the telephone service is really an extension of the telegraph. There are outlying places four, five or six miles away from the office served by one telegraph office and to save time and inconvenience in delivering messages to out-of-the way places, the message is sent over the telephone. It is a great convenience to the public in those places there is no doubt about that, but there is no increased revenue on account of that even though the person sending the message brings into use two services, the telephone and telegraph. There is a charge of 5c. for the use of the telephone. I will bring in a statement showing the revenue and expenditure in this connection.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: Just now the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs informed the House that when he receives applications for telephones he asks Mr. Veitch to make an estimate and that estimate is passed on to the Executive Government. I would like to ask whether the estimate to instal a telephone at Comfort Cove which was made two years ago is still on his desk or has it been passed on to the Executive Government. I think he will find it still on his desk.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I am not positive. I will take that matter up. I think at the time there was no possibility of granting the request; no money. However I will take the matter up and see what has happened that.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I quite appreciate that if that estimate for a telephone at Comfort Cove has gone to the Executive Government the Minister is clear of the responsibility, but—

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I may have been negligent. I won't hold the Executive Government responsible yet.

MR. HALFYARD—Has the Minister of Posts got to ask the Executive Government to approve of installing a telephone in a place like Comfort Cove?

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—Yes. I have to send a report to them. I have no authority to spend a dollar to install a telephone or telegraph office at any place. I can't install a telegraph office, a post office or anything else without first making a recommendation to the Colonial Secretary and then the Colonial Secretary brings the matter before the Executive Government.

MR. HALFYARD—Does the same apply to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to lights and fog alarms. That is very little responsibility to spend two or three hundred dollars on telephone service when money is voted. I know that

was the case when it was not a Department, when it was under the Colonial Secretary.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I know nothing about the Minister of Marine and Fisheries but we have an auditor in our department who is continually at work, all the year round and he will not allow any expenditure without first having the authority of an authorized letter from the Colonial Secretary giving Executive authority for the payment of money for any purpose whatever. That is the check that is kept on us and that may be the reason we have to economise so much as possible. We are not allowed to spend one dollar; so, there may not be any credit to me or the staff; it is the system, and it is a very good system.

MR. BROWN — Mr. Chairman: I agree with what my colleague has said in regard to Comfort Cove. It is a very important place, and if we can get any special monies placed at our disposal this year, or to our credit I believe that my colleague will agree with me to hand over a few hundred dollars to have that telephone installation. It is a central place for the mail couriers in the winter season, and the place is more important in the winter time than in the summer time. I think that it is only right if you can not get the money that we should try to help you, providing this House votes any special monies this year for the credit of Twillingate.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I am reminded of the persistent requests made from two islands off the South West Coast, Sagona and Brunette, for wireless facilities. Petitions have been presented on their behalf to this House. I quite understand that anything I may say here now will not result in the necessary wireless being included in these estimates for that purpose. I just wish to emphasize the necessity of taking those two islands into consideration, when an amount is allocated out of the public expenditure that may be contemplated, for public improvements. To emphasize the necessity of this I would like to inform the committee that within the last three weeks a very important incident in the life of these people on Sagona occurred when a man was taken very suddenly ill there. There is absolutely no telegraph communication. There is only one boat going between the island and the mainland. And it was some days before the weather permitted of communication by boat. Finally through the courtesy of the Railway Commission a steamer called at the island and took that man off. He was brought down here and he is now in the General Hospital, where it was discovered that he is suffering from a malignant disease, and one from which he might have recovered had he been gotten down here a week before and been operated on. The chances are now he cannot be operated on, and that he has no chance of life. Then you have got to take into consideration the fishermen up there, along the shore the fishery is practically a failure. All along these islands there are plenty of fish, and the people do well with their traps and lines, and if the shore fishermen were in touch with these outlying stations they would often undoubtedly be able to secure a saving voyage. But anyway from the standpoint of humanity, it is only fair to give these people the accommodation that is necessary and vital to their industry, because I understand from the Minister that it is only a relatively small matter of five or six hundred dollars. I urge very strongly upon the Government that when they are allocating an amount out of the loan for public improvements, that they will consider the request from these people, and I may

state right here now that no question of partisanship arises here now, because I understand that the people on these islands are thoroughly disgusted with the failure of this Government and their predecessors to look after their interests, and give them those facilities in that respect.

The Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON, THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, In moving the adjournment of the House this evening I would like to call the attention of the House to an article that appeared in the paper caller the Fishermen's Advocate, of a recent issue. The Hon. Member for Trinity told us again this afternoon that he had no interest in the Fishermen's Advocate. I assume anyhow that he meant that he had no financial or active interest in the management of the paper. But this paper places itself on record as being the official organ of the Fishermen's Protective Union of Newfoundland, and there is an honourable gentleman in this House who is president of that Union, and there are at least five members of this House who came in here under the banner of that particular organisation. There is an article which appears here, I wish to refer to. I have seen very many despicable articles in this paper during the last three or four years, but there is an article here atacking the Deputy Minister of Public Works, in a most despicable way. I mentioned the other day in this House that Mr. Harris the Deputy Minister of Public Works was an official who stood beyond any partisanship in my opinion in the conduct of the work of his office. He has been in that office for many years and served under various Governments, and never before has Mr. Harris been accused of political partisanship. I do not for an instant believe, and I do not believe that any member of the House believes, that Mr. Harris would be guilty of anything of the kind, or of any such act of political partisanship, as to be accused of joining with Mr. Jesse Whiteway in turning into their own pockets various sums of Government patronage, what ever that may be. I will read the whole article.

(Reads)

Of course the whole article is more or less ungrammatical. But the individual by the name of Toby B, says unquestionably that Mr. Whiteway and Mr. Harris of the Board of Wor have been dviding up in connection with Government patronage. I do not think that anybody else would read it in any other way. While Mr. Whiteway is able to take care of himself I just want to say that I urge upon the Hon. Member for Trinity who has not any interest in the Fishermen's Advocate to try and get himself interested as quickly as he possibly can and try to stop that dispicable kind of thing.

MR. SCAMMELL— Mr. Speaker, The Prime Minister in the course of his remarks this afternon regarding the paper item has named the Fishermen's Protective Union, and there are members of the Union who sit in Opposition in this House, and at least one member is President of that Union. The Fishermen's Advocate is the official organ of the Fishermen's Protective Union, and it is in their cause I would now stand up and reply to the Prime Minister this afternoon. Newspapers generally take the precaution to publish in their columns this fact that they are not responsible for the opinions expressed by the contributors. Now I am not a legal man, but I suppose that in law a newspaper

is really responsible for the opinions expressed by its contributors. Be that as it may, you have got up here this afternoon and made a great fuss about an article, that was published, as a contribution in the Fishermen's Advocate. Now as regards Mr. Harris and what has been said about him, I hold my own opinion, but I have nothing to say against him from any personal sense whatever. But everybody gets offended and every member of the Government is upset when the Advocate has anything to say. But there is no consideration to be given to the feelings of Hon. Members on this side of the House, when they are misrepresented and held up to ridicule, and their statements broadcast the world over by two newspapers supported by the Government in this town. Never was there a greater example of a man being held up to public scandal, than were the expressions of my own the other day, when I stood up here and gave expression of my own humble opinion and my own conviction, and which was broadcast to the world, and because I said that there was here a growing feeling of friendship for America, and that 90% of the people were American in sentiment. I was branded as Anti-British. I am glad to know that after all Mr. Harris has got the sympathy of the whole of that particular department. He must be a very valuable official. I am not ashamed of anything in that paper. If anybody objects to anything in that paper, then he can have recourse to another place.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, I am rather amused at the statement of Mr. Scammell that he is not ashamed of anything that appeared in the Fishermen's Advocate. He ought to be. You are the editor of that paper, I know you are. I think that when a private citizen is attacked like that, that it is very indecent. And the author of that whoever he may be is a disgrace to his country, to the people he lives with, and he is only a contemptible cur at the best of it. I am quite in harmony with what the Prime Minister has said about Mr. Harris. I will simply say that I have known him, when I was in the Opposition and when I was in the Government, and I can only endorse every word that has been said about him. At the same time if the Hon. Member knows anything different about him he ought to be the last one to say it about him. And so far as I am concerned, and I believe that members of the opposite side of the House if they are honest about it will say the same, that if you go into Mr. Harris's office to enquire about anything that you will get decent treatment.

The Hon. Member for St. Barbe knows that Mr. Harris does not bother about him, and if the Hon. Member and his Party had control of the affairs of the country to-morrow, he knows as well as I do that they would have to keep Mr. Harris in the position he now occupies. Mr. Scammell states he is not ashamed of anything that appeared in the "Advocate". Well he ought to, and if he were attacked like Mr. Harris has been I would be one of the first to sympathize with him. Now Mr. Scammell, as is well known in this House, is very tender when he is touched himself, but he evidently forgets about the feelings of others. This fellow Toby B. has not allowed any public man associated with the Government to escape his foul pen, but the man responsible for this scribe's doings is the editor of the "Advocate". I have had some experiences with the "Advocate" and I put those people in their proper places, and I want to say now that I hope that Mr. Harris will take the earliest opportunity by way of redress and put in their place this menace to public opinion and common decency.

MR. HALFYARD, Mr. Speaker, As my name has been mentioned by the

Prime Minister in connection with the "Advocate", I must sincerely sympathize with Mr. Harris if he has been misrepresented by any newspaper. Newspapers should be more particular of what they write about public men. I think that will be agreed to by everybody in the House. Of course, a great deal depends on how you say a thing just as the effect of an article that's written depends upon the authorship. I thought nobody took any serious notice of Toby B., whoever he may be, but I suppose we are not all made up alike. An Editorial article in a newspaper, of course, will have more effect than any other, whether that Editorial is instructive, descriptive or abusive. However, I will take occasion to say that personally I do not agree with misrepresentation in any newspaper. It seems that as soon as a man becomes a member of the House of Assembly he is to be regarded as a rogue in the opinion of some people and it is bad enough to have outsiders who have nothing else to do but to criticise and misrepresent, but when you come to have a press that is regarded as half decent in the community going out of their way to tolerate such misrepresentation and by distorting statements that a member makes in this House, it is not very pleasant to say the least of it, but I suppose we have to submit to it. I do know that Mr. Scammell, who is the President of the F.P.U. would be the last man to countenance anything that he thought was not playing the game with regard to any public official, although he has expressed himself on the spur of the moment in the way he has. I am sure we all regret that people are not more careful in their writings in the public press about public men, and I trust that those of us in this House who have any influence will use it to make our newspapers appear a little more respectable for the sake of ourselves and for the sake of those who have to read these newspapers outside the country.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to tomorrow, Tuesday, July 26th., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Hibbs gave Notice of Question.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 26th, 1927.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: In connection with outport collectors, I know that at Cape Broyle there is one getting twelve hundred dollars and there is no necessity for his being there at all and the other collector there for about thirty years gets about eight hundred, I think. I don't think there is any necessity for that other individual at Cape Broyle and I want to ask the Minister if he will move him somewhere else. I think this is where the Government could save twelve hundred dollars. Possibly the Government might be of opinion that there might be some smuggling and that would justify having him there, on account of Lunenburg vessels, but I don't think the revenue has swollen any since that individual has taken office. I don't see any necessity for having him there. He is a menace to the community and an eye-sore to every one and I ask the Government to have him removed.

MR. MOORE—I would like to support my colleague in connection with that matter, and ask the Minister if he doesn't want to discharge that man to move him somewhere else. The people up there don't want him.

He is a busybody and the people in Caplin Bay don't want him in the place. Anything that crops up up there you will find this fellow coming along with an article in the Telegram or News and he has made himself very unpopular to the people up there. I think the Minister might look into the matter and see if he cannot move that man to some other place.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: Can the Hon. the Colonial Secretary tell me whether the Imperial authorities have ever repaid to this country a considerable amount of the money that is due from them on account of the pensions payable by the Imperial authorities. There was an amount running up to $10.000 that was collectable by this country from the Imperial authorities. The Canadians have made some large advances in the same line and have got their money back by sending a special commissioner to the Old Country who took up the matter with the Imperial authorities. We paid out money to the sum of $73,000 and it was the intention at the time to send a man over to the Old Country to negotiate for the repayment of that money. That was not done and when a new Government came into power the Board of Commissioners was changed. Has that matter been taken up since then

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman: I do not know whether the hon. member refers to the naval pensions. Well in 1925 when I was over there, in connection with the Beaumont Hamel Memorial, I took the matter up with the Minister of Pensions. The position as I understand it was that the Canadians, who had made certain additional pensions the Naval Reservists, had made representation to the Pension Board and the Minister of Pensions in London. The Canadians paid the difference in the amount of money given the Naval Reservist as against the Military Pensions. I took the matter up with the Minister of Pensions in London, and found considerable difficulty that although they had paid the Canadians this amount, they found that they had rather put their foot in it, because the different other parts of the Empire were beginning to demand and did demand the same consideration. The Minister told me that it would be necessary to bring it before the House of Commons and get the legal authority for this repayment. Well, I pointed out to him this fact that Newfoundland stood in the unique position with regard to its naval force, in so far that we were the only part of the British Empire that had a naval force ready for operation when the war was declared, and I said that when one views this matter from the standpoint of every man being worthy of similar treatment whether in the navy or the army and that the Canadian Government had paid the same amount to their naval reservists as to their military force, that we considered that we felt bound to pay our naval reservists the same pensions as they were getting under the military service act. Some considerable time elapsed and I kept continually reminding the High Commissioner to keep the matter before the Minister of Pensions and some time during the past year I got the intimation from the Minister of Pensions in London to the effect that he had received the sum of £20,000 on account of that service. That happened about this time last year. I think that we were very well treated and I feel a certain amount of gratification that I had something to do with acquiring that payment.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I would like to congratulate the Hon. Minister on his success because to my knowledge that matter has been in the slings for quite a number of

years. Certain half-hearted attempts had been made to have that money paid. The amount was very large and worth while fighting for. Besides it belonged to Newfoundland, seeing that the Imperial Government had treated Canada in the way that it did.

Before the Department of Pensions goes through, I would like to call the attention of the Hon. Member for Carbonear, whom I think is now Acting Chairman of that Board, to a matter. There hoppens to be a number of cases of dependents of soldiers, who had lost their lives during the war, and who are in exceedingly poor circumstances, and who find it very difficult to take them into consideration and to give them relief to some extent. I have in mind one or two cases of men who at the time that their sons went overseas were well capable of earning their own living, but since that time have become ill, and having lost their sons, are not able to earn a dollar and are now without support. But there seems to be some technicality under the Act. I know that the Commissioners are acting in accordance with the Act, and that prevents the Board from giving adequate aid to the cases I have cited. It is really a matter for some serious consideration as to whether some broad latitude should not be allowed instead of binding them down to a hard and fast rule in this particular question. I know that some of the members of the Board have gone out of their way as far as the law will allow them, to give these soldiers or their dependents the benefit of every doubt that might arise. But there were cases that prevented us from getting what we thought was only fair play, had we not been so trammelled. The cases that I am now referring to are in my own district. One is an elderly man who is very poorly off. He is incapable of earning his own living. He lost two sons. The other son that he had was since drowned, and he is left without any shelter and thrown on his own. There are one or two other cases of a similar nature and I am speaking of them now, just purely and simply to call the attention of the Government to certain cases of that class, and to urge that they deserve special consideration, and some special arrangement should be made to look after them, because their position is entirely due to the sacrifice that they made of their children when the war was on and having bereft them of that support that they would ordinarily have if these children were alive.

HON. MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman: I sympathise with the member for Fortune. I feel the same with regard to these cases that come before the Board. I have one case I will just mention now, a man belonging to Twillingate. He was discharged in the regular way. No disability at the time. Of course he does not come under the act. The same thing probably applies to the persons that the member for Fortune has mentioned. In some cases this act is most liberal, and perhaps they do not deserve it, and there are other cases again that deserve consideration, and they cannot get it under the Act. I want to assure the member for Fortune that I have every sympathy with him.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I might say that there is some legislation contemplated to be introduced at this session with regard to pensions that will be an extension of the powers of the Board to meet the cases referred to. There is quite an interesting situation in regard to the position appertaining to the relief of those who have been incapacitated by the war and their dependents that do not come within the purview of the Act at all, and there are some cases that I have

personal knowledge of and on several occasions I have sent such deserving cases to the Pensions Board as the only organization that could help them. But the Pensions Board are bound by the Act and they have no power to go outside the Act. They even have no moneys to use in a sympathetic way in any set of circumstances. We have two committees outside of the Pensions Board. One is known as the Patriotic Association Fund Committe. This Committee was formed after the War and are to-day expending five thousand dollars a year which amount is voted by this House, but this is merely a return of moneys collected at the beginning of the war by the Patriotic Association. It will be remembered that after the war started a Patriotic Association was started here and they collected from citizens and others approximately $100,000.00 and the original intention was that the money was ensured to maintain the Newfoundland Regiment. It showed how moderate we were in our requirements, but yet it showed how patriotic we were when we could get from private citizens that amount for the benefit of our war efforts. It was very soon that we found that our anticipations were going to be short beyond all comparison in that direction and the Colonial Secretary's Department, through the Government of that day. took the matter in hand and administered war matters for a long time, then the Militia Department was formed taking over the administration of the work entirely. This fund which was collected was kept in the Bank became a Trust fund and was not spent until after the war a commitee was appointed by the Patriotic Fund Trustees. That Board of Trustees have been receiving since the war $5,000.00 a year as interest on the money which was collected from the citizens of the community and they administer $5,000.00 a year to meet emergency cases, such as has been suggested, but even that cannot cover all the claims that are coming in. The War Veterans themselves have also a charitable organization under the Chairmanship of Mr. Dawe, who I must say I have the highest admiration and appreciation for on the splendid work he has done in that direction. It was a labour of love for Mr. Dawe and his associates who were most conscientious in trying to do everything possible in assisting their brother soldiers and dependents during the trying period. But they depend practically entirely upon the subscriptions raised through "Poppy Day" and "Empire Day" collections. For the past two years the funds have been depleted beyond anything they could do to recoup them and they made application to the Government for financial help and I was gratified, on behalf of the Government, to pass them over $1,000.00 and I hope to be able to do the same this year. That $1,000.00 was judiciously handled and every cent was spent in the right direction. Last Winter a meeting was held in my office at which Hon. Mr. Duff, of the Pensions Board, and representatives of the Veterans Charitable Organization, were present and it was thought we might consolidate the whole thing whereby it would be made easier to look after emergency cases which were affected by the war; but the Patriotic Fund Trustees felt that they had a duty to perform and that they would cease to function next year and nothing definite resulted from the meeting. But I think as far as their funds permitted the Patriotic Fund Trustees and the War Veterans Organization have done as much as they possibly could with the funds at their disposal. Of course,, every year new demands are made. The pensions generally show no appreciable decrease, owing to the Pensions Act being periodically extended and from Dr. Parsons, the Chairman of the Pensions Board I understand that he does

not anticipate any great reductions in the pensions for the next couple of years, but in the meantime the Pensions Board have the Act to go by and I think they have done all that could be expected of them, and the matter referred to by the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay will be covered in the new Act which is now in the hands of the Minister of Justice and I feel sure that it will be accepted by the whole House without any very lengthy debate.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, Seemingly, the longer this House is kept open the more information we get, and I must confess that the fact that the Colonial Secretary got twenty thousand pounds from the Imperial authorities because of Newfoundland's Naval ratings in connection with the war is news to me. I wish to offer my congratulations to the Colonial Secretary on the result of his efforts. I believe that this money could have been secured long ago, if a proper attempt had been made. However, a section of the press here thinks that we should not accept money from the Imperial Government. Well were we not as patriotic in the war as the Canadians and they have already got a large amount from the Home Government. Personally, I cannot understand why publicity was not given before to the amount that the Colonial Secretary was responsible for getting, and my reason for rising to speak this afternoon is to congratulate him on the success of his mission and I would suggest to the Government that Sir John Bennett be sent back again to London with a view to getting a further payment on account of the part our naval men played in the war.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Crown Royalties".

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, In connection with this matter I may say that the Bill has been printed for some time, but as I thought that this Bill as well as the next item on the Order Paper relating to Patents would be best handled by a Select Committee I will not make a motion for Second Reading. However, I may explain them. The Crown Royalties Bill is a special Act. It is new legislation with the idea of providing that were royalty arises out of any land, mineral, timber or water power such royalty shall be held to attach to and run with the property. Even if such lands, etc., be transferred or assigned to third parties the royalty would still be attached.

Primarily it arises out of the matter of considering the Buchan's Mine Agreement. Honorable Members will remember that the question was asked as to where the Colony would benefit in respect of this enterprise apart from labour and income or business profits tax and it was pointed out that under the Act of 1905 giving the original right of working mineral lands to the A. N. D. Company a five per cent royalty was payable. In view of the fact that these lands are now being worked on by another company the American Smelters and in view of the possibility that there might be transfers of property to such a concern it was felt it was better to clarify the position with regard to the position of those royalties through any such transfers. In the next place, that in the event of any sales or dispositions of any of the workings of the mine we felt provision ought to be made in such a case; it is general application; that there should be some method of seeing to it that the sale was a bona-fide sale. In other words a fictitious

disposition ought not to be made. That is the purport of the Bill. I will no more than distribute it to-day so that Hon. Members will have an opportuity to consider it.

The next item on the Order Paper is an Act respecting Patents. With your permission Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words of explanation now. I propose after distribution and on motion for the second reading to have the Bill referred to a Select Committee for the purpose of saving the time of the House in what is merely a technical Bill; rather more a matter of procedure with regard to the handling of patents than it is anything of an every day businesslike character. That Bill again arose out of this work at Buchan's Mine. It has been felt that with the advent of mining machinery materials of all kinds and new processes of a technical nature coming into the country that people holding foreign patents should be in a position to possibly tie up industry by coming along requesting patents for something well known and in existence some years and those making use of it have not taken out patent rights, and application will have to be made within a year of the taking out of the foreign patent.

The present Bill is an effort to put some things on the Statute Book and make them law in a way somewhat in line with present day legislation in this connection. I stated already in discussing this matter that in a country like Newfoundland we must remember it is absolutely impossible to be as progressive as other countries in the sense of patent legislation. In countries like the United States and Great Britain of course the machinery is elaborate because thousands and hundreds of thousand of patents are taken out and they have a staff of experts of all kinds to go into details of every application. Some times it takes years before a patent is granted; from application up to the time of issue. We don't propose any such machinery at all of that nature; nothing at all involving a departure from present procedure in the sense of expense; but we are endeavouring with the idea of bearing in mind local conditions to make an improvement in the patent law at present on the Statute Book and I think it will be found a considerable improvement on the present unsatisfactory conditions. As a matter of fact we have had two or three cases in which the matter of some machinery to test rights of patent applicants clear of the Executive Council ought to be provided for. The Executive Council naturally are not equipped to test matters in this connection so we hope to improve matters with the machinery provided here. With the permission of the House, therefore, I ask that the second reading of these two items be deferred until to-morrow.

On motion the second readings of the Bills entitled:

"An Act respecting Education."

"An Act respecting Crown Royalties."

"An Act respecting Patents."

were deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting an agreement between the Government and the Anglo-Nfld. Development Company Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GODDEN—Subsection 3. That clause there is very much against the grain of my idea. ("All bags for concentrates.")

(Reads)

I take it that "Bags and containers for concentrates" means that these bags or containers are to export concentrates from the country, in other words raw material. We are to allow bags to come in duty free so

that the raw material can be sent out of the country. I think I have said before if we are granting concessions to this company the least they can do is give something in return besides mere labour and I would like to have it put to them straight, will they or will they not erect smelters at Buchan's Mine and have the ore smelted there. I think it is rubbing it in to ask that containers come in duty free, in which to pack the raw material to export out of the country. I suggest that a particular request be made to the A.N.D. Company to have smelters erected in the country before we grant these concessions.

DR. MOSDELL—Is the Bill now in the form in which it was when the Committee rose?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The only change to-day is the elimination of the word "spruce."

I think that what the Hon. Member for Fortune indicates is that the original paper that he has got in his hands is different from the original resolutions tabled. This is the second edition of the original resolutions. That is true.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I hope that it will be the last edition. I do not hope from the standpoint of enactment but for the committee to consider. Sec. 2 I regard as very objectionable and I so expressed myself the last time that the Committee sat. I think that the claim that I made for my objection was the broad scope of territory that may be taken as included under the term Red Indian Lake District. And the specific objection that I raised to that is that you have at Buchan's particularly a proven property according to the public announcement of 500,000,000 tons of ore at a value of $175,000,000 or $200,000,000. Now you make this claim that if this Government goes so far as to the development of the land that it is going far enough, and also the development of that specific body of ore. They would be enabling the country to show that a successful industry can be established there, and in the adjoining areas in that neighborhood. They can call themselves princes in that industry, and they will not be taking the chance that this country is taking, even in respect of a most valuable property. They would have the example of a successful and valuable industry in being, and paying profits. I presume that if it does not pay profits that other people will not come in and take land. From the standpoint of justice itself there is an important consideration in this fact that the new development I understand is to be controlled by the American Smelters. The A. N. D. Company have the right to assign all the privileges they obtain under this Act to any other company. Now, the American Smelters is not in the position of the A. N. D. Company which is run on a limited capital, and consequently they find it difficult to raise sufficient money to do development work. That company, the American Smelters, consists of some of the outstanding moneyed men of the United States. The list of its directors really reads like the roll call of American millionaires. That commany itself has a capital of something over $200,000,000. It has very large holdings in various parts of the world and it runs a very large and profitable establishment in the United States and elsewhere, so that from the standpoint of the necessary assistance being given, there is absolutely no reason for that company to ask for all the concessions that they are asking for under this Act, and if the Company were to content itself with restricting its concessions to the immediate vicinity of Buchan's and were given all the reasonable encouragement and assistance even though that company does not ac-

tually acquire the right to develop that property, then I think that they have got all that should be reasonably asked for and all that this Legislature should reasonably be expected to give, but these concessions are so absolutely sweeping and so far-reaching, and you are giving away so much and so unnecessarily that I am not surprised at the manufacturing and other classes of the community objecting to it. I claim in the first place that we should be provided in this House with a detailed plan of that part of the country, showing exactly where the areas concerned are, what the scope of the concessions is from the standpoint of territory. We are told the Red Indian Lake district is the Red Indian Lake watershed, and that may be a great deal more than the property that was owned by the A. N. D. Company, and I would ask that the honourable Minister of Agriculture and Mines would bring out some of the maps that he has down in his department so that we might be able to see as to what territory these concessions are to be applied, and I strongly make that suggestion to this Committee and to the Minister himself.

THE HINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, There is no special objection to having a plan of the area produced for the Committee, but the Hon. Gentleman who has just sat down knows that the territory to which he refers comprises two thousand square miles. That is the area which the present legislation deals with. In the meantime I will have it for the next sitting of the Committee. Now it just struck me while the Hon. Member was talking that he stated that the public are informed that these people have over there a property to the value of $100,000,000. We at least have had no official confirmation of any such thing. We know that they have a valuable deposit of minerals over there, but recently Docter Baker was there, and he spent some time there, on instructions from the Govt., and when he came back he told me that Buchan's Mine was not at all to be compared to the St. George's Coal Fields. Now there is not the slightest doubt about the erection of smelters. They are already at work there harnessing the water power and getting in the necessary machinery. So something is going to take place after all. Now I think that we ought all to be glad and throwing up our hats that we have such monied men as Doctor Mosdell has just told us, in the country. I have not had the opportunity of reading up what the personnel of that company is. But I think we should all be proud to know that we have such capable men interested in developing our natural resources. For too long now are men coming in here and getting options on the various portions of the mineral properties of this country, and then going away and that is the last that we hear of them. But by having the American Smelters, a reputable mining company, in Newfoundland, it looks to me as if these people mean business. I think that perhaps we may be mislead by certain sections of the public when they state this company has proven property of one hundred million tons of ore. We have no official information to that effect. However, when the Committee sits again I will try to have the information asked for.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, Does the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture hold that nothing but reasonable concessions are being asked for under this Bill, take in respect to an area of a district covered by the concessions. Now we are talking in terms of long concessions, where a whole large area has nothing but the business to make it profitable. But here you have an area in one specific section of which, there is a very large body of ore, large enough to make it profitable. And

yet we have concessions of the most sweping sort applying to an area of over two thousand square miles, according to the Minister's own statement.

HON THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I have no hesitation in giving concessions to the whole area of the whole country. If another company came in and asked for similar concessions for 20,000 square miles, I would be delighted to give it to them.

DR. MOSDELL—That is where I differ from the Hon. gentleman. While this company should get all the encouragement necessary to enable it to show a profit and make a success of it, but the people who come in after the pioneers, should be required to take a chance in a district proven by its predecessors. But here you have an area in one section of which there is the possibilities of unlimited development. And all concessions are given to a large company to enable the company to transfer them where when and to whom they like. It does not strike me as reasonable or necessary from that standpoint. And a much less period of time than twenty years would enable a company to establish a business there on a profitable basis. Beyond that actual period I do not see that it is necessary to go, in respect to these concessions. I put it up to the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who is particularly concerned with this bill that there should be a safety clause added to Sub. Sec. E of Section 2 in respect to the Railway, that nothing under the provisions of the Railway Laws can be construed as giving the Company the right to construct an independent line in any portion of that district.

There was a question asked by the member for Twillingate, Mr. Ashbourne, and it was directed to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines asking for correspondence as between his department and the A. N. D. Company regarding the construction and continuation of that railroad from Millertown to Buchan's. The only correspondence supplied was in the nature of an application for some lands or right of way for their railroad. That brings up again the question as to where the ownership of that land rests. I am told in the Crown, and I understand that there were no Crown Lands there. Will not the Honourable Minister agree with me that it is dangerous to have this section as it is?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would make it the whole Island. It is a pity it does not embrace the whole Island.

DR. MOSDELL—We asked for that correspondence and we simply have tabled here an application from the A. N. D. Company for the right of way to build a railroad, but we have not been supplied with any application from the Company to the Government asking for permission to extend that railroad. Apparently they can build a railroad without getting any charity to do it. If they are doing that in respect to an extension surely they can go ahead and utilize the material and machinery to build it wherever they like. I ask in view of that consideration that there be added to sub-section E sufficient to show that they are not by virtue of the wording of this measure, given the right to build a railroad without first seeking the sanction of the Government.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I do not think there is any disagreement on the last po nt made by the honourable member, as I do not think that anyone would presume to think for a moment that it could be implied in this Bill that the Company has any right to construct a railroad outside of their own, but if :t is thought there is any possibility of it being so construed it might be worth while for the Minister to give thought to the idea of a rider

to that effect. I repeat there is no such right in these resolutions, nor could any right be read into them. However, as I say I agree on the point that we do not want to have any such right conveyed, and I cannot see any harm at all in the idea being cons dered about making a provision to that effect.

Now frankly and boldly I say to the honourable member for Fortune Bay that, as regards the point he raises here about the broad term "Red Indian Lake District," and the admission for twenty years goods free of duty, about the only hope I have is that it will contain two thousand square miles and that it would have a mine in every square mile of it, that every mine would start working and that every development would start in periods of ten years between so that there would be a never end ng admission of materials duty free. The trouble about this country is that we are not producers in a proposition of this nature and we got to get the outside fellow to produce, and, despite the suggestion here about an alarming situat on, I honestly say that I hope the area is sufficiently vast in the matter of outcrops as to have the promoters of Buchan's Mine start fifty different developments next year, because the one thing about mining that makes it different from anything else is that, while sometimes we hear of rosy pictures painted about them, side by side with them we have the worst kind of money losers. There is nothing in the world to-day that so exemplifies the uncertainty of people pinning their faith on our natural resources than what is known to be the history of minerals found in this country. We heard a lot of talk and figures quoted of the immense possibilities of Buchan's Mine. I trust these vast figures are true and will be borne out in the years to come for the reason that the wealthier that mine is the greater the rush there will be for the employment of our people and the greater the rush there is going to be for the people working that mine. We have suffered up to now many and many a blighted hope in connection with mines. You may have them with the most promising appearance at first, only to discover later that they were nothing but money sinkers. Now, as to concessions, as I view it, instead of giving concessions to the man who has *not* got the means to operate a mine I would give concessions to the man who has the wealth to work it. We cannot blind our eyes to the fact that throughout Newfoundland to-day there is a number of mineral finds possible of development, but lying dormant because people who are interested and who have been trying to do something with these mines have not had the money to go ahead with the development. Therefore, the only hope these people have is to get the men from outside, men who have the money to come in and develop the properties. And so I respectfully submit, in answer to the query put by the honourable member for Fortune Bay, that so far as I am concerned in supporting the Bill, I support it with particular pleasure because I am told by the honourable member for Fortune Bay that people who are here are wealthy, and I only hope that Guggenheim of New York will not only send his money but that he will come along himself. We want all the Guggenheims we can get in this country now. If Buchans Mine is going to bring Guggenheims here and some of their money here, I think we all must admit that it is badly wanted. I think also the notion of confining this Red Indian Lake District to a specific development is a mistake. It is a separate development and ought to be encouraged. With regard to the question asked by Mr. Grimes as to my viewpoint about concessions for local manufacturies. I would be prepared to grant concessions to any legitimate

industrial enterprise. For instance, this rabbit industry that Mr. Grimes spoke about in the House a few days ago I would be willing and ready to give concessions to that. With regard to the clause dealing with locally manufactured timber. The clause is one that could be reasonably expected to be put in any such Bill. They are to get timber grown in Newfoundland, if and when this timber is required by them, but it is absurd to suggest that we should be able to tell when the Company are to place their orders or what notice they are to give. If our people expect the trade, they have got to have the goods in stock. The lumber business is run on business lines just like any other business is. The man in the business in order to cater to the trade that is going has got to stock up. I do not think the honourable member for Twillingate would seriously urge that these people should have to place their orders in for timber at such and such a time.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I would so much fear that provision as regards the railway were it not for the fact that the A.N.D. Company are not alone in this proposition. They are linked up with American interests. We know the A.N.D. Company and we are dealing with their name only in this thing. I should think that the honourable member for Fortune Bay's point is well taken that there should be a definite limitation geographically or some other form as regards the Red Indian Lake area. I do not think there is anything unreasonable about that and it is only by meeting such reasonable requests and suggestions that we can hope to make any substantial progress on this measure.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I have no objection, in fact I would be delighted to get that information before proceeding further. I would be glad to have any information as regards maps or blue-prints produced to-morrow. I may say also that as to the suggest on of the honourable member for Fortune Bay with respect to the Company not having the right to build a railway, I could have something embodied in the Bill in that connection. If it is not the des re of the Committee to proceed further with the discussion this afternoon, I would move that the Committee rise.

DR. MOSDELL—If that information is brought down, I would be glad to see the Bill proceed without any further interruption.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act respecting Crown Royalties."

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I would now call the Second Reading of this Bill merely to get it advanced a stage. I will not go into the details now because I think there will be a general agreement as to the principle involved. As I have already intimated, there is a general provision under which machinery is provided to carry into effect any royalties on Crown properties and seeing that any such royalties are attached and run with the properties, no matter what transfers or assignments take place. I have, therefore, to ask that any discussion that is about to take place on this Bill will occur in Committee stage?

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice and with unanimous consent of the House the order that the Second Reading of the Bill entitled: "An Act relating to Crown Royalties" be deferred until to-morrow was rescinded and

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

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn until Thursday, July 28th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House than adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 28th, 1927.

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

A Petition was presented by:

Mr. Linegar, from unemployed persons in St. John's, re Employment.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions, which were then read a first time as follows:

Department of Posts and Telegraphs	$1,213,636.15
Department of the Assessor of Taxes	15,120.00
Department of Customs ..	588,353.00
Department of the Pension's Board Commissioners	618,550.00

The said resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the Resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act relating to Crown Royalties."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I think it will be remembered that some time ago when we were considering certain stages of the Buchans Mine Agreement the question of Royalties and timber lands involved arose. At that time I remarked that it was the intention of the Government to bring down general legislation providing for cases in which the Crown may be interested in the way of Royalties. The object, therefore, is to put on our Statute Book a provision which will ensure that where a Royalty is reserved in any contract with any party from the Crown that the benefit of that Royalty will be kept alive no matter what may happen to the property. In other words, if we contract with any particular corporation in this Legislature for any particular purpose and arising out of that contract a Royalty is to be exacted, and if subsequent to that any transfer or assignment takes place, the object of this Bill is to safeguard the Colony from any possible doubt as to the payment of that Royalty. As a matter of fact, the Bill as far as I can think has only application at the moment in particular to this especial case. I do not know of any actual operation that is going on out of which we are receiving a Royalty, except the one at Buchans Mine. This ensures, therefore, that in view of the position that has been raised as to the possibility of this Company assigning this property, or a considerable portion of this property, to any other concern that this right of Royalty and the charges upon the land will attach to and run with the property wherever it goes. Secondly, it will be noticed that this Bill devises a method by which the value of a Royalty can be ascertained. It will be remembered in the 1905 Act this five per cent. was to be established upon a certain basis and the question naturally arose and could be very propertly asked as to what was the selling price when stuff was sold and what test could be made to show that the sale was genuine. Now this present Bill sees to it that such a transaction is to be a genuine one. That is shortly the effect of this Bill, which was introduced arising out of a possible uncertainty as regards

the situation about Buchans Mines, but in its present form it now becomes applicable to any case and is not aimed at the A.N.D. Company or any particular corporation.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, does the passing of this Act mean that the most we can expect to get is a royalty of five per cent. on the net profits of the A.N.D. Company in respect to the development of their property in Red Indian Lake district? The 1905 Act provides for such a five p.c. royalty on net profits. Now we have before us a new measure, based to some extent on the old one, but going a great deal further by giving the Company better and greater concessions, advantages and privileges than they were given in the original agreement. Can the Legislature demand from the Company—and I take it it can if it wants to—better returns for the concessions and advantages given them, prior to the passing of this Act, and is there anything in this Act that perverts the Legislature seeking from the Company better arrangements and advantages?

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, the only effect of this Legislation is that where a royalty does exist it merely ensures that a Royalty attaches to and runs with the land and secondly it provides the machinery for devising a method by which the selling price can be ascertained; but it in no way interferes with or prejudices any possibilty of doing anything tending to reduce the Royalty that will be done respecting the A.N.D. Company.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I suppose I cannot criticise this Act from a legal standpoint but I fail to see where it is accomplishing the object aimed at. It is a disappointment to me and I would urge against it, because I thought you were going to bring down a general policy with regard to Crown Land Royalties. All you are doing under this Act is providing legal machinery to safeguard the payments of royalties in the event of assignments or transfers being made of any property also to ascertain the value of a Royalty. I really thought that the Minister of Justice knows what I have in my mind, namely, a general scale laid down for Royalties.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE Mr. Chairman, how could you possibly to-day bring in any general measures with the unfortunate limited knowledge we got of our natural resources of fixing for water power or Royalty for timber. The unfortunate situation is that we are not possessed of sufficient knowledge to lay down any definite policy as a fixed charge. The remark of the honourable member for St. Barbe is in line with my own thought as regards the Crown Lands Act. That Act has been on the Statute Book for a number of years and calls for a minimum price of $2.00 per quare mile for timber lands. On two properties that passed last year to the Reid Company we merely fixed a price of 25 cents per acre, but we had nothing to base that on. We had fairly general information as to the nature of the territory, but the great difficulty is to come in with an enactment that the royalty for developing water power shall be so much and the same applies to mineral and timber lands, because the conditions you would attach to the properties would vary, according to the location of the places, and naturally the royalty to be charged would depend upon that. Certainly I had no notion of misleading the House into the idea that the Act now before us was going to be a fixed policy and I cannot see now, without securing a considerable amount of advice and without giving a considerable amount of thought and consideration to the matter, how you would be able to come in here and fix a price as to what royalties should be charged on our natural resources in the light of the very

limited information we have at our disposal concerning those resources.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: You have been obliged to introduce this legislation arising out of Buchan's Mine. As has been pointed out by members from this side of the House, you are going to have considerable difficulty to ascertain what the net profits of the A.N.D. Company would be from the operations of Buchan's Mine. Under those operations we would have to get a royalty. Now, as a layman, I do not think matters are simplified anything. You got the machinery for arbitrations; but you got to adopt one of two courses and you have no good ground for making your royalty sure. You must either accept or reject the statement of the A.N.D. Company. If you reject it, there will be recourse to this machinery for arbitration which might be such an extensive and complicated process that it may be better to accept the original statement of the company. If the A.N.D. Company on this day had been one year in operation and the Government had to discover what their profits were and supposing the company sent in their statement to the Government, would you be prepared to accept that statement off-hand or would you prefer to have it go to arbitration or do you anticipate any arbitration would be necessary

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: The reason why we got to do this is to do justice to all parties concerned. For example, if the Governor-in-Council appoints a person on an arbitration, surely the person interested in a property has the right also to be represented at such an arbitration, as provided by Section 3 of the Act. The whole essence of the Act virtually is that that connection is contained in Section 1 and which reads in part: "It shall be deemed to be a term of such Act, agreement, grant, lease, license, concession or other arrangement unless otherwise therein expressly stated that the mineral, timber, power or other product or thing shall be sold or disposed of at or about the current commercial value of the same and that the sales shall be made and the operations carried on upon ordinary and reasonable commercial terms and conditions so as to produce to the Crown such Royalty as shall be fair and proper under all the circumstances." As a matter of fact to-day it would be perfectly within the scope of the enactment to have a sale for a nominal value made. There is no provision to-day that ensures that the profits shall be based upon an ordinary commercial venture. To illustrate the point, supposing the A.N.D. Company are out there owners of this property and they come to an arrangement to sell their ore to the American Smelters for a very small figure, but the American Smelters in selling that in turn might have a very different figure on it, then the object we have in view is to ensure that the country gets by way of royalty what is the reasonable value of that article as it is shipped from this country. As to whether or not we anticipate any arbitrations, I could not say with any degree of accuracy, but with our experiences with the A.N.D. Company we do not expect anything but just, honest and proper statements from them.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I feel that I am not at all impressed with the proposition that the royalty upon net profits of the A.N.D. Company will amount to much for Newfoundland. We cannot evade now the provisions of the 1905 Act, but I do say that in my opinion the Government might make arrangements that the royalty in connection with Buchan's Mine ought to be on a straight basis of ore so much per ton. If we have to trust to getting royalty on the basis of net profits, I am afraid

that we will get very little for all our trouble. I would much prefer that we would get paid a royalty on the straight basis of the ore, but if the Minister of Justice, who is the Law Officer of the Crown, is satisfied that we cannot abrogate the 1905 agreement in that respect, then there is nothing left for us to do, although he is placed in a delicate position because these Resolutions that we have before us now were brought in by reason of the Buchan's Mine proposition.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman: I must say that I was somewhat interested in the remarks of the hon. member for St. Barbe because I think he struck the right note when he talked about getting down to some general basis for Crown Royalties. For years, as is well known, we have been giving away virtually our timber lands and water powers for nothing. Now the time has come when the present Crown Lands Act must be abolished. There are many things which are absolutely essential to be changed, as the Crown Lands Act stands to-day. For instance take our mining locations. We get on a half square mile $10 plus a $1 stamp or $11 a year, and no matter what mineral is found on the property the Government gets nothing. The time has come when we must make a bigger price and get a greater revenue. Besides that for every $6,000 spent on a half square mile you get a fee simple mining location, so that after spending $60,000 you get five square miles for always. Then take timber lands upon which you get $2 a square mile and, I think, 50 cents on a thousand feet board measurement. In Quebec they pay from $400 to $500 per square mile for new wood and pulp lands, and $1.08 per cord stumpage. Now we have this Labrador Boundary. There is a certain amount of timber down here, and it is time we got down to some basis of a fixed royalty. Canada charges five dollars per square miles rental per annum; gets an annual revenue of five dollars per square mile stumpage, and two dollars and seventy-five cents per thousand feet b.m., besides that a bonus is paid up to $60 per square mile. Why shouldn't we adopt some kind of laws similar to the Quebec timber laws. The Quebec timber laws are about the best in Canada. On the other hand the Ontario mining laws are the best in Canada. For water power they pay according to the size of the water power. At Lake St. John where Mr. Stadler is erecting a small mill there was paid ten thousand dollars down and five thousand a year and fifty cents per horse power developed and development not to be less than fifteen thousand. We get practically nothing here for water power. I think we should get down to some basis for royalties on our timber lands and should get a bonus per square mile and then stumpage. Surely if timber is worth so much to Quebec and the United States our timber should have a proportionate value. That is one reason why I would like to see the Crown Lands Act amended as quickly as possible and if it is not taken up this session it should be taken up either by this Government or the incoming Government. Mr. Scammell remarks about our profit from Buchan's Mine on their net profits. I understand besides getting this five per cent. on net profits we would be entitled to income tax. When the income tax was in force we got a very considerable sum from the A.N.D. Company. They are not exempt from Income and Business Profits Tax, as some other large corporations are..

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Under the 1905 Pulp and Paper Act with regard to the question of net profits, the sort of machinery that was provided there was this:

(Reads)

That shows the kind of thing that will be taken into consideration:

(Reads)

MR. ASHBOURNE—I would like to ask whether the A.N.D. Company has inquired as to some definition of the term what is meant by net profits?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—So far as I know, the Colonial Secretary might check me up, I never heard of any request of the A.N.D. Company with regard to royalties. This did not arise on account of any request for information on their part. It is simply general legislation. It simply comes at this time because the matter was drawn to our attention at this time. It is an unfortunate coincidence.

MR. ASHBOURNE—It seems to me that Section 1 is rather loose:

(Reads)

I fail to see where there is any improvement at all on the 1905 Act method. I was under the impression that the Colony was to derive a benefit of 5 per cent. from the net profits of ore. It seems to me, according to this, to be on the manufactured product, not on the raw material.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We get 5 per cent. on whatever profits are made by the A.N.D. Company by selling of ore whether in raw state or manufactured when they sell it. Whatever their profits, we get 5 per cent. The language of the act on that point is:

(Reads)

MR. ASHBOURNE—Is there anything to prevent the company; I don't say that they would do it; forming a subsidiary company and selling ore to that company at a nominal price?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Without being bad-minded, that is the very thing the Bill is aimed at.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Ashbourne spoke about ore exported in the raw state. I assume he thought it was going to be exported raw. I might remind him there will be considerable labour given in concentrating the ore.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I said if it wasn't smelted. A different value in regard to labor if they export concentrates.

MR. SULLIVAN—There is a considerable amount of money spent concentrating ore so it is not raw material. All ore must be concentrated. You cannot ship away a lot of rock. The extra freight for that would kill it. As far as I can hear they are going to build a smelting plant as soon as they are ready. That means an expenditure of another three million if they go ahead with the smelting. That is just the rumor I hear. It will be noticed that the act only asks for ten years for bags for concentrates, so aparently it is in their minds to smelt ore.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill 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 Bill be read a third time presently.

Thereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Second Reading of bill "An Act Respecting Education."

MR. HALFYARD — Mr. Speaker, Realizing the importance of the questoin of Education as it affects the individual and the state, and having some knowledge of my own inability to treat with the subject as it should be treated, I aproach this question with some diffidence and reluctance. Treating with such a tremendously important subject I would like to have the prestige and influence as an edu-

cationalist of Mr. Paton, the President of the Memorial College; I would like to be able to present any statements that I may make with the authority from a historical point of view as Mr. Whiteway, the principal of the Normal School, who is so sure of historical dates and facts. I would also like to have the profound knowledge of education as it is in Newfoundland, of Dr. Blackall the superintendent of the Church of England schools, who can treat with the subject as an authority in a particular and most exhaustive manner, and I would like also be able to present my statements having the enthusiastic and convincing effect as subjects of any nature can be treated by Dr. Curtis. I also envy the ability certain members of the Legislature have of presenting their statements, marshaling their facts, in respect to any subject of importance, in such a way as to command the attention and interest of the House. I would prefer to sit and listen to Mr. Browne the Honorable Member for St. John's West, a University graduate, a man who through ability, energy and industry succeeded in winning the Rhodes Scholarship and secured credit to himself and it is an honor to this Legislature to have such a man associated with us, and I feel quite sure that he could present his statements in connection with the important matter of Education in such a manner as would appeal to this House in a more assured and convincing manner than anything I can say; bearing in mind that my opportunities to secure an education and my experience and my acquirements are not such as are possessed by those men whom I have mentioned. I would also refer to my Honorable friend the Member for Twillingate Mr. Ashbourne who is another University graduate. I trust that with their knowledge of higher education and what it means to the individual and community and the state that they will interest themselves in the subject now before the House and before the question is put to a vote we will have the oportunity of listening to a speech from them on the subject.

Mr. Speaker, I take it for granted that every Member of this Legislature is interested in the subject and appreciates the value of education. It is the most important question we as a Legislature have to consider. We speak of the importance of education to the individual in domestic life, private life, commercial life and in the life of the state. We are told and we quite believe that education is the first duty of any Government. We are told that the question is as broad as the ocean, and that it has occupied the minds of the greatest thinkers in the past and is occupying the minds of the greatest thinkers in the present, and still the question is so profound, in its depth and height and expansion that the fringe of the subject is only touched at the present time. We have been told that the progress of humanity depends upon the development of the human mind thraugh education. That being so, if our progress as a community from a humanitarian point of view, from an industrial, commercial, material or spiritual point of view depends largely on education, therefore any time we may spend in considering the question of education I hope will not be lost. It is said that the education of children is regulated not by their brain formation, their mental development, but by the wealth of parents or by the will of the municipality in the interest they may take in education or by the will and action of the Government to grant money to provide means for the education of the youth. Education is not universally appreciated, commended and encouraged. It is said that the ignorant man who succeeds through natural force and lucky oportunity is fond of saying "What is

the use of Education?" I imagine such men are few and far between, but possibly we would find even in our own country men questioning the large vote for education and saying that they got on very well and never spent much time in school and why spend so much time and money in sending a boy to elementary schools, and then for two years university course that we now have the advantage of at the Memorial College. Well that is viewing the matter from a very low standpoint; that is only material; nothing for the cultural side; the pleasure education gives whether it gives monetary gain or not, is not considered by individuals who make such statements. We know that a great many people, hundreds and thousands, have been satisfied with very little gain. They have sacrificed pleasures and luxuries and all the material joys of life, and what they get as their greatest pleasure is th knowledge of nature, and all that applies to the well-being of mankind. That is their life, their being. Unfortunately through industrial conditions the higher ideal of education is forgotten in a great many instances, and it is simply grovelling in the dust as it were for a bare existence. "How shall we be fed and wherewith shall we be clothed." That is what is occupying the attention of the majority of individuals, not only in this country but throughout the world. But we should view education this afternoon from the educational point of view, from the pleasure we get from knowing things. We may view it from the material point of view, and it is said that the greatness of a nation depends upon the average mental power of that nation's citizens. And this mental power depends largely upon education. Therefore we regard the public schools as a most important institution. And the most important citizens of the country are the teachers. It therefore behoves every individual in this country to give attention to our educational problems, and find out if we are doing the best we can under the circumstances, and getting the best returns possible for the public moneys voted for the cause of education throughout the country. Are we seeing that the mental power of the youth of this country is being developed? Are they given a chance as they become men and women to take their place in the industrial life of this country, and to fight the battles of life wherever their lot may be cast, whether in the country or outside of it? Are we doing our duty as legislators, and the people of adult life in this country are they doing their duty in connection with the cause of education? I submit that the introduction of this Act has given us an opportunity to do a little thinking. I trust that the time spent on this question will cause each of us to think and think in the right direction. This is no party question. This is too big for party politics. There is nothing partisan about it. It is too comprehensive and too important. Therefore I trust that the remarks I am making will be taken in the spirit in which they are meant. And when I speak in connection with any matter I trust that I will not be subjected to the bullets of the literary political assassin. We as legislators in the past have not given the serious thought to the subject of education that we should. We have looked upon it as someone else's job. We have left practically the whole matter in the hands of the educational authorities. That may possibly be all right, but have we supported the efforts or the recommendations of the educationalists of this country, either in the present or in the past? I propose this afternoon to prove that we have not given heed to the recommendations of the superintendents of education and the authorities who are supposed to be looking after the edu-

cational system of Newfoundland. We canont get more out of the schools than we put in them. What I mean by that is, that if you put in your schools men and women as teachers who have never had an opportunity of even being submitted to a test to get a grade, and I am not speaking now of the opportunities of a college education or a teachers' training school. How can we expect results when we cannot afford to train our teachers. Really we cannot afford not to train our teachers. But that is not the question. Can we afford to neglect our schools, and not to see that those who have the most important, or yo umay call it the sacred duty, of teaching are properly trained. We should see that the youth of this country at their most impressionable time of life are not submitted to the teaching of those who have no knowledge of teaching whateyer. No knowledge of tra ning the child as it should be trained. What our schools of to-day are is an infallible index of what the men and the women of twenty years hence will be. They are in the formative period. And the ideas a child gets of h s or her responsibility to the community and to himself or herself greatly depends upon the teaching that he or she gets before twelve or fifteen years of age. And speaking of the value of education, we cannot do better than to refer to the report of the Department of Education for 1922-1923 and quote Dr. Burke, the Deputy Minister of Education.

(Reads.)

I recommend the reports of the Department of Education to the members of this House of Assembly. That is Dr. Burke's reference to the increased productive capacity of education, and I would infringe upon the time of the House too long if I were to refer to it any further. Now let us take the 1925-26 report.

(Reads.)

Russia has been the victim of revolution and disaster through the want of education. It couldn't play its part in the Great World War when its officers were wiped out because, while it could get millions of men but none of them with knowledge enough to take officers' appointments. They had no leaders through lack of education. But to my mind it would be worth anyone's while to read the articles that are now being published in the Even ng Telegram newspaper from the pen of Dr. Blackall. He is leading up to the necessity of having people educated to understand the industrial conditions under which they live, and to get people to work under any circumstances and to make themselves ndependent of circumstances, even if they have to endure want and suffering for the time being. Now I think that I have taken up enough time for my introductory remarks with regard to the value of education. I would also with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and with the indulgence of the House, refer to the reports of the superintendents and find out how we stand with regard to education in this country, and I refer now in particular to elementary education. We are fairly well looked after with regard to Higher Education. Forward steps have been taken in that respect. But how has the efforts of the Governments present and past affected the people in the extern districts, in small and sparsely settled communities. These people are in no better position today than they were twenty years ago. Are the people who live in sparsely settled communities gett ng any better educational advantages than they got ten years ago. According to the reports of the Superintendents of Education they are not. They are not one iota better off than they were ten years ago. Now referreing to the School Report for 1920-21 we find that there were 1511 teachers, and out of

that number there were 397 third grade and 341 ungraded. That was about six years ago. There were 730 teachers, I will venture to say, who never had an opoprtunity of attending college, let alone having an opportunity of teacher training or Normal School training. Some of these are little girls just in their teens. They happened to pass Primary and Prelim. Grade. The educational authorities tried to do the best they could and they had to use the material at their disposal. And any kind of school was better than no school at all, and they taught the children to read and write anyhow. In 1922 there were 1520 teachers. There were 286 third grade and 326 ungraded that year. In 1923 there were 1471 teachers, or 99 teachers less in 1923 than in 1922. No doubt the lesser number of teachers can be accounted for as ungraded teachers and third grade teachers included. That is, there were 99 schools that should have been opened and were not opened for want of money. If the schools were opened in '22 certainly there were need of schools then. But the next year it was found that the grant had been all used up. This shows that as far as elementary education is concerned in this country we are not making any progress.

(Reads.)

Every alternate year there seems to be a lesser number of teachers. Thereofre it would be worth taking time and trouble to find out where we get off with regard to elementary education in this country. What are we doing as a Government, as a people, and as a Legislature? Cannot we possibly find the money to give schools to these places where the children are of schoolable age and have no opportunity of attending school. Take the average man on the street, take the members of this House, take the strangers in this Assembly, if they have children of their own, what kind of feelings would they have if they knew that they had to raise their children without giving them an opportunity of even the most elementary education. From my point of view it is unthinkable. Still we do not realise it. But from my point of view rather than be responsible for bringing children into this world without giving them an elementary education, I would go and jump over the wharf. It is criminal. I may get too much exercised over that point but anyhow I feel strongly on that matter, whether it is criminal or not, and it is something that we should anyhow try to remedy if it is at all possible.

I would also like to refer the House to the remarks of the Superintendents of Education on inspection and supervision. Here is what Dr. Blackall, the Church of England Superintendent says in his report for 1920-21:

(Reads.)

The Deputy Minister of Education also made a report for that year. It is worth while to read some of these reports because they contain the cream of the opinions of the greatest educationalists of modern times, as all the Deputy Minister has to do is to copy these opinions and put them in form to be read. In referring to the Superintendents the Deputy Minster says in his report:

(Reads)

The Superintendents have a qualification in regard to experience for inspecting schcols and no doubt they can give their assistance and advice to supervisors, but still whereever possible the chief and director, as is pointed out by the Deputy Minister, should get in touch with the actual work and visit the schools. I think it is time for all of us to realise what we are doing in the cause of education. I am not giving my own opinion, but I am giving the opinions of those who are suposed to know what they are talking about. This is what the Deputy Minster says in his report for 1922-23

concerning outport schools:

(Reads)

The other day I asked a question here as to the number of schools were inspected by the Superintendents, but I did not get an answer. In his report for 1923 Dr. Blackall says that he visited 72 schools and that the number of visits he made was 124, so that the greater number of these schools were visited twice. That is what we want to know. We want to know what those public officials are doing for the salaries they get, not when people ask for a question here to be held up to ridicule and contempt by the public press. In his report for 1924-25 the Deputy Minister points out the lack of our educational facilities and the weaknesses of our educational system. He says:

(Reads)

For the same year Dr. Blackall says that as much as possible was done in the way of inspection for that year. Dr. Curtis's report for last years says:

(Reads)

Then Mr. Samson, the C. of E. Assistant Superintendent of Education, reports for that year as follows:

(Reads)

Now what applies to the Church of England schools aplies to the other denominations. Then the Deputy Minister of Education refers to what is called age graded teachers. Here is the list of the table:

(Reads)

So we have to deplore the fact of our disadvantages in that respect. We know that teachers should be trained An effort was made in 1920 to train our teachers properly and I think the Superintendents of Education and educationalists generally are pleased with the progress that has been made in that direction. I have here reports from Dr. Blackall and Dr. Curtis on that aspect of the question.

(Reads)

I can sympathize with Dr. Curtis in his remarks, because when I began to teach school I experimented upon the little children whom I taught and I am very pleased to know of the wonderful advances that have been made in regard to teachers training in Newfoundland, although it only applies to higher grade schools where the necessity is not so great. But I am afraid it will be a long while before we get a first grade or associate teacher to go to places in White Bay or any other remote section of the country, and that is my idea of taking up the time of the House to try and make us realise our responsibility to the children who have no facilities or no advantages comparatively speaking. In speaking of the Normal School, Dr. Blackall in his report for 1924-25 says:

(Reads)

I trust that if this work has been appreciated in any way for the advancement of education that it will be indemnified a thousand-fold and that the result of his efforts may reach every section of the country. Dr. Blackall in his report refers also to the interest the Prime Minister has taken in education and of his interest in the Memorial College and Training School. Perhaps, that is the only thing to the credit of the Prime Minister, and perhaps my object would not be advanced one whit further if I were to refer to the benefits of teachers training. Something was said in one of the reports here about compulsory education. Well it is a pity that we have not got compulsory attendance at school, as I feel that should be the goal we should all work for—that is, compulsory education for children of a certain age. It would mean of course a further grant of money by the Legislature, as fees no doubt would have to be cut out, but it should be tackled if at all possible and I do not want to be hypocritical in this matter. Compulsory education should be enforced at once, if the finances of the country would permit it. I merely mention that in passing. I understand the wo-

men who were interested in the right to vote had compulsory education as a plank in their platform. This may sound political on my part, as if I go to the country again I will have these women on my side. Anyhow, whether we have compulsory education or not the advantage of some kind of a decent education should be given to the children in the remote sections of the Island. If that is done, then the parent who would neglect to send his or her child to school and with the advantages of an education at their disposal should be ostracized and regarded as not a fit subject to live in any community. Some of these reports I have contain a number of recommendations for medical inspection of schools. No doubt the health of the children should get the first consideration and there should be proper medical inspection of schools, even if it did cost more money. The health of the children should be protected. We know that the laws of God and Nature are broken invariably through ignorance, and I contend it is the duty of the State to endeavour as far as possible to eliminate that ignorance. Dr. Blackall has this to say on medical inspection of schools:

(Reads)

We all must realise the necessity of medical inspection of schools and yet here we are looking for funds to give our children that care and attention from a health point of view. It shows how sadly lacking we are in giving our children the essentials in connection with that care and attention they should get. Now, I am non-political in my remarks this afternoon. We have had Supervisors since 1920, I think, three of them, Mr. Elliott, Church of England; Mr. Serrick, Methodist, and Mr. English, Roman Catholic. But there is no credit to us for these Supervisors, either as a Government or as a Legislature, because it was through the philanthropic bequest of the late Hon. John Harvey that supervision was made possible. In connection with this matter Dr. Blackall says this in a report:

(Reads)

This country will ever be under a lasting debt of gratitude to the late Hon. John Harvey. He was a philanthropist. His mind was always exercised in thinking up plans to benefit the people of Newfoundland That is evidenced in his tuberculosis campaign; then by his bequest of fifteen thousand dollars for the supervision of schools in sparsely settled settlements. It is a thousand pities we haven't more men of the stamp of the Hon. John Harvey and I trust that some one who is blessed with this world's goods and money before departing this life will be inspired with the same thought for the same object as inspired Mr. Harvey. Some people may say we are doing all we can for education but in this last report of the superintendents three is a statement of comparative expenditure:

(Reads)

In the list of comparative expenditure according to population we are away down. Then besides that we are locally handicapped because people are scattered over a coast line of two thousand miles, in out-of-the-way places and if the people were brought together into half a dozen large communities the money spent now would do ten times as much good. But we can't help that. Anyhow we compare our expenditure and our incomes in other respects with the provinces of the Dominion of Canada. That is an eye-opener; after all we are not doing anything wonderful.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the trouble to speak of ungraded and third graded teachers throughout the country and I think I have proved to the House we are no better off in that respect than we were years and years ago. With regard to inspec-

tion the system of inspection may be better. If the superintendents of education did not do better than formerly then they would not be worthy of their positions. They have better facilities and greater opportunities of knowing things than when I taught school twenty-odd years ago. I spoke of inspection as it applied when I taught school and it was absolutely a farce in a great many respects; and at the present time if all we put into the estimates for inspections is twenty thousand, what is the good Isn't it farcical, when we have half the schools not inspected The vote for inspection should be doubled or trebled. Then we would be doing something. I intended to speak on that matter when the estimates were going through. I have shown we are sadly lacking in several matters in regard to supervision in regard to medical inspection of schools; in regard to age standard; we are behind in that respect. I have an object also in leading up to this point of inspection and in speaking of that matter of teacher and supervision I can't help referring to the speech given by Dr. Barnes when he introduced the Education Act of 1920. Dr. Barnes is the educationalist of Newfoundland. I can appreciate him possibly more than others because I have rubbed shoulders with him for three for four years. He has a thorough grasp of educational matters. He has no side lines; nothing else to divert his attention; a student all the time and his life is devoted to education. There may be other men of equal appointments in this country with regard to education but I am not acquainted with them so closely. Dr. Barnes entered the political arena in 1919 with one object, to do something for education. He had been under the supervision of Dr. Blackall as superintendent of education and he knew what he was talking about. He had got information locally and from travel in European countries. His idea was not altogether just the establishment of the Memorial University College. That was only secondary. Alright for that but his principle idea was to have the teachers trained so that they could teach the children in the outports properly. He did not stop at that. In the 1920 Act there was provision made for ten or eleven supervisors and these men were actually selected by the superintendents of education. They were picked men and sent to two of the greatest teaching universities in the United States to get a thorough training in teaching and come back and teach the teachers how to teach. They would go to those schools taught by ungraded and third grade teachers and teach those to teach who didn't know how to teach. They would encourage and advise and sympathise. The old system of inspection would be eradicated where inspectors come in and stop a short time and get a poor idea of what the school was like because the children would be frightened in the presence of a stranger. The idea was to get away from the cold inspectorial atmosphere and have the inspector give an example of teaching on different subjects and stay there for one, two or three or four days and get a good idea of what exactly each school was like. But we know what happened and that is always the way with education . That is the history of our country and every other country under the sun. And we can't understand it. Opposition of the strongest kind is set up against every movement of this kind in connection with education against everything regarded as a new departure. Mr. Speaker, I could not do better than refer to this part of the speech made on this subject by Dr. Barnes in 1921. His language is so beautiful and his description is so apt you can see culture in every line and every

sentence Speaking of education:

(Reads)

But Pastolozzi passed away, and a monument was raised to his memory, and every school throughout the country has his picture hung upon the walls. This is human nature all through our history.

(Reads)

At that time Dr. Barnes had to do the most unpleasant thing in his life no doubt. At that time he gave an excellent speech. He spoke of what the supervisors were supposed to do. How they could benefit education, and then he had to wind up by saying:

(Reads)

His work as far as that is concerned has all gone to the four winds of Heaven. Mr. Hodder was sent away to get a year's training at the public expense, and now he is doing clerical work in the Post Office, when he should be out performing his God-given duty of trying to encourage the teachers to carry on their work, and to raise the standard of education. But what as a Government have we done? Our schools are in the same regrettable, deplorable condition that they were in ten years ago. With regard to grades and with regard in the majority of cases to inspectors, I am of the opinion that the Prime Minister should get the superintendents or someone to give us the names of the schools that wern't inspected last year. Then we would get some idea as to whether these out of the way places are getting any attention or not. Or whether the higher grade schools are getting supervision or not. We cannot congratulate ourselves on having done anything, during the last three or four years, with regard to elementary education. There was an effort and a sincere effort made, in 1920 but it could not be put into effect, either through politics or people not knowing the difference. Every report which has been issued by the Minister of Education since 1920 have been filled up with the great need of supervisors and praying the Legislature for funds to be provided to send out supervisors. Nothing has been done outside of the three men sent out. The Government cannot take any credit for doing anything. Higher education is alright But it is causes that we have to investigate. How does it affect the well-being of the producing classes in this country who do not know what is wrong with the country. And they cannot read some of them to find out. It is considered a blessing if people can get work to keep body and soul together, and trying to find fault with those who happen to be in power at that time. But whether we are responsible or not we are not taking any pains to try and teach the people differently, the people who are trying to fight their battles in connection with all other countries in the world, who have to go through the period of depression in connection with their marketable produce.

Now we are asked by this Act of 1927, to repeal the Education Act of 1920, and to cut out the Department of Education. But if there was anything of a forward movement given to education of the country, and I think that there was as a result of the creation of the Department of Education, and as it happened that there was an educationalist at the head of it at the time, then I think that there should be a Minister of Education at the present time. But I would regard it as impertinent on my part to indicate to the Government or to the Prime Minister that when he came from the polls in 1924, that he did not have a man in his party, in whom he had enough confidence and respect to make him Minister of Education. That Department of Education should be functioning under a Minister at the present time. And

you have a man in your own party who is fully qualified to act as Minister of Education a man of learning and integrity and honesty of purpose, a man who could be Minister and a member of the Executive Government. They may be few but they are there. You may look upon them as being not matured in point of years. I mention Mr. Browne, the member for St. John's West. Why not make him Minister of Education, if he would accept it and devote his whole attention to that department. It is the most important department that was ever created And it is our purpose to wipe it out. What did the Minister of Education and his Department do, when it was functioning, that it is recommended that we do not want a Minister any longer. Did he do something to defeat the objects of the Educational Superintendents in the country, and by the cutting out of that department will you give an impetus to education. Will it help in any way. We have heads of departments for everything else under the sun. I contend that with this Bureau of Education under this Bill, and the Prime Minister at the time being the president of it, that the superintendents of education and their secretaries may write out reports until they dropt out of existence, and they will have no more effect upon the Executive Government of the day than these reports had upon the Government since 1920. Why does not the present Government do something to justify their existence, as being interested in education, by apointing a few supervisors. The activities of the Memorial College, under Mr. Paton, one of the greatest educationalists that ever came to this side of the water I am told, will continue to function. We have Mr. Whiteway one of the greatest teachers in this country, who spent a lifetime at education, and under him the Normal School will continue to function with great satisfaction throughout the country. Those institutions may function automatically, and as for any action by the present Government with regard to them, there is absolutely none. And the reports of the Department of Education proved it. It is not a political statement of mine. We have not improved one iota in elementary education as it applies to the extern parts of this country, and unless supervisors are appointed to visit those places your teachers' training at the Normal School will have nothing at all to do with it. The activities and the functioning of the Normal Training School have absolutely nothing directly to do with one-third of the schools throughout the island Therefore, it is the duty of this Legislature to bring in a vote in Additional Estimates for more supervisors and give heart to the Superintendents of Education who are trying to awaken us to a sense of our duty. But, Mr. Speaker, for the life of me I do not know why this act was introduced here now. I have perused it and I cannot see anything in it that will forward matters educationally. There is nothing in it any more than what is contained in the 1920 Act s an Amendment to the 1916 Act. It is admitted that teachers will contribute one per cent. of their salaries to provide for pensions, but that could be brought in as an Amendment to the 1920 Act and introduced in a half dozen words. But even that one per cent will not meet the requirements of the pensions fund; it will only partly meet it. Under the old system they paid a premium according to age. Now they pay that and also one per cent of their salaries. I must apologize to you, Mr. Speaker, for taking up so much of the time and attention of the House and also for the patience you have exercised while I was talking. As I have further remarks to make, I would feel obliged

to you Sir if you would accept my motion for the adjournment of the debate on the Second Reading of this Bill this afternoon.

On Motion the Second Reading was deferred.

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Patents".

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, In view of the fact that I purpose making a motion to have this Bill referred to a Select Committee of the Whole House, I would ask the House to agree on the Second Reading. I do not know if there is any occasion at this stage for me to say much, as with the principle of the Bill there can be no question. It is simply an enlargement of our present law respecting patents and already has had the approval of independent legal gentlemen out side the House whose opinions I sought upon the matter, and also certain other ex-members of the Legislature who are occupying other positions now. For that reason I have taken care to bring along to the House a Bill that is nothing more or less than a practical embodiment of those who have had considerable experience with Patent Laws in this country. As I have previously intimated to the House, we cannot afford to have in this country legislation pertaining to the issue of patents in conformity to large countries like Great Britain and the United States because they have large technical Bureaus and experts for the examination and investigation of patents. We cannot attempt anything like that here. Our patent law, despite the fact of it having been on the Statute Book for a considerable number of years, has not been a source of much trouble in the past. It has recently been the subject of much comment in certain quarters regarding the claim for the issue of patents, and we felt that the time had arrived when we should bring ourselves somewhat in conformity with legislation elsewhere, especially as regards the issuing of patents in Newfoundland to those who have had already patents issued abroad. Under our present law, no matter how long a man has a patent elsewhere he can come along here and apply for a patent; but under this new Bill an inventor who has obtained a patent abroad must make application within one year from the date of the issue of the first foreign patent before a patent will be issued to him in Newfoundland but not otherwise. Then again, "The patent granted in this Colony shall not continue in force after the expiration of the first foreign patent; and no letters patent for or in respect of any invention for which any patent or like privilege shall have been obtained elsewhere and which shall be granted in this Colony after the expiration of the term for which such patent or privilege was granted or was in force shall be of any validity." "The term of the patent in this Colony shall not exceed 14 years, subject to extension by order of the Supreme Court." I do not think I need go further into the details of the Bill, and, I, therefore, make the motion for Second Reading.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Patents" was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Select Committee for consideration and report.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Committee as follows:

Hon. Minister of Justice.
Hon. Colonial Secretary.
Hon. Mr. Cramm.
Mr. Halfyard.
Mr. Bradley.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to tomorrow, July 29th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 29th, 1927.

The House met at three of the clock

in the afternoon pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance, the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until later in the sitting.

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act respecting Education."

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I again crave the attention of the House to further discuss this Bill and in order that any words of mine may have any effect or be intelligently received honourable members would require to have a copy of the Act before them because it is my intention to refer to some other clauses of this Act and to point out what I believe to be altogether irregular and possibly unnecessary. As I stated yesterday, it was my purpose to treat this matter from a non-political point of view. We presume that the present Bill is a revision and a consideration of the Education Acts and an Amendment to the 1916 Act and the object would be naturally to improve and increase the efficiency of our educational affairs, otherwise this Bill would be of no effect and it would be a waste of time to consider it. Therefore, we should examine this Bill carefully and see what it contains, whether it will give a stimulus to education and whether it will mean greater proficiency in the public schools in Newfoundland. Evidently the intention of this Bill is to abolish the Department of Education and create in its place a Bureau of Education. The Bureau is to consist of eleven persons made up of the Prime Minister; the three Superintendents of Education. The Education Secretary appointed under Section 68 of the Act and six other persons. Now from the information we get from the school reports as presented to this legislature from year to year we are told by the Superintendents themselves that they have more work than they can perform as Superintendents of Education. The number of schools has increased in the country during the past twenty years, still they point out that their help has not increased proportionately and that is why school inspection has not been carried on to the extent that it should be, according to the reports of the Superintendents themselves; but under the present Bill before the House the Superintendents will give less time to school inspection because the administration work and clerical work that they will have to do in connection with the Bureau will compel them to confine their activities to their office for a great deal of their time. Twenty years ago the Superintendents and their assistants spent nearly all their time visiting schools. They cannot do that to-day. I have tried to find out how many schools were inspected last year by the Superintendents and I cannot get a reply to my question. Neither can I get a reply to my question as to how many schools were not inspected. I regret that we have not got this information in order to discuss this subject more intelligently and to find out whether those schools in sparsely inhabited localities were getting inspection or not and whether high grade schools are getting the most attention from supervisors and inspectors. I may say that schools that have third grade and ungraded teachers should get more attention than schools that command the services of high grade teachers. We are, therefore, if we accept this Bill as it is, giving the Superintendents more work than they have already. If the Superintendents had a Minister in charge of the Department who would take away from them part of the administration duties of the Department they wou'd be able to devote more time to inspection work. The Superintendents have told themselves in their reports that because they had more work than they could attend to during the past three years very little inspection of schools was done

by some of them, and, according to the report of the Deputy Minister of Education, it is the duty of Superintendents to put in as much time at inspection work as possible and which he states would be an object lesson. That is the maxim set forth by the Deputy Minister. From that point of view I cannot see where there will be greater progress made in the cause of education in Newfoundland by giving Superintendents more work than they can manage already. Now it is proposed in the present Bill to have a Bureau of Education. A Bureau I think is defined as a Government Department for the transaction of public business. It is a department without a head. There are to be three Superintendents in it who are responsible to nobody. Well I do not think there is anything to be gained by that arrangement. Now it is proposed for the Prime Minister of the day to be President of the Bureau.

What attention can the Prime Minister of the day give to the important question of education? He is only President in name. It may be regarded as an honorary pos tion. Is that good enough for such an important sul ject as education? We all realise it is tremendously important, and is it good enough that that position should be held by the Prime Minister of the day? We can't get supermen to do half a dozen jobs effic ently, and with all the important work the Prime Minister has to oversee I can't see for the life of me how education can be advanced and profit by having a President in name only, not to do any actual work. It s impossible, no matter how much inclined any Prime Minister may be. He has to represent the Bureau in the Government, simply to do what he is told. He has not the time to give serious thought to the recommendations made ly the Bureau, and with regard to actual attendance, it is impossible for the Prime Minister to put in actual time. He is only a medium to pass on the recommendations of the members of the Bureau or the Superintendents of Education. Well, he may be a very wise man, a very honest man; that may apply to every other Minister. Leave t with the Deputy Minister and his assistant to pass matters on to the Prime Minister. It is only the old story over again. You can relegate this important question to somebody else and not have a Minster of Education in this House to answer any questions put to him on any matter, and have facts and figures and data at his disposal and be able to give any informtiona that is asked to the House and country, and that is necessary for the advancement of education. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the abolition of the Educat.on Department is a retrograde movement, nothing progressive about it, nothing forward about it. I state that now in all seriousness, with all due deference to the opinions of those who are supposed to know better than I do. So the quest on boils down to this: Is this an improvement on the Department of Education under a Minister? That is what the House has to consider. Before putting this Act on the Statute Book we want to see the reason why and whether it is beneficial or otherwise to give the Superintendents these large powers. I think they have powers enough now. It prevents the Government from interfering in any way with their little kingdoms. In the system of education we have in th s country there are three entire educational kingdoms; they are of equal status and nothing must interfere with the status of the Church of England Superintendent, or w.th the status of the Roman Catholic Superintendent, or with the status of the United Church Superintendent of Schools. We are a law unto ourselves and don't interfere. Well, that is all right if we have to consider everything from a denominational

standpo nt, and denominational education is a principle according to this "by-law established in Newfoundland". I suppose one would be a subject of contempt, perhaps may be regarded as of atheistic ideas if he were to mention the word 'denom national". If each meml er of the Legislature would honestly express his views regarding the educational system of the country and truthfully and honestly state what he felt and be brave enough and courageous enough to do so, he would say that the denominational system of education is a germ which creates sectarian sm that permeates the whole country.

The Superintendents of Education have spent the l est years of their lives and some of them are getting advanced in years in the cause of education, and in speaking of them we speak with respect for the r age and experience, l ut outside of that we must regard the Superintendents of Education as public servants and they have to be treated as such, and they should give an account of all their doings and activities to the Legislature and Government as well as any other public servant in the country. They have duties to perform but I can't see under this new Bill who is to see that they perform their duties. This Act gives the Bureau authority to appoint superv sing inspectors and prepare rules and regulations to govern their duties.

(Reads.)

I refer now to sections 9 and 10 of section 3 of the Act.

(Reads.)

Now those refer to the work of the Bureau, and I see in looking through the Act that in section 11, which gives the dut es, functions and powers of a Board of Education, it is provided:

(Reads.)

The Bureau have got to prescribe courses of study, recommend text books and apparatus, etc. Now turn over and you find the school l oards have to do the same. That is altogether unnecessary. It is only a duplication of work and will not work properly. I don't think you will find the majority of school l oards n the outports sufficiently qualified to prescrit e text books and courses of study. Last year the school l oard was to prescrit e the curriculum. That is cut out this year because no doul t it was thought too ridiculous to put that into the hands of the school l oards. Sect on 3, sub-section 11 reads:

(Reads.)

The provision in the 1920 Act was l etter. The Bureau is made up of Superintendents of Education and the teachers may have disputes with the Superintendents and still the Superintendents have to decide in connection with any appeal made from their own decision themselves. Section 4, sul -section (d)

(Reads.)

Of course a good deal depends upon the qualifications of the Secretary. He has to

(Reads Sec. 4.)

Sub-section (d)—to prepare the annual report for the Legislature. Well now under the 1920 Act the Deputy Minister was to bring annually to the Legislature no later than three weeks after the opening thereof the report of all schools in the Colony. There is no date given. I don't know whether that is done intentionally or not. It may be twelve months after the opening of the Leg slature. It was in l efore and it would be no harm to have it in and not leave it to come under the general rule with regard to tal ling of reports which is never adhered to.

Section 34

(Reads)

A consulting comm ttee. But still they may l e mem l ers of the C. H. E. I draw the attention of the Prime Minister to that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The

committee is only for such matters as may from time to time be referred to it by the Council.

MR. HALFYARD—It will be found that the consulting body and the advisory body will have members belonging to both and in a great many cases they will be advising themselves. I would refer also to the question of examinations or of boards of examiners. Now I think in respect of that it is a matter for this House to consider. In this Act you will find there is no provision made for boards of examiners for public school teachers of Newfoundland. I think it is unwise that there shouldn't be one board of examiners so that all teachers of all denominations would have the same standard and there would be no question as to the value of the grade of any teacher of the same grade. I would refer to the remarks of the Superintendent of Education for United Church Schools on this matter.

(Reads.)

Mr. Speaker, the House knows that there are spent large amounts on supplementary or augmentation grants paid out according to the grade of the teacher. Now last year, I understand, there were so many teachers in the United Church schools that had reached a higher grade during the year, had gone from first to A.A. or second to A.A., that when it came to distributing the augmentation grant there would be needed an increase of twenty-five per cent. on the grant to give the teachers the same as they were getting the previous year. After some time an appeal was made to the Government to increase the grant, but according to our denominational system which governs everything in connection with education and lots of other things when ten thousand dollars has to be given to the United Church Superintendent to be distributed the Roman Catholic and Church of England boards demand that their grants be increased proportionately whether they want it or not. One denomination because the teachers have reached a higher standard could definitely state what they wanted and made a request and they got it, say ten thousand dollars and then the Church of England and the Roman Catholic boards must get a proportionate amount. Why couldn't the grant for augmentation be distributed to the public school teachers of Newfoundland according to grade outside of the denominational aspect and there would be a saving effected. Next year the same may apply in the Church of England or Roman Catholic Boards. If the standard in the Church of England Board next year goes up so that they want ten thousand dollars whether the Methodist Board wants it or not they will get it. So why shouldn't that grant be one fund distributed to the public school teachers of Newfoundland. All the teachers want is to get their salary, according to their grade. Each denomination only wants to keep the teacher's salary up to the standard for the grade he holds. That should be done and it would not interfere with denominational education one iota. There should be as I say one board of examiners and then the teachers of every denomination according to grade would be of equal standard. No provision is made in the Act for this. With regard to the payment of pensions it is permitted to take one per cent. from the salaries of teachers and pensions are paid under certain conditions. If the teachers think this advantageous I am not here to question the financial interests of the teachers. It is merely a financial matter to them.

It has nothing to do with the educational interests of the country. It is only a matter of giving teachers their salaries in a different way. A little earlier than they would be getting it. These are three points that should

be attended to. That can be brought and put through this legislature in ten minutes. Because there is no principle attached to it. It is purely a financial matter. But when you come down to what affects the encouragement of education in this country, then this Bill accomplishes nothing. I only regard the abolition of the Department as a retrograde step. As I already said, I think that this House should hesitate before being a party to anything that they think would not further the interests of education. This Act makes no forward movement in education. It enlarges unnecessarily the powers and the control of the Superintendents who claim that they are heavily taxed with work now, and it gives the Superintendents control over the educational system of the country, as well as individual denominational control.

(Reads)

There is a clause in this Act that refers to the Superintendents of education inspecting other schools than their own. In the 1920 Act, provision was made there for a Superintendent to be required to inspect such schools but he was to get no extra pay. That is left out in this Bill, so the Superintendents are looking after themselves in this respect. Last year with regard to their salaries they repealed the 1920 Act, and they went back to the 1916 Act so that the salaries would not be less than so much.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—They cannot be less than this legislature votes.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I may inform the Prime Minister, that if we took the trouble to look up the 1916 Act we would find that the Superintendents of Education were getting $1620. But it was found that the Superintendents were not living on $1620. Their salaries were up nearer $3,500. The Minister of Education of the day found what their salaries were, from different sources, and he made their salaries accordingly. You will find that in this vote for education there is a vote there for every other denomination.

(Reads)

That was the estimate for a year or two ago. These are little amounts voted to the Superintendents of Education, who has the disposal of these. I think that provision should be made for a Board of Examiners of the public schools of the island, and use the augmentation grant for the teachers, so that each denomination would not have to make out a separate application. But a sufficient amount of money should be voted to meet the requirements of the Argumentation Grant. In this Act there is no further provision made for the supervision of Schools. That is a matter for the legislature to consider. The question may be asked "What is being done with regard to the amalgamated schools. I get my information from the School Report.

(Reads)

That is what that Minister of Education would be able to give his undivided attention to. It is said that you cannot get schools in the outports, United or Amalgamated whichever you like to call them inter-denominational. They have been tried in some industrial centres and they have given excellent results, and it is a pity that we cannot get more.

I have tried, Mr. Speaker, in a very feeble way to interest the House on the question of education. It is an important subject, and a serious subject, and most subjects of that nature, unless they are treated by a person who can handle the subject in a more attractive manner than I, will be dry and from the presentation point of view uninteresting. All the same I trust that the presenting of this Act has been the means of arousing some interests in the schools, and that we will take the trouble to interest ourselves in the school reports printed

from year to year, and that we will get information from our friends who happen to come to the city, and in our travels to the outports that we will try to make ourselves acquainted with the school system and education as it exists there. Then we would be prepared to add something better for education with regard to the providing ways and means for the better inspection of schools. I submit that before this House closes, that the vote for inspection of schools should be doubled or trebled. Then to instruct the Superintendents of education to get in touch with those qualified to teach as supervisors, wherever they are in the island now. To get them at work during the ensuing year. There are three men that I understand who are doing excellent work.

I read the report that Mr. English gave to his Superintendents, and it shows those who have read any educational literature, that he has the modern idea of what should be tried in the schools. He speaks of curriculum, and trying to get the children interested in their everyday environment. Get them so interested that they will use their leisure time to getting valuable information from their surroundings. No doubt but these men are doing good work, and the pity is that we have not four times the number, to visit the schools in the extern portions of the island and direct those who have not the advantage of trained school teachers. Now at the present time I do really think that this Bill is of such an important nature that it should be referred to a Select Committee of this House for its consideration. I do now propose that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. The different clauses in that Bill cannot be intelligently grasped without more time than this House can give to it. I really believe that not five per cent. of the members of this House have read the Bill. Perhaps I would be right if I said that not five per cent of the members took it off their desks. I might have been just as guilty of that, but somebody said that I was going to speak to the Bill so I had to read it. I now propose that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee for consideration.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Speaker: We had an afternoon's address yesterday from the Honourable Member for Trinity, and we have had a continuation of his remarks this afternoon, and I sincerely hope that he will not be as a result subjected any longer to the bullets of the literary political assassins that he referred to yesterday. It is very encouraging to find some members of this House beginning to take an interest in educational matters and educational legislation, and I am perfectly sure that everybody will be very pleased to see that Mr. Halfyard is taking such an active interest. I think if there is one thing that he proved very conclusively during the day or two which he spent on his address that it is that the Bill as it stands now must be almost perfect, because he has really not offered any opposition that is of any importance to the Bill as constituted. Mainly the Honourable Member takes exception to the establishment of a bureau instead of having a Minister in charge of the Department. He does not see in any way how there is an improvement in this resect. I think I have already pointed out that there is an improvement in respect to the fact that we save four thousand a year salary of a Minister. I claim that is of particular importance. Now the Honourable Member said that a bureau would not be in any way better than a Minister. He meant a Minister we will say of the standing of Dr. Barnes. I have no reason for depreciating anything that Dr. Barnes did in respect to his ministerial work in the Education Department, but I

do claim that the proper people to manage educational affairs in this country are the people who have the most knowledge of the educational system. We have heard from Mr. Halfyard that the Deputy Minister according to his reports, and according to his work has done splendid service. He paid a tribute to Dr. Blackall, Dr. Curtis and no doubt he similarly feels that he could pay a tribute to Mr. Kennedy. These men are all doing excellent work. They have given excellent reports. The work of the Educational Department in my opinion stands second to no other department. They are taking the greatest interest in their work, and these are in my opinion the proper men to take charge of educational affa rs. It is argued that one man is better than three; that the Minister in charge would be better than a triumvirate. I take exception to that. I think that three heads are better than one. I don't think you could have anything better in the way of assistance w.th a committee consisting of the Superintendents, the Deputy Superintendent, the Prime Minister, and what we call the Secretary. The honourable member suggests that there should be a select committee to consider this Bill. He goes on to say that he does not believe that five per cent. of the members of this House have ever taken the Bill out of their desks :n order to find out what is in it. If that is correct, where are you going to get a select committee that is going to give it careful consideration. This Bill, I want to impress upon the members of this House, has been trashed over for months. It was thrashed over last year and again this year before it was brought down. Every man that is interested in education and educational affairs has thrashed it through. The heads of the different denominations, teachers, all who have an interest in education have gone through it and read it thoroughly. Are not they better able to judge it than this House. I claim they are very much better able to judge it. I have been Minister of Education for three years. I do not claim to have done any detailed work in connection with this Department. I have been merely the mouthpiece of the Department in the House of Assembly, and I do not consider that there is anything further necessary in connection with the education department. I consider that the Super.ntendents are well able to take charge, of course, referring the various subjects of importance to the Minister for his consent. The House votes certain moneys, and just how these moneys will be expended will be determined by th.s Board. That Board since I held office have never decided on anything without coming to an unanimous decision. There has never been a minority decis on on anything done in connection with that Department. I take the stand that those three or four men forming an Executive Council of education have been infinitely preferal le to any Minister that may be put there. The honourat le member has said that it is acknowledged that there .s no improvement. He said:

(Reads)

I am perfectly willing to concede that we have still many teachers unsuited to the profession. One of the purports of this bill is to give no encouragement in the way of increased salary to any teachers who are not able to advance, and every encouragement to the teacher that is able to advance. Surely there is a great improvement in the fact that we have now got in this country a Normal School with an excellent superintendent and that teachers are now coming in here to be taught. And the more teachers that are taught the less necessity for supervision. What has appealed no doubt to the honourable member in the years gone by was that some teachers were found incapable.

I believe that by this system that is now being adopted that a teacher will advance in grade, and the schools will improve as a natural result and there will be less necessity for supervision. At the same time I quite agree with the statement that more supervision is advisable and necessary.

The honourable member has referred to inter-denominational education as being preferable to the present system. Well it is well known in this community that I was a great advocate of inter-denominational education but we did not succeed in bringing it about as the churches were opposed to it. But I believe that inter-denominational education would be beneficial to this country. At the same time I want to say that there are advantages in the denominational system. I think that if we did not have the denominations vieing with one another in the shape of competition we would not have Bishop Feild College or the United Church College on the Hill. It would probably be found that certain people, when the schools are purely denominational, may be induced to give money to the erection of a school, that they would not give if it was inter-denominational, and I think that in that respect and in that respect only, is there any advantage in the present denominational system. I have always contended that under the denominational system, there must be duplication. In many places there are perhaps three schools where only one is needed. There is a difficulty there and it cannot be got over and so we have to make the most of the situation as it stands. Free schools by all means, if we could afford it. Compulsory education if we could afford it. Free schools, would mean that this legislature would have to vote very much more money than we are voting to-day. Certainly free and compulsory education if it could be done would be beneficial to this country. When we go into Committee on this Bill, there are some points which the honourable member has referred to, which we shall be glad to take up, and any minor alterations to the Bill, we are prepared to consider, as we are, in connection with all the Bills that come before this House, but we cannot consent to send this Bill to a select committee, because it means nothing else than a twelve months hoist, and it is just as well to be quite frank about the matter. I do not think that the honourable member wants this bill to go through. I know that the other day he expressed a hope that this bill was not coming before the legislature. I really believe that if Dr. Barnes were not in prospect to come back under another Government as Minister of Education, that we would not hear much opposition to this bill from the honourable member.

MR. HALFYARD—That is unkind.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I want to congratulate the honourable member on standing by his friend, and on his good feeling towards Dr. Barnes. But Dr. Barnes is not always so certain of being elected to this legislature, and his party may not be elected even if he is. Consequently I want to point out to the honourable gentleman that you are taking some risk, if you are going to trust the future of education in this country to the possibility of Dr. Barnes, and his party being elected in this House. I really do think, and I do not want to misjudge the honourable gentleman in any way, when I say that this was at the back of his mind in opposing this Bill. He has not pointed out, to my mind, anything that is detrimental in the subject matter of this bill. There are many points that are very important. The whole act requires consolidation. The districts boundaries require to be reorganised as they, are in this bill. I think that the bill would have gone through without any opposition whatever if it had not been for that

clause with respect to the establishment of a Bureau. It has got to be remembered that under this bill the country is saving the salary of a Minister, which we do not think is necessary. And the country also saves an amount equivalent to the contribution which the teachers are voluntarily making towards their own pensions fund. That is something, as I mentioned before, most commendable on the part of the teachers particularly those that are getting a salary that is probably out of all proportion with any payment for any other work that is done in this country. For that reason I cannot acceed to the honourable member's request, that this bill should be submitted to a Select Committee and I hope that the honourable member will not try to force that particular point, but allow the Bill to go into Committee and when we go into Committee we will take up the matters to which the honourable member has referred.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Speaker, probably I am one of the members that Mr. Halfyard referred to when he intimated that not more than five per cent. of the members of the House were seriously cognizant of the contents of this Bill or who had given serious study to it, and because I am one of them I strongly support the suggestion he has made that this Bill ought to be referred to a Select Committee of this House to be dealt with. Mr. Halfyard's position is well taken and well sustained and I have absolutely no fear in reiterating boldly what Mr. Halfyard has declared in effect, namely, that the majority of the members of the House have not given this Bill the serious attention that its importance merits. There is something about the nature of this Bill, the manner in which it was conceived and the manner in which the Prime Minister is trying to urge it upon this Chamber that I do not like. For example, the Prime Minister has urged only two main points in extenuation of this Bill. One is the plea of economy that by abolishing the Department of Education there will be a saving of $4,000 a year and that by the passing of this Bill the teachers will contribute more to the pensions fund and that will mean a further saving of $7,000 a year; secondly, I think it will be in the memory of some members of this Legislature that the Prime Minister made a specific plea not long since to the effect that he wanted to see this education act passed as something that would endure for him as a monument for the period that he was Prime Minister and Minister of Education. If the Prime Minister, after being four years in office, is going out of office either voluntarily or by the will of the people and if this legislation that we have before us to-day is going to be the sole monument of his four years in charge of this country's affairs, then all I have to say is that I am sorry for him. I would rather despite the criticism urged against the new hotel, wish to see a new hotel built and equipped as a going concern as a monument to the Prime Minister's four years of office in preference to this education act. I am opposed to this Bill, but I am not opposed to this Bill because of anything that it has to do with the consolidation of the education acts; but I am opposed to it when you go so far as to abolish the Department of Education to make provision for a Bureau of Education, as I fail to see where the Prime Minister or any member of his Government has got a mandate from the people of this country to do what this Bill contemplates doing. It is all very well for the Prime Minister to say he believes that a great saving will be effected by manipulating the various Superintendents of Education, but I want to say that we as legislators and as individual members of this House have the fundamental responsibility of being

called upon to vote the money which make the machinery of educational affairs function. Is it because three or four men not responsible to this leg slature or to the country at large draft a Bill of this nature that we must accept it and pass it. Now I do not want to be misunderstood. When the Superintendents of Education ask us to consider something of a re-arrangement affecting internal educational affa rs in various districts throughout the country I have no quarrel; but I have to question the right of Superintendents of Education to ask this legislature to abolish the Department of Education and to establish a Bureau in its stead. Th.s is either the work of the Superintendents; it must be the policy of the Government or it must be solely the work of the Prime Minister himself. If the Pr.me Minister was anxious on the plea of economy to have that Department of Education abolished why not put the office back to the Colonial Secretary's Department where it was formerly. If your excuse is that you purpose saving through this legislat on the salary of a Minister of $4,000 and if you feel the machinery attached to the Department is not necessary, then why not go straight back to where we began in the Colonial Secretary's Department. Really you are merely abolishing one set of machinery and setting up another, but by setting up another you have no guarantee that the machinery attached to the Bureau and the frills attached to the Bureau w.ll not prove more expensive and probably less effective; and it may be that the Prime Minister may not be in the House to tell the story, despite the sneers thrown across the floors of the House as regards Dr. Barnes. It may be that I will not be here either to tell the story, but I am going to tell you that you are not going to save any money by the establishment of th s Bureau. It is true that the Prime Minister is not drawing down the salary of Minister of Education and for that we applaud him, but it is no criter.on that because he holds the combined offices of Prime Minister and Minister of Education and accepts the salary for one that another Prime Min.ster cannot be found to do the same thing. If I were holding two departmental jobs and could do only the work of one, I would not draw the salary for both either. There are others in this country who are just as economical in the public interest as the present Prime Min.ster Therefore, his argument as to economy does not carry any weight. If you abolish the Department of Education and create the Bureau of Education, you are going to make machinery that will be just as expensive as the machinery you now propose to abolish. Now I am not going to mince matters and I have no hesitation in saying that the Superintendents of Education in this country are ruling as czars, instead of educat.onalists. Noboby dares question what they do. Even the Prime Minister, who is the Minister of Education, cannot question what they do, because they drafted this piece of legislat.on and the Prime Minister accepted it, and he accepted it as being the one and living monument of his four years of office as Prime Minister and M.nister of Education. But I fail to see where the Prime Minister or his Government has got any backing or any mandate from the people of this country to come in here and do as he is doing now in connection with our Education. Act. Frankly I do not like the look of this Bill. I did not like it last year either, and I do not like the manner in which the Prime Minister dealt with the various comments of Mr. Halfyard in regard to this legislation. Mr. Halfyard gave this Act careful study from a techn.cal point of view. I am only speaking along general lines, but I want more convincing proof than that given by the Prime Minister that this

legislation is anything more than the br nging al out of a radical change in our educational system and I am unalterably opposed to this Bill, particularly as regards sections one and two of it. In so far as it proposes to consolidate the Education Act, in so far as it calls upon teachers to contribute to the pensions fund and in so far as it gives fresh impetus to teachers I am in accord with the Bill; but, as I pointed out from the beginning, why such a sweeping change by abolishing the department. I ask as a Newfoundlander in all seriousness to give this Bill more consideration, and, if necessary, give it the hoist. I served some time in the field of education as a teacher. I understand the Bill and there s nothing new in it for me to read about. The Prime Minister has suggested that any amendments we may have to make can be done when we go into Committee. I do not like what the Prime Minister proposes to do and I would rather subscribe $50 to-morrow to build a monument for the Prime Min ster than to have this Education Bill as a monument for what he has done for this country. I do not like this Bill and I want to go on record as being unalterably opposed to it. I hold no brief for Dr. Barnes I may say, as he is well able to fight his own battles, politically or otherwise; but I have a strong conviction that the Prime Minister would be well advised by taking the suggestion of Mr. Halfyard and referring th s Bill to a Select Committee. If the Prime Minister wants to go on with the Bill he can do so, but I am going to register my protest against it for the reasons I have outlined and if I were a supporter of the Prime Minister or in his party I would have absolutely nothing to do with it.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, during the last two days it has been our privilege to hear Mr. Halfyard, the honourable member for the District of Trinity, address this House on the Educat on Bill and the principles affected by its various provisions. The honourable gentleman is peculiarly fitted for the role he has just enacted. His experience as a parliamentarian is only exceeded by the length of his experience as a pract cal teacher, and a most successful one at that. The extent and the nature of his remarks show that he has given the subject the most careful attention and that he has subjected this Bill to minute scrutiny. It has been my privilege during the last few days to be associated with the honourable gentleman in a careful analysis of the Bill and an attempt at an estimate of the effect in practice of certain of its outstanding provisions. My own views regarding the measure, therefore, coinc de with those of the honourable memb er for the District of Trinity, and, in the main, for exactly the same reasons as those he has just stated so carefully and so lucidly. There is, it follows, scarcely any justification for me to traverse the same ground or to occupy the time of th s House in reiterating identical convictions.

I must, however, go definitely on record as being opposed particularly to what I regard as a violation of principle nvolved by the al olition of the Department of Education and the substitution therefor of a Bureau of Education. First, however, let me state that I am not at all concerned with any of the personalities mentioned from time to time in the course of this debate on the new Education Bill. I am not interested at all in the fact that the Prime Minister states he thinks a drastic change in our Educat on Act is necessary at this time. My opinion does not coincide with his when he states that the measure we are now considering will be beneficial to education in Newfoundland. It is of no part cular interest to me that, if the Act be left unchanged, my old friend and teacher, Dr. Barnes, may with a change of Government, become

Minister of Education again. The Prime Minister was scarcely fair to the honourable the member for Trinity when he insinuated that a great deal of that gentleman's opposition to the new Bill was inspired by his intimate friendship with Dr. Barnes, a desire of his to champion Dr. Barnes and his educational methods and ideas and an anxiety on his part to maintain in existence an office to which Dr. Barnes is peculiarly adapted. Mr. Halfyard, I am confident, earnestly endeavored to treat the measure on its merits, and I assure you, sir, I am now just as anxiously and sincerely endeavoring to follow suit. The main feature of my objection to this Bill is stated when I observe that I regard the proposed abolition of the Department of Education as a retrograde step and one which, as the honourable the member for St. Barbe has pointed out, really relegates the administration of our educational affairs to the position it occupied before the Department of Education was created.

The Hon. the Prime Minister, in his speech at the moving of the second reading of this Bill, stated that he presumed there would be little opposition to a measure that had the endorsation of the heads of the various religious denominations. The honourable gentleman either overlooked or ignored the fact that the same approval was given to the creation of the Department of Education. Unless I misunderstand the position, the same heads of denominations could discover nothing objectionable in the system of administration that the Government now proposes to abolish, citing the same endorsation as justification. I took some little interest in the administration by which the Department was created and am somewhat intimate with the details of that creation, and my information is that the outstanding religious leaders of the country had the plan submitted to them fairly and squarely, took plenty of time to give it the most careful consideration, and finally decided that it could not with any show of reason be objected to. I am, therefore, justified in concluding that strong representations in favor of abolition of the Department must have been made to these reverend gentlemen. Certainly, there has been nothing adduced here calculated to persuade me that they moved for abolition of their own volition. They were, I am presuming, simply assured the change would not result in an invasion of denominational rights, and approved it accordingly.

Before the Department of Education was created, the administration of our educational affairs was in the hands of the superintendents of the school systems of the larger denominations. The office routine was attended to by a clerk in the department of the Colonial Secretary. It is scarcely necessary to state that during the whole of the long period of this regime, education made nothing like the progress that has marked it since the inception of the Department in charge of a responsible Minister. Under the present Bill it is now proposed to revert to the former system, with administration once more controlled by the three denominational superintendents. There are some differences, of course. Some of the reforms and improvements instituted by the Ministry are being preserved. The Departmental machinery is being maintained and it is to be controlled by the Secretary of the Bureau, an experienced educationalist, instead of, as before, by a clerk without knowledge of practical educational affairs. Even so, the step proposed under this Bill is a backward one. It is a step, I am reluctantly forced to conclude, dictated rather by considerations of personal importance than by the highest and truest possible concern on the part of those who have in-

itiated and are advocating it. They were always averse to Departmental control and they are now eagerly grasping an opportunity for the abolition of the Ministry of Education.

Educational affairs, under the system to be set up by the provisions of this measure, are, I contend, placed too far in the background of our public life and of our legislative activities. The step is an utterly unnecessary and unjustifiable one. Those who are taking that step ignore the source of the expenditures involved under the Education Act. The people supply these moneys out of their taxes and the taxpayers should have in this House direct representation from themselves and from the Department handling such finances. But, the financial considerations apart, the subject of education is so important and proper administration of educational affairs is so vital to the general public weal that a Minister of Education should have a place in the Executive Government and should occupy a seat in the People's House. We are taking a course that puts us out of step with countries that are commonly regarded as well advanced along the pathway of educational progress. We had done far better to have maintained ourselves in line with the example of the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada. Here, let me remark that the statement of the honourable the Prime Minister in moving the second reading of this bill, and to the effect that the Canadians are showing outstanding signs of abandoning Departments and Ministries of Education is scarcely in accordance with the facts. The Provinces of British Columbia, Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan have their independent Educational Departments, with Ministers occupying seats in their elective legislatures, and, usually, holding their portfolios as members of the Executive Government of the province. In New Brunswick, the Lieutenant-Governor is really Minister of Education, being president of the Provincial Board of Education which comprises all the members of the Executive Council. In Prince Edward Island the Superintendent of Education is a member of the Executive Council of that province. The system in Nova Scotia alone approximates to any extent the system to which we are proposing to revert here. There, educational affairs are controlled by a Council of Public Instruction, of which the Prime Minister is President. For the most part, then, Canadians not only regard educational affairs with the utmost seriousness but put their administration in the very forefront of public undertakings, commit them to the charge of outstanding public men and keep them constantly under surveillance of elected representatives of the people. In this country we, perhaps, have equally as high a conception of the value of a progressive educational policy, but we are not prepared to take equally as effective steps to ensure it being carried out. We are, certainly, here taking an absolutely retrogressive step. The importance of education and of the effective administration of educational affairs in this country demands the presence in this House of a member specially charged with responsibilities of this nature. The best man available in any Government may not be the most suitable man to fill the position of Minister of Education. The same observation may be made in connection with the heads of other departments. The necessity for keeping in touch with other elected representatives of the people, the necessity for taking counsel together here as to what does or does not advance the educational interests of the country and the large amount of money represented by educational expenditures from year to

year, are factors that make it quite imperative that they should be numbered amongst the Departmental Heads here present from time to time a Minister of Education possessing a mandate from the people as such.

It has been contended, Sir, that the nomination of the Prime Minister as president of the proposed Bureau of Education meets most of the contentions I have just raised. I hold a totally different opinion on the matter. The present Prime Minister remarked, in the speech to which I referred a short while ago, that under the regime of the Bureau there will be a saving of $4000 per annum in respect to the Minister's salary and that the Leader of the Government for the time being, an elected representative of the people, will hold a seat in this House. The honourable gentleman thought that such an arrangement should disarm critics of the present Bill of one of their weapons. Mr. Speaker, general public conditions being as they are to-day; political conditions being of such an unsettled nature, such an arrangement does not give promise of the utmost possible in the way of legislative surveillance and nurture of educational interests in Newfoundland. The Prime Minister is too busy a man to assume the duties of educational representative in the House. He has to exercise general superintendence of matters administrative; he has to direct the policy of his Government and he has to keep himself everlastingly busy shaping and reshaping party affairs. Sometimes, too, he has a private business that demands some considerable share of his time and attention. Even were the bureaucratic system the best one for education in Newfoundland, the Prime Minister is the last one who should be chosen to sit here as its Legislative representative. It is not necessary to stick to any such nomination on the score of the suitability of the Prime Minister for the position. I am sure that every party contains a number of members of average intelligence and of sufficient knowledge of educational affairs generally to fit them to detect the merits or demerits of any educational proposition put up to them by the superintendents and to hold the balances even as between the conflicting recommendations sometimes made in respect to the school systems of the various denominations. Very few Government parties include in their membership financial experts or fishery experts, for instance, yet we always manage to find men more or less suited to the position of Minister of Fisheries or Minister of Finance. We do manage to transact our public business in practical fashion. Our experience is scarcely likely to be less satisfactory in connection with a Department of Education. Some men, of ordinary common-sense and average intelligence will always be available to direct the administration of education in co-operation with the deputy minister and the superintendents and others concerned therein.

Mr. Speaker, another point that the Prime Minister attempted to make in favor of the change from a department to a Bureau of Education was that this would ensure an annual saving of four thousand dollars, the amount of the Minister's salary. Let us analyze the situation created by the new Education Act and try to discover for ourselves whether or not this contention is true in fact, or to probability. Personally, I do not think it is and I will adduce my reasons for my conclusion. According to the Annual Report Issued by the Department of Education, the present superintendents have, of their own admission, been unable to give up the schools under their charge that constant care and attention, that systematic and regular inspection that

we all know to be essential to the maintenance of any satisfactory standard of teaching. The explanation given is that the officials referred to have so many duties of a routine nature to discharge and have so much office work to perform that it is only with the greatest difficulty that they can manage to get away from St. John's long enough to inspect a portion of the schools of their various denominations each year. It is scarcely necessary for me to point out to honourable members what an unfortunate and what an actually injurious state of affairs such a condition denotes. Constant and capable school inspection is a sine qua non to educational stability and progress. It not only checks up on the nature of the work done by our teachers but also ensures, or should ensure, higher efficiency of teachers in the discharge of their very important duties. That being, and on the admission of the officials themselves, the position of the Superintendents of Education, it is obvious that they are already kept far too much occupied with duties other than those for which they were appointed and which it is essential should be performed regularly and efficiently. If, then, they are now to be called upon to play a leading part in connection with the general administration of educational affairs in Newfoundland, they will have still less time and opportunity to check up on the work done by the teachers and the progress made by the schools of their several denominations. This means that, not only is the work of inspection deprived of the services of three of the educationalists most experienced therein, but that the trio of Superintendents will be employed doing the work that formerly occupied the time of only one man, the Minister. Where, too, the Minister cost the country four thousand dollars per year by way of salary, the three gentlemen who substitute for him will cost three times three thousand dollars per year or a total of over nine thousand dollars. The actual cost, as as matter of fact, will run to close on ten thousand dollars per year. That represents educational economy of a most peculiar sort. Nor is that the sum total of the extra expenditure involved by abolishing the Ministry of Education and substituting therefor a Bureau under which the three Superintendents do the major portion of the administrative work. To perform the duties of inspection that formerly fell to the lot of the Superintendents ten new officials are to be appointed. They are to be known as supervising inspectors. Three of them are employed already. At a salary of, say at least fifteen hundred dollars each per annum, the cost to the country of the additional seven officials would be oven ten thousand dollars more. Efficiency is therefore lost in superintendence and in inspection; there will certainly be no additional efficiency in administration and the country, instead of saving under the newer, less efficient regime, will be put to far greater expense than was entailed under the regime of the Department and the Ministry of Education.

Then, too, on the motion for the second reading of this Bill, the Hon. the Prime Minister cited what he regarded as another reason in support of the al olition of the M nistry of Education. He stated that the one man control exercised by a Minister was not and could not be a system duly and properly representative of the denominational character of our educational system. I fail to appreciate the face of such an argument. I claim, indeed, that it is not founded on the facts discoverable by reference to the character of the Ministry of Education and the principles on which it was founded. Under the Act of 1920 which created the Department provision was made for an Advisory

Bo rd, to act in conjunct on with the Min ster. That Board took on a denominational complexion. Besides, it also gave representation to the teachers, an important feature of education-al administrat on that has disappeared altogether from the measure now before this House. The three superintendents were, ex officio, members of that Board. Not only, therefore, did the constitution of the Department of Education throw ample safeguards around the denominational system in this country, it also ensured a share, an important part in the administration of educational affairs to the leading and most experienced educationalists of Newfoundland. Such a provis on spelled a long step forward for education; the destruction of that provision signifies another distinctly retrograde step in the same connect on. Nothing more of increased or characteristically denominational representation is provided under the proposed Bureau of Education than was provided for or already in existence under the regime of the Department of Education wh ch that Bureau is to replace.

The Hon. the Prime Minister places himself in a rather awkward position because of another point that he adduced in favor of the change that he is sponsoring. He alleged that the great rel gous denominations were prepared to place in the Bureau of Education greater confidence than they had accorded the Ministry of Education. In this connection he reiterated the claim that the Bureau would give them better representation than was theirs under the Ministry. I have already exposed the fallacy of that contention. If the honourable gentleman, on the other hand, pleads that the confidence of the heads of denominations is increased because, under the bureaucratic regime, administrative affa rs will be the particular care of the three Superintendents, then he admits, in effect, the correctness of my previous contention that the Bureau will be more expensive instead of more economical than the Ministry. Perhaps the honourable gentleman, however, w.ll repudiate my contention that the Superintendents will have to spend most of their time attending to the administration of Educational matters. It may be that he takes the position that they can still engage in the work of actual inspection of schools pretty much as formerly. Let us examine the situation he creates if he assumes that stand. Administrative work must still be performed, even in the absence of the three Superintendents from the Department ,or Bureau. The Secretary for Education w ll have to carry on in their stead. That is, under circumstances such as these, we merely have a change from one-man control under a Ministry of Education to control by one man under the Bureau of Education. I have no more reason for saying that there would be any denominational objection raised to the Secretary for Education and the scope of his powers than those who advocate the changes involved under this Bill have for alleging such denominational objections to the personality and the Ministerial record of the former head of the Education Department. And I have just as much reason for alleg ng such objection as have they. All that has been done is to create a distinction as between a Ministry and a Bureau of Education, but without any actual difference being shown by the sponsors of the change. On the other hand, I am advocating the retention of the Min ster, because the alternative is less efficiency of administration, less of representation for the people who pay the bills, more of expense and more of confusing and trammelling details of adm nistration. To emphasise my point, before passing from this phase of my argument, permit me, Sir, to reiterate that, unless the Hon. the Prime Minister is

prepared to admit that instead of saving the salary of one Minister of Education he had entailed on the country the expense of maintaining three virtual Ministers of Education, then he must agree with me that the administration of educational affairs is still left in the hands of a single man, and that that man is the Secretary for Education, under the Bureau, and a civil servant, instead of, as under the Act of 1920, a Minister of Education, an elected representative of the people and, as such, a member of this House of Assembly.

I have already referred, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that, under the Education Act of 1920, there was created an Advisory Board, which gave some measure of representation to the teachers of the country. As I remarked in passing, that arrangement was found to be of very great assistance to the department, made for co-operation as between the teachers and the department and was bound to have far-reaching and beneficial effects upon the cause of education throughout our country. The failure, under the Bill now before us, to continue the inclusion of this Advisory Board as part and parcel of our educational machinery, is, therefore, a very regrettable one, particularly since it has obviously been caused of deliberate intent. There is also a respect, Sir, in which this omission represents not only an injury to the cause of education but an injustice to the interests of those practical educationalists, the teachers of Newfoundland. It is quite conceivable that cases will arise whereunder teachers, disciplined by superintendents or boards of education will consider themselves dealt with unjustly. In such circumstances the aggrieved parties should have the right of appeal to some central body. No such avenue for the prevention of injustice or for the amelioration thereof is opened, or even maintained under the new Education Bill, As a matter of fact, the effect of this measure is to place the central control and the supreme authority in the hands of the very parties against whom, in the last analysis, such appeals on the part of teachers would have to be made. The total membership of the Newfoundland teaching profession is almost fifteen hundred. The men and the women enrolled therein are now being deprived of a safeguard that commonsense and the dictates of fairplay urge should be retained to them unimpaired. Such an action constitutes a violation of principle so glaring that I certainly cannot vote my personal endorsation of it.

There are other very noticeable omissions from this measure that offend my sense of what the Bill, on principle and for the effectual protection and advancement of the cause of education, should contain. Such an outstanding and very noticeable omission is that of proper provision for teacher training. The various denominations, apparently, are to be left to their own devices in regard to the basis they are to adopt for the grading of their teachers. Under such a regime confusion and lack of efficiency are certain to ensue. It is indisputable that the highest possible efficiency will not be attained by the schools of the country. The Bill does not provide for practical training as an indispensable preliminary to the activities of a teacher. With a modern Normal School functioning in the country and with the facilities of several model schools available, there is no justification, there is no excuse, in fact, for statutory toleration of such haphazard methods of teachers training and of the grading of teachers. If our schools are to improve and if through them the cause of education generally is to be advanced, then improvement and advancement must begin with the teachers who are charged with the important duty of teaching the young idea "how to shoot." Ap-

parently, because it was not found possible to secure denominational agreement on the proper methods of training and the proper standard of grad'ng to adopt, this important issue has been sidestepped, with certain injury to the cause that the Bill is designed to protect and to advance. Now, Sir, I contend, on principle, that this s a phase of educational administration in which the state is fully justified in imposing its will and its author ty on the religious denominations. The state admits the right of the denominations to administer their educational affairs. The state agrees to its funds being expended on denominat onal schools as such. The state has at least the right to demand and to make sure that these schools are maintained at a standard and satisfactory degree of efficiency, and that can be ensured only by the employment of efficient teachers. That right of the state should have been affirmed and acted on in the measure we are now considering. The time is long past when a Counc l of Higher Education Diploma and the certificate of a Denominational grading board could complacently be accepted as proof of the possession of all the qualifications essential to enrolment in the ranks of the important teaching profess on. In this respect the new Education Act represents a throwback to a past that is anything but creditable from a general educational standpoint.

Equally grave is the failure of this measure to establish an uniform system of curricula for the schools and of examination tests in respect to results attained in teaching in such public schools. The provisions of the Bill are provocative of a great deal of confusion in these connections. One finds it difficult to decide whether it is the superintendents, the Boards of Education, the Bureau of education or somebody else or all of them in conjunction who shall stipulate what courses of secular studies shall be pursued or what textbooks shall be used in conjunction therewith. Such a situation, particularly when created by statutory enactment, is fatal to orderly and systematic educational progress in this country. Apparently, those who framed the measure either lacked the knowledge or the courage essential to the blazing of a trail or modernity through the confused wilderness of our educational system or lack of it. Is this due to uncertainty as to whether our school system shall be moulded according to the thought of the classicals or the scientific? Couldn't those charged with this duty decide whether our children should be taught in terms of theory or in those of life and its practical problems? Provision for systematic and definite curricula should be embodied in this measure. It should include evidence of a single-minded idea and determination to teach the dignity of all labor and especially of labors such as our own people are wont to engage in. The production of the necessities of life, especially articles of food, such as our fish products, should be dealt with and glorified as much as possible. A stern effort should be made through our schools to disabuse the minds of our rising generation of the idea, all too prevalent nowadays, that manual labor is demeaning and that only "white collar jobs" are worth aspiring to.

I am sorry, too, to note that this new Education Bill, while making rather passing reference to the subject, fails to provide specifically and definitely for adult education in Newfoundland. Movements towards this end are outstanding features of the educational systems of many of the nations of the civilized and progressive world, particularly in the Old Country. In these lands arrangements are made and are being made to place, free of cost, the advantages

of supplementary educational courses at the disposal of those who had to leave school at an early age and thus had many educational advantages denied them. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Superintendent of Church of England Schools states that, on an average, half the number of children in attendance at our schools abandon educational pursuits just as they reach the Preliminary Grade. In other words, fifty per cent. of our Newfoundland children are taken from school just as the seeds of knowledge are beginning to sprout in their young minds, and just as they are giving promise of developing a rich harvest to delight their teachers and parents and to benefit themselves and their generation, when, a few years later, they play their individual roles on the stage of life. What a tragedy these statistics lay bare! We may not be able to avert such tragedies in real life, but we can do something to lessen their effects. Our avenue of help is the medium of adult schools. This measure fails to make the necessary provision. It appeals to me as regarding and treating adult education as something not of serious import, a sort of fad or frill tacked on to a system mainly concerned with school provision for the younger generation of our citizenship. In this respect there is nothing modern or progressive about the Bill. It fails not only to ensure the utmost of educational benefit to Newfoundlanders who are young in years, it also neglects the opportunity of conferring the inestimable boon of adult education of those who, educationally speaking, are children of slightly longer growth.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot discover any respect or any educational connection in which this new Act makes a single, decided step forward. It shows no advance on the Act of 1920, of which it is in many respects a very garbled and much less effective version. The act of 1916 is, in my opinion, quite as advanced, quite as modern. I don't think I could speak of the new Bill in more condemnatory terms than that. It fails to standardise our schools, our teacher training and our educational system generally. It neglects to face squarely modern issues in the sphere of education and it omits the slightest provision of general and outstanding educational benefit. I am not now prepared to speak at greater length on this Bill. There are, it is true, important details with which I propose to deal when the measure is considered in Committee, that is if the honourable the Prime Minister refuses the request of the honourable the member for Trinity District that it be referred to a Select Committee before it is proceeded with further in this House. The Bill is merely a consolidation of former Acts. There are few points about it that entitle it to be described as a revision. It embodies many anomalies, a multitude of contradictions and very many inexactitudes. It would, in my opinion, be very dangerous to our real educational interests to enact it as law in its present shape. I, therefore, second Mr. Halfyard's motion for the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee and I urge on the honourable the Prime Minister, in the interest of the Bill and in the interest of education generally that this is an essential, an almost inescapable policy to adopt at this juncture. I have no desire to obstruct its eventual passage, even though I do not believe in its principles and its provisions. I assure the honorable gentleman in charge of the Bill that if I have anything to do with such a Select Committee I will use every effort to have the measure returned to this House for action thereon during the present session.

Pursuant to order the Prime Minister moved that the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting Education" be now read a second time.

Mr. Halfyard moved and Mr. Scammell seconded that the following words be added to the motion as an amendment, namely "And thereafter be referred to a Select Committee for consideration and report to this Assembly."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment: Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Godden, Mr. Ashbourne, Dr. Mosdell, Mr. Russell, (6); and against it: Hon. Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Minister of Posts, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Long, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Power, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Linegar, Mr. Browne, (14); so it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion being put, there appeared for it: Hon. Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Minister of Posts, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Long, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Power, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Puddester, Mr. Linegar, Mr. Browne, (14); and against it: Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Godden, Mr. Ashbourne, Dr. Mosdell, Mr. Russell, (6), so it passed in the affirmative; and the Bill was accordingly read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the whole on the Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: It is proposed here, now that the point has been raised by the hon. member on the other side, that under the resolutions that we are considering now it may be considered that the company have the right to build railways. It is proposed and we have actually considered it, to bring in a special bill to apply generally to cases of this kind. Shortly the effect is going to be that it is proposed to add certain clauses to the Railway Act.

(Reads)

It is proposed to bring that in as a general enactment. We think that is a better way for this reason, that it will be applicable to general industrial operations in the country. I think that it would be a mistake to have it apply to this particular Bill. As a matter of fact I intend to give notice of the new Bill on Monday.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman; When this Buchan's Mine Bill was last before Committee, I made some references to the high financial standing of the American Smelters who, we understand, are backing the Anglo-Newfoundland Co., in the exploitation of this mineral area. I was endeavoring to show that they were not the sort of struggling concern that stood in need of very valuable concessions to help them or to induce them to locate and operate in Newfoundland. The honourable the Minister of Justice expressed great pleasure over such wealthy people becoming interested in this proposition. He hoped, he said, that the future would see a large influx of this class of tourist into Newfoundland. I echo his expressions of pleasure and I certainly trust his hopes will be realised. What I am concerned about is

the extent to which benefits will accrue to our country and our fellow-countrymen generally from the advent of these people here and as a result of their mining operations in Newfoundland. I am not yet convinced that this agreement secures to us the future financial benefits that should accrue to us, when this property is fully developed and in good and profitable working order.

The country is asked to make very large concessions to the exploiters of this Buchan's Mine property, concessions that run in value to large sums of money. The position I take is that Newfoundland, by giving these concessions, enables the industry to get on its legs and to be developed profitably and that Newfoundland, therefore, to all intents and purposes and as certainly as if the country put so much cash capital into it, becomes a partner in the enterprise. That being the case, the Buchan's Mine industry being enabled to start and having eventually developed to a profitable extent, how are we to share in the profits and to what extent? How and to what extent does this Agreement ensure the taxpayers of Newfoundland a share of such future profits? I know that a certain amount of trade will be created and a certain amount of employment will be afforded Newfoundland laborers, but, I submit, Sir, that is not the full extent of benefits that we have a reasonable right to demand.

Our expectations as to one material source of profit arose out of some remarks made by the Prime Minister himself, to the effect that the railroad would benefit greatly through the operations at Buchan's Mine. The honourable gentleman declared that the great amount of freight traffic created in connection with the enterprise would result in such increased railroad revenue as would materially reduce the present deficit on operations. But, there is nothing in the Bill before us to ensure to the Newfoundland Railway a continuance of the freight traffic in connection with the Buchan's Mine activities that will doubtless accrue to it in the opening stages of the mining development. There is no provision protective of the Newfoundland Railway. There is nothing to ensure the maintenance of that railroad in its position of initial advantage. As a matter of fact, there is nothing to prevent the company from making a convenience of the railway and from using it so long and only so long as it suits the company's purpose to do so. I conclude, from the remarks of the honourable the Minister of Justice, that there is nothing to prevent the company from constructing their own railway line when they decide it is good business to embark on such an enterprise. The provisions of the old agreement are such that the company have such an undoubted right. This new agreement takes from them nothing of that right, in fact gives them additional facilities for such an undertaking. We are, therefore, depending on this enterprise to provide the railroad with sufficient additional freight and other traffic to help it out of the financial hole in which it is at present, but we are doing nothing to ensure a continuation of that advantage to the Newfoundland Railway. We are, indeed, asked to enact legislation that, in my opinion, creates the certain menace of an independent line of railroad. That is a very serious position, indeed.

The honourable, the Minister of Justice, dealing with some former remarks of mine in connection with the railroad aspect of this Bill, said he did not think we should insert after clause (e) any provision that permanently and definitely prevented the Company from getting a railway charter. That was not my position at all. I made no such demand

to that effect. All I wanted was a provis on assuring this House and the country generally that clause (e) does not, by intention or by implication, bestow upon them such a charter, per se. Under the 1905 Act, the Governor-in-Counicl must, at their written demand, grant them all the Crown Lands they may require for a railroad right-of-way. Under this Act they are assured the free entry of all that they may require for the construction, operation and maintenance of such a railroad. Neither in the former agreement nor in this present one is there any formal provis.on that they must apply to the Newfoundland Government for a charter before they begin construction. The implication, indeed, from the terms of the two agreements is that they need make no such application and that they are empowered to take such action on their own account. If that be a false impression on my part and if the Company take no such position, then there is nothing whatever to prevent the Government from inserting a provision that will make certain that no such misapprehensions are created in the future. It is the safest way for all concerned and the most satisfactory.

We are giving the associated companies very considerable assistance, by virture of this provision and other sections of the Act, surely it is just and reasonable to demand that the country generally, and the railroad particularly, shall be ensured some material benefits because of this assistance. The country does not bother much about what legal men say. It looks to the Legislature which, after all, is making the agreement, to protect pul lic nterests. The Legislature should take care to discharge this duty carefully, because we have it in our power to make the future far less unpromising financially than it happens to be at this present time.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —By no implicat.on can clause (e) be read to mean that the company is given any right to build a railway.

DR. MOSDELL—The position may be as stated by the Minister of Justice. I doubt it, though, and hold that I have reasonable grounds for that doubt.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. I did not think for a moment that by any construction could it be intended to suggest that under clause E, could .t mean that they had the right to build a railway. My point was not regarding clause E at all. My point was that to-day regarding the general right of any person to build railways, the only protection that we know of is, that those people must of necessity come and get a franchise before they can start any work of that k.nd at all. For that reason, I say that it is unnecessary to put in the bill such provision with regard to a railway. I never thought for a moment that the honourable member meant seriously that there were any words in this subsection E that could be read as giv.ng the company the right to build a railway. But nowhere that I am aware of is their any specific enactment that requires a person to come and ask the Government for their consent to build a railway. As I say that this is a better way to handle it, and it is the reason as a matter of fact, why I suggest this method to the committee. I therefore recommend to the Minister in charge that instead of losing time, and talk ng about an amendment to a clause like this, that it would be better to adopt the other method. I am not talking from the point raised by the honourable member, except that I do not think that it is as strong as he wants us to believe.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, under sub-section (e) of Section 2 of this Agreement, the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company is given the right to import duty free railway material and plant that represents

many thousands of dollars in value and that also represents a correspondingly great saving to the company in respect to the duties that this country proposes to forego. The materials st pulated to come in duty free are machinery, parts, plant, utensils and implements for the construction and equipment of transportation and shipping facilities at and between railway and tramways and conveyors of any k nd. The Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company has already built independent lines of railway without obtaining specific charters from the Government for the purpose. Apparently, there was no necessity for them to make any such application. No such need is created under this agreement. But, the Government now proposes to g ve the Company greater facilities for obtaining the material essential to such a purpose as railroad building. According to the admission of the honourat le the Minister of Justice, or, at least, he .s aware of the fact, the company, if it has not already built an independent line of railroad to Buchan's Mine, has been extending and is still greatly extending the line already in ex stence. I asked for the specific permission granted them to proceed with such an undertaking. None was asked or granted. They did, however, apply to the Goyernor-in-Council for grants of land for a right-of-way for the extension of their railway. Now, I have been informed that all the terr tory in the section covered by this Bill belonged to the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company. Why, then, this necessity for an application for Crown Lands, under the provisions of the Act of 1905?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They only own the timber rights up there.

DR. MOSDELL—That is peculiar. We were told that the whole of the Red Indian Lake area was held by the Company in fee s mple. The concessions in respect of mining operations in all of that territory referred to in Section 2 of the measure as "the Red Indian Lake District." Plainly, then, these concessions apply to a section that is extra-territorial, as far as the A.N.D. Co. are concerned. That is exactly the point on which I wanted to satisfy myself when I asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to bring before this Committee, plans showing exactly what lands in the Red Indian Lake District are held by the Company and where and what are the additional lands covered by the concessions which we are now discussing. Now, according to the showing of both honourable gentlemen, there is land . . . .

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—There are lots of locations taken up by outside individuals.

DR. MOSDELL—There is land to which this Bill refers not held by the Company but covered by the concessions granted under the Bill. Even so, it is plain that the A.N.D. Co. will be in a position to sell or transfer to such outside concerns or parties the privileges that this Bill stipulates shall become the property of the company. Surely, that is an indefensible policy for the Government to adopt. The position of the Government appeals to me as an absolutely indefensible one. The company is in possession of two thousand square miles of territory. That huge area has been blanketed by the concession provisions of this Bill. Nobody denies the right of the Company to make to the Government propositions for the exploitation of the mineral resources of its own property. It is not, however, good business for the Government to put the A.N.D. Co., or any other concern in possession of concessions such as these representing privileges so sweeping and so profitable under circumstances that allow them to make a transfer not only to concerns parcelling up their own lands but also to concerns that are extra-territorial, as I have already

observed. Such an arrangement puts the A.N.D. Co. in a position to secure double royalties in respect to its own territory—one royalty in respect to its land rights and the other in respect to the rights here given them by the Government. Or, where owners of land outside the A.N.D. Co. territory in Red Indian Lake District want to share in the concessions in the Bill now before us, they can be accommodated, because the A.N.D. Co. has the right to vend these concessions for royalties or other valuable considerations. I am puzzled to explain why the Government did not force the A. N.D. Co. to be content with concessions covering only a reasonably large proportion of their territory, enough—ample enough, if you like—to enable them to test and prove the value or otherwise of these mineral deposits. Beyond that the country should not be prepared to go. The Red Indian Lake District being proved, and proved with the assistance of our concessions, a profitable mineral district, then the country should maintain itself in a position to exact terms of general public profit from the Company in respect to the major portion of the territory. The Company, under this Agreement, gets everything of value it asks for in respect to the development of its whole huge territory. What does the Minister of Justice expect the people of Newfoundland to get?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Work.

DR. MOSDELL—What class of work, or what valuable consideration, beyond ordinary labor? Surely the Minister of Justice does not desire to have our own people continually enact the role of hewers of wood and drawers of water. That is about all they are here ensured. Under this Measure outsiders are to get all the cream of the profits, while Newfoundlanders get only the skimmed milk. The Company have prospected the area sufficiently to know its value and are able, without crippling themselves, to concede us great and general benefits from the profits that will be made when the territory is developed with the assistance of the concessions we are making. Now, Sir, I contend this Agreement is not contingent on the 1905 Act. This is a new Agreement entirely. It is true that it has reference to the lands granted to the A.N. D. Co. under another Act. Still, we are now making a new bargain with the Company for the development of this territory. We do not dispute the right of the Company to possess on of that territory, and we do not question the possession by the Company of the original concessions under which that territory was to be developed. The Company, however, wants a better bargain in respect to development concessions. We are proceeding to grant their request, but we are not balancing things up with new and greater benefits for the people of Newfoundland on whose behalf we are acting as members of this House. Why should the Government pin itself down to an Agreement such as this, with no due consideration to the extent to which it now enhances the natural value of this Red Indian Lake property, with no definite provision made for the protection of our railroad and with no assurance as to the employment of our people, except in the most menial and inferior of positions? The only returns ensured the country generally, and their value is entirely problematical, are under the provision that the Company must pay the Government a five per cent. royalty on net profits. If and when we enact a general income tax, the Company must pay it, of course. But that income tax may be removed at any time. There is no such tax applicable now, for instance.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We got $100,000 a year from the A. N. D. Co. whilst the income tax was on.

DR. MOSDELL—I can quite appreciate that the country, with an income tax law in force, would receive material profit, but it might be only temporary profit. We can scarcely discriminate against this corporation, or any other corporation, by the enactment of such a law to fit their case specifically. The only way to effect such a result is to embody an income tax provision in the Agreement now being considered by this Committee. If that be not done now, then the corporation will pay an income tax only if and as other concerns are by a general law forced to do the same. Judging from the attitude of a large and powerful group within the present Government, such a general income tax law is extremely unlikely to be enacted in the immediate future. So, the corporation will most certainly escape the necessity for meeting any such obligation and the treasury will lose large prospective returns.

The country is asked to give great and sweeping duty concessions extending over a lengthy period of years, but the country is most assuredly not being put in a position to demand a reasonable share of the eventual profits which these concessions will materially assist the Company to make. This Act is far more sweeping than the old one in its effects, in its beneficial effects on the operations of the Company. The Government is granting all the concessions asked, over the whole period mentioned by the Company. The Company, in fact, is driving a hard and profitable bargain for itself. The Company's solicitors are setting their faces firmly against any modifications in respect to the terms of the concessions or the period over which they shall be extended. Why shouldn't the Government emulate the corporation lawyers and drive equally as hard and as profitable a bargain for the people of whom we all are the representatives?

We have been told that there are extensive mineral deposits at Buchan's Mine. An estimate, given wide publicity, stated many millions of tons had been located and that the value ran into a huge sum total in dollars and cents. If these predictions are untrue, we lose nothing, even if we permit the scope of the concessions to cover the Whole Red Indian Lake District, as the Bill has it. If, however, they are true or approximate the truth at all, we stand to lose a huge possible sum total in revenue. Our help, by means of our concessions, will enable the Company to explore and develop the area as cheaply as possible and to make the utmost by way of profits therefrom. It is but reasonable to contend that, in that event, we have earned the right to a material share in such profits, by way of income tax or otherwise. Yet, where we are giving all the practical encouragement demanded by the Company, we are demanding nothing commensurate by way of returns. Naturally, the Company will proffer us nothing that they can avoid giving. It is our business and it is our duty as members of this House of Assembly and as guardians of the people's rights and stewards of the people's interests to insist that the people profit and profit materially from this Agreement with the A.N.D. Co. and from the concessions we make them thereunder.

Hitherto, the wealth of Newfoundland has been taken out of the country in the raw state. That has been our experience at Bell Island. It has been an unfortunate mistake and one that we should carefully avoid repeating in the future. Past mistakes should teach us present caution. This country, the people of this country, have received anything but decent treatment from corporations that have made and that are making fortunes through the exploitation of our raw materials. The present Government has had its own bitter experience with the corporation interested in Bell

Island. It has been unable to induce reasonable conduct on their part in their relations with Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. That being our past experience with corporations, Newfoundland is illadvised to leave anything whatever to chance in her future relations of this kind. A definite and specific arrangement should be made between the Government and the Company. It should embody far better terms for the country than those that now appear in the Agreement before us. This Bill does not appeal to me as seriously attempting to attain this object.

A great deal of the present hostility to this Bill has been created by the length of the period during which the concessions are to remain in force. Is it necessary that twenty years should be given? Is that the minimum period essential to the development purposes of the Company? The general contention is that the Government should refuse to make concessions for a period representing more than half that at present proposed to be covered. The Company should be notified to that effect, because the contention is a fair and reasonable one. Or, if the Company refuse to accede to such a demand, then the Government should make it plain that the returns to the country from profits eventually made by the Company must be greatly amplified.

Under the present Bill, not only are we facilitating development by the Company of its Buchan's Mine area; not only are we ensuring profitable development of an extremely rich mineral deposit, but we are foolishly making it easier than would otherwise be the case for the Company to export the ores mined in a raw or semi-raw state. We are providing for the free entry of bags and containers in which the concentrates are to be exported from the country and taken to the smelters in the United States to be manufactured into the finished product. That strikes me as anything but good business on the part of Newfoundland or of the Government of Newfoundland. The Company should take a stand which, in effect, says to the Company: "You shall have the right of free entry for materials, machinery and plant for five years, in order that your mineral areas shall be developed as cheaply and as profitably as possible. During that period you shall have the right to ship abroad Newfoundland ore so that it may be used in your smelters and manufacturing plants and tested to the utmost. The area having been thoroughly prospected and explored during the five year period, you will have fairly definite knowledge as to the quantity of ore available. The quality of the ore having been put to practical tests during the same period, you know whether or not it is suitable and profitable for your manufacturing processes. At the end of the five year period, you must either manufacture the ore in Newfoundland or lose the concessions, then you must pay the country a royalty in respect to every ton of ore you take away from time to time." That is my suggestion to the Government and I respectfully and earnestly urge it on their consideration.

We should, at least, ensure the best possible returns from this development in the way of labor for Newfoundlanders. In doing this we must avoid having our people again degraded to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water in connection with corporation exploitation of our natural resources at the general expense of the taxpayers of the country. If the Company are not prepared to see eye to eye with us in this connection; if they still insist on taking our raw materials or the concentrates abroad to provide work and wages for outsiders in smelters or in manufactories, then at the end of the test period of five years which I have suggested, the Company should be forced

to pay a royalty on their exports or forego their valuable concessions. Everything possible should be done to induce the Company to build and operate smelters and manufactur ng plants in this country. It is our duty to ensure the utmost of profit to Newfoundlanders from the raw material produced in their country and to that end the Government should discourage a continuation of the practice of exporting such raw material.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman: I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Honourable Member and one point strikes me particularly with regard to the Resolutions now under consideration and that was in connection with the matter of transportation. When this contract was first considered one of the outstanding points that was an attraction to the Government was that the development of this area would entail the transportation of large quantities of mineral over the Government Railway and would thereby bring in considerable revenue and help to make up the deficits the railway is meeting each year. If the Resolutions we are now considering do not absolutely cover that point, the legislation mentioned by the Minister of Justice this afternoon will certainly copper fasten it. I have that much faith in his legal judgment that it will copper fasten it. I think if any loop-hole were left that this company could construct a railway to the point of shipping, it would be a very serious matter. Therefore, I feel the point is well taken, and I hope the new Bill will have the effect of making it absolutely sure that the railway will be protected in every possible way because it has been in the minds of the Government in the consideration of all contracts recently where the operations would entail transportation of material to shipping points that the railway would materially benefit by these operations and thereby assist the whole country and prevent, I hope, some day having the deficit anything like what we have at the present time. Reference has been made to the value of the area and that is a point that I would refer to. It is extraordinary that since the introduction of this measure into this Chamber what a tremendous value has been put on that deposit over there. I don't know where all these statements come from. I have endeavoured to find some authoritative source to corroborate those statements of a hundred million tons of ore being in sight and such figures that people have stated to be there, and I have yet to learn of any authority that can verify those statements or even suggest them. Nobody has told the Government that there is any such deposit there, and I have grave doubts as to anybody being qualified in this country to make such a statement outside of possibly Dr. Baker, the Government Geologist. Now, when this contract was made they had been prospecting on that area for twenty years and only last year, I think, they really located the main deposit, and even then if it had not been for some new development or new discovery with regard to concentrating or some new way of separating the minerals, that mine would not be worth working to-day. Now, a reputable company comes along, a strong and influential company, and wants to negotiate a contract for the development of that mine. Isn't it good policy on the part of the Government to receive them with open arms and show them that we are ready to be liberal and to give as good a welcome as possible, and if they ask for concessions, let us consider the position that we are in in this country. We are peculiarly situated; we are away off the continent; we are not a productive coun-

try; we don't produce anything outside of codfish and timber, and everything has to be imported into the country, often at great expense. If this mine were in Canada or in the United States, they would not want these concessions, because the articles they require would be manufactured in the country and there would be no necessity for any such legislation as here. These companies, naturally, want to feel that they are not going to be handicapped in comparison with companies operating in other parts where they can get raw material without any duty at all times. Therefore, we are handicapped to that extent. With regard to the 20 years period, I was in the House in 1905 when the agreement was made with the A.N.D. Company, giving them concessions in respect of their starting operations at Grand Falls, and then it was considered that the whole country was being given away. The Government had betrayed the people. A principality in the centre of Newfoundland had been given away to outsiders, where you couldn't go over the land; couldn't shoot a bird there; and we were after giving away the birthright of the people. Mass meetings were held. I remember a meeting held in the British Hall and some of our most influential citizens in the hall passed resolutions condemning the whole project. However the Government of the day were wise in their generation and went ahead and passed that contract and that contract gave twenty years to construct a mill and twenty years free importation and they carried it out in four years. Companies coming in have no guarantee that in five years or ten years the property may be bringing in returns, proper returns, and if they want concessions they want them over a period of years because the period of installation and inauguration of an industry is naturally the expensive period and no one starting an industry expects immediate returns. They are prepared to look ahead twenty or thirty years. These big companies are not spending one million to get a million in the next year. They are content to wait and they may get good profits, big profits, in the future, but they are not concerned whether that future is immediate or some years ahead. Therefore I don't see any ground for the criticism that has been extended, but I do say that I agree with the Honourable Member that every possible precaution should be taken to see that nothing interferes with the advantage to accrue to the railway in respect of the products of that mine when it is started.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I want to ask the honourable the Minister of Justice how railway legislation, proposed to be brought in subsequent to the passing of this Act, can bind the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company. This agreement is being made now, under conditions and laws as they exist in respect to railroad matters. There is nothing in it stipulating it is conditional on the terms of railroad legislation such as the honorable gentleman states he proposes presently to introduce. Now, then, can that proposed legislation affect this agreement? Has the Government formally notified the Company of an intention to bring in such legislation applicable to this agreement, as well as to others?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There is no misapprehension on the part of the Company on the point. They have been distinctly told of the intention to pass legislation. This point was discussed as to what form in which we would make clear the position about railway building. Then we just told them that it was proposed to bring in general legisla-

tion. There is no doubt about the matter.

DR. MOSDELL—I just wanted to satisfy myself that the Government had made the position perfectly clear to the Company; that there was no misapprehension on the matter and that nothing could subsequently develop that could possibly be construed as a breach of faith in this connection. Personally, I had come to the conclusion that there could be read into Clause (e) of Section 2 of this Agreement the implied right of the Company to construct a railway from point to point, as suited their interests. I have been reading that clause in conjunction with Section 10, of the Act of 1905, which says: "If at any time or times during the said term the lessee shall be desirous of acquiring lands incident to flowage rights, or rights of way for. . . . . railways, tramway or roads . . . . . or for wharves, piers, docks or other shipping facilities, up to and not exceeding in the whole ten thousand acres, on lands belonging to the Crown, the Governor-in-Council shall, upon the request in writing of the Lessee, convey such lands to the Lessee upon the same terms and conditions as the herein demised lands are conveyed."

Then, again, under the old agreement is an obligation imposed upon the Governor-in-Council, in respect to granting the Company lands for a railroad right-of-way. Under the agreement now before us, "all materials, machinery, parts, plants, utensils and implements for the construction and equipment of transportation and shipping facilities at and between mines and railway points or ports in Newfoundland, including . . . . railways, tramways and conveyors of any kind," will be admitted to the country duty free. How can the Government show that the effect, if not the intention of these two sets of provisions is not to permit the Company to build its own independent line of railroad? How can the Government prevent the Company building such an independent line? Only, I claim, by inserting a clause in this subsection (e) making the position on the matter perfectly clear.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to the remarks of the honourable the Colonial Secretary in reference to the value of the Buchan's Mine property. According to the honourable gentleman, and despite the glowing reports we have heard and read, nobody has any definite knowledge as to what the area is actually worth. Now, the honourable Minister of Agriculture and Mines has associated with him in his dep't, men of wide general knowledge and of first-class standing and reputation, such as Dr. Baker, the Government Geologist. Surely, in order to post honourable members for discussion of this matter on a reasonable and authoritative basis, it is advisable to get from the gentlemen mentioned definite information on this very important point. The information on which I have been basing my remarks was obtained from the writings of a local correspondent published in outside papers. Apparently, it is the same journalist who has been regailing to the world at large accounts of the conversations between the Government and the International Paper Co. When I referred to these articles some time ago, I stated they had created the impression that they were written by one possessing the confidence of somebody high in Government circles. The articles on the Buchan's Mine area and prospects were akin in tone to the others. The statements appear to be official or semi-official. The honourable Minister says 'No!' Then, we don't know just where we are on this matter. It would, I contend, be well for the honourable the Minister of Agricul-

ture and Mines to make a determined effort to obtain official and authentic information so that honourable members can have a proper conception of the subject under discussion.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman; In raising the Committee I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that I made the statement at the last session of the House that Dr. Baker had visited the property on instructions from the Department and that he had reported to me that Buchans Mine was not as important as a large section of the community thought it was. He reported to me that St. George's Coal Fields were ten times greater and more valuable to the country than the Buchan's area. I may send him there and he may spend a month there and at the end of the month he would be able to submit to the Government very little information. He is a geologist. But he is able to tell whether the strata of rock contains gold, silver or any particular metal. But it would take a lot of work to be able to size up accurately or give any kind of real idea of the tonnage in the area. Now while I am on that point I would like to remind the members of this House that during the past twenty-five years while I have been in this House, that very little has been done for our natural resources. I could name scores of properties that looked in the beginning to be very valuable, but those people who put money in them became very disappointed.

As you remember that here in Newfoundland we are in a different position from Canada or the States. These countries have been proven to be rich in minerals. Take Ontario in the past twenty or thirty years, has developed two billions of dollars worth of minerals. But we are a new country, and we are anxious that we should get reputable people to come in here with finances at their back, and it is desirable for that purpose that we should give them all the concessions that we can. I think every member in this House is anxious that we should get every dollar that we can into the country. But we on this side have the responsibility. We have to put through this legislation. We have done our very best. We have tried to bind that company down as much as possible. I merely wanted to make these few remarks.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, August 1st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 1st, 1927.

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

A Petition was presented by:

Hon. Colonial Secretary, from Shearstown, re Roads.

Hon. Prime Minister, as Minister of Education, tabled Report of the Examinations of the Council of Higher Education, and Financial Statement of the Council of Higher Education.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Mr. Moore gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Minister a question. I take it that all this money has been paid out. Did it come out of general revenue account.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Yes.

MR. CASHIN—Then it has been charged to revenue and expenditure account? Because I take it that if it came out of Current Account it is voted. This is money that has been paid out without authority and now we are coming and looking for authority for what has been done. Now with regard to the Justice Department. I ask the Minister of Justice now whether all the bills in connection with the Labrador Boundary question have been settled.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—All that have been presented.

MR. CASHIN—Will you be in a position to come into the House tomorrow when we are on Supplementary Supply and tell us whether there are any more to be presented.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There are more to be presented.

MR. CASHIN—I think that it is only right that all these bills should be presented while the House is open, and not wait until the House is closed, and then in another session to come in here and find another large amount of money in Supplementary Supply because no vote was taken this year to meet bills that have already been incurred. Because you will agree with me that the services to be rendered by certain gentlemen have been rendered, and their bills should be presented.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable gentleman, I may say that as far as the Labrador Boundary is concerned, I have told the House repeatedly that we have got to wait, we cannot go over and commandeer the people in England. We can only send word as has been done to ask them to send in their bills as soon as possible.

MR. CASHIN—Sir Patrick McGrath is not in England.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The honourable member will permit me to take one point at a time. The suggestion has been made here that the Labrador Boundary question is over, but there is work still going on in connection with it, very important work. As a matter of fact getting a judgment is one thing and merely carrying out certain requirements in the way of having the judgment properly recorded is another thing. Certain arrangements that the honourable member himself will appreciate as important have got to be made. Our solicitors over there are still seeing that these matters are cleaned up. So far however as there being anything to hide, I do not think that there is, because if Sir Patrick McGrath and myself, were only to be awarded one twentieth that has been awarded us in the public papers, there would not be very much objection. He like others, may be, is waiting to see the finances of the country in a better condition to pay the bills that are going to be paid us. I do not think however that we will receive the $100,000.00 that it is said in the papers is going to be paid us. You must recognise this fact that if a man has got a proper claim for services rendered, he is going to see to it that he is paid. But I want one point to be made clear, that I retained no one on the Labrador Boundary Question at all. We made no new retainers. This Government added not one cent to the cost of the Labrador Boundary case, in the sense of retainers. I want to say that as far as I am concerned I went in and found certain counsel retained, and certain arrangements with individuals not lawyers. Sir Patrick Mc-

Grath is an example of a local man, with whom certain arrangements were made to have work done. And I will say that whatever arrangements were enter d into with him, by the Minister of the day, that so far as S r Patrick was concerned he gave 100 per cent. value. It is only right to say this here that there are certain times when one might question the amounts paid to men in their public capacity, but it would be very wrong if I did not say here that any reasonable claim that is due any person under any arrangement that person may have had with an administration, it is certainly due the man that more than made up for any expenditure, and is ten t mes as great as any amount that we may be called upon to pay him. In the sense of research work he was practically alone as compared with the expert staff that has been carrying on the work for years. Now as to my idea, or any particular reason for thinking that any one is holding back his bills, I do not know of any. The arrangements were made before this Government came into power and therefore as far as we are concerned, when the bills come from these people we have got to pay them. I do not know of any further information that I can give just now, but any information that may be required, I will be only too glad to lay t on the table.

MR. CASHIN—May I ask if there are certain people now working on the Labrador boundary question.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Yes.

MR. CASHIN—In what capacity.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Hon. members will appreciate that there have been a great many documents accumulating over a lengthy period of time, and we cannot have them thrown to the four winds of heaven. It is proposed to place them probably in the educat onal institutions, as well as say, the Supereme Court library. The cost of printing has been so terrific that it was considered that if they were cast abroad that it would be an unnecessary waste of public funds.

MR. CASHIN—The Minister will agree with me that the strenuous work of the case is finished, and then the next thing that Sir Patrick McGrath will be looking for is the money. That is why I have been after these accounts. Now the labourer is worthy of his hire. But Sir Patr ck is an astute politician, and he is waiting for his opportunity. I am not saying that he is not worthy of what he is going to get, but I know that he is astute enough, and tactician enough to know when to present his bill and when not to present it. And he surely knows that he stands a much better chance of getting more money when the House is closed than when it is open. However I do not want to delay the Committee so I will defer any remarks that I may have to make until it sits again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled: "An Act respecting Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I think we have pretty well reviewed this situation on Second Reading and I would suggest to the Committee that we go on with the reading of the Bill, and if there is any clause that members want explained or amended we will be glad to take

up these matters and deal with them as we go through.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I am taking it for granted that the President of the Bureau, the Prime Minister for the time being, and the Secretary for Education will be members of the Executive body. I conclude, too, that I am correct in understanding that the three Superintendents will also be included, making up the balance of the membership of five. What is not clear to me is why the administrative functions should be placed absolutely in the hands of this limited number instead of the membership of the Bureau or a majority thereof being allowed to function. There does not appear to me to be any reason at all why this House should now be required to legislate that any specified number of members shall constitute an Executive or to empower that Executive to assume the full powers and prerogatives of the Bureau. That is a point which, perhaps, the honourable the Prime Minister, who has assumed control of the Bill here, will clear up for members of this Committee.

If, as appears certain, the three Superintendents are to find a place on the Executive of the Bureau, the tendency will be for the major portion of the educational business of the country to be controlled by them. It is certain that the six general members of the Bureau, at any rate, will gradually get out of touch with educational administration. The tendency will be to ignore them. Their advice and their assistance can, under this Bill, be absolutely dispensed with. I presume that, from time to time, the three superintendents will be out of town visiting schools and attending to the general educational needs of their various denominations. The general membership of the Bureau is, by implication, debarred from carrying on; they have assigned their powers to the Executive, the majority of whom are absent. Obviously, a danger arises of neglect of the educational interests of the smaller denominations who will be almost powerless to help themselves. They must depend on the good offices of educational representatives of other denominations. Not only will they have less say than the three superintendents representing the major denominations, they will have no say at all.

I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the honourable the Prime Minister would be well advised to drop altogether the stipulation in this Bill for an Executive of a certain size and composed of certain elements with certain sweeping powers, and to leave the decision on that point to the general membership of the Bureau. The Bureau can form up its own Executive, can function for the most part as a whole and can, as and when it chooses, refer certain specific matters to the Executive for specific action along specific lines. Such an alternative arrangement would abolish the objection that the Bureau is only a name for privileged denominational representatives to masquerade under. It would make the administration of our educational affairs truly denominational and truly democratic at the same time. I am taking the Prime Minister at his word when he states his objections to one man control of educational administration in this country. Yet, he is making it certain that, for a major portion of each year, that system of one-man control will obtain. The superintendents are to spend a lot of their time on tours of inspection. The Prime Minister is too busy a man to devote close or persistent attention to the affairs of the Bureau. The whole administration would be then thrown on the Secretary The general membership of the Bureau need not be called together at all. It would be far better to leave all the members of the

Bureau in positions of equal responsibility. I hope to discuss this point further, later on in the debate. Meanwhile, I would like to hear the Prime Minister's views on the subject.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: I may say that my views were very similar to those of the member for Fortune Bay when the matter came up for consideration, but it was pointed out at that time that almost daily some little matters would crop up and that the Bureau, as constituted, would be too unweildly to deal with such matters as a whole, but that it was necessary to have a small Executive Committee to deal with them as they came up. The parties who represented this to me spoke with knowledge because this Bureau, as far as working under an Executive Committee is concerned, has really been in existence for the past three years. The three Superintendents and the Secretary have comprised an Executive Committee and have been managing matters the past three years and they have never yet decided upon anything without a unanimous vote of those present, and, I have no doubt, that if there is anything of a contentious nature to come up it will be referred to the entire Bureau for settlement. But if you have a Secretary and a President agreed upon a matter, what do you want to call upon the other gentlement of the Board every other day for? I am certain they will not be able to give the time to it, because the Superintendents of Education, who do not claim now to be doing much in the way of supervising schools, have got to give more of their time to running the Bureau and superintending their own particular branch of education. The member for Trinity (Mr. Halfyard) spoke of the great necessity there was for more supervision and he thought that ten or eleven men more were needed for such work. I think the late Minister of Education spent over $20,000.00 in connection with the training of Supervisors, ten of whom were sent away at a salary of $1,600.00 each, plus over $5,000.00 for travelling expenses. When they came back the plea was put up that the various denominations raised objection to these people, but I think really the reason these officials did not function was because the Government of that day, like ourselves, were in need of finance. I say it is very necessary to have supervisors, but it would cost about $25,000.00 a year to have them and pay them decent salaries. Unfortunately, we cannot afford that at present, but when we can afford it I think we should have them. With regard to that matter of the Bureau functioning as a whole, I am quite convinced that, in view of what has been placed before me that all matters will be decided upon unanimously. That has been accepted and agreed to by all the other members of the Bureau and the Educational Secretary of the Salvation Army and the Presbyterians who are desirous of being on the Bureau and who are perfectly satisfied with the Bureau as at present arranged and constituted.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: With all deference to the position set up by the honourable the Prime Minister, I hold the opinion that, under this Act, a situation may be created in connection with our educational affairs that would be anything but democratic and that would violate all our conceptions of what constitutes fair representation in connection with the governance of public affairs. It is true that a great deal has been said in condemnation of the denominational system of conducting educational affairs. Perhaps a good many of these objections are well founded. That, however, is not now the question at issue. I am quite ready to state frankly, and I do so now, that,

apart from my opinions or the opinions of anybody else as to what is or is not the most effective system of education for this country or any other, the recognition of denominational education is an outstanding and inescapable exemplification of democratic rule. Education is not yet enough of an exact science for me or for any other honourable member of this house, for any educationalist, indeed, to be in a position to say that the practice of education must be conducted thus or so in order for our school system to attain to highest possible efficiency. So long as schools conducted under denominational auspices are conducted in strict accord with the educational standards set up by the State, just so long will the State have no real cause for complaint of the results attained by the system in voque in this country. For the present, at any rate, I feel that I am perfectly justified in regarding democracy and denominationalism in education as synonymous.

If, to be truly democratic, we feel that we cannot in fairness deny the denominations the right to manage their own denominational schools, we must, logically, make sure that our educational system affords equal rights to all and special privileges to none of the denominations concerned. That is a principle which, in my opinion, the new Education Act violates, or threatens with violation. I do not see how a Bureau, so composed that a few men who are interested particularly in their own denominations only, but who are yet permitted to control and dictate the educational policy of other and smaller denominations, can be truly democratic and truly representative of all denominational classes and all denominational interests. It is an open secret that the honourable the Prime Minister is not an advocate of denominational education. As a matter of fact, he is but one of a great number of Newfoundlanders who hold similar views on the matter. Still, the system is with us, or as the Act we are now considering puts it in more places than one, it is "by law established in Newfoundland." That being the case, I feel certain I am but doing the honourable gentleman bare justice when I express the belief that his sole idea in advocating this measure is to ensure the most practical, efficient and thoroughly representative manner of administering our educational affairs under present circumstances. He has, however, defeated his own object, first by undertaking the abolition of the Ministry of Education, and secondly, by assenting to the drafting of the opening sections of the Act which, in providing the composition the Bureau of Education, makes provision for the delegation of the powers of the total membership of eleven to an Executive of five of the members. That, I have gathered in the course of this debate, was the original idea and intention of the honourable gentleman. I think it a great pity that he did not refuse to budge from that position. I would have a great deal more respect for him and for this obviously favorite legislative offspring of his had he remained firm and had the measure we are now considering maintained the control of general educational affairs in the hands of a full and properly representative membership instead of delegating it eventually to a small inner circle. Let me reaffirm my conscientious conviction, Sir, that, just so long as denominational education is the order of the day in this country, it should be fully observed and properly protected against invasion of any kind. This Bill by no means approaches my ideal, in that it places control of the educational affairs of some denominations absolutely in the hands of members of the new Bureau who are

not members of those denominations.

Well, it strikes me, Mr. Chairman, that the idea the Prime Minister had was the most practical and most representative and therefore the most democratic manner of managing the educational affairs of the country and the manner most closely in keeping with the denominational system, the Act says, by law established in Newfoundland, and I think it is a great pity the Prime Minister did not remain firm on that point and have the Bureau itself its own Executive and I think further it is a great pity that the Prime Minister doesn't return to the original idea. He would be setting up a better Bureau. Now just so long as denominational education is the order of the day in this country it should be observed and protected and I do not think that this Bill gives the most effective protection possible to denominational educational rights in this country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in reply to the honourable member, because I can't follow his argument in any way. He has referred to the autocracy more or less of the three Superintendents. Another honourable member referred to them I think, as czars in education. I want to remind the House that when we went into office there was a Minister of Education and the Opposition of the day might equally well or perhaps even more aptly refer to him as a czar of education because, as a matter of fact, there were occasions on which he never consulted the Superintendents of Education. The Bill which he drew up, which I raised no objection to at all, might have been improved if he had taken the Superintendents into his confidence. If the Minister of Education of that day had taken the Superintendents more into his confidence in compiling the legislation, I think it would have been more of an improvement on the 1916 Act than it was. My point is that the Bureau is not to be considered out of business because the Executive Committee of the Bureau can call for meetings just as often as they want to have them, but I do claim that in any minor matters that may come up to be decided on, you don't want to call a Board of large numbers together. Therefore you want an Executive Committee that can be called more or less at a moment's notice to decide minor matters. It will be found I am sure that nothing of a contentious nature will be decided without unanimous consent and where necessary reference to the Bureau with representation of other denominations. The other members of the Bureau and educational representatives of other denominations concerned have expressed themselves as quite satisfied to have the Bureau as a whole for all matters of importance and to have minor matters attended to by an Executive Committee.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, while absolutely disclaiming any intention of attempting to waste the time of this Committee by prolonging the debate unnecessarily or by making useless repetitions of arguments already adduced in this connection, I would like to make a few more remarks on points already covered in this discussion, though perhaps in a rather different way. In the first place, the Bureau of Education is something radically different from the Ministry of Education, because the Minister held a seat in this House as an elected representative of the people. Under the Bureau that feature of our educational administration now disappears. The managers of our educational affairs are not now to be directly responsible to this House. Where, aforetime, we had the advantage of being able to deal directly with a member directly concerned with management of education in this country, we must now be content to get in touch in a

round-about indirect manner with members of a Bureau who are civil servants, under pay by the particular administration of the day. These gentlemen cannot be expected to take the same view of their responsibilities or to give the same trend to their activities as would a Minister elected by vote of the people themselves. That is the point on which I am now desirous to harp and not in the fact that Dr. Blackall is superintendent of Church of England Schools; or Dr. Curtis of United Church Schools; or Mr. Kennedy of Roman Catholic Schools. The Bureau makes these three gentleman, plus the Secretary for Education and the Prime Minister for the time being predominant in educational administration, to the exclusion for all practical purposes, of all other denominational interests. What I am particularly anxious about is that educational power and educational authority should rest only in men fairly representative of all educational interests in the country, that is from a denominational standpoint. I note, first, that this Bill creates a Bureau of Education with a total membership of eleven. I note, in the next place, that there is to be created an executive of five members with full powers to act on behalf of the whole Bureau. I bear in mind that interpretation of democratic principles by which educational denominationalism in this country is justified. Now, consider that a situation may arise, quite conceivably will at some time arise, whereunder an executive of a limited membership is called upon to solve a problem concerning educational interests that have no executive representation, and this Committee must agree with me that all parties to such a dispute and controversy cannot be described as being afforded the fullest protection that their rights and their privileges deserve and demand. It may, of course, be decided that the Executive shall not have power to deal with such a prospective problem. Personally, I doubt if, after this legislation is enacted, there can be any limitation imposed on the Executive. As a matter of fact, we are now ostensibly legislating in regard to a Bureau, but really in connection with the Executive of that Bureau. Why not leave Executive matters to the Bureau itself for decision? Let the general membership of that Bureau decide whether or not an Executive is indispensable, what size or form it shall assume and what position that Executive shall take in the counsels and activities of the Bureau.

The Hon. the Prime Minister alleges that the Act of 1922 was drafted mainly by the former Minister of Education, who made practically no reference whatever of that measure to the three superintendents. I have read through the admin strative portion of this act with the greatest care and have carefully compared its provisions with those of the Act of 1920, as well as with the Act of 1916. Except that under the present measure, certain powers formerly held by the Minister have now been delegated to either the Bureau or the Secretary for Education, I cannot discover that any substantial changes have been made. The board provisions, particularly of our two last Education Acts, remain substantially the same. Obviously, then, the superintendents have been unable to find any glaring faults in the legislation that the former Minister drafted on his account. It is plain that the 1920 Act lost nothing of effectiveness because of any failure or refusal to submit it to the scrutiny and criticism of these assertive gentlemen. It is more than a little significant that, being afforded a chance to sit in judgment on the Act of 1920, to make what changes they pleased, or draft a measure of their own, they stick very closely to the legislative creation of the very Minister with whose methods and

activities they are so prone to find fault.

The three School Superintendents may be outstanding local educationalsts, as they undoubtedly are; they may be men of very large and very prolonged practical educational experience, and I would be the last to deny it; and they may have a thorough understanding of the educational affairs of this country, and nobody contradicts even that idea, but one of these qualifications, not, indeed, the possession of all of them can give them any just right or any undisputed privilege of deciding for denominations other than their own in matters educational. They may be given, as they are given under this Act, statutory power to act as educational overlords outside their own denominational confines, but any such enactment in nature and effects and of itself constitutes a violation of the principle of denominational education "as by law established in Newfoundland," to quote the new Act itself once more. If we are to adhere as strictly to denominational education as the framers of the present measure appear to be overanxious to do, then we must make quite sure that there is no discrimination practiced and that no denomination, no matter how small numerically, is put in a less advantageous position proportionately than is any other denomination. While the present system exists, the Bureau which boasts of being denominationally representative must be so in actual fact and to the utmost of detail. Only by the greatest care and exactitude can this be ensured and denominational grievances and injustices be averted. There are greater menaces to denominational rights under the bureaucratic system than could ever have been created under the Ministry of Education. I regard Section One of the new Act as embodying such real and grave menaces and I emphatically object to the proposition that this House enact them and give them the status and the force of law.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I have been stressing the point that there is great need for more supervisors. That idea was foremost in the minds of those who drafted the 1920 Act. Now it is my opinion that as a country and as a legislature we can't afford not to afford supervisors, or supervising instructors for the encouragement of education in this country, and I think that the spending of twenty or thirty thousand on supervisors, to send out ten men to the remoter parts of the country particularly. Ten men could cover nearly all the schools in the island. I think it would be better for us even to add that sum to our capital expenditure. Really even if our current revenue can't meet that expenditure I think if we had to come in for an extra amount in supplementary supply to be spent in the interests of education and the benefit of the country by sending out those extra supervisors, it would be money well spent. Evidently they did not like the Minister of Education because he did not get down on his hands and knees to the Superintendents.

(Reads)

For the life of me I cannot see where the powers of the Minister were arbitrary any more than they are now under this proposed act. Then it would meet the objection made by the member for Fortune. We have a Minister anyhow as head of the Department, and all the denominations seemed to be quite satisfied to have the Minister accept their recommendations, and with the right kind of Minister, you would find that there would not be anything of an arbitrary nature done to interfere with the proper administration of education in the country under the denominational system. I submit that the Prime Minister cannot give the time that he would like to education, and it has

been intimated that the superintendents now cannot act as the Executive of the Bureau because it is not expected of them. I do not suppose that it is to be expected that they would confine themselves solely to the Bureau.

After all I do not see anything to be gained by even pointing out what may be regarded as the irregularities in this Bill. This legislature as it is composed now finds this question very tiresome, and very uninteresting. The Chairman has his work cut out to keep a quorum while we are talking about education. Why is this question treated with such contempt? We are making a radical change with regard to the system of education in this country by abolishing the education department, but nobody seems to take notice of it. I think that it is the wrong move that we are making. I fear that we shall all live to regret it. Because there is nothing to be gained by it. The Government has been quick to accept recommendations possibly in some cases from its own members, and in other cases from members outside of the Government altogether. Changes have been made in our laws which are not beneficial to the country. This matter of abolishing the Department of Education, I cannot for the life of me understand why the Superintendents of Education are so much interested in it. They are interested however, and they have canvassed nearly every member of the House of Assembly to try and impress upon them the great benefits that will accrue, benefits as have been pointed out, which are only of a financial nature. There is the pension fund and there is the augmentation grant.

(Reads)

You are not even doing that, in this bill. Why cannot we have one examination board. Then in connection with the augmentation grant I notice that in supplementary supply for augmentation there is $28,000. That amount was not required last year. But it so happened that one denomination was short, and because $10,000 had to be given to one denomination, all the denominations had to get it. Anyhow I think that it is a mistake to think that the powers of the Minister are in any way greater now that it is confined to the Secretary, and the Bureau do the rest. The powers are not curtailed in any way.

(Reads)

What service can anyone expect from the five extra men that are on that Bureau outside of the Prime Minister, the Secretary and the three Superintendents. Then there is the educational secretary and three other men outside. What service do you think that they are going to give if they do not get adequate remuneration. Anyhow I could go on to put in the time which I hate to do, discussing these sections.

DR. MOSDELL—Subsection 5 of Section 1 of this Act appeals to me as binding Principal Paton of the Memorial College to seek endorsation from the Bureau of Education, which being interpreted means the Superintendents of Education, for the engagement of any professor or professors of his staff. I do not regard this Bureau of Education or any other local body as competent to pass upon a man selected by Principal Paton or to dictate to him as to the personnel of his staff.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would like to remind the Honourable gentleman that it was these Superintendents of Education that found him and brought him here.

DR. MOSDELL—If they know him so well, they should know him well enough to leave him untrammelled in the selection of his assistants. Professor Paton is an outstanding authority in the educational field and I would prefer to see him left to decide absolutely for himself who should or should not be added to or removed

from the staff of the College. No matter who is head of the institution, there should be the minimum of interference with him if the maximum of efficiency is to be obtained from the activities of the College.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it is unthinkable that anybody would try to interfere with Mr. Paton in his selection of a professor, but he is not going to be in charge of that college forever, he may not be in charge of it very long. After all he retired from another educational institution before he came here, and is only undertaking to do four year's work here, but we do not know who may succeed him in charge of that college, and whoever he may be it seems that it would be better to have three or four men with a knowledge of the affairs of this country to decide whether to turn down the recommendation or otherwise of the appointment of professors.

DR. MOSDELL—There is just one other observation that I beg to be permitted to make in connection with this important institution ,the Memorial College. It occurs to me that the provisions made in subsections 5 and 6 of this section mean, in actual practice, that a denominational status is given to the institution. If the control of the affairs of the Bureau is to remain as stipulated in Section 1, then, such management of the college is denominational in deed and in truth, and certain denominations are excluded from any share in the control of the activities of the institution. I certainly do not regard such a development as progressive. It is, rather, a retrogressive step. The Memorial College should not be under denominational control.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think the one feature that appeals to me in the constitution of the bureau is that it is absolutely denominational. It is true that we have not every denomination in the Executive of the bureau, but we have every denomination represented on the bureau itself, but I do not know how many more religious bodies may come along. We have taken the three largest religious bodies and put them in charge of the Educational Executive of the bureau. We have not every denomination represented in the Executive Council of the Government, and we never did have or will have, but I think that this is as interdenominational as we can possibly expect any council to be.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador" with the following amendments:

1. Strike out Section 2.
2. Renumber Section 3 as Section 2.

On motion these amendments were read a first time.

On motion, and with unanimous consent, the amendments were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body of such concurrence.

It was moved and seconded that this House at its rising do adjourn to tomorrow, Tuesday, August 2nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 2nd, 1927.

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

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Bill for the confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and International Paper Company of Nfld., Ltd.

Hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Bill to amend the Act 15, Geo. V., 1924, Chap. 2, entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Ltd.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in order that the House may appreciate what the present government has done in the matter of supplementing the original votes provided during the past three years, I have had the records looked up. And it seems to me after looking over the figures that the present administration's record in the making of Estimates compares very favourably with governments of the past. For purposes of fair comparison I have divided the last nine years into three-year periods, namely: from 1918 to 1921; from 1921 to 1924; and, finally, from 1924 to 1927.

I find that from 1918 to 1921 the original estimates asked for in the House had to be supplemented by the huge sum of $5,721,938.10.

Take from 1921 to 1924: These three years were not so bad but still the Supplementary Supply amounted to $3,158,527.19.

Now take the past three years, since the present government assumed power, and you will find that the total Supplementary Estimates asked for (including the present year's) only amounted to $2,242,998.97, as compared with $5,721,9938.10 in the 1918-1921 period and $3,158,527.19 in the 1921-1924 period.

Honourable members opposite must know as well as I do that it is impossible to abolish Supplementary Estimates. Items crop up every month for which no specific provision has been made. To prove this contention I have only to point out that since the House has been in session and the estimates printed, we will have to seek an additional $15,000.00 estimates for the current year. If the House was closed as it might under ordinary circumstances, this $15,000 would have to be supplied in the Supplementary Estimates for 1927-1928 at the next session of the Legislature. But we are asking for it now, a fact which should convince the House that we are endeavouring to cover all known requirements in the original votes laid on the table.

The following statement of Supplementary Votes and Special Warrant overdrafts from 1918-1919 to date will show that since I have had the houour to be Finance Minister everything possible has been done to keep the Supplementary Estimates as low as possible:

	Supplemental Estimates	Special Warrant	Total
1918-1919	$1,373,413.57	$ 51,523.76	$1,424,937.33
1919-1920	2,412,219.00	36,595.00	2,448,814.00
1920-1921	1,364,961.83	482,324.94	1,847,286.77
			$5,721,938.10
1921-1922	771,196.53	200,336.31	971,562.84
1922-1923	1,054,739.77	.....	1,054,739.77
1923-1924	713,639.92	418,530.66	1,132,224.58
			$3,158,527.19
1924-1925	505,905.51	181,228.06	687,133.57
1925-1926	532,657.67	28,101.19	560,758.86
1926-1927	815,106.54	180,000.00	995,106.54
			$2,242,998.97

In other words, our records for three years show that we have cut (as compared with the 1918 to 1921 period) the amount required for Supplementary Supply by the huge sum of three and one-half million dollars.

(Reads: Supplementary Supply)

Now there is no doubt in my mind but that there are too many men there. They have not been put there by me. I suppose we live in hopes that we will get rid of them some time. I think we ought for future years let everybody know about these supernumeraries. As I found them there, they are still there, and there are a lot of these men going about put in by past Governments possibly one or two put in by me if I found we wanted them, but they have never been appointed officially.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—How did you figure out you wanted them when you had too many?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—These are always home sick or something and have a doctor's certificate. When you want them you can't get them. What I would like to do is pension the whole crowd of them. We do not get value for these paid supernumeraries, but it is difficult to cut them out. If you do you have members and clergymen and others interceding to get them back and telling us that we are starving these people.

(Reads)

When I went to the Department there were heavy stocks of printed matter and we didn't need as much as we did the past year. I would like to point out we get a lot for these forms sold. Everybody who buys a form in the outports pays for it. We get a good lot of that six thousand back.

(Reads)

We get a good deal of it back; revenue stamps and one thing and another.

(Reads)

I don't think it will be denied that lots of the outports are overstaffed and yet I don't think any member will recommend me in his district to turn them out. My opinion as far as the cutting down of expenditure goes you won't do much with that kind of cleaning out unless you have an absolutely united party.

That is as I found these supernumeraries and it seems that has been

going on, and will go on.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Do you admit that you are too weak to carry out retrenchment?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I don't admit anything, but I do admit that to carry out retrenchment in this country you want a Mussolini round here who can control a Government in absolute union, but I haven't seen that Government yet. There are so many influences brought to bear in any case of attempting to cut out officials and you have got to consider what Members' recommendations are. The thing goes on in each district and they try to help out and it will go on until somebody changes it or until perhaps it changes itself.

(Reads)

I would like to explain the "Daisy" cost instead of twenty thousand, forty-two thousand, and why we don't have to ask for twenty thousand instead of fifteen is that the boat was used by the Justice Department for the Circuit Court, and we were paid five thousand dollars by the Justice Department.

(Reads)

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask about that fifteen thousand extraordinary expenditure for Public Charities on the second page.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Yesterday when the matter came up I was asked to get an explanation, and this morning I got this memorandum from the Charities Commissioner.

(Reads)

Under this head are included a large number of small items.

(Reads)

MR. CASHIN—Might I ask in connection with the Finance Department, that interest on public debt, is that last year's loan? That is six months' interest, but we have more than six months' interest to pay. That money was raised somewhere round September.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—The loan was issued in October and we didn't get it until January. We didn't take charge of the money until January.

MR. CASHIN—I see; you didn't get the money until January. On the question of these outport supernumeries would that individual I have spoken of on some occasions in this House who is at Cape Broyle be paid out of that vote?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I think he is, I am pretty sure.

MR. CASHIN—The Minister a few minutes ago said no Member would recommend that individuals occupying civil service position in his district should be hove out. Well I am recommending that that individual be hove out and hove out quick. He is a collector of Customs at Cape Broyle. It is only a matter of time when he will be hove out. It may not be in this Minister's time or my time. He is getting twelve hundred dollars a year for sitting down doing nothing. He is a nuisance; if he was any good I wouldn't mind his staying there, but he is a nuisance.

I would like to ask too if you have details of that six thousand five hundred dollars for the Finance Commission?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —The explanation of supplementary supply six thousand five hundred dollars; Finance Commission; is as follows:—

(Reads)

MR. CASHIN—I presume it is the intention of the Government now to pay the other two members of the Finance Commission. Mr. Morine is out of the country and he has received one thousand dollars on account of acting as chairman. No doubt the other two gentlemen acting

on that commission performed valuable service, and it surprises me that they are not in receipt of a cheque the same as Mr. Morine. I wonder if I could get the information what date that cheque was paid to Mr. Morine. This Finance Commission anyhow has proved itself so indispensable to the country it has spent six thousand five hundred dollars and saved seventeen; and we have been talking about cutting down expenditure. It would be a nice sum in proportion to make up: if the Government saves seventeen dollars by expending six thousand five hundred how much would it have to expend in order to save one million.

(Reads: details expenditure $6,500)

There is one more question I would like to ask and that is this eight hundred and odd thousand dollars, supplementary supply, I would like to know what account, what particular account this money was paid from; whether paid from public exchequer or revenue; paid from public exchequer and recouped from loan?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Paid from exchequer.

MR. CASHIN—How can it be when one item: (bounty)

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—That is last year.

MR. CASHIN—No, this year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Part paid loan account and put back exchequer account afterwards.

MR. CASHIN—It seems very difficult to find out exactly about these things. In my opinion most of this sum of eight hundred and fifteen thousand was paid out of loan account.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—No.

MR. CASHIN—Well a good proportion because our revenue can't stand it. When figures are tabled for 1926-27 they will show that these amounts shall have been paid from loan; paid out of exchequer account and take a cheque from loan account and pass it over; that is the only way; consequently paid out of loan account.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Paid out of loan account when you have got a deficit there.

MR. CASHIN—I don't want to hold up this supplementary supply. It is paid already. It is a liability on the country. All that is wanted is the sanction of the House in order to become law. We have got to pay the bills that are contracted. I take it this kind of thing has gone on for years in past Governments but that doesn't affect the situation. Reference was made to the Government in 1918 and 1919. I think the Honourable Minister will agree with me that the war was on and the Government did not know what money they wanted; but as the years passed and after the war was over if this country had got down to brass tacks it should have and lived within its income as it should have done there would be no such thing as this extraordinary amount of supplementary supply because I think every member in the House will agree with me that the amount now before the House for us to vote of eight hundred and fifteen thousand is appalling and on top of that all those amounts have been spent from them by Minute of Council and by Special Warrant, anything you like to call it; consequently our spending power is at the stupendous amount of twelve millions whereas our revenue can't come much over eight and a half millions at the present time. Where are we going to get three and a half millions every year if we keep on as we are going at the present time spending three and a half millions per year more than we are earning; whether it comes from loan or anything else we are spending three and

a half millions more than we are earning.

I have heard remarks made in this House and outside to the effect that a certain gentleman saved the country three or four hundred thousand dollars; he took a certain step and felt by so doing he would save that to the country. Such a statement could only have its beginning in the brain of an idiot.

The Minister made a remark a few minutes ago with regard to recommendations of members to throw out any one in the civil service. I have recommended one and he is still in it; who should never be there, unfit to take the job, a nuisance to the public, unnecessary at that. He is in my district and if I represent the district again and become any one in a Government he is going to be thrown out, so if the Government doesn't and I am in a Government he is going to go because he was only put there for political reasons by an individual member of the present Government whom he served during the previous election. Just imagine, what is the use of any one recommending any kind of economy when it is not carried out. I look at this document before me to-day and I realize the public debt of Newfoundland to-day on loan account alone is somewhere in the vicinity of seventy-two millions. This year we are going to add I suppose five or six millions more; consequently our public liabilities for loans without guarantees at the present time is about seventy-seven or seventy-eight millions; plus our guarantees will bring it up to nearly a hundred millions. We are at breaking point now. We are up now as far as we can get. Mr. Chairman, we have been told by the public press in recent editions; editions to which I do not wish to go so far back; editions issued in March that this Labrador boundary question being settled was going to cure all our ills. I am going to make a statement this afternoon; perhaps I take my political life in my hands to a certain extent in making it. I feel it is the greatest curse, so to speak, in a sense, as I look at it now, that we have won the Labrador dispute. Why is that? Because it has enhanced our borrowing capacity but has not enhanced our ability to pay money which we will borrow on this account.

That brings me to another phase of the situation regarding the Labrador boundary situation. I do not want the Honourable Minister to think that I am going to hold up the House at any length this evening in connection with this because I am too busy, but during the recent session this legislation has been introduced by the Government regarding the disposition of the Labrador. The members of the Opposition recommended certain exchanges in that bill, and they were absolutely ignored. That bill goes to the Upper Chamber and to people who represent no one, and when they throw out that clause it comes in here and receives the entire approval of the present administration. It is only another proof that any suggestion coming from this side of the House, even if we suggest it to-morrow that by any chance we could wipe out the public debt of this country, I venture the opinion that the present administration would not adopt it. Why we spoke and talked here on both sides of the House for days, on this Labrador Bill. It went to the Upper House and they turned it out and sent it back with a clause taken out of it, and when the Speaker read it, not a man on the other side of the House ventured an opinion concerning that department which I shall strongly advocate to be dispensed with in the country. The Upper Chamber I claim to-day as far as this country is concerned is only useless expenditure. We know what

has taken place in other dominions of the Empire regarding the Upper Chamber. We know that in certain sections of Australia strong representation has been made to the British Parliament and to the Crown to abolish the Upper House. I would like the members of that Upper House to tell why their suggestions can be carried out when some suggestions made by the present administration are not carried out. They would have a hard time convincing you or me how that is possible. The amount of money expended by the present Government during the past two years in connection with able bodied pauper relief is simply appalling. We have gone so far as to borrow money to give to able bodied pauper relief. I am going to venture another opinion now and I suppose that I am going to take my political life in my hands, when I say that there are people in this country who have been receiving able bodied pauper relief and they have bank accounts, and there are members in this House that know it. If one reads this report submitted by the Finance Commission, God bless the mark, that is all that it talks about. It made two strong points. Some people are receiving extra remuneration through the recommendations of that commission in the sense of the giving out of able bodied relief. But that cannot go on as one hon. member said to-day that what we want in this country is a strong-arm Mussolini, but if he arose to-day, the public press would denounce him as the greatest rascal that ever entered the Narrows. What we require in this country now is an independent public press, and that we have not got. A press that would criticise the Governent for their wrongdoings if they did wrong, and that would criticise the Opposition for any tactics that they may pursue that may be obstructing the wheels of progress, as far as the Government doings are concerned. It is not because the public press has to choose one side or the other of politics, it is not because they may have supported the Monroe administration, in opposition to the Hickman party. It is not because their party has been elected to power that they should forget for one minute that their party may be able to commit wrong as well as any other party, and that should be able to keep that party in place and hold a firm hand, and not be afraid as they are at present. As I said a moment ago, this Supplementary Supply that is before us at the present time is simply appalling. I would go so far as to say that it is preposterous, because it could have been avoided. These bills were paid for out of money that was borrowed last year, and the year before. In the Justice Department alone there has been $9,000 handed out to various lawyers for their services in connection with Crown prosecutions, alone. That could have been avoided provided that a Government came into power to-morrow strong enough to appoint some lawyer to that position.

Now I have also various questions to-day in connection with the Supplementary Supply. And I feel that if the time were at my disposal, that I could take up the time of this House to greater advantage if I were to go into these matters in greater detail. But I purpose to next week after we receive the Budget to present to the best of my ability a few figures that I have obtained during the session, and the figures that I obtain between now and then because I say that when you are presented with a statethat you cannot depend on the one that you get from the Auditor General.

(Reads)

The details are so flimsy. All the construction that one can put on them

today is that these monies were paid to party supporters. I will venture the opinion here this evening now that two-thirds of the supplies were given to a gentleman called Mr. Gould, two-thirds of the clothing to Mr. Whiteway and sundries represents I suppose other gentlemen standing in the good graces of the Government. However, I will defer further remarks until a later date. I make these remarks in all sincerity but I will defer further remarks until after we receive the Budget and additional estimates.

MR. GRIMES—I quite agree with the honourable member for Ferryland that when we see supplementary estimates coming in amounting to $815,000 that it is a very serious matter for the country. I cannot help but thinking that members on the other side as well as on this side must in their own heart confess that the country is certainly faced by a very serious situation. While the Government has made no effort to keep down expenses it is surprising when we know that there are men who have for the last three or four years been loud in their expression as to what should be done in order that the country may keep within its revenue. I cannot for the life of me see why we should have supplementary estimates for this years amount. We have here in connection with medical attendance to paupers and hospital fees the extraordinary amount of $145,000, and the honourable member for Trinity some few days ago asked the House as to what benefit this new commission was in connection with the public charities that is supposed to effect a saving in connection with the country, and instead of effecting a saving we find that there is an increase of $110,000. Well they have certainly not justified their existence in so far as effecting economy in connection with the charitable institutions of this country. There are quite a number aware that those who go to these hospitals many of them can well afford to pay for the services that is rendered, yet we find that $65,000 has to be provided by this House in order to pay up their hospital fees. I wonder if the Colonial Secretary is able to say to-day that the Board of Governors are making any attempt to collect the fees, which they can collect if they make the effort.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —The Board of Governors are making an effort and they have placed all the fees in the hands of a solicitor to collect.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, then I would like to ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary why that $60,000 should be in the estimates in connection with hospital fees. How long are they making an effort to collect these amounts, and what amount has been collected through the Board of Governors.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —The trouble is that it takes months to pay.

HON. MR. LONG—I may say that under this Government I think that the honourable member will admit that the Board of Governors have collected three times as much as under any previous Government.

MR. CASHIN—But there is no doubt about it but that this amount is too large, and that the Board of Governors should see to it that the solicitors that they have engaged should keep after the people that owe until they pay up. Now in reference to the public institutions . . .

(Reads)

And then the Minister will say that all that expenditure is justifiable. But I would say this that there is a considerable amount of supplies given for the various institutions, that are not given out by tender. Is not that a fact.

(Reads)

Now I do not want to delay the

House but I do say this that the Minister of Public Works if he went about it in the right way could get better requirements and at letters prices, in the way of supplies for the public institutions, than he is getting during the past year.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chariman, with regard to that vote for $6,500.00 for the Finance Commission, if I were uncharitable I could make a statement to the effect that this amount gave an opportunity to the members of that Commission to use up some of their surplus energy, and in doing that of course it incurred an expenditure which this House is called upon to meet. The intention may have been good, but, evidently, the Government have fallen down on their job. If any saving had been effected, as we expected it would, by the functioning of that Commission surely the estimates are no criterion of it, although according to the recommendations made and tabled in this House within the last few weeks told us a different story, and I fear that that $6,500.00 expenditure is only on account, as Mr. Morine got $1,000.00 on account and certainly the other members of the Finance Commission are equally deserving of remuneration. Therefore, that $6,500.-00 is not all that the Finance Commission will cost this Colony and it is regrettable that the recommendations put forward by the Commission have not been put into effect and are not likely to be. I contend it is only history repeating itself with regard to the appointments of Commissions. After expenses are incurred in connection with Commissions, unless the powers-that-be put their recommendations into effect and act fearlessly in doing so, then of course it is all a waste of money and from that point of view I cannot see what good can come out of the recommendations of the Finance Commission. It was a gross blunder and a waste of money in the first place to appoint this Finance Commission, and, perhaps, nothing will be gained by making any further remarks in connection with this subject because the money has been paid to those who had anything to do with the work of that Commission and this Committee has to indemnify the actions of the Executive Government in making these payments. With regard to hospital fees and medical attendance to paupers, the Government thought that when they assumed power a great saving would be made by the appointment of a new Board of Health; but they found they were sadly disappointed, as there seems to be no one in authority and everything goes on in the same old way. Under the old system, sick people would come from outports and be put up at boarding houses and while waiting to get admittance to hospital would cost the Government a dollar a day. Now you have scarcely anyone waiting at boarding houses and you have four or five hospitals and still patients are costing three and four dollars a day. So that expenses in that connection have increased, although I do not propose to offer any solution to that problem unless some different management is undertaken by the present Government. If I were to be critical, I could point out to the Government where they could remedy things and whereby they would not have an over-expenditure of over $815,000.00 in one year. I quite agree with the utterances of the Finance Minister that you want to be more than strong to bring about reforms financially as a Government, and no matter how good our intentions may be—as we are all politicians—you would want a Mussolini to arouse public opinion in order to bring about retrenchment, reduction in expenditure and reduction in taxation. Now I do not presume to say that you can bring about a saving of millions of dollars, but in connection with the general business of the country, apart from the civil service, if we

were united as a legislature and if the Government was strong enough, there could be a considerable saving effected. Any how, Mr. Chairman, we got to submit, as I have already intimated, to the figures presented here in Supplementary Supply, but it shows the very poor state we are in financially when we got to find this money outside the original estimates, and what the outcome is going to be as a result it is a difficult matter to conjecture. In referring to the vote for the Marine and Fisheries Department I would like to ask if the Government has any serious intention of giving any consideration to the petitions I presented to this legislature from the Fishermen's Industrial Organization headquarters at Catalina, and has the Government had the time to give any serious thought to the set of petitions presented by the member for St. Barbe, President of the F.P.U., and in connection with the question of standardization does the Government hold out any hope that the prayer of the petitioners will be given any attention this season or not?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member for Trinity I wish to say that we as a Government have not had time to give any consideration to the petitions he refers to. The Government have had a tremendous amount of work to attend to recently, and, as the Colonial Secretary can verify, we have had to tackle night and day a mass of correspondence piled up in his department in connection with the International legislation, so that it was not quite possible for us to give any consideration to the subject matter referred to by the honourable member for Trinity.

MR. HALFYARD—I thank the Prime Minister for his explanation. No doubt the members of the Executive Government have had their hands full within the past month in connection with this International legislation; but if we were all honest with ourselves in this House we would inform the public that that was the reason why the business of this House has been delayed. I fully realise that important question has been occupying the attention of the Government, but instead of being here to-day and making no progress whatever, why could we not be dealing with the Finance Minister's Budget. But as far as the appointment of a Fisheries Commission to consider these petitions presented by the President of the F.P.U. and myself, I think it could be an easy matter for the Executive Government to appoint the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and two or three other men to go into the matter fully and make their recommendations and possibly have something of a practical character done before this House closes.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if it is the intention of the Government to continue the work of the Finance Commission, and if Mr. Cohen, who received $1,400.00, and Mr. Gushue, who received $1,265.00, and others, are still under pay? It appears that as some of these gentlemen who were connected with the work of that Commission were paid only on account, the Commission will cost $15,000.00 by the time all the bills are in, instead of $6,500.00 which appears in the Supplemental Estimates. One of the Commissioners received $1,000.00 on account and certainly the others will look for something, and if that expenditure is going to continue, there is going to be a huge amount of public moneys spent for no purpose whatever. Now I would like to know if that Commission is going to continue functioning or not?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the honorable member that the bulk of the work of the Finance Commission was done in Mr. Morine's office, subject, of course, to the other members of the Commission. Mr. Sullivan has

done a great deal of work, but has not sent in any bill for it; nor has Mr. Cramm been looking for anything he has done. Mr. Morine recommended when he was going away that Mr. Sullivan take the Chairmanship, if the work continued, but Mr. Sullivan has not wanted to take it. At all events, it is not very encouraging for these gentlemen to find that the work done by them does not appeear to be appreciated. I must say that it is rather unfortunate that Mr. Morine's health gave out, because I think a great deal of good and a considerable amount of valuable statistics have been secured by Mr. Morine, but the Government decided not to act until the full and complete report of the Commission was in their hands, because the continual cry was not to cut down one man unless to cut down all, and the policy of the Government was to tackle the Postal Telegraphs proposition, through which, as I have already stated, would mean a saving of between $150,000.00 and $200,000.00 a year, and even there you would be putting certain men out of their positions while other men in the service would not be affected and so the Government, as a whole, decided it was better to have the matter stand until the whole report was submitted, but, as already stated, Mr. Morine's health gave out and the work of the Commission ceased. But if we get anybody else to take Mr. Morine's position as Cha rman of the Commission or whether it will become the policy of the Government, after the House closes, to deal with the matter in piecemeal or whether it goes to another Government to deal with I cannot tell the Opposition whether the Finance Commission w ll continue to function as a whole. Now with regard to Mr. Cohen, I remember he was under salary when and before we came into office. He was handed out as a legacy to us, in other words, from the previous administration and he was one of these officials that some people did not like to turn on the street. I am not afraid to acknowledge it, and I quite agree with the Finance Minister that it would require a local Mussolini to start in and clean up the public expenditure. Personally, I adm t that we as a Government are not strong enough to tackle such a problem to-day, but I would be glad to have a Mussolini step in and take charge and tackle and clean up these public offices as they require to be cleaned up, but it requires a superman to do it. If this Government went out of office to-morrow and the gentlemen on the other side of the House came into power, they would not do any better than we have done and that is not talk.ng party politics when I say that. It requires a superman to handle this question as it should be handled. For argument's sake, let us go back to many years ago when Mr. Morine started in and cleaned up the Department of Finance and Customs. He cleaned it up effectively no doul t, but what happened? He became unpopular politically and remained so ever since. There is the encouragement to any man who wants to start and do the same thing as Mr. Morine did. Personally, I feel that any Government in this country who think they can clean up our public offices as they should be cleaned up will have very little hope for re-election. The position s a difficult one and personally I think it is hopeless from a political standpoint.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the House in connection with this vote now, and I do not suppose that it would be any use to attempt to go over the po nts, that have been gone over by the member that spoke before me, but I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a statement that I have heard within the past two or three days in connection with some of the public institutions. I do not

know since the honourable member became Minister that he has visited the lunatic asylum, especially during meal hours. I have been informed on very good authority that the help in the lunatic asylum are given anything but good food. Now I know that in the Morris administration, that the Minister of that day used to sit at the table and find out what kind of food was being supplied there. Now the Government are not to blame in connection with this, because they are supplying the money. But the food is not being supplied to these institutions. At the Lunatic the help out there is not getting the kind of food that they should get. It is for the Minister to enquire now. Go in there and dig around a little bit. Do not go to the heads of the Department. Keep clear of them. But go to the common help and you will find that they are only half fed. I do not say that in connection with the General Hospital. The food is alright down there. But in connection with the Lunatic Asylum you will find that what I am saying is true.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I may say in reply to the honourable member for Ferryland, Mr. Moore, that I have not heard of it. I have had occasion to go in there, and I have interviewed the doctor and the head nurse and I know of no complaint about what you refer to.

MR. MOORE—I am told that they are afraid to complain for fear that they may lose their jobs.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the honourable member has brought that matter up, because I do not think that there are any public servants more deserving of consideration than the servants at the Lunatic Asylum. They have a very strenuous life and very difficult tasks to perform, and I would be very sorry to think that they are not properly treated. I am very glad that the member brought the matter up, and I am sure that the Minister will take it up.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: I have listened to the reply of the Prime Minister to the question asked by Mr. Halfyard, and it is disappointing to hear that the Government are not doing anything towards making a move in connection with improving the fisheries of this country. I can quite understand that the members of the Executive have been very busy during the number of weeks now getting ready important legislation, and they have not much time themselves to give to the question of the fisheries. But I think that the suggestion made by Mr. Halfyard is a good one. There are men interested in the fisheries apart from the Executive Government who could go into the whole question of the improvement of the fisheries. What is to be done this year. The conditions in this country are anything but good. I think that everyone realises that there is room for a good deal of improvement. The earning power of the people could be considerably increased. When we see such a large number as have left the fisheries this year, and a great many of those gone out of the country, and the number of those engaged in the fisheries declining every year, there ought to be something done by the Government to help to stop this drain upon the fisheries of this country. I am firm in the conviction though I am not a fish merchant, and I do not pretend to tell the Prime Minister, who is engaged in that business himself or any other man who is engaged in the fish business, that I know more about it than they do, but from the standpoint of boosting the industry, I think that I can say without being egotistical, that a considerable lot can be done towards people to eat more fish in this country. Now you take in the Old Coun-

try at the present time and not only there but in Canada and in the United States and in fact every country in the world there is more attention paid to the home market. They are beginning to realise that every country today is trying to establish an industry in their own country, and to discourage importation from outside countries into that country. What efforts are we putting forward along these lines. We are learning nothing by the experience of other countries. It has been said that we want a Mussolini. I do not know whether he is required but what I think is required is a little co-operation, on the part of people that are interested in the various industries of this country and who will not allow politics to interfere with the advance of trade in this country. I think that there are men in this country who could do a tremendous lot towards improving the conditions in connection with the various industries, if they would only forget their personal dislikes, and get together and say now "Let us forget politics, and see if we cannot do something towards the improvement of the trade of the country."

Now we are importing a lot of foodstuffs into this country, in the way of canned meats and that kind of article. I know that during the summer season it will be found that a great many people eat their share of fish, but after the month of November, there is very little fish eaten in this country compared to what is eaten in other countries and practically during six months of the year there is very little fish consumed by the people in this country, other than on Fridays and by certain portions of the population during the Lenten season. Supposing that the Government were to make a move and they said that they would get some of the merchants on Water Street along with some of the sellers of fish, representatives of say the lobster fishermen in the country, and say, "We are going now to try to get our people to use fish more as a food in this country," and let that organization be started not only in the city but throughout the country, not only would it affect the fishing industry but the laborers and the workmen and every other class of men throughout the country, and I would say this that there would be more prosperity than if we were to depend on our own resources. Let you have that organization with branches in every outport in the country, and will the chairman or any member tell me that he cannot arouse enthusiasm enough in this country to purchase the products of this country, and everything that we produce in the way of foodstuffs in this country. This enthusiasm could be aroused if the business men of this country and the leaders in the political life of this country, would show the example. I venture to say that twelve months from now you would see a vast improvement in the fishing industry of this country alone, not to mention other industries. But there it is and there seems to be a lack of faith in each other. There seems to me mistrust prevalent, which is disastrous in its effects upon the country today and no attempt is being made to try and side-track that and introduce a spirit of enthusiasm which would have for its object the encouragement of our own industries; to get our own people to consume all they can of what we produce here ourselves. Well now, the Prime Minister is an influential man in this country. The Minister of Finance and Customs is another; the Leader of the Opposition is another; Sir William Coaker has influence in this country. Let these men get together and let them get in touch with those carrying on the trade of the country and let them get the merchants

to cooperate with them to arouse a spirit of co-operation between all classes in the country to encourage the purchase of our own productions by our people, and then you will see a very different spirit in this country within the next few months than what we have to-day. We can remove the bad spirit that exists if we will, and those I have mentioned can do considerable towards removing that bad spirit existing in this country to-day, and if we are interested in the welfare of the country, these improvements can be brought about by co-operation. Why should this not be begun now? Why should not an attempt be made to appoint a committee or commission, if you will, to call together representatives of these various trades and industries, and I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of men in this country to-day who are ready to co-operate in such a movement because they see the condition of the country that exists to-day, and that that is the only way we can develop a truly patriotic spirit amongst the people of the country to-day. Imagine a committee appointed that way, established here in St. John's, established in the various outports, and I believe that all on that committee will forget about politics and think of the interests of the country as a whole and the interests of the trade of the country, and will you not say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that when we get them together that they will not be enthused at the idea, that they will not be ready to assist in every way possible and give their time and use every effort to help to bring about what they see themselves is absolutely necessary in order to make things better in this country to-day than they are. It is regrettable, Mr. Chairman, if the Government is going to allow another opportunity to pass for the making of a movement in this direction, and if they do it just shows to what extent we can depend on statements made in the House that they have tried and accomplished nothing, that they have done this and that. You have not done all that can be done, and you can do it now with very little expense to the country, very little would do a tremendous lot. It may be you would spend a few dollars on it, but what is that compared to the resuscitation of an industry to-day such as that, very little, but it means a tremendous lot to one of the important industries of this country to-day, if it is allowed to go to the dogs, as it has been going during the last four or five years. I say the Government can do a tremendous lot towards arousing an interest, in fact there is some interest already taken in the matter. We have had articles appearing in the press from time to time during the last six or seven months showing the readiness of a number of people to co-operate in a movement of this kind, and why should not the Government take advantage of the interest already manifested, and make an endeavour in this direction. At any rate it would be no harm to try and see what can be done in that way. It would do you a tremendous lot of good. If you make an attempt and fail, it need not appear to be your fault. If you are truly in earnest and want to do something to help the country, particularly in connection with the starvation conditions of our fishermen to-day, you cannot refuse to make an attempt. There are numbers willing to co-operate and help this industry out, and if the Government loses this chance;if they do not do something to better the situation to-day, I say that they will be up against it on that account alone. I am not using that as a threat. I do not put that forward in that way at all. That is not the spirit that

prompts me to say that, but I am saying this, that there is no earthly reason whatever why the Government cannot begin now and get hold of interested parties and start this, and ask them to go ahead and ask for suggestions for ways and means to improve these conditions in the country, and see what can be done to carry out these suggestions.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—I did not w.sh to delay the House at this stage, but I want to stand up and compliment any member with sufficient courage to get up and put aside politics for a few moments and give expression to his honest convictions, as the honourable member has in saying what is the proper course for public men at this juncture. The honourable member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard, spoke in connection with the fisheries and agriculture, and I made a note and I intended to have a work to say. However strong my intention might be at that particular moment, there was no question whatever about my decision when Mr. Grimes had been speaking a few moments. It is a well known fact; every member of this Committee must realize; it is absolutely waste of time to appoint a Committee in this House to deal with public matters unless both sides of the House have an honest desire to come together and make an effort to work in union to assist the particular avenue of trade that may be in need of that help. Last year there was a Committee appointed to deal with various matter in connection with the fisheries and for reasons best known to themselves members of the House proposed for that Committee did not care to act. I think that there is a different spirit in the Assembly this afternoon from what there was at that time, perhaps it is that members of the House on both sides have come to fully realize the serious conditions existing. Those of us who have an honest desire to try to do something in the interests of the country; those of us who in a short period of time will have passed out of this House, out of this world altogether, must realize that we have a sacred duty to perform. When we pass away we must remember, we are succeeded by future generations, and it is our bounden duty to see to it that we look to the benefit of these future generations, of our children; that as public men we leave the country if possible in a better condition than we found it. If we make an honest attempt and fail, we have done our duty at any rate. We are not making it. We are here as long as I can remember playing party politics. I have been here sixteen years, and in that time I may say I have seen party politics played all the time. I have been playing party politics. I have been trying to keep my party in power and trying to hold my seat myself, and every other member with me has been serving party and self instead of the country; every politician, with very few exceptions if any. We are voting in supply $250,000 over and above what we voted last year. We are asked to vote now $815,000 and there is going to be additional estimates when the House meets again, and as has been pointed out we can only see where we are going to raise eight to nine millions, and we are going to be short another million. That is going on and no serious attempt is being made to try and offset such a serious condition of affairs. There is a splendid opportunity right now if men are big enough to rise to the occasion. I think the country at the present time is on the verge of prosperity. Never in the history of Newfoundland was such interest displayed in its natural resources—timber and mineral. We have to-day scores of mining men scattered around Newfoundland who are here quietly, not advertising themselves at all, coming in as Tourists and quietly in-

vestigat ng the possibilities of the country, scientific men seeing what the possibilities are, who will go back and report to their companies. We are dealing with out t mber resources, contracts are going to be discussed here within the next few days. I do not forget the fact that the fisheries are still the most important of our industries, and there are a whole lot of improvements that can be brought about in connect on with them if members of the House are big enough to put aside party politics and get to work. On the presentation of a petition by the honourable member for Trinity I took occasion to support the prayer of it, and I want to take th s opportunity to declare myself as being one that does not submit to the idea that nothing further can be done for the fisheries. Something can and must be done, or we have got to abandon the industry entirely. Without further delay I would say that I hope and trust that the advice given to this Committee this afternoon by the honorable member for Twillingate, who has held a seat in this House for a long period, representing an important district, and who has always contributed materially to the debates of this House, will not fall on deaf ears. When he mentions public men willing to come together in the common interest, I feel he knows what he is talking about. I want to announce from my seat in this House that I am prepared to vacate the office of Agriculture and Mines and my seat in this House if I could thereby add anything to the success of the work of these men, if they are prepared to get together. I am prepared to support to the unmost any such measure to get together the best men in the country.

I was one of those who held a seat in the Government and in this House of the Coalition Party dur ng the War, and in my honest opinion this afternoon conditions were never so gloomy during that war period as they are to-day. Now, without entering into any further debate on the subject I want to give my whole-hearted support to what has been said by Mr Grimes, and I want to thank him for giving me this opportunity for making these few remarks. With regard to the extra vote in Supplementary Supply for the Department of Agriculture and Mines, I may say that the vote for salaries is explained in that Mr. Summers, who, for a long time was attached to the Department as third clerk, was moved up as Secretary to Dr. Baker and his salary has now been increased to $1,500.00. As to the $500.00 for the Museum, that is voted to repair the roof of the bu lding, because if a substantial amount was not spent on it to make permanent repairs the rain would be pouring down on the exhibits and there would be very little of the exhibits left in fit condition if the building was allowed to remain in the condition it was before repa rs were started on it. With regard to $1,500.00 spent on forest fires, I think I have already explained to this House what it has cost in that connection with n the past year, over and about what was estimated. It was because of the extra activities on the part of Inspectors Thistle and Phillips in connection with timber throughout the country that the vote for timber inspection was increased by $250.00. Our contingencies were increased because of the amount of foreign advertising that occurred during the past year and we had to overdraw the vote to the extent of $800.00. The last item of $10,675.00 is to pay the cost of Agricultural stat stics now being compiled. We have been asked repeatedly for agricultural statistics but we have never been able to give any with any degree of accuracy and we used to have to take our information from the Census. Now, we have reliable statistics compiled, but it cost $10,675.00 to do it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the Remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. SPEAKER—In reference to the two notices of motion given this afternoon by the Hon. the Prime Minister relative to the introduction to-morrow of resolutions initiating the International Paper Co. and the Gander Valley Pulp and Paper Co. bills, it is my duty to point out that this procedure is not in accordance with the Rules of the House. In my opinion these two bills are private measures, and should therefore be introduced by way of petition, following notice by advertisement in the press, as required by Rule 290. I may refer to a specific ruling I made on this subject in 1925, when I emphasized the necessity of strictly carrying out the rules governing private bills. Of particular importance is Rule 303 which requires the bill after second reading to be referred to a select committee whose duties include the consideration of petitions for or against the proposed measure. In again drawing attention to the matter, I wish to repeat that I think these Rules should be strictly complied with—except in cases of urgent and pressing necessity when they may be relaxed by the House under Rule 315.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION–The International Paper Company I understand has an option from the British Government on the security they have over the property at Corner Brook. If the matter is urgent as the Prime Minister has pointed out I see no objection to having it go ahead as soon as possible. It seems unfortunate that to comply with the rules of the House if they are insisted on would make it impossible to proceed with the legislation for a month.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I think we might proceed with it as a private Bill in as much as it might be referred to a select committee after second reading. That entails a week's delay in putting the bill through so as to give anybody an opportunity of putting in a petition. Under rule 303 there is also a delay as a safeguard in connection with private measures making it necessary to publish a notice in the Gazette for several weeks and there is a further delay in submitting it to a select committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I suggest what would happen in an ordinary case would be that a petition would come in attached to resolutions exactly as submitted and as we know on reference to a selct committee the invariable result would be the committee reports that the rules respect to notice be waived. That is the one month's notice. I would suggest that the motion be that the rule as regards presenting this Bill by way of petition be suspended and that the Bill be introduced to-morrow. After second reading if it is felt that there is any occasion to refer it to a committee it could be referred to a select committee. It seems to me a good deal is going to depend on the progress made with regard to the measure as regards the value of time. I should recommend therefore the course as to procedure to be at present the waiving of the presentation of the petition and let the matter proceed with and the week's delay required under the rule may be availed of when necessary after the second reading.

On motion of Hon. Prime Minister, and by unanimous consent and in view of urgent necessity as contemplated by Rule 314, it was resolved in relation to the Resolutions whereof the Prime Minister has given notice for to-morrow that the Rules of the House relating to private bills be dispensed with to the extent of dispensing with the requirements as to petitions and notice by advertisement under Rule 290, but that otherwise the said matters be proceeded with as private bills.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Wednesday, August 3rd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, August 3rd, 1927.

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

Mr. Scammell gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Bill for the confirmation of a contract between the Government and the International Paper Company.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—

Mr. Speaker,—As the House is aware, negotiations were finalized in the autumn of 1922, for the creation of what was popularly known as the "Humber project," which was embodied in the paper mills at Corner Brook. The parties to these negotiations were, on the one side, the Armstrong Whitworth Company of London and the Reid Newfoundland Company of this City and, on the other side, the Governments of Great Britain and Newfoundland. The basis of the agreement was that the Reid Company provided timber lands, water-powers and other properties essential to the establishing of the industry, the Armstrong Whitworth Company undertook the financing, construction and subsequent operation of the mills and the two Governments each guaranteed two million pounds of debentures, this being the amount which the first estimates represented would suffice for the erection and starting of the mill of 400 ton capacity of newsprint paper a day, which was projected.

The preliminary work was set on foot that autumn, and in the ensuing spring, following upon a general election in which the Government of the day sought a renewal of power to carry out this undertaking, the necessary legislation was put through the House and eventually became law. The mills, as you are aware, opened in August 1925, and everybody hoped that the operations of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, which was the corporation created to carry on this industry, would be attended with the fullest measure of success. Unfortunately, however, these expectations were not realized, for a variety of reasons. The first of these is that through the effort to hurry completion of the mills, a work which should have taken four to five years, it was rushed through in two years at an enormously increased cost. Perhaps the chief reason of all the calamities that have come upon the enterprise since was the undue "rush" in building the mills, for in actual fact the original estimate of expenditure was more than doubled.

The additional cost of the properties was financed by the Armstrong Whitworth Company. This additional money was used to build the town, two paper—storage warehouses and to buy two steamers,—the "Corner Brook" and the "Humber Arm" for

the transport of the paper. To secure these advances the Armstrong Whitworth Company took first mortgage utility bonds on these so-called utility assets, and in addition what was then a third mortgage on the mill itself, and $6,500,000 of income debentures junior to the "B" debentures. Some time later, when the Armstrong Whitworth Company got into difficulties the bonds were taken over by the Bank of England; so that the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company now owes to the Bank of England ten million dollars secured by pledge of these bonds. Perhaps I should say at this point that this ten million dollars was in addition to the one million pounds advanced a year ago on the security of a first mortgage debenture about which I shall speak more fully later. Accordingly, the Bank of England is interested through its virtual ownership of the ten million dollars of the so-called utility bonds which are a mortgage on a part of the esesntial assets of the Company.

The second contributory to the failure of the mill was that the undertaking was launched and carried on by people who were not papermakers nor connected in any way previously with papermaking.

Before long rumours began to circulate that things were not going well with the Company, and the first official intimation of this was more than a year ago, when the Government was asked to consent to the raising of two million pounds of first mortgage debentures, to rank before those guaranteed by the British Government and those guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government, the purpose of this new loan being, to secure additional money and to furnish working capital. The British and Newfoundland Governments agreed to this because a failure to do so would have thrown the enterprise into the hards of a receiver, with possibly the suspension of operations, and certainly the risk of very seriously interfering with the working of the plant. Of the two million pounds thus authorised only one million pounds was raised, and this was done through the Bank of England. The Company endeavoured to carry on in the hope that an increase in output and a rise in market might enable it to weather the storm. This, however, proved not to be the case.

Meanwhile another trouble arose. The parent Company—the Armstrong Whitworth Company—got into difficulties itself, difficulties so serious that its existence was jeopardised for a period and that its radical re-organization has come to be inevitable, according to the report of the last annual meeting of the Company held in England last month, a summary of which appeared in the local papers. This Company was forced to obtain a five year moratorium in regard to its general business and a committee of three eminent English financiers, Mr. J. Frater Taylor, who is now vice-chairman of the Armstrongs, Mr. E. R. Peacock, a director of Baring Bros., and Mr. Walter Whigham, a director of the Bank of England were appointed to undertake the task of revitalising the Armstrong Whitworth Company and especially to devise means of improving the situation with regard to this Newfoundland enterprise, the mishaps of the parent Company being largely ascribed to losses sustained in connection with the establishing and working of the Corner Brook enterprise. These gentlemen gave particular attention to this matter and installed a new management at Corner Brook and took other steps which it was hoped would save the Company.

But now came a third trouble—a drop in the world's paper market. This was a condition which, unfortunately, we are not unacquainted with in relation to our fish markets and, therefore, I do not need to speak at any length with regard to it. Due to the increased prosperity in the

newsprint market a few years ago many companies, including the Corner Brook Company, went into papermaking. As a result, counting only the machines now u ler construction, there will be a forty per c' '. increase in the production of paper in Canada during this year and the next. The consequent over-production has led to lower prices and has meant that all mills must run at far below their capacity. Those who are acquainted with the papermaking industry, assure me that it may be five years before conditions are again normal and consumption overtakes production. I need not dwell on this phase of the matter; nor need I emphasize the seriousness of this situation to the Corner Brook Company further than to say that the Company announced that it has lost $1,200,000 during the fifteen months prior to July 1st of this year. As a result of these losses th Company found itself unable to pay the interest on the "B" debentures which were guaranteed by the Government of Newfoundland and thus called upon me to meet this interest on July 15th. I am glad to say that arrangements were made through the Bank of Montreal to pay the necessary money. The Bank, however, cannot continue to make loans for this purpose and the Colony faces a liability of approximately $535,000 a year interest and $446,000 sinking fund, making a total of nearly $1,000,000 a year which the Colony might have had to meet if th rrangements with the International Paper Company had not been made.

This was a situation which could not continue and after the New Y r the management at Corner Brook and Mr. Frater Taylor's committee decided that an effort would have to be made to sell the mill. Accordingly, negotiations were opened with the International Paper Company of New York, and on February 1st the Government received a cablegram from Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, reading as follows:

To Governor, St. John's, Nfld.

Please give following message from Trades Facilities Act Advisory Committee to your Prime Minister. Begins:—

On account of very uncertain sale outlook which has recently developed apparently through over-production newsprint elsewhere, the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company is confronted with a difficult financial situation. Unless it sells practically its entire output at not less than $65 per ton it is represented to us that it cannot possibly meet its bond interest. The President Company and others interested are in conference here We are advised best way out of difficulty for all concerned is the International Paper Company. We understand International Paper Company has already certain interests in Newfoundland and may seek further concessions from your Government. If this is the case you might find it convenient to discuss Corner Brook undertaking with them. Preliminary negotiations have been started by Armstrong's direct with International Paper Company and we are informed they are interested to extent that they are about to examine the property. Mr. Smith, President of Newfoundland Company, is proceeding to St. John's via Halifax, leaving here this week and will talk over foregoing with you. Ends.

SECRETARY OF STATE
FOR DOMINION AFFAIRS

As a result of these negotiations the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company granted an option on its properties to the International Paper Company. The terms of this option were settled in London between representatives of the Armstrong Whitworth Co., the Bank of England and representatives of the International Paper Company, and it was approved of at the time by the Armstrong Whitworth

Company, the Bank of England and the British Treasury. The whole arrangement was, of course, dependent upon the consent of the Newfoundland Government.

Mr. Bernard Smith, President of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, who was in London during the negotiations, on his return wrote to me a letter announcing the proposed terms of the option which was granted to the International Paper Company and which letter I now propose to read.

(Copy)

Newfoundland Power & Paper Co., Ltd., Corner Brook, Nfld.,

May 28th, 1927.

Sir,—We beg to submit to you the following information regarding the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company.

The conditions in the paper market are bad and the outlook for a number of years is not promising due principally to the over-production which exists in the industry and which will be accentuated by the number of new paper machines now under construction by our competitors. At the present time we are running only three of our four machines and we have on hand a large amount of unsold paper. Prices have been low and the result is that the company has had to call on the Government of Newfoundland to pay the interest which is coming due on July 15th this year on the £2,000,000 of 5½ B Debenture Stock guaranteed by the Government. This means that the Government must be prepared to meet the interest, and sinking fund on this Debenture Stock for some years or until such time as the Company is reorganized or sold.

To meet the situation we have granted to the International Paper Company an option to purchase our assets. This option provides for a transfer of our properties to a new company whose funded debt after the transfer will consist of only £1,000,000 of First Mortgage Bonds (to replace the existing loan of that amount by the Bank of England now secured by a pledge of First Mortgage Debenture Stock), £2,000,000 of the A. Debenture Stock guaranteed by the British Government and £2,000,000 of the B. Debenture Stock guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government.

All other Debentures and bonds including the $10,000,000 of so called Utility Bonds will be eliminated. The Utility Bonds as to part of the assets rank ahead of the A. and B Debenture Stock. The elimination of these Utility Bonds and the release of these assets, improve the security of all the remaining Debentures including the B. Debentures guaranteed by the Government of Newfoundland. The elimination of these other debentures and bonds removes the danger of their throwing the company into liquidation through the non-payment of interest. This would make the A. and B. Debentures due and payable immediately which would require that the Newfoundland Government pay the £2,000,000 of B. Debentures which it has guaranteed.

The International Paper Company has stipulated, however, that before it will purchase the property and assume responsibility for its management, the following changes must be made in the above mentioned securities.

(a) There is at present issued and pledged to the Bank of England £1,000,000 of First Mortgage Debenture Stock which ranks ahead of the A. and B. Debenture Stocks.

The new Company must be free to build additions to the present mill, acquire new property such as timber lands" raise additional work-

ing capital and refund at any time Mortgage Bonds then outstanding, and, to provide funds for these purposes, must be able to sell in addition to the £1,000,000 now pledged to the Bank of England £3,000,000 of First Mortgage Bonds. All such new property would form part of the security for the First Mortgage Bonds and the A and B. Debentures.

(b) The maturities of the A. and B. Debenture stocks must be extended to 1937 which requires the consent of the two Government guarantors. The British Government has given its consent to the extension of maturity of the A. Debentures. There will also be modifications in the Guarantee Agreements relating to these stocks by which the restrictions on the amounts and kinds of share capital, or the declaration of dividends, or the issuance of new share capital and the provisions regarding the special Debenture Reserve Fund will be eliminated. The International Paper Company is not only willing but anxious that the Director representing the Newfoundland Government on the Board of the Company be continued

(c) Additional legislation will be necessary, the more important of which we understand to be the following: Extension of tax and duty exemption of the company; elimination of Government's royalties on paper and power which were to have been paid out of profits; modification in the Company's Labrador Water power rights and provision of timber reserves in Labrador to insure continuous operation of the Company's mills; more specific provision regarding railway service and rates and provisions for export of wood proportional to the production of paper by the Company in Newfoundland.

The option to the International Paper Company is the result of months of work to interest that Company in the Corner Brook property. The British Treasury and the Bank of England feel that this is the best and wisest solution and have given their approval in letters copies of which are attached.

We ourselves earnestly urge the adoption of the procedure suggested.

We have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servants,
THE NEWFOUNDLAND POWER AND PAPER CO., LTD.,
(Sgd.) E. BERNARD SMITH,
President

Hon W. S Monroe,
Prime Minister

(COPY)

Branch Banks Office,
Bank of England, London E.C. 2.,
18th May, 1927

Messrs. The International Paper Co.,
100 East 42nd Street,
New York, U.S.A.

Dear Sirs,—I am directed to inform you that the option Agreement of to-day's date addressed to you by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Ltd., has been considered by the Bank of England and its terms have their approval.

It is understood that the transaction requires formal ratification by the Board of Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd., but that in this respect no difficulty is anticipated.

Furthermore, I am able to assure you that the Bank of England will lend their support to the effective carrying out of the transaction embodied in the Agreement in so far as they are advised that they can do so.

I am,
Dear Sirs,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) E. N. TRAVERS,
Principal.

ENT|RSSH

(COPY)

Treasury Chambers,
Whitehall,
18th May, 1927.

Sir,—I have laid before the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury the draft option letter addressed by your Company on the 18th inst., to the International Paper Company, and I have to inform you that their Lordships are prepared to agree in principle, so far as they are concerned as guarantors of the 4½% "A" Mortgage Debenture Stock, and subject to consideration of the details, to the option which you therein propose to offer to the International Paper Company.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) O. MIEMEYER.

The Secretary,
Newfoundland Power & Paper Co.

F 4440|3.

We as a Government felt that negotiations should not have been carried to this point without being informed and, therefore, cabled to Mr Amery as follows protesting against the proposed terms.

June 1st, 1927.

Secretary of State for
Dominion Affairs, London.

Newfoundland Power and Paper Company notify Government not able pay July interest on "B" Debentures, wherefore Government must pay. Together with this notice, Company inform Government it has granted International Paper Company option to buy its entire assets on terms asesnted to by British Treasury and Bank of England, and option is the result of months of work to interest International. My Ministers are only now informed of details these negotiations, and are surprised and chagrined that British Treasury should approve option without prior consultation with them or their representatives. They have hitherto felt that British Treasury and this Colony as guarantors of debentures had common interests and should co-operate. International acquired option with stipulations made by it concerning additional bond issue which would materially affect the Colony's security, and for concessions by Colony concerning extension tax free period, elimination Government royalties and provisions regarding railway service, export of pulpwood from Colony and concessions of Labrador timber areas. All these if granted would be at sole cost of Colony, the other mortgagees positions being improved and others made worthless. The proposals even provide that the working capital of new Company shall be raised out of the preferential bond issue secured on the assets in this Colony. Ministers understand no competitive bids were sought by London Managers of Newfoundland Power and Paper Company and are at a loss to understand how such an apparently reckless sacrifice could have been made as terms outline. They believe better terms can be obtained from other quarters if time be given. Payment by Company of July interest so as to give time for proper consideration of situation, and its solution in best interests of all is obviously proper. There is not sufficient time before July interest due or enough reliable data, to give proposition adequate consideration, and most of stipulations by International are wholly unacceptable under any circumstances. Ministers feel they have no mandate or moral authority to seriously alter conditions created by Legislation of 1923. They respectfully ask you express to British Treasury and Bank of England your disapproval of pressure upon Government, and urge that July interest should be paid by Company, thus affording time for enquiry. If Newfoundland is compelled to pay

July interest she will pursue her remedies under mortgage at whatever cost. International have not yet been furnished. Foregoing facts are from statement made to Prime Minister by Newfoundland Power & Paper Company. You can probably get more accurate tatement from London Office of Company.

GOVERNOR.

In due course we received a reply which, being marked confidential, I cannot read to the House, but which told us the British Government had heard nothing of extra concessions being asked and advised us we were perfectly free to reject any proposition made to us.

We then come, as you can see, into direct contact with the International Paper Comp..ny, and with respect to this Company I would quote a brief summary of its history and achievements in the past thirty years, from a letter which was recently published by its President, Mr. Graustein. It says:—

"The International Paper Company, organized in 1898, is engaged in the manufacture of many different classes of paper, and is, with its subsidiaries, the largest manufacturer of paper in the world and one of the largest holders of waterpower in North America. The capacity of its pulp and paper mills is more than twice as great as that of any other company in North America. Its timber land freeholds and Canadian Crown timber limit leases, cover 13,537,759 acres or an area substantially larger than the combined areas of Massachusetts, Connecticut and New Hampshire and are estimated to contain over 51,700,000 cords of pulpwood. It has now twenty-three paper and pulp mills, including some of the largest and most efficient in the world. Waterpowers in operation or under construction aggregate 700,000 h.p. capable of being increased through further development, and through utilisation of undeveloped sites to over 1,500,000 h.p."

According to the balance sheet of April 30th the International Paper Company, with its subsidaries, except the Gatineau Power Company, which is still under construction, hold total assets of approximately $218,000,000 with capital and surplus of $125,000,000. It may properly be said, it seems to me, that the Company occupies the same position in the paper world as the Canadian Pacific Railway in the railroad world, the Bank of Montreal in the banking world, and the United States Steel Corporation in the steel industry.

It is apparent from the history of this Company that it is progressive, sound and essentially a builder. Since the first of January of this year the Company has carried out the following undertakings:—

In January the first units of a 40,000 h.p. development on the Gatineau River near Ottawa were brought into operation. In March the Company began the construction of a 165 ton a day kraft mill in the State of Arkansas. Kraft paper, I might explain, is used for wrapping paper and bags. In the same month the Company purchased another kraft mill in the State of Louisiana of 125 tons daily making the International Paper Company the largest kraft making company in the world. In April the Company completed the purchase of three paper mills of the De Grasse Paper Company in the United States. These mills belonged to the "New York World," one of the largest daily newspapers in America. It has also brought into operation in the same month the first machine of the Gatineau newsprint mill, a large mill on the Ottawa river. This is among the largest

newsprint mills in the world and it has the largest and most up to date paper machines now in use. The largest mill in Canada and, indeed, in the world, is owned by and is operated at Three Rivers. Quebec, making 700 tons of paper a day. A the present time the Company is carrying on a development of 60,000 h.p. on the St. John River in New Brunswick. This is the largest waterpower in the Maritime Provinces, and slightly larger than our own plant at Grand Falls.

I gather both from information furnished me by people competent to speak on the matter and from what I can glean from the trade and other journals that the International is amongst the most competent, efficiently managed and progressive enterprises in the world. This is being borne out by the fact that the Bank of England has been willing to cancel a loan of $10,000,000 secured by a first mortgage on part of the property of the Company and has taken in return, as the larger part of its consideration, preferred stock in the new International Paper Company of Newfoundland, which means that it will receive dividends from the Company only if it makes profits sufficient to pay its dividends, and this can be brought about only by efficient management. No better evidence of the faith of financial leaders in the capacity of this Company and the future of its operations at Corner Brook would, I think, be desired by anyone. I regard this as a very important point as it makes the Bank of England virtually a partner in the Corner Brook enterprise. Thus the Colony has as associates the most powerful bank in the world and the largest paper company in the world.

This brings me to another advantage which accrues to the Colony through ownership of Corner Brook by the International Paper Company. Through its great selling organization we are assured that the Corner Brook mill will be run to as full capacity as the big Canadian mills, and we need no longer fear the unemployment which faces the Colony as would follow interruption and part time operation at Corner Brook. It must be remembered that anything less than full operation means not only loss of employment at the mill but also what is more serious a curtailment of woods operations.

As a result of the negotiations I am in a position to table this afternoon an agreement between the Government and the International Paper Co. of Newfoundland with regard to the Corner Brook enterprise. The essential parts of the Bill are as follows:—

1. The International Paper Company through its subsidiary, the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, is acquiring all the properties of the present Newfoundland Power & Paper Co.

2. At the time of the transfer of the property to this new Company the mortgage debt of the Company will be dropped from the present amount of $41,000,000 to $25,000,000, consisting of $5,000,000 first mortgage bonds and the $20,000,000 in "A" and "B" debentures guaranteed by the British and Newfoundland Governments respectively. You will see that this includes cancellation of the $10,000,000 of so-called "utility bonds" which now hold a first mortgage on some of the essential parts of the property as well as the $6,500,000 of income debentures. This will add to the protection of the 'B" debentures by eliminating a $10,000,000 prior charge on an important portion of the properties. By the elimination of this prior charge on these utlity properties they cannot be separated from the enterprise as a whole as would be the case if the mortgage securing such charge were to be foreclosed.

3. The "A" debentures were to have matured in 1948 and the "B" debentures in 1943. Subject to the consent of the debenture holders these maturities are to be extended to 1973 in each case. This has already been consented to by the British Treasury insofar as the "A" debentures are concerned, and we give our consent in this Bill.

The "B" debentures mature in sixteen years, and since the sinking fund begins next year, this means that the entire $10,000,000 has to be retired within fifteen years or there is a default under the terms. This is a very heavy burden to put on the industry, and if it is not met by the Company must be met by the Colony. Even with the proposed reduction in funded debt, or bonds, the mill is heavily bonded for its size, and extending the maturity of these debentures makes it possible for the Company to meet the sinking fund requirements. If the bondholders are willing to do this we should be satisfied, as it decreases the chances of our being called upon to pay this sinking fund.

4. The new Company is authorized to issue, in addition to the one million pounds of mortgage bonds authorized last year, an additional three million pounds of first mortgage bonds the proceeds of which can only be used for building and buying new properties, for working capital to a limited extent and to pay off first mortgage bonds which may be outstanding at any time. The Agreement provides that all properties so acquired will become security for the "A" and "B" debentures, as well as for the first mortgage debentures. This is a great advantage to the Colony because it affords a means of financing new construction which will take place shortly to the benefit of the Colony, and all such new construction will form part of the Colony's security.

5. The present charter of the Nfld. Power and Paper Company provides for thirty years' exemption from duties of materials for construction purposes. The present agreement limits this exemption to a period of 20 years, and adds material for town construction with certain exceptions (principally products of Newfoundland) which you will find enumerated in the agreement. One of the complaints from Corner Brook to-day is the lack of housing for employees. Town construction by companies is always a losing proposition and the houses are built only to serve the industry—each house means an employee well cared for. We should encourage house construction, not burden it. We feel, therefore, that town construction materials of a kind not cheaply obtainable here with the exceptions provided for should be admitted duty free.

6. In respect of duties other than for construction the agreement provides as follows.—On food, clothing dry goods, hand tools, stores, lumber on articles intended for use by individuals and numerous other goods and articles enumerated in the agreement, the Company is to pay the ordinary duties applying from time to time. On replacements, renewals, spare parts, etcetera, the duty is not to exceed 25% for forty years. On all other things used in the Company's business it is to pay not to exceed the present duties for twenty years and not to exceed the present duties plus ten per cent. of the value of the articles imported for another twenty years.

The purpose of this is to ensure stability to the Company which is particularly necessary for the financing which will have to be done for the large constructive programme which the Company has in mind, and I wish to emphasize that under the proposed agreement we are (with the minor exception) giving up no revenue now received and through promoting this enterprise are providing for increased

revenues through duties by the increase in production and the consequent increase in importation of goods on which duty will be paid by the two companies.

The Company assures us that it intends to add two more machines at Corner Brook just as soon as the market will take the product and since the Company will probably be unable to make any profit previous to the installation of these two machines, and since the Company loses its export of pulpwood rights if the extension is not completed by 1933 we feel justified in assuming that these will be put in at the earliest possible time. In the meantime we are assured of full operation of the four machines now installed.

7. If, and only if, two additional machines are constructed and put into operation at Corner Brook by 1933, the Company is given the right to export from any lands it may own in the Northern Peninsula, one half a cord of pulpwood a year for each ton of paper produced over and above the present capacity of the machine. If the construction is not completed by 1933 the Company loses its pulpwood export rights. If in any year the 600 ton mill is not operated to eighty per cent. capacity the right of pulpwood export is cancelled for the following year. The right is to last for fifty years, the Company paying an export tax of $1.00 a cord adjustable upwards after twenty years in relation to the then price of newsprint. I will speak of this point at greater length in connection with the Gander Bill.

8. At the time the Government gave its guarantee of the "B" debentures it was given as consideration for the guarantee a royalty of one dollar per ton of paper produced and twenty-five cents per horse power. We have never received this and I feel safe in saying that under the present arrangements never would receive it. This Agreement provides for a flat payment of $75,000 a year for the years 1928, 29, 30 and 31 and thereafter till 1973 $150,000 a year payable out of income calculated before interest on the bonds. The Colony receives this substantial increase in its revenue immediately. The Company is given half-rate for four years to enable it to pull itself out of the present difficulties and to reduce the burden during the construction period.

The Newfoundland Power and Paper Company holds certain rights to a grant of a large water power on Hamilton River in Labrador. The new Company is to surrender all the rights. This marks another step in our progress toward regaining for the Colony the natural resources of our Labrador territory.

There are other points in the Bill of which details will be furnished when we go into committee, but I shall not delay the House now by elaborating these as I think the honourable members would prefer to read this speech, the resolutions, and the accompanying correspondence, before debating the matter at any length.

I am submitting to the House at the same time another agreement in which the International Paper Company is interested this one having relation to the building of a newsprint mill in the Gander Valley. Some years ago the Reid Newfoundland Company began its endeavours to interest outside capital in the building of a mill on the Gander River. It was only when they went to the United States that they received encouragement and as a result of three years of negotiations the International Paper Company took an option on the property and has spent a great deal of money and time in investigating the properties. I shall digress at this point to speak of the Hampden operations of the International Paper Company, which are being carried on at the present time, by virtue of a bill passed

by the Legislature at the last session. The purpose of thc International Paper Company in entering into this operation was to make a trial of the operating conditions on the Island, and we owe it to the bill which was passed last year that we can now expect to have a mill built on the Gander River. I might also point out that this is an example of the thoroughness with which the International Paper Company investigates a new proposition before entering into it.

I understand that the International Paper Company were advised by a great many people who purported to know forest conditions in Newfoundland that they should not attempt to build or operate mill on this Island and it was in spite of these advisers that the International Paper Company has gone to this point.

I explained to you at some length in my introductory remarks on the Corner Brook mill, the existing state of the newsprint market and this applies to the Gander with all the greater force, since a new mill must be built. Makers of newsprint all over the world have announced that they will grant no new properties for the purpose of erection of Newsprint mills for some years. In spite of this, and to meet our wishes the agreement which I now lay before the House provides that the Company is to spend on construction at least $500,000 a year in the years 1929 1930 and 1931 and $1,000,000 in 1932, completing a mill of at least 200 tons daily capacity in 1932 with the option of delaying the completion for two years on paying to the Government as a penalty $50,000 a year. We should have preferred to have construction started next year and the completion of the mill at an earlier date, but the Company has pointed out that the railroad must be completed to the site, and careful plans must be made before the construction starts, the force of which is obvious. We want no more Corner Brook constructions. The present state of the newsprint market is such that we cannot fairly insist on too early a date for completion, and this has led us to grant the Company's request for the option to extend the normal four year construction period by two years. This extended period of construction will give our people work for a longer period and it will minimize the risks of wasteful expenditure antendant on too hurried completion of such an undertaking, of which we have a sad example and warning in the case of Corner Brook. To meet the need for employment in the interim the Company has agreed that, if **requested by the Government** it will cut 25,000 cords of wood a year for four years beginning in 1928. This wood may be exported. The Company was willing to take this wood to Corner Brook, but if it is to provide additional labour it must be exported, as taking it to Corner Brook would merely reduce the West Coast cut by that much.

While this agreement provides for a mill of 200 tons, it is estimated that there is sufficient wood on the Gander Limits for a 400 ton mill, in fact the International Paper Company insisted on this much wood as they say that a 200 ton mill which cannot be expanded would not interest them. They have stated that they intend to increase the Gander mill when the paper can be sold. Therefore we can look forward to a 400 ton mill on the Gander in the not too distant future

Other principal points of the agreement are as follows:—

1. The Company is granted the same limitations on duties as in the Corner Brook agreement.

2. If, and only if, the mill is completed by the date set in the agreement, the Company is granted the right to export pulpwood from its own lands on the Northern Peninsula, at the rate of ½ cord wood to every ton of paper produced for fifty years.

paying to the Government an export tax of $1.00 a cord for twenty years, the tax thereafter increasing as the price of newsprint increases. Any wood not exported in any year can be exported in any year following, provided, however that not more than two years' quota can be exported in any one year. If in any year the mill does not run at 80 per cent. capacity the right of pulpwood export is cancelled for the following year.

The Government is aware of the feeling against the allowing of export of wood from the Island, but I wish to tell the House that the Government has considered the matter carefully and feels that the interests of the Colony are not jeopardized by granting the right which I have spoken of. The reasons which lead to this conclusion are many and I will attempt to outline only the most important of them. In every year as much wood goes to waste as is used in the mills. This is a condition which exists in all Canada as well as Newfoundland. This wood consists of overmature timber, of blown down timber, of trees killed by insects and of fire-killed wood. All of this wood rots and in a few years becomes unfit for use. Furthermore, until it is cleared the new growth cannot start up.

If this wood is cut, exported and made use of, the Colony receives the benefit of the money expended on its cutting and exportation, and one dollar a cord export tax. I am informed that of the 25,000 cords of pulpwood cut by the International Paper Company at Hampden this year nearly 20,000 cords were blown down and over mature timber which would have rotted and been lost to the Colony had they not been cut. The Company spent for labour over $250,000 in the White Bay district and paid to the Government $12,500 export tax on the 25,000 cords exported.

Those with a knowledge of forest conditions, say that such wood can be cut from the Island for export with a result that in 50 years there will be a greater supply than if it were not cut. We are assured that the operations will be carried out in a careful and prudent manner, because the International Paper Company has long experience in cutting operations, and having two large and new mills on the Island, representing the investment of many millions of dollars to protect, it must be for its own welfare to insure an adequate supply not only for the mills as they would exist but for any extensions which might be built.

The export of sawn lumber has always been looked upon with favour by any forest country. In fact I know of no place which prohibits the export of sawn lumber. It is a fact, however, that more money is spent for labour on the Island on rossed or peeled pulpwood for export, than on an equal amount of sawn lumber. It costs to cut and saw and load a thousand feet of lumber approximately $20.00. One thousand feet of lumber represents about two cords of pulpwood. It costs to cut, prepare and load pulpwood approximately $24 for the two cords. Therefore, in addition to the fact that there is a much greater yield of pulpwood than of sawn timber from each tree, the Colony actually gets approximately 25 per cent. more from the pulpwood than from the sawn lumber.

The International Paper Company's operations at Hampden have shown what good accrues to a district having such an operation. The reports which we have, show that prosperity has visited White Bay for the first time in many years. Hundreds of people are being given employment there in the International's operations. If the right of export were not given to the lands in the Northern Peninsula, it would be many years before these timber lands would be operated for the mills on the Island. This because of its larger cost of operations would be held for a future reserve. Granting

the right of export means that many Hampdens will be started in the Northern Peninsula, the wood going to the existing mills in the Island, in the years the Company does not exercise its right of export. Thus the grant of export furnished employment for the Northern Peninsula.

The right of export does not begin under either the Corner Brook or the Gander Valley Charters until the additional machines are completed, and in each case the right is conditional on building the machines and running all of them, in addition to the four now at Corner Brook, to 80 per cent. capacity. This means that the International Paper Company will have an investment of between 60 and 80 millions of dollars in this Island which it will have to protect regardless of any export rights. This assures the Colony that the most efficient and modern methods of practical forestry will be carried out to conserve the timber resources of Newfoundland.

I would like the House to understand very clearly that the right of export of pulpwood granted therein only applies to the Northern Peninsula and for the reasons given above. Elsewhere throughout the Island this right is not enjoyed and the Government is being strongly urged to prohibit the export of wood entirely from every other part of the Island.

3. The Government agrees to build a branch line approximately 30 miles long, into the mill site, by 1928. It is obviously impossible for the company to begin on construction prior to access by rail to the site of the mill. The Company has agreed to pay half of the interest on the estimated cost of the line to the mill as soon as it is put into operation and if the mill is not completed and put in operation by 1935, the Company has agreed to pay full interest and sinking fund required for the estimated cost of construction of this branch line. This protects the Government against risk of loss.

While the International Paper Company felt that it should be given grants of timber lands on the Labrador for the purpose of assuring expansion to the Corner Brook and Gander Mills the Government did not feel that this was a propitious time to make such grants and the company waived its requests in this respect. I should say here that in my judgment and that of my colleagues a first consideration in the disposal of Labrador timberlands in the future ought to be to ensure that the existing paper mills in this Island and any others that may be erected in the future are ensured such additional pulpwood requirements as they may need from the timberlands on Labrador.

The outstanding feature of these two bills is that it brings industries to the Island. It is reliably estimated that the 400 tons a day (Corner Brook extension and Gander) which will be the result of these agreements will bring into the Island each year over $3,500,000 which will be expended here principally for labor. The Government will get added yearly revenue from this through its ordinary taxes and duties of over $1,500,000 this in addition to the amounts collected directly from the two Companies. It also means employment for over 2000 men not now employed. I need not tell you what this will mean to our economic conditions.

I feel that I cannot close without bearing testimony to the fine spirit in which the International Paper Company and its representatives have entered into negotiations with the Government and their desire to see our point of view and meet it as far as possible consistent with a proper regard for the successful operation of the company's undertakings in the Island and I feel sure that if the Legislature confirms this agreement the Colony will have reason to be thankful for the foresight and enterprise of our predecessors in this House twenty

years ago when the Legislature made possible the Harmsworth enterprise at Grand Falls.

This completes my review of the proposals and the next step will be to submit them to committee of the whole House. After we get into Committee we should, I think, rise again after the reading of the first resolution in order that honourable gentlemen may have an opportunity of considering the text of these resolutions, of my speech this afternoon and of the correspondence leading up to these negotiations which I now lay on the table. I propose that we resume in Committee the consideration of this matter on such date as would be agreeable to honorable gentlemen opposite and am arranging to have an extended report of my remarks published in the newspapers tomorrow.

I now formally move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider these two sets of resolutions.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: It is not my intention to make any lengthy remarks in reference to these two Resolutions because I have not had the chance to look over them. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what I might regard as a convincing review given by the Prime Minister. I have followed him very closely, and I must admit that as far as I am concerned I think the hole is the only part of the doughnut that Newfoundland will get out of these propositions. Now I would like to ask the Prime Minister a few questions in connection with these matters. Some time ago we were told here in answer to a question that the people of Newfoundland would have to pay the interest due on the bonds, although I was under the impression that the N. P. and P. Company had to pay the interest and I would like to know this afternoon if the Government has given the Bank of Montreal any guarantee for the interest paid in July? The Prime Minister also referred this afternoon to a confidential reply he had received from the Secretary of State, and I would now suggest to the Prime Minister that before these Resolutions can be fully discussed that he get permission from the Secretary of State to let us know the contents of that message. Now as this is a matter of great magnitude and one in which all Newfoundland people are interested in, I would suggest that all the correspondence, whether private or otherwise, should be submitted to the House and all possible information given so that this matter could be gone into fully and thoroughly discussed. If it is agreeable to the Prime Minister, I would suggest that the Committee rise and that the discussion and consideration of these Resolutions be deferred until the middle of next week.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable leader of the Opposition I may say that perhaps my statement was a little misleading as regards the payment of the interest by the Bank of Montreal. I only happened to know that the Bank had paid the interest on behalf of the Corner Brook Company, but we had nothing to do with the negotiations of it. I have already mentioned to the House that we asked the Corner Brook Company last Winter to cut 25,000 cords of wood extra in order to help out the unemployment situation, which was acute at that time, and they had guaranteed an amount of $10 per cord which would be refunded as soon as the agreement with the International Paper Company was finalized and the I. P. Co. took over the Corner Brook enterprise. That is the position as regards the interest. It was clearly understood, if my remarks were not as clear as they should be, that the N. P. and P. Company were to pay the interest in July themselves. With re-

gard to the confidential reply from the Secretary of State, I do not see any reason why the Leader of the Opposition or any other member of the Oppos.tion should not see the private message, but it must not be used for publication and under these conditions I would be very pleased to pass over that message from the Secretary of State. With regard to the suggestion of the adjournment of the House and the adjournment of the debat on these two propositions, I am quite satisfied to have the House adjourn until Monday next, but on which date we w.ll have to get down to business, as it must be undertood by members on the other side of the House that the International Paper Company have taken an option on this property and they have to exercise their option by September, and it is necessary for the Internat onal representatives to be over in England to make financial arrangements, so that no time should be lost to get this legislation through, if we are going to get it through. If it is to be thrown out, we might just as well have it done first as last, but I see no reason for any unnecessary postponement of th s debate beyond Monday next, and I would respectfully suggest that we take up the consideration of these measures on Monday next.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on certa n Resolutions respecting a Bill to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V. (1924) Cap. 2 entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matters to them referred and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was order that the Comm.ttee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to tomorrow, Monday, August 8th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 8th, 1927.

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

Mr. Godden gave notice of Question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of Quest.on.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill ent.tled "An Act respecting Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — When we adjourned the debate on this Education Bill last week there were one or two clauses that we left to go back over. Clause 9 on page 4, to which exception was taken:

(Reads)

It was suggested that another clause might be conflicted with. If we made that read:

(Reads)

That would leave the other point in

the other clause which might be considered denominational entirely to be dealt with as provided. It was considered I think that it conflicted with another clause and that will get over that difficulty. In clause (m) on page seven exception was taken I think by Mr. Halfyard to the last day of February as being very late. He claimed we ought to be able to get the report in by the last of November. I may say it never has been in and it seems it is physically impossible to do that. We propose making that now no later than the last day of January which would give time for bringing the annual report before the House of Assembly in almost any year. If that would meet with the wishes of the House I would propose those amendments. We propose to make that no later than the last day of January. It would be in time for the purposes of the Education Act and in time for its presentation to the House of Assembly, almost any year, if that will meet with the approval of the Committee.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I beg to draw the Hon. the Prime Minister's attention to the fact that there is no provision in any part of this Bill stipulating for the practical training of all teachers. I have already referred to another grave failure of the Bill, that of omitting to stipulate for standardised grading of teachers. A definite stand should be taken in both connections. We are all now accepting without question the system of denominational education, "as by law established in Newfoundland." Nobody is here disputing the right of each denomination to control of its own educational system. But these denominations are responsible to this House for the manner in which they use the funds provided by the State for purposes of secular education. The State, that is this House for the most part, should make certain that schools are conducted under such auspices that the utmost possible by way of efficiency is attained. There could, I respectfully submit to this Committee, be no objection from any religious denomination if provision were made under this Bill for a minimum term of practical training for each teacher, before actual entry into the profession be permitted, and, in the next place, for uniform and standard grading of teachers by a single Board of Examiners. Inefficient teachers cannot produce efficiency in our schools. Unsystematised grading will produce confusion in our whole school system and will gravely discount the total. Nobody would dream of entrusting the care and the operation of a piece of delicate and intricate machinery to anybody but an expert. Logically, we should regard as ridiculous the bare possibility that the delicate, the intricate and the almost mysterious processes of the child mind could come under the control of anybody not traind properly for efficient discharge of the grave and important responsibilities and duties involved. When I referred to this point a little while ago, the Hon. the Prime Minister promised to go into the matter with the superintendents. I don't know whether or not he now has any information for the Committee on this point. I do know that this Bill permits any average person, by virtue of general educational attainments and equipment, to embark on a career as school teacher in this country. Even the provisions that make somewhat casual reference to teacher training allow of the interpretation that, at the will and pleasure of the Boards of Examiners, or somebody else, that period can be greatly cut down or dispensed with altogether. No teacher should be granted a certificate unless and until the period of practical training has been gone through successfully. A minimum length of time should be set for such training. I regard the alternative as objectionable and dangerous procedure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, if the honourable member would refer to Schedule F at the back of the book he would find that the position is fairly well defined there as to the regulations governing the grant.ng of a certificate for a teacher.

(Reads)

It seems to me that Section F covers the point that the honourable member has made. He also made the suggestion that Clause 55 does not cover the particular period.

(Reads)

I think that the honourable member made the point that there should be a specific time which was to be observed in order to comply with that clause, and it is proposed to add the words . . .

(Reads)

I think that will cover entirely the objection of the honourable member.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, the provisions of Section F, now under consideration, are not specific enough to attain the object at which, I presume, they aim, that is the due and careful training of teachers. Those provisions should be made definite beyond peradventure and no deviations therefrom should be permitted. The practical training of teachers, apart from mere book knowledge of teaching, heretofore accepted as sufficient for all purposes, is so very important that that practical training for a stipulated and minimum period should be required of every aspirant to a teaching certificate. Now that we have a modern, well equipped and properly staffed Normal School, as well as other training schools and model schools available for the purpose, we ought to insist upon the invariable use of these institutions for the staffing of schools of all denominations throughout the country. This Act should insist upon the use of these training institutions under stipulated conditions before the teachers are allowed to go out and take up their regular duties.

I beg to call the attention of the Committee to the provisions of subsection (f) of Section 75 of this Bill, as found at the top of Page 33. The members and officers of the Teachers' Associat.on raise strong objection particularly to that portion which begins "if any teacher, after thirty years of service, etc., etc.," and continues to the end of the clause. There is very considerable difference between the effect on the teachers' pensions of the prov.sion now before us and that embodied in sub-section (7) of the Pensions Section of the Education Act of 1916. If I now read the two clauses, the Committee will note the outstanding difference, a difference to which the teachers are voic.ng objection. (Reads) Members of the Committee will note that the effect of the change embodied in the new Bill is to reduce materially the pension that can now be claimed by a teacher under a g.ven set of circumstances. The teachers contend that one of the profession so retired, after thirty years of service, is entitled to the full amount of the pension. I think their contention is well founded and that it should rece.ve the attention and the approval of members of this Committee. I have with me here now a letter from the Secretary of the Teachers' Association which is the text for my remarks on this point.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have been informed by the President of the Associat on that they were satisfied with the Act as it stands.

DR. MOSDELL—In that event, and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, it will be of interest to the Committee to hear what is said in the letter to which I have just referred.

(Reads)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We might let that part stand over.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, before the curtain rings down upon this act, I want to put myself on record as being absolutely opposed to

it. I think that it is a retrograde step. It is reactionary instead of paving the way so that the progress of education may move on a higher plane. Two or three amendments should be made to the Education Act, nothing else is necessary. We have not even under this act a General Board of Examiners for the public school teachers of this island. The same thing applies with regard to the augmentation grant. There certainly should be one general vote for the augmentation grant for teachers. If the vote for the graded teachers of the island is short there should certainly be an increase in the vote so that every teacher would get proportional augmentation. Under the present system if you are going to continue that system, it seems that if one section of the country wants an increase of the grant then every other section must get an increase whether it wants it or not. You are spending money for education and granting money unnecessarily for augmentation which goes to other purposes. I trust Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister will use his influence with his Government for increasing the grant so that we will get more supervisors. I have a list of the schools that were not inspected last year, the Church of England Schools, during the year 1926. I think that the superintendent of Schools reports that there were 119 schools that were not inspected.

(Reads)

We must realise that one third of the Island are not getting the school facilities that possibly they should get. Then there are about 34 United Church Schools that were not inspected. Now I was rather surprised to find that 15 schools under the Salvation Army Board of Education were not visited by the Educational Secretary. There are nine out of fifteen ungraded. Sixty two Roman Catholic Schools were not visited during the year. A number of these schools are listed as ungraded. The teachers have had no opportunity of a teachers' training. It is a question that the House should consider as to what we should do to remedy this condition of affairs. If we can possibly find the money to get supervision, I think that it should be voted. The House is determined to put this through, and in their wisdom I hope that I am absolutely wrong in my opinion, but the doing away with the Department is I think an unwise step.

HON.. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, before asking the Committee to rise I would like to explain in reply to a question asked by the honourable member for Fortune the other day as to whether the Superintendents were justified in collecting commissions in connection with applications from teachers, or from the Boards that want teachers. I promised that I would make enquiries in connection with that, and I found that the only superintendent who had collected any commissions, was the superintendent of the Church of England Schools. It is according to the Act as it was before and as it is to-day the duty of the Board to appoint teachers, and not the duty of the superintendent. Consequently if a superintendent is asked by the Board to find a teacher he is asked to do work which is not his. In the case of the United Church Schools they always advertise for teachers which cost some money, but I understand that even in the case of the United Church Schools that they have had a great deal of trouble because at the last moment they find that they have not had a satisfactory reply to the advertisement, and then at the last moment perhaps they apply to Dr. Curtis to find a teacher. Dr. Blackall has adopted a different system and as it may be inferred that there is something surreptitious about this thing, I want to explain to the House that he has forms which he sends to anybody applying to the post, and at the top of this form is the following:

(Reads)

He makes a charge of $1.00 for doing this work. In that case I do not think there is anything unreasonable or wrong in the system which he has adopted, and which he is continuing, and there is no reason why he should do otherwise. The Board should find its own teachers and if they call upon him they have got to pay him a fee for doing so.

DR. MOSDELL—Before the Committee rises, Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record, with the honourable the member for Trinity, as objecting to the nature of the changes in educational administration being made by this Bill. Since the measure has come before this House, I have done my utmost, in conjunction with members on both sides, to make the Bill as nearly perfect as possible. I want to assure the Hon. the Prime Minister that it was solely with that object in mind that I have made any remarks whatever in Committee. I have been persuaded from the beginning that the measure is calculated to do harm rather than good, but I have carefully eschewed any attempt at obstruction. The Government is determined to enact the measure and, in the last analysis, the responsibility for any mischief done rests fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Government. Unfortunately, the fixing of responsibility will not avoid the mischievous effects on our school system that is bound to result from the enactment and enforcement of the new Act. I want to thank the honourable gentleman in charge of the Bill for the spirit in which he has accepted the suggestions made to him from time to time in the course of the debate and I hope with him that the new system that has now been adopted will work to the greatest possible advantage to education in this country though, as I have remarked, I am firmly persuaded to the contrary.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the honourable members for the assistance they have given me in connection with this Bill. There are two or three matters that we let stand over, and we will take them up when we go into Committee again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I do not know if there is anything I can add to what has been said on these Resolutions since last session. The point raised by the honourable member for Fortune with regard to the wisdom of inserting a clause in the Bill whereby the Company would not be permitted to build a railway in competition with the Government railway is covered by the general bill that the Government have announced their intention of bringing in.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I take it that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the honourable gentleman in charge of this Buchan's Mine Bill is refusing to put in the measure any specific provision in relation to the building of a railway. The honourable the Minister of Justice has promised the House a Bill specifically covering the points I have

raised in this connection from time to time. We have no such general Bill now, and we may never have one. The presumption of the company under this Agreement and the previous one of 1905 is that there is an implied authority to build railways for Company purposes. Acting on that presumption, the Company is proceeding to extend its railway from a point near Millertown to the scene of operations at Buchan's Mine. If that be their position now, they will surely maintain it in the future in relation to railway construction and operation, especially seeing that we are giving them duty free concessions for such purposes.

It is claimed that the Company are accorded no such special rights under the 1905 Act and Agreement. If that interpretation be correct, then the Company must construe the present Agreement as putting them in such a favored position. Whether they get it under the Old Agreement or the present one, the Company are acting as if the right were theirs. They have not only not obtained specific permission for railroad construction in the Red Indian District, they have not applied for any. Correspondence between the Government and the Company as tabled here, shows no evidence of specific application for permission to construct, because it embodies an application for the grant of certain Crown Lands for railroad right-of-way. The Company, therefore, not only regard themselves as possessing the right of constructing a railroad through lands that are theirs but also through lands not in their possession.

Champions of the Company have had a great deal to say about the general reasonableness of the Company's attitude towards its relations to the country. If this presentation be correct then we may expect the Company to be reasonable enough to agree to the inclusion of the clause I suggest as a protection for the Newfoundland Railway. The Company are insistent on the broadest possible description of the concessions they are to obtain under this agreement. The Company would be most unreasonable were they to refuse the Government the right to be explicit in stating concessions and privileges that the agreement does not grant them. The honourable gentlemen on the opposite side of the House claim that the Agreement does not include and was never intended to include the grant of rights to construct an independent line of railway. Their plans and intentions may be well known to themselves but only when they are embodied in the Agreement itself are they made known and perfectly plain to the public generally and to the Company particularly.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman: The ppoint is well taken by the member for Fortune but I do not think that the company has the right to build a railway. Then as against that why are we asked to have the material referred to in sub-section C included in that section. I do not think that the Government have any objection to putting in a clause to that effect. At the same time the Attorney General and other members of the Government are agreed that a general bill covers the point raised by the Hon. Member for Fortune.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: There is no misunderstanding, I would like to say, on this point at all. The House is as one on the idea that one of the things that influenced the Government in making this contract was the carriage of materials by its railway. I go further and say this with the approval of the Minister in charge of the Bill, whose position I have for the clearing up of the legal position, that so far as this House is concerned, I think that on that particular point

there is no dissention at all. That is the reason that we say that one of the things that would weigh with us in giving certain duty exemptions here would be the fact that the railway would benefit by this industry. Of course that point will not be doubted for one moment. We say that we do not want to admit, and we have given a great deal of thought to this matter, that this bill gives them any rights as regards railway building at all. We further say that any railway rights that they get they acquire them under the 1905 contract. The hon. members therefore if they follow me will see the point that I desire to make with regard to a general bill. Under this act here they may get in duty free railway building materials. But that duty free admission does not give them any right to build a railway, in other words so far as that is concerned, the building of a railway that might conflict with our own. We took up this position with the companies and we were practically faced with this problem as to which alternative it would be better for us to take. In the first place if we presume to say here in this particular measure, that they shall not build a railway, we are faced with the position that if they have got the right to build a railway which they do not contend themselves, we put ourselves in the position that we have got to give them an alternative. In other words it is perfectly reasonable that if we say that they shall not build a railway, then we must be prepared to contract that their mineral products shall be taken out by our own railway, at reasonable rates, and in reasonable and proper quantities. We feel that not alone with regard to this particular industry but with regard to other industries as well that are likely to be under consideration during the next few days, that we should have this point cleared up, for which there is no specific provision at the present time. Under the General Railway Act to-day the only provision for the controlling of railways is with regard to the people that come here specifically to run railways—people whose business it is to construct railways. There is not any provision there that makes clear a case such as this, where an industrial concern such as the pulp and paper companies build a railway on their own land. Therefore we propose as intimated to introduce a bill covering that point. I may point out to the House in advance that it probably will be somewhat objectionable to these people on the very same grounds. As the Minister in charge of the bill intimated, this point was taken up and it was then pointed out that if you are going to legislate against that company, then you had to give them certain services, and that the Governor-in-Council ought not to refuse permission where the Government of the day is not competent to deliver that service. I think that it will be agreed by everyone that if there is an industry in the island that employs people, that no Government is going to refuse permission to build a railway, if they are not able to give the service. The matter is clearly a question of procedure and I may say to the House that so far as the method of procedure is concerned, the decision that we have arrived at is that it is better to make sure and have a general provision about the building of railways than to confine it to this contract.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I think I have already stated in this House the salient points with regard to this question of transportation by the railway. When the Bill was being considered by the Government in January last one of the things that appealed to me favorably was when it was pointed out that the mineral area was so situated

as to make it impossible for the Company to ship except in part over the Newfoundland Railway. It was anticipated then that our railway would be in a position to dictate terms to the Company where the Newfoundland Railway met the A.N.D. Company's railway both at Bishop's Falls and at Millertown Junction, and I think that the Minister of Justice would do well to make it clear to the House that there is no possibility under this Act being rescinded and I would like to know from him what constitutes a port in Newfoundland. In this country we recognize a port as a place of embarkation or debarkation into or from the sea and if there is any doubt on that point I think it ought to be safeguarded now because it would be suicidal if we lost any opportunity to protect our railway. It must be borne in mind that this country is confronted with two or three serious economic problems and one of these is the earning power of our railway and I think every effort should be made, under any circumstances, to try and develop our railway traffic and put the railway on a paying basis. The hon. Minister of Justice stated here a few days ago that it was the intention at this session of the House to make a general law with regard to the construction of railroads. That in my opinion if the Act is so framed to cover this and every other case would be a most desirable and necessary Bill. We have evidence of railway development in other directions. Only within the last few days propositions were made to develop mineral areas in the locality which we are now discussing and if that is so and there are large deposits found there it may be that we will have many concerns to deal with. Therefore, if we have a general Bill there will be no misunderstandings afterwards, as no matter what company goes in that territory to develop their properties it must be clearly understood that they got to ship their goods in part over the Newfoundland Railway. If these developments in the interior are going to be of the size and of the magnitude that we are told they are, then there are wonderful possibilities for having our railway revenue enhanced considerably. Consequently I am very anxious to know if the Company at Buchan's Mine have rights to build a railway that will go to the sea? They have a railway now from Bishops Falls to Botwood, but intervening there is a section of the Newfoundland Railway that they must of necessity have to pass over and they must not, under any consideration, have the right to establish a railway in competition with ours in that territory and which would prevent the Newfoundlanr Railway from increasing its earning powers.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: If honourable members will follow the wording of subsection (e) of the Bill, they will see the point I am endeavouring to make and they will see the unwisdom of making any provision in this particular Bill that might appear to indicate a doubt as to the relative positions. To-day the position is that we are dealing with a Company that has got a railway of its own from Millertown Junction to Millertown and it has got a railway of its own from Grand Falls to Botwood. Arising out of this mine, we will admit in duty free all materials transported on that railway of theirs. Already the Company have their paper business and they have rolling stock to carry on their paper business, but, if they require further rolling stock to carry their concentrates, the Government is prepared, under this Bill, to allow the Company's material duty free to help out the Buchan's Mine proposition, but it certainly does not mean to have it included that they will get

anything else. With regard to the point raised of "ports in Newfoundland". We say to the Company that you can bring your barges and boats down the lake to Millertown and from Millertown to Millertown Junction, but that should you require to have aditional rolling stock for your new industry we will allow those in duty free. There is nothing at all ese covered in the Bill. Whatever rights the Company got we want to have. There is a further point that requires a great deal of consideration and that is a matter of rights they got under the 1905 Act so far as railway building is concerned. We say that the Company got no rights to build a railroad and their legal adviser has not insisted that they have. We do not want to put into this agreement words that might possibly be construed to mean that they have rights under the 1905 Act so we have got to see to it that the Company becomes subject to any general law that is enacted here with regard to the building of railroads.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman: I may say that the last time this Bill was before the Committee I pointed out that the Company could build a railway and there was nothing to prevent them from so doing; but the question is whether or not they would be permitted to operate if they built a railway. If they are allowed to import materials for railway construction, why not they be allowed to build a railway? And, if they operate a railway, will it not be detrimental to other people in the country, because I understand that the town of Buchan's Mine will be an open town and that other people, apart from those that the Company have a direct interest in, will be allowed to establish places of business. This will be of little use to them if their competitors in business can get preferential rights on freights from the Company. It looks to me as if Buchan's Mine is going to be a town in the heart of the country to which no person will have the right to travel. It seems to me to be such an important matter as to require direct consideration from the Government at once, because the very fact that the Company can operate a railway of their own between Millertown Junction and Buchan's Mine suggests the possibility of the construction of a railway to other places, and I think the matter is one deserving of serious and immediate attention.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That Chapter 20 about the construction of railroads and Docks, is only applicable to people in the railway business, persons who build railroads for the public conveyance of passengers and freight. Now the act that we propose to bring in, is an act that makes certain that no railway of any kind whether private or otherwise can be built but will be obliged to pay the Newfoundland Railway running rates.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I gather from what the honorable the Minister of Justice has just said that, under the provisions of the Act and the Agreement of 1905, if the Company demand Crown Lands for railroad construction, the Government is in duty bound to grant them that land. In that respect, I conclude, the Act of 1905 and the present Act must be read together. They really constitute one Agreement. Under the Act of 1905, the Government must satisfy the demands of the Company for lands for railroad right-of-way up to a total of ten thousand acres. Should the Company decide it is to their advantage to build an independent railway to handle the products of Buchan's Mine, they have but to connect up the ends of the Millertown and Botwood branches, a distance of about twenty-five miles. The ten thousand acres stipulated for under the 1905 Act is more than sufficient

for their purposes, i n fact it is enough for right-of-way for a line a couple of hundred miles long.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: As a matter of fact that is the very reason why we are giving consideration to the extent to which they may operate in the right of giving land. We rather think that this is a good chance of bringing in a general law, from the standpoint of any possible claim that they may have for interference, than if we specifically legislated against them.

DR. MOSDELL–Mr. Chairman: I claim the Government has the opportunity now of either getting back some of the privileges formerly accorded the Company or of getting additional benefits for the country under the terms of both this Agreement and the old one. One such privilege, and a very important one, is that of making it perfectly plain to the Company that under neither the Act of 1905 nor this present Act can they possibly presume that it has any specific right to undertake railroad construction in this country for any purpose soever They are, as I have previously observed, acting under such a presumption. We must prevent them from maintaining a position that menaces the Newfoundland Railway with a competitor and with the total loss of the freight and other business created by the Buchan's Mine operations. They have assumed that position in respect to railroad construction generally. We must see to it, and that right now, that they are not allowed to proceed to cut out of their traffic system that portion of our own railroad line between Millertown Junction and Grand Falls.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: The difference between making the Governor-in-Council bound under this agreement and making the Governor - in - Council bound under a general act is this, that under contract you are dealing with a different situation in the sense of compulsion. You cannot make the Governor-in-Council under a general law do anything. In other words if a company comes along and takes the position that it does not like your railway, and he claims that it is not giving the satisfaction, under the agreement you are compelled to let that company go ahead, but under a general law it is a different position.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: I think that the suggestion of the member for Fortune ought to be taken into consideration, as to the taking advantage of the re-opening of this matter in connection with railway construction by getting the A.N.D. Co. to give proper protection to the people doing business in Buchan's Mine which is to be an open town as well as the people doing business in Botwood. The reason why I mention this here is because in the past business people have reason to complain of the shipments of goods that have been sent to them in Botwood, coming over the A.N.D. Co's line from Grand Falls to Botwood. The Company takes the preference, for any materials that they want sent down to Botwood. And any person in Botwood has to wait until the Company's interests are served first. If that is happening at Botwood at the present time it seems that that can happen to the Newfoundland Railway and to the detriment of the public.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—There it proves what I say that there ought to be a general law to take care of this. If that is going on then the way to cure it is by a general law.

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—With reference to the Bill now before the House. The question has been asked many times, "Why the Anglo-Newfoundland Dev. Co., Ltd, asked for a twenty year period, for free entries, for original construction and extension at Buchan's." No doubt the rea-

son is because the experience of the Company at Grand Falls has been that, since 1905 until the present time, they have been going on making capital expenditure for expansion, and the same is likely to occur in connection with their mining areas. It is surely much better to give any Company sufficient time for expansion, rather than make them rush their construction work in a short time, and probably make the same blunders and mistakes that were made in connection with the Development at Corner Brook, which had to be done in two years.

A very good reason in asking for free entries on construction is to avoid inflation of capital expenditure, and capital expenditure only.

As far back as 1905 when the Harmsworth and Albert Read Companies pointed out to the late Sir Robert Bond, that it was about 50 per cent. more expensive to build mills in Newfoundalnd than elsewhere, because practically all construction material and equipment would have to be imported, Sir Robert Bond and his Government very wisely agreed to forgo the duties on construction material, and make it easier for the Companies to establish their plants without inflation of capital expenditure.

It is surely better for the country and everybody concerned, to get, if possible, a dollar's worth of asset value behind every dollar of capital expenditure. Sy such means the productivity of the plant per dollar is increased and the operation depreciation and similar charges which are almost proportionate to the total capital expenditure are reduced to the lowest point.

It is only reasonable to suppose that one must keep the same idea in mind when dealing with capital expenditure for houses and all things that are needed for the housing and comfort of the community, I have taken the trouble to get some figures in connection with Grand Falls town. They have had the sorry experience of paying duty on practically everything that went into town construction, and each year the town has to bear a very heavy deficit. To pay heavy duty on water pipes, fire protection pipes, sewerage pipes, cement for cellars and foundations for houses, etc., simply swells the cost of the house and the town facilities, increases the annual depreciation charge and the deficit which increased the production cost per ton of product.

The following figures show details of the deficit last year on public utilities alone. Figures are for twelve months, from August 31st, 1925 to August 31st, 1$26:

House Repairs	$17,159.39
Town Utilities	28,560.56
Medical	12,194.50
Coal Sales	5,318.87
Farm	19,459.87
School Donation	5,400.00
School Rent	4,195.32
School Debt	1,200.00

Making a total loss on public utilities of $93,488.51. An additional loss for public utilities of $20,000.00 has also been absorbed in their manufacturing cost, which the Company absorbed as a sort of Municipal Tax, or in lieu of such tax.

It may be of interest to this House to know that the capital expenditure by the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., for house property and accessories, for staff and employees, amounts to over $2,000,000.00, upon this amount they get no return but suffer a considerable loss. In a word then, is it not right to contend that any import duties that inflate capital expenditure are bad in principle, because, for all time, they add to the production cost of the manufacturer.

In regard to the importation free of duty of concentrate bags for a period of ten years, these, like re-

turned metal ended cores will be a constant nuisance and expense to the manufacturer. It is a well known fact that returned empties are very hard to control, and concentrate bags like cores for reels of paper, are, after all, only returned empties.

A lot of talk has been made by some people about the necessity of protecting local factories or home industries. Is not the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., a very large local industry, and is not every one associated with that company as entitled to consideration as any other local factory? The term "local" surely means Newfoundland, and does not mean one spot more than another.

All should regard revenue as money the chosen Government of the people must get, by various means, in order to pay for public services, which the people need. To lower the cost of these things, the smaller the amount of money will have to be collected or extracted from the people. This, to my mind, sounds very reasonable, but many of the people have criticized the request for free entry upon items of capital expenditure think that companies who get free entries, are robbing the revenue of, or trying to get something unfairly. In this case, the tax payer is not asked to pay anything, nor is the Department of Finance asked to pay anything. The company is building its own railroad, is paying a royalty on the ore, and will also come under any income tax, or business profits tax law that may be in force. The Government and the country are simply asked to waive an extra temporary receipt of money for duties, in order to get an increased revenue later on.

There has been many statements about giving concessions, and getting nothing but a little employment in return. Surely the prosperity of every country depends upon the useful activities of its people, and anything likely to stimulate an increase of such activities must increase production, and thereby increase commodities, and other things, for the general public.

I took occasion to ascertain from the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., their cash disbursements in Newfoundland for twelve months ending August 31st, 1926, as follows:

Wakes and Salaries	$2,379,151.57
Duties	100,439.98
Purchases, mostly in St. John's	273,314.70
Freight on Railway	189,540.01
Telegrams and Postage..	4,200.51
Sundry Payments	24,352.38
Total	$3,040,999.16

The above are again despersed, or the larger part of them w thin Newfoundland, to pay for maintainance of Hospitals, and all other public institutions, and payment for pul lic health, and Pul lic Officials etc.

Nothing has l cen included n the figures I have quoted you that cover any purchases outside of Newfoundland, either for raw materials like coal, sulphur, china clay, etc., or any materials such as wires, felts, machinary, etc., nor does the table include any moneys paid out for wages, or other th ngs used on new construction or extension work, so that the total figures represent an annual cash exchange for the actual annual consumption, of what they may l e termed the "Resources of Newfoundland." From it you may easily calculate the portion which may directly or indirectly go into the coffers of the Finance Department.

I th nk you will agree with me that the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., is a local factory, and a special local factory, in so far as they bring into the country and circulate the portion a much larger amount of money than a great numl er of small shops or factories.

The Company deals with the local factories in every way they can, and

make purchases all over the Island, and particularly in St. John's. They do this voluntary, because they have always felt themselves to be as much a part of the country, as any other business firm. In many cases local Merchants and agents have been of assistance and service in connection with importations and other purchases, for which the Company has been pleased to pay. In other directions they place considerable business, because those with whom they place it understand the commodity or commodities, and their markets a little better than they do. They supply in a word, assistance and assurance, as to quantity and quality, etc., that the Company deems worth paying for. Instead of directly placing the orders to those at the source of supply, they have always preferred to place with the local House or Agent, wherever help, service, and guarantees have been given.

As to the remarks of the honourable member for Fortune Bay, when referring to the necessity of protecting the Newfoundland Railway against competition, I quite agree with him, provided that the railway can handle the traffic, and do so without charging expensive freight rates. I see no reason why any clause should be put in this Bill dealing with the right or otherwise of building a railway, an Amendment of our Railway Act would do all that is necessary.

I am quite confident that the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., had, and has no intention of building a railroad from Millertown Junction to Grand Falls. If I were in their place, I would not admit that I had no right to build a railroad, if it were necessary, in order to continue their business, or defend themselves against exhorbitant charges, that may be imposed.

Legally, they may not be able to build such a railroad without Government consent, they certainly would be very foolish to agree to anything going in the Bill which would compel them to put all their traffic over the Government Line, because some Government, or corporation which later might acquire the railway, might make the rates so high, that it would land the Company in insolvency. The Company might not be able to help itself, should the Government Railway or corporation put the screws on. But that is another matter, and could be dealt with when the occasion arose.

There are many business people, and others outside and inside the House of Assembly, who would like to put very stringent railroad stipulations against the Company. What do any of the business people do to assist the Government Railroad? In most cases, they import direct to St. John's by steamer, because, they find it cheaper to do so. In turn, they may, and do ship largely to their Customers over the Newfoundland Railway System. Who pays? Not the shipper, the customers have to pay for that part of the business, and they, like the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., and other Companies, have no choice.

It may not be out of place here to recall one or two instances which go to show how unwise it would be to pledge traffic to a Railway.

(1) Many of the members present in this House will remember that years ago Lewis Miller of Crieff, Scotland, came to Newfoundland to establish Lumber Mills at Millertown. Mr. Miller built the Millertown Branch Railway, I was on the construction of same. He was promised all sorts of transportation facilities, so that he might be able to put his Lumber F.O.B. Lewisporte, at a cost at which he could compete with other Lumber Industries. Mr. Miller expressed himself very strongly at the way he was treated in connection with Freight Rates, and evidently, he did not receive anything like the facilities or Rates promised.

(2) In 1908 and 1909 the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., thought to arrange an agreement with the Railway Company of that day, it was thought that the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., had no alternative but to ship over the present Railway. The A. N.D. Co., Ltd., and the Railway Company could not come to any terms with reference to Rates at that t.me, as you are all aware, the Railway was operated by a private Company, as the A. N.D. Co., Ltd., could not come to terms. they built the Botwood Railway, and with the additional experience of Railroading over the past eighteen years, I am sure the Company feels and knows that but for the Botwood Railway, the Plants at B.shop's Falls, and Grand Falls, would have been crippled, or put out of business, as they certainly could not afford to pay the Rates demanded.

(3) Another instance is more recent, and concerns the Newfoundland Railway. As you all readily understand, the transportation of Hay and Oats for woods' operations, is a costly business, with the result that these two items alone, cost Paper and Pulp Companies, on the job, about twice as much as they cost logging Companies in Canada. Naturally, those Pulp and Paper Companies feel that they are entitled to cheapen transportation charges all they can, and with that in view, they had to import Hay and Oats by steamer to Corner Brook, and thence to Millertown Junction and Badger, etc.

The Company realizes that the Railroad is anxious to get, and keep traffic from North Sydney. They tried to induce the Newfoundland Railway to give them a lower Freight Rate, they were not successful, and furthermore, they were told that if they did not ship by the Newfoundland System, that the Freight Rates might be increased from Corner Brook to Millertown Junction. Personally, I do not agree with that policy of the Railway Management. Many of the A.N.D. Co.'s operations are conducted in places dependent upon the Newfoundland Railway, Buchan's and Millertown, are two of them.

In conversation recently with the Manager of the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., he assurred me that Mr. Russell and his colleagues have treated them very well, and have tried to meet their requirements. The requirements of the big industrial concern, such as the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., are at the mercy of the Newfoundland Railroad, and at the mercy of those who may, from time to time, dictate its policy.

The Government, or any other Government might enact laws to enforce Companies to route their traffic over the Newfoundland Government Railway, but surely, we must all know that would not be necessary, as long as the Government Railway conducts its business in a fair manner.

The Goverment realizes as the Railway Management realizes that there are few sources of traffic within the country. There is also the fact that the various steamers plying to St. John's, are able to deliver goods direct to St. John's cheaper than the railroad can deliver them from North Sydney to Port aux Basques.

If larger industrial concerns in the interior are to be charged exclusive rates in order to swell the Railroad Revenue, it would be grossly unfair.

There is not, at the present time, sufficient traffic to support the Newfoundland Railway, but it is increasing, and in time, may be sufficiently large enough to pay expense and upkeep, at least, I hope so.

To introduce coercive measures against those industries who already laregly support the Newfoundland Railway, is surely a mistake, and one would be lead to wonder whether the Government regards the Railroad as of more importance than the industry supporting it.

We can imagine, if the Importers of St. John's were compelled by Leg-

islation, to use the Newfoundland Railway, they would put up a tremendous fight if such a thing happened. Some of them do not hesitate to recommend compulsory measures for others who are absolutely dependent on the Railway.

No industrial concern would want to build a railway from Millertown Junction to Grand Falls, if a railroad already in existence, could handle the traffic, and at a reasonable rate. At a cost of $25,000 to $30,000.00 per mile of railroad, industrial concerns would not be anxious to rush in to build railroads, if they could avoid doing so.

I am sure that this House can feel that if ever the A.N.D. Co., Ltd., or the Buchan's Company, want to build a line from Millertown Junction to Grand Falls, we can all rest assured that such a railroad has become absolutely necessary to the business concerned, because, the present railway had failed to cope with the traffic, or had imposed impossible conditions or rates.

LOGGING RAILROADS

I discussed this matter with the Minister of Justice on one occasion, and I would like to add a word or two more, because, at that time it was proposed that logging railways could only be built five miles. Here again I want to say that logging operators do not want to build railroads, if they can avoid doing so. Now, why do they want to build logging railroads? The explanation is simple enough, there are distances beyond which horse transportation is not economical.

I am sure, people engaged in logging operations do not regard a logging railroad as anything other than a method of logging, or a method of transporting supplies and logs, it would do no more to compete with the Nfld. Railway than an ordinary logging road would, or even a wood's trail. It would be foolish to talk of limiting a logging railroad to a length of five miles only, this would only show an ignorance of logging in general, or of logging railroads in particular.

The Abitibi Paper Co. in Ontario, has, at the present time, its own logging railroad, it is standard gauge, and is at present 20 to 30 miles long.

Further, the A. N. D. Co., Ltd., for the past two or three years has been building a light logging railway in on Harpoon, and I think it is now constructed for a distance of about fourteen miles.

I feel sure that the A. N. D. Co., Ltd., assumed from the start that the Nfld. Railway would haul their freight from Millertown Junction to Grand Falls, or Bishop's Falls, or elsewhere, as required, and that the Nfld. Railway could do so at a rate which would be acceptable to the A. N. D. Co. Ltd.

With reference to the remarks that have been made in this House from time to time of the value of the property known as Buchan's Mine, I do not think it is in the best interests of the mining interest of the Company that there should be such gross exaggeration and misrepresentation. I have heard the statement repeated many times by people that Buchan's was the largest mine of its kind in the world, it is absolutely untrue, as the Sullivan Mine is several times as large as the Buchan's Mine, and there is another very large mine similar to Buchan's in Illinois, or Idaho, and other large deposits of similar quality in Australia, in Canada, and the Malay States. Propaganda work has been put out by certain parties, for reasons of their own, in connection with Buchan's Mine. Other properties are undoubtedly trying to be exploited, because it is known that Buchan's Mine is a fairly good mine, and that the Company have decided to go ahead and develop it. What we should all realize at the moment is that when

considering a mineral property (such as Buchan's) of this nature, it is only a waste of time talking in terms of "gross ore value." With zinc and lead, and particularly with the former metal contents of the ore. In fact, cases have been known where it did not pay to ship concentrates away to the smelter. In the case of Buchan's Mine, a great deal of it depends on the market price of metals when they are ready to produce. Recently, I understand, there has been rather a bad slump, and should they continue to go down very much more, it is quite possible that the profit which the Company hope could be derieved from the working of the Buchan's Mine, might be wiped out. Buchan's Mine is at present a very promising proposition, but there are other mines of similar kind in the world, which could put Buchan's hopelessly in the shade, both as regards quantity of ore, and possible profits. On enquiry I find that the results obtained this year as regards finding any new ore bodies or extensions of the ones already known, have, so far, been very disappointing. Although, I am told, that a large amount of diamond drilling and electrical prospecting work has been done, no further discoveries of ore have been made. A large party of prominent mining and metallurgical men will visit this country in September in connection with the Empire Mining Congress, which is being held in Canada this year, and that a party of them will be visiting Buchan's Mine. After reading the several accounts that have been in the papers recently, and the article in the Financial Post of recent date, I trust that the visiting Congress will not be disappointed in Buchan's when they visit there. The A. N. D. Co. Ltd. are to be congratulated in inducing the American Smelters to start development work in Newfoundland, and I trust that in a few years time there will be considerable development work done on other properties in this country. The American Smelters are evidently keenly interested, as they have, at the present time, in this country, a Mr. Meens, geologist and mining engineer, who, I understand, is to remain here this season, and will, I presume, visit any out crop of ore of a promising nature. What we want now is capital, and lots of it, and I trust the day is not far distant when we will have a great influx of capital to develop the mineral of this country.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Before the Committee rises I just want to occupy two or three minutes on the point raised by the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay. I think it is a point well worth while. There seems to be some doubt whether the Company have the right to build a railway side by side in competition with the Newfoundland Railway. If I thought the A. N. D. Company had such a right I would immediately ask to have this Bill withdrawn. One of the most attractive features of this Bill was that the Newfoundland Government Railway would be assisted considerably by the additional traffic that would accrue. The point raised is a knotty one and is worthy of every consideration, and if the Honorable Member for Fortune Bay has an amendment to offer to Clause C I would be glad to have him submit it to me before the House meets again on this particular measure. I look upon the discussion as well worth while; some good points have been raised and because of new companies, some large areas adjoining have been acquired by a local syndicate, I want to say that I want to see the rights of that syndicate and such companies preserved. If I thought that private individuals would not be allowed to pass over the A. N. D. Company's railroad to visit Buchan's Mine I would not be at all enthusiastic over this going through. I want to extend an

invitation again to the Honourable Member for Fortune Bay to submit any amendment he may have to me before the House meets again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again 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. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—On the motion that the remaining orders of the day be deferred I would just like to say that we are not prepared to go on to-morrow with the two resolutions for confirmation of agreements between the Government and International Paper Company and Government and Gander Valley Pulp and Paper Company; the last two on the order paper. I would like to give the House that information, but on Wednesday if the House is open we would be prepared to go into discussion of these resolutions or if the House adjourns over Wednesday on Thursday.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—There is no desire on the part of the Government to rush the Opposition into a debate on this Bill until they are ready. As I have told the House when introducing these measures there is a desire on the part of the International people to get across to England to exercise the option, and there is a desire naturally on the part of these men representing the International Paper Company in St. John's at the present time to get back to their regular business, but I unhesitatingly accede to the request of the Leader of the Opposition, and as there is not much else on the Order Paper until we get down to this and the Budget is ready I would suggest that when the House adjourns we adjourn until Thursday, and give the Opposition time to consider this Legislation.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Possible the Prime Minister misunderstood me. We have no desire to adjourn over to-morrow unless it is the wish of the Prime Minister. I spoke only of the last two Resolutions on the Order Paper. If you wish to dispose of the A. N. D. Co. contract and proceed with the other items on the Order Paper to-morrow we would be prepared to do that. It has taken the Government several weeks, if not months, to consider these Resolutions, and while we adjourned over Wednesday last it was rather difficult to get members together for a meeting over the week-end and with the Regatta, and I think the House would be better served by putting off this matter for the couple of days.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We would be quite prepared to go ahead with Buchan's Mine. I am quite as anxious as anybody in the House to proceed with legislation and have the House closed. I move that the House now rising do adjourn until to-morrow, Tuesday, at 3 of the clock.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, at 3 of the clock.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 9th, 1927.

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

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave

to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 206 of the Consolidated Statutes 1916 entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies.'"

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to say a few words here. I would like to read a few messages that I have received from the district of Twillingate, relative to the hospital there. This is the message that I received a few days ago, from the Board of Directors of the Twillingate Memorial Hospital.

(Reads)

Now I have had quite a number of messages sent me relative to this matter. This is one I received from Pilley's Island.

(Reads)

This one I received from Little Bay Islands.

(Reads)

Carmanville, Fogo.

(Reads)

Change Islands.

(Reads)

From Lewisporte, LaScie, Fogo, Nipper's Hr., Tilt Cove, Change Islands, Springdale, Tizzard's Hr. and Carmanville:

(Reads messages)

Mr. Speaker, in thanking you for for permission to read these telegrams, I must join with those people and ask that the Government take this matter into their most serious consideration at the earliest possible moment with a view to granting an extra $10,000.00, which is so absolutely necessary for the upkeep of this hospital. As has been pointed out, the Twillingate Memorial Hospital handles half as many patients as the General Hospital in St. John's and yet the General Hospital costs the Government $20,000.00 a month to operate and Twillingate Hospital gets a grant of $15,000.00 a year. I think, after all, Mr. Speaker, it is only fair that the grant for Twillingate Hospital should be increased, particularly in view of the fact that they get nothing for pauper cases. For the first six months of this year pauper cases cost the Hospital in the vicinity of $11,000.00, and in all probability will cost more than the present total grant—$15,000.00—by the time the year is to an end, so I think it is entirely out of place to expect this institution to handle pauper cases out of $15,000.00 a year. Supposing that many of those cases had to come on to St. John's and wait for months before getting admission into the General Hospital, I wonder what would be the result and how much money it would cost the Government, but these people got good treatment in Twillingate Hospital, which is up-to-date and well equipped in every particular, and it cost the patients nothing. Now, I think, it is our duty to have that vote increased by at least $10,000.00 a year. I believe that every member of this House, irrespective of political affiliations, is in favor of seeing the good work at that institution being continued. As a representative of that district I appeal to the Government to give their immediate and earnest consideration to this urgent request, and I ask that the vote be increased to $25,000.00. I give this matter my fullest and entire support, and I ask that it be considered without delay, if necessary, by a Select Committee, but I do want to have something done in the interest of the Twillingate Hospital so that it will not close down this Fall. I would also ask the members on both sides of this House to use their influence in an endeavour to have this much needed institution kept going?

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to what has been said by the member for Twillingate. It will be remembered that when the vote was being passed for this Twillingate Hospital some of us members advocated that this vote of $15,000.00 be increased to, at least, $20,000.00, and we pointed out at that

time that we regarded this as an economic move for the reason of the large number of patients that are treated in that institution, because if they had to come on to St. John's it would entail very considerable expense upon the Government and far more expense than the increase asked for. People who seek medical attendance require to get to some hospital and that hospital at Twillingate has been a God send since it was established. Members representing northern districts used always have patients coming on every steamboat to St. John's for hospital treatment and they used have to remain in boarding houses here for long periods and under poor conditions while awaiting admission to the General Hospital; but since that hospital was established at Twillingate the number of patients coming this way have been greatly minimized. I feel sure that the largely signed and influential representations made by Mr. Brown cannot be ignored, particularly when one considers the public spirit and sacrifice shown by the people in the different constituencies served by this hospital, as I understand over seven thousand dollars was collected from them since last Fall. But the idea of closing that hospital owing to lack of funds is to my mind out of the question. The Government cannot afford to have it closed. It has filled a long felt want and I think it would be nothing short of disastrous to have it closed, although the Memorial Committee have pointed out that there is no alternative, but to close it if the necessary increased vote is not forthcoming. I strongly support the petitions from these people and I feel that it deserves the immediate and sympathetic support of the Government from an economic viewpoint as well as from a humanitarian viewpoint. We cannot afford to have our people endure the hardships and privations that they have had to undergo in the past, especially when they have a modern institution and medical assistance available in their own districts.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I was born in Twillingate and I want also to add my support and approval to the petition just presented by my colleague, Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown is senior representative of the district and although I am resident of Twillingate he had the privilege of presenting the petition. We are all well aware what St. Anthony Hospital has meant to Newfoundland and of the good work done by Dr. Grenfell in the north, and it is unnecessary for me this afternoon to recall to your mind what Dr. Grenfell has done for Newfoundland. Now Twillingate stands approximately about midway between St. John's and St. Anthony, and being midway it is a very important centre for the people of Twillingate district and Fogo district nearby to have a hospital at Twillingate where it is within easy reach otherwise it would be necessary for patients to have to come to St. John's or else go north to St. Anthony for treatment. Now the hospital at Twillingate has cost a considerable amount of money, I think about $130,000.00, of which the Government of Newfoundland contributed only $10,000.00. To-day according to the messages presented here it looks as though the hospital will have to be closed unless more funds are forthcoming for its upkeep. Some time ago when the House was in Committee on Supply I took up the matter of the allowance which is made the General Hospital here from the Charities Department, which allowance is $1 per day for pauper cases, and I thought that the same privilege should be extended to the Twillingate Hospital, which could not be expected to take care of pauper cases out of a small grant of $15,000.00. I think the Government will see at once that it is necessary that some financial help be given Twillingate Hospital. I hope that the Government

will consider this and that the Twillingate Hospital will be "an open hospital."

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the bill entitled "An Act respecting Education."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It was suggested yesterday that we leave out Clause 84. Dr. Burke and Dr. Blackall are both out of town to-day, and Dr. Curtis was the only one of the Superintendents I consulted. He considered that while of course it is more or less immaterial, at the same time he does not feel that he would like to see the Clause taken out. He believes it is a good thing to have the Clause left in, as a warning to some teachers to whom it might be necessary. Whether it means very much or whether it does not, personally I feel I would not like to see it written out, because it would rather look as if we were protecting the teachers by taking it out once it had been put in. I suggest that the Clause stand. There were some other small amendments to Clauses left over from yesterday.

(Reads)

I think that covers all the points left over.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent it was ordered that the bill be read a third time presently and passed, and be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman when the Committee rose last evening I asked the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay, Dr. Mosdell, if he would submit an amendment to Clause (c) with regard to the building of railways that he had referred to. I would like to ask if he has any amendment to offer.

DR. MOSDELL—Arising out of the suggestion of the Honourable introducer of the Bill I have prepared a Clause to add to (e)

(Reads)

I suggest that that be added as an amendment to sub-section (e).

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I am perfectly satisfied to accept the amendment. Has the Attorney General anything to say about it?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I am quite prepared to accept it. My submission all along is that it does not effect it at all. The addition of these words can do no harm certainly. I would like to say that I gave notice of a Bill to be introduced tomorrow dealing with Railway affairs that is more definite.

DR. MOSDELL—In respect to any benefits of this country, profits, because of that development and operations at Buchans Mine, how exactly does this country profit? There is a provision in the Agreement of 1905 for a royalty on net profits of 5 per cent., but generally apart from labour or eventual payment of duty when the exemption period is passed, there are other payments I understand by

which the country can profit. The income tax would be applicable to this Company just as it has been previously to the A. N. D. Co.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —There is no question about that.

DR. MOSDELL—I take it that income tax would be paid and deducted from profits in order to arrive at net profits and then the royalty would be assessed.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Yes.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, there are one or two points I want to have cleared up on this Bill. As I said before I maintain that the twenty years period is absolutely too long. During the period of construction of this the Executive Government has authority under the Customs' Act at the present time to allow in free of duty anything needed for original construction, and I do not see any reason why any further concessions should be given them beyond that. If the revenue of the country is in such a prosperous state that we can allow a Company to come in bringing in goods for twenty years, then a reduction of taxation should be made all round. I maintain that these corporations that come in should pay a proportionate share of taxation. We have to build up a town, Customs officers, post offices and other buildings and it is only right and proper and fair that these corporations should pay a proportionate share of the Government's expenses, in my opinion. With regard to the Railway, under the 1905 Act I understand the A. N. D. Company has the right and can claim from the Government, and the Governor in Council must grant to them, on application, up to ten thousand acres of land for railway building purposes. I want to ask the Honourable Minister of Justice is there anything to prevent the A. N. D. Company from linking up their railway at Millertown Junction with their railway at Grand Falls.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I have already intimated that I have given notice of a Bill dealing with that very point.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I maintain that it would be advisable to have that Bill before the House before we pass the present bill so that we shall know what we are doing in this matter. Now the argument is put forth that when this contract was given to the company we had hopes that there would be a large income to the railway on account of hauling mineral over the Government railway lines. In fact we have been told here in the House that Buchan's Mine may be looked upon as worth more to Newfoundland than the Labrador, but I fail to see what Newfoundland is going to get out of it except the labor on mining the ore and haulage over the railway to the seaport. This Company while I have absolutely nothing against the A. N. D. Company, yet this Company under the 1905 Act got certain concessions and procured these mineral rights in the Buchan's Mine area and, as I understand it, they do not pay any rentals. If the area at Buchan's Mine is of such value as we have been led to believe and we haven't anything to prove that it is not ,then we want to move very slowly in the granting of concessions to this Company. We were informed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines yesterday that other Companies in this area, were interested in adjoining areas to this one, and one account of that we have to be very careful in the making of our Bills for this Company, and in concessions that we give to this Company, because it is only natural to expect that other companies coming forward would expect the same concessions as granted here. How can this House or Government grant concessions to one Company and deny them to another? For this reason alone we have

to be very careful in granting such a long time to the Company free of duty as twenty years. As I said before, the Executive Government at the present time has authority under the Customs Act to allow in free of duty anything needed for construction, and I think personally the House would be well advised to have this Bill referred to a Select Committee. I understand that it was the intention of the Company to build a mill capable of handling 500 tons of ore per day. Wasn't that what the Hon. Mr. Sullivan said?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I said 200 tons of concentrates, and that is still the intention, that would be 500 tons a day I imagine.

MR. ASHBOURNE—In yesterday morning's paper there was an interview with Mr. J. W. Williams published, who is Superintendent of operations at Buchans Mine, and in that he speaks somewhere of a 100 ton concentrating mill. I understood first that it was 500, and now it is down to 100, and Mr. Sullivan informs the House his idea is a 200 ton concentrating mill. Let us take it for granted that they are erecting a mill capable of handling 200 tons of concentrates per day. It is estimated that would require perhaps 500 tons of ore, that would mean for 300 days of the year 150,000 tons of ore. 150,000 tons of ore per year. Now they want free entry for 20 years, so for 20 years we would expect then to have in view a total amount of about 3,000,000 tons of ore, that is how I have got it figured out. Now in the course of the interview Mr. Williams is asked as to the extent of the property.

(Reads)

Now those people are not coming down here and going into this thing unless they have some assurance they have something down there, and if they build a mill capable of handling 150,000 tons a year for 20 years there would be 3,000,000 tons of ore worked. Now are we in a position to-day, or is the Government in a position to know the value of that ore?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The Company does not know.

MR. ASHBOURNE — Well if the Company does not know and the Government does not know, how are we to know what concessions to give them? We are told that it may be worth more than the Labrador, and we are told that we expect to get no inconsiderable sum from the 5 p.c. royalty. Unless we are in a position to know what that property is out there, and certainly the Government has a Geologist and should be in a postiion to know, what is the use for us to come in granting duty for 20 years if they are in a position to pay duty on things coming in. What relief they get from taxation! What does the fishermen get, if he wants to start in and build up a place, or any other person here. I consider that this is a great place for wealthy foreign corporations. But when it comes to the Newfoundland taxpayer, he is here and you are going to tax him anyway. Now my argument is that although I am not adverse to capitalists coming into this country, I want to see them coming in, but I also want to be sure that this country gets a square deal, and gets something for having these minerals within her bosom. We have a large body of ore over on Belle Isle, and what benefit is it to the country, except for the labour that it provided. I maintain, sir, that if the Government is desirous of giving these companies encouragement, that at least they should insist that these people smelt the mineral here, or else that an export tax should be paid on the ore as it goes out, commensurate with the value of the ore. There is nothing as far as I know to prevent the A. N. D. Co. from building their own

railway to compete with the Newfoundland railway. If they could not do that they could probably run the concentrates from Millertown to Grand Falls by motor road, and where would our railway come in then. These are the things that it is necessary for us to look into. I do not know if this is the proper place to ask this question, but I would like to ask the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice whether he thinks this bill should be marked as a money bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I would say so, but that is a matter for the speaker. The time to raise that point would be at the Third Reading before it goes to the Upper House.

MR. ASHBOURNE—As I said before I consider that that period of twenty years is too long. It could be cut down to five years, and at the end of that time the Company could come to the Government, and if they needed other concessions I do not think that this Government or any Government would refuse to give them these concessions or a longer period of time, if convinced it was necessary. And the fact that they have been brought in and agreed to by the Executive Government is not a sufficient reason why this House should pass them, because since that time other matters have come up, and the matter of railway building at the present time seems to be somewhat obscure. I would think that for the present this matter be left over until the railway bill comes up for consideration.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, we all agree that it is a very worthy object for the Government to encourage capitalists to come into this country. But in doing that the interests of the counry must also be given consideration. Now I submit, sir, that if we do pass those very sweepting concessions to the A.N.D. Co., then we are not protecting the best interests of Newfoundland. We seem to be always prepared to humble ourselves when any corporation asks for concessions. They are always rosy looking in the beginning, but they do not always appear so rosy looking when we view them more closely. Now as regards the value of this property. It is sheer nonsense for anybody in this House now to even pass an opinion as to the value of this mine. All we can say is that as far as we can learn, and from experts too, men who have been on the spot, is that there seems to be a very valuable deposit of mineral in sight. It seems that the A. N. D. Co. and the Americal Smelters have a very valuable property. As a matter of fact, some time ago, the Prime Minister made what I consider a sweeping statement when he said that Buchan's Mine was of greater value than the Labrador. Now we are glad to hear that, because it does not minimise the value of the Labrador, I suppose. But it seems that sometimes we talk just as we feel, on the spur of the moment. Vast projects of that kind are inclined to make us do it. At the time that the Prime Minister made that statement, we were stressing the value of the Labrador, and we were urging the Govt. to take back from the land grabbers, the landsharks, those valuable areas which were held by them, as far as we could legally do so. It seemed to us then that certain gentlemen on the Government side of the House did not see eye to eye, and were more or less inclined to minimise the value of the Labrador. However, since then I myself have taken some steps to acquaint myself with the value of that mine at the present time. I had an opportunity since of discussing the matter with a mining expert, who put down the first shaft in that mine twenty-five years ago. He is working with the A. N. D. Co. at the present time, and perhaps it would not be right to mention his name in this

House. He said: "I was in charge of the operations there, and we put down a shaft 400 ft. and then we drove ahead 200 ft. and then into another seam, and never once did we get out of the mineral." I asked him what his opinion was as to the value of it, and he said, "In my opinion, it is one of the most valuable properties in the world." He seemed to be well acquainted with that particular class of mineral. I was also speaking to a young engineer, I think that he is operating the diamond drill, and he told me the same thing. Of course whilst it is not conclusive proof it is at the same time in confliction with the report of Mr. Williams the other day. You cannot blame him. He comes into St. John's and is interviewed by a newspaper reporter. He wants to be conservative. Just at this particular juncture, it would not be wise for him perhaps to make extravagant statements with regard to that mine. Besides just at this particular time that those resolutions are before the House, the Opposition have been putting forward strong arguments that that property is valuable. That is one of the reasons why we on this side of the House do not feel that we should give such sweeping concessions to that company at this time. We feel that twenty years is too long. You may point to other agreements made by other companies, and say that they were given a longer period. But you must take the circumstances into consideration. For instance there is no comparison between Buchans and the Humber. Another feature of the bill which we certainly cannot support, and that is the allowing of material for town construction to come in duty free. I submit that there is no parallel between the material for town construction and what is necessary for the operation of the mine, or mill. There is no comparison whatever. Now as far as the town is concerned it is immaterial whether you charge the company duty on the material going into that House, the miner is called upon to pay some rental. There is no doubt about that. I do not see that that is any reason why you should permit the material to come in duty free. I would ask the Government now, so as to secure the co-operation of the Opposition, to have this go through the House unanimously, as I believe it would, to reduce that down to five years. If you cannot get it down to five make it ten. Some time ago, I understand, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines got in touch with the company and they did not seem to be satisfied to agree to the suggestion made by this side of the House. But if they ask this legislature for certain concessions we are not required to tumble over ourselves to give them everything that they ask for. I know that it is a matter of general complaint in Grand Falls, I have head it discussed by the people there, they say that they have to pay rentals of anywhere from $12 up to thirty dollars a month, and lots of these houses are only one storey buildings, and their upkeep is not very great, compared to the houses in St. John's for instance. However, that is a matter that I am not competent to argue on. But I say that it is a strong argument in favour of my contention to know that there is too much duty paid upon the material that went into the construction of the homes in Grand Falls. And I think that if the Government of that day, the Bond administration, was inclined to give those people too many concessions, but at the same time it seems that they drew the line when it came to permitting materials for the construction of their homes to come in duty free. After all what is the people of Newfoundland going to get out of an operation of that kind? We stress the matter of labour. But that is the only thing that we can get.

Assuming that two thousand men be employed at let us suppose the usual rate of 25 cents an hour. That is no more than giving them a mere existence. So I do not think that we should stress that point. But that company has no greater right to expect to erect a town and to get the material in duty free, than Mr. Monroe would have down in Bonavista Bay, if he was to go to an isolated place whether there is no house and start to build a house there. He would not think of asking this legislature to allow the material for that house in duty free. I think that it is altogether wrong. These are the particular points that I would impress upon the committee, that the period of twenty years is too long, and the material for the houses as far as the company is concerned should not be admitted duty free. Of course as far as the homes for the miners and the workmen is concerned that is a different question. But I do not think that this country should be deprived of one dollar that could lawfully be paid here. However the Government do not see fit to consider that. But I want to endorse what Mr. Ashbourne said that this bill be refererd to a select Committee for further consideration.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES—Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member has said that the fifty year period is too long, but I take it that he realises that the whole House, both sides of the House, are trying to make the best possible bargain to the benefit of the country. But we must not lose sight of the fact as I said before that the A. N. D. Co. had rights in that territory with regard to which we are now legislating, under the 1905 Act. There has not been a tap struck, clear of mineral prospecting down on the south side of Red Indian Lake. I will come to that in a moment. The only point that I was a bit anxious about, the point raised by the Hon. Member for Fortune, with regard to the railway rights, and being a lay man, we must only take the word of the Attorney General that that is now covered by the amendment offered by the Member for Fortune Bay, and by the general legislation that the Attorney General gave notice of this afternoon. And in that particular point these two amendments satisfied me that we have nothing to fear with regard to the A. N. D. Co. becoming a competitor of the Newfoundland railway. The Member who comes from one of the most important mining districts in Newfoundland knows that twenty-five years ago when I was a young man, Little Bay was in full swing, and Pilley's Island was a very promising mine. It has since been closed down, and all the men there, practically all miners, have not obtained a dollar's worth of employment from these places, and they have found it necessary to leave the country, and for the past twenty-five years, no serious attempt has been made by any reputable company to develop anything. Year after year people go down to the Crown Lands Office and they take out grants of land with the hope of striking mineral, but as far as developing a mine nothing has been done. No intelligent search has been made for minerals. And now the A. N. D. Co. have succeeded in interesting one of the biggest mining corporations in the world, and with regard to the reports in the papers, whether exaggerated or otherwise I am not in a position to say. The Hon. Member has said: "What have we a geologist for. He should be able to put us in the way of first class information." That is absolutely impossible. His job is only to go over the area and find out whether it contains minerals, but to what extent can only be ascertained by diamond drilling. With regard to the area that we are discussing, I have talked with miners all over

Newfoundland, and it seems that the surface is so hard to bore through that it is almost impossible to get down to bedrock at all. Perhaps you would have to go down thirty feet. And if you have to do that over an extensive period, you can realise what that is going to cost. I point out this argument merely to support the argument made by myself that I am satisfied that twenty years from now, prospecting will still be going on in that area.

With regard to the argument just adduced by the Hon. Member for Fogo, who stated that he had recently been in conversation with some mining expert who told him that twenty-five years ago he had worked at Buchan's Mine, and that he worked in a shaft that was put down 400 feet. I want to tell the Hon. Member that no such thing ever happened, with all due respect to him and the mining expert referred to. Twenty-five years ago there was not a tap struck at Buchan's, except on the south side of Red Indian Lake, where there was a very low grade of copper, that is not of commercial value at the present time. There was a considerable amount of money spent by the A. N. D. Co. in that area, but it had nothing to do with Buchan's Mine. That mine was discovered by electrical process. I was in touch with a company in New York with the hope of getting them here, to do certain work in Conception Bay. It would cost $250 or $300 a day. The person walks over the surface of the ground and the mineral or sulphide ores are discovered by electrical appliances, which indicates only whether the ores are there or not, but it cannot tell in what quantity. That can only be found out by diamond drilling. That was the system adopted to discover the Lucky Strike at Buchan's. Since then two or four diamond drills have been in operation, and I have been informed by Mr. Williams, and I can only take his word for it, as I have no means of finding out whether he is bluffing me or not, but he tells me that since they discovered the mine known as the Lucky Strike Mine, they have not been successful in locating one ounce of additional ore. Consequently I am inclined to believe that the company is playing fair with the Government with regard to what is the value of the property. Whilst I admit that there is a whole lot of truth in the statement of Mr. Williams, still these people must have a nice little property out there, or there would be no sense in their coming in here and building twenty-two miles of railroad, unless they saw some hope of returns for their money. But my suggestion to the Committee is that it is not a matter for us at the present time to offer what terms we like, but we must try to get a reputable company, by giving them concessions to develop our mineral resources. They are absolutely of no value to us while they remain in the bowels of the earth. I think that it is almost impossible to expect that local capital will be able to any extent to develop our resources. Not only our mineral resources, but we have come now to the stage, where I believe that if we are going to properly develop our fisheries, we have got to go out and get foreign capital to do it. Whether it is because we have not got the money or whether it is that we have not sufficient faith in it to put our money in it. We have had many promising mineral propositions, that a considerable amount of money has been put into, but it has been an uphill fight. The promoters of La Manche Mine have been engaged for nearly two years now in trying to get a $100,000 to put that mine on a developing basis. But it is only because of the natural geographical position at La Manche and because of the development work that was done there fifty or sixty years ago when my dad

was one of the pioneer miners, just as he was at Little Bay that this mine can be exploited.

Now I think that everything reasonably possible has been done by the Government to promote the best interests of Newfoundland with regard to housing conditions for workmen at Buchans Mine. I know myself I have worked overtime in connection with this proposition in order to have it materialize and I am prepared to work harder still, as I see no hope for the future prosperity of this country than to have our mineral resources developed to the utmost. Here we have two reputable companies concerned and I dare say they have keen business men watching closely the debates that have been going on regarding Buchan's Mine. The Consolidated Mining Assurance Co. and the British Smelters are now prepared to send in diamond drills and electrical apparatus, and we can hope to have several other mines opened up in that Red Indian Lake territory provided we offer the inducements to outside capitalists to come in. In Canada mining machinery and equipment could be manufactured next door to the mine and there is no duty paid on it, but situated as we are in this country naturally everything has to be imported and duty paid, but I think that we should provide equal facilities with Canada to concerns anxious to come in here.

I do not remember any Bill or any discussion with regard to any mining resource of Newfoundland to compare with the present one. This is the first time in our memory here that any serious attempt has been made or that such interest has been displayed by outside financiers. Even if these reports we have heard about that Buchans Mine is worth a couple of hundred million dollars are greatly exaggerated I do not know if it would be considered good business until the stock is put on the market. I remember during the war period there was a great shortage of copper abroad and there had been a shortage of it for several years before. Some crooks in Arizona took some copper from an abandoned mine and they went to some "sucker" as they thought he was and asked him to buy this copper which was supposed to be no good by the crooks. The man paid over a substantial amount of money, but the mine referred to is one of the richest in the United States to-day. I was speaking not long since to a geologist on the Labrador who had been investigating mines at Burin Island and Little Bay on behalf of the Consolidated Smelters which is spreading all over the country, and let us hope that all these mines will be of lasting benefit to Newfoundland. The time has come when the fisheries are no longer a promising hope for Newfoundland, and the only hope is the development of our mineral and pulp resources. Conditions have changed.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the material, other than lumber, to be used in the building of houses is to come in duty free, and if so, will that make the house rent less for the workingmen by allowing that material in duty free. I am prepared to say that the men will not get the benefit of that reduction at Buchan's Mine. Mr. Sullivan mentioned yesterday the large amount the A. N. D. Co. lost on house rent at Grand Falls. Now that statement of figures he handed us was handed to him to read, and I say here and now that I do not feel like believing that statement. Everything is charged up so high for overhead expenses that it is very easy for the Company to show a deficit. The people are charged fairly high for house rent and I do not think that the rent should be as high as it is. I know that the owners of a dozen or more houses in Grand Falls have paid for them over and over again. To-day if

an occupant of a house in Grand Falls goes to repair his house he has got to stand on something that is likely to break his legs. I lived in a house in Grand Falls and paid high rent for it; but in Corner Brook the houses are much better, even if they did cost more to build. The houses in Grand Falls were only slapped together because I watched the contractors building them. In fact they were so badly constructed that a man could walk through one.

Mr. Sullivan also referred to the cheap coal that was sold the people in Grand Falls and how much the Company lost as a result. I have no knowledge of coal selling there for $10.50 a ton. The last time I was there it was $13.00. Previous to the strike it was $8.00, but after the strike coal went up from $8.00 to $13.50 a ton. All this was done to get after the poor man who was looking for a living wage. The Company kept up that price for a couple of years before they dropped it to $10.50 and I fail to see where the Company lost money on it. With regard to this Buchans Mine measure I want to say that I am not in favor of giving that Company exemption from duty for twenty years, and further I would like for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to itemize the articles they want duty free. I contend this Company has a good proposition and we should not as a legislature be called upon to give them free duty on all their materials for twenty years in connection with the operation of that mine. Why not let it be this way? If they find after they start that they cannot make a success of the project, give them five years free of duty and at the expiration of that period if they cannot make it pay this legislature would be only too glad to make a further extension, provided that the Company would produce their books showing that they are not making this a paying concern. If this Company will not operate without getting free duty for twenty years, there are other Companies in the United States that would buy out this mine, and then if this Company will not sell it out it shows that we should not give them these concessions for twenty years. If they know they have a good thing, they should go ahead under the Customs Act. Grand Falls never got their building material free of duty for twenty years under the 1905 Act. The A. N. D. Company are the best Company that ever came to Newfoundland to do business, but I am against giving this twenty years' concessions at Buchan's Mine when there is nothing in this Bill about wages for workingmen. Every member of this House knows that 25 cents an hour is not enough for any laboring man and his family to exist on and yet we give huge and unlimited concessions to encourage a Company to come in here and operate, and the last thing we think about is our own workingmen and their wages. It may be said that the price to be paid for labor was never stated in any former Bills, but it does not matter what past Governments have done in that direction. Let us start here now and put a clause in the Bill to the effect that 33 cents an hour shall be paid for common labour. I was speaking to a man to-day who is interested in the International Paper Company and he said that the common laborer in the United States and Canada is paid 35 cents and 40 cents an hour; but it appears that we must be satisfied and allow our workman to slave for 25 cents an hour. I consider that both sides of the House should seriously consider this aspect of the Bill in Select Committee. As a rule the skilled workman will get his own price; but I think it is only right and proper to insert a clause in the Bill stipulating a living wage for the unskilled workman. I am therefore in

accord with the motion made by the hon. member for Fogo, namely, that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest with what has been said by Mr. Brown regarding a wage clause which should be inserted in the Bill to protect the interests of the men working in the mine. I do not know what form that should take so as to serve the interests of the men and the Company as well, but I know that it is not new to have such a clause embodied in an agreement with a Company in order to protect the interests of the men in mines or in any other industry. Go to Australia and you will find what they do in the way of fixing wages for the working class of people in that country. In all its mining industries, railways and other industries the great commonwealth of Australia have labor laws specifying wages, not by agreement with companies or laws on the Statute Book, but by machinery set up by arbitration boards. The rates of wages are discussed by that board and whatever decision is arrived at is final and has all the force of law; and if a Bill is enforced in this House such as the present one I cannot see why the Minister of Justice could not have a general enactment in Newfoundland for the protection of the working class of people in this country in relation to wages that workers have to receive and respecting the conditions under which they have to work. I think the time has arrived when legislation of this sort should be introduced here. I feel sure that every member of this House recognises that it is impossible for a man to live and support his family or dependents on a wage of 25 cents an hour. If he wants to clothe or educate his family as he should he cannot do it on such a paltry wage as 25 cents an hour, and in nearly all cases a man who is paid such a low rate of wage has got to take his children from school at an early age. That has been the experience of the vast majority of our people in the past, and if that is so, and if a general law or act is going to be introduced in this House in order to protect the railway from competition from mining companies who are interested in the building of railways, I think that the interests of the working classes ought to be protected in a similar way by a general law, and, so that it would be in the best interests of all concerned, any dispute arising between workmen and employers ought to be submitted to a board of arbitrators for adjustment like what is done elsewhere.

There is another question with regard to railway privileges of the Company. As I pointed out yesterday ,the people of Botwood suffered great inconvenience and loss of money last year on perishable goods. Fresh beef and fruit came from Sydney to St. John's. The people of Botwood had to wait until such time as the A. N. D. Company had all their own material and goods in first before they got theirs. The result was that the beef and fruit arrived in bad condition and had to be destroyed. May I ask what protection is offered in this Bill for any person who may establish a business in Corner Brook? And if that happened in connection with the people of Botwood, is it not likely to happen again in connection with Buchan's Mine? So long as there are persons to be found who will comply with these conditions and there might be quite a number they have to run the risk of their business being inconvenienced in the winter season at any rate by the same conditions prevailing as at Botwood last year and the year before that. So I suggest to the Committee that there be some consultation with the Company in order that people may be protected with respect to their business

affairs at that place and to see if we cannot have something introduced in this Bill to protect the interests of the people who may do business there. We have no guarantee that co-operative stores may do business there. We have no guarantee that there may not be some sort of a monopoly existing there with regard to the sale of general merchandise, and if there are only three or four stores operating in that town; four or five like Grand Falls; they may easily regulate prices amongst themselves. It is very nice to have only three or four business concerns who may have an understanding one with another to divide the trade of the town between themselves satisfy themselves with such and such a price and decide that that is what they are going to charge. These are conditions that should be given attention to in this Bill.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Isn't there a law on the Statute Book to protect people against a combine?

MR. GRIMES—Yes; but we know the history of enforcement of laws of that kind in this country. Suppose, in the winter season, they want to get fruit or fresh meat in from Sydney, and they find that they have got to wait a month or more before they get it, and when they do, it is unfit for consumption. That is a poor position to be placed in.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is the position half the people in the country are placed in as far as I can see.

MR. GRIMES—It doesn't prevail the same as in places where these monopolies exist. With regard to privileges that have been granted in this Bill of free entry of goods; I listened with interest to what the Minister had to say about the mines down in Green Bay, Tilt Cove, Bett's Cove, Pilley's Island, that started under very auspicious circumstances and carried on successfully for a while. They carried them on for a while and yet they never got concessions when starting operations as granted under this Bill to Buchan's Mine. Now if these people were satisfied to start the Pilley's Island Mine and Bett's Cove and these other places without special privileges as granted in this Bill I can't for the life of me see why we should be establishing a precedent in connection with Buchan's Mine and when we do this we leave ourselves open and not without good reason on the part of other companies who may want to carry on mining industries or other industries in this country, to having them asking privileges from the legislature and to be consistent we can't refuse them. Why favour one company or one set of individuals more than another that may ask privileges of this House? And yet this is the precedent we are going to establish if this Bill passes the House in its present form, and I think it is an outrage; an outrage to allow any company to get any other privileges than those privileges under the Customs Act. It has been stated when houses were built down at Port Union they had to pay duty on the material that went into the construction of the houses. When the company started Bell Island they had workmen's houses there and they had to pay duty on material for construction of houses over there, and here we draw the line between these companies and the company interested in the present Bill before the House. It is partially the reason why I think it is unwise on the part of this House to allow the Bill to go through with the privileges granted in connection with exemption on building material and town construction. Now when the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company built their housese there in Corner Brook it has already been stated that rents were charged in Corner Brook higher than in Grand Falls despite the fact that the A. N. D. Company

paid duty for material for building construction for that town and the N. P. & P. got that privilege of building construction material free, and yet we find according to the statement before the House that rents today in Corner Brook are higher than in Grand Falls. That, to me, is self evident that we are going to have no cheaper rents for the working men out in Buchan's Mine because of giving free entry of building materials. Now if there was some proviso in the Bill saying that in consideration of your getting building construction material free of duty that rents are not to be over a certain price there might be some round reason for having it placed in the Bill, but we have no protection whatever against rentals that may be excessive in comparison with the incomes of men working in the mine. I suggest this to the committee that before this Bill passes through the House that they get in touch with the officials of the Company and ask them this question: "If we allow the free entry of material for building construction, will you be ready to agree to a low rental or a rental that will be lower because of free entry of building material than a reasonable rental to be charged in comparison with other such places if you had not that privilege. I don't see why that could not be done and a clause put in here to cover it. I think it is worthy of the consideration of the House and I respectfully suggest that it be seen what can be done in that direction. That term of twenty years; well, we are going to wing in this country giving any company twenty years concessions. Five years it appears to me as already suggested in the House would be quite long enough to give concessions to the company to carry on construction work, and I am in accord with what has been already said in that regard. These are the few points that strike me as being worthy the consideration of the Minister; first, that he see the Company and ask if they will not make the rentals such as will allow of lower rents than paid in Grand Falls to-day or Corner Brook because of free entry for building construction. That is a fair proposition and I think it ought be given consideration.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, this legislation has now been before us some considerable period of time. A lot of different opinions have been expressed regarding the time limit for exemption from duty for the A. N. D. Company who are working in conjunction with the American Smelters. Yesterday we were treated by the Honorable Mr. Sullivan to a history of the A. N. D. Company's philanthropy for Newfoundland in as much as one would gather from his remarks that the A. N. D. Company during the past few years have been going down hill; in other words that their properties at least at Grand Falls have been anything but a going concern. That may or may not be. If they have lost money it is none of our fault. And I feel if they lost money they did it with their eyes wide open or otherwise they were very much closed and the chances are they will take every precaution possible this year to offset the loss.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They are not figuring upon putting the rents up.

MR. CASHIN—I will not believe for one moment that the A. N. D. Co. have lost money. I have never seen the houses constructed for workingmen in Grand Falls and I don't know the charge, but I feel they are business people enough to see they don't lose any money in connection with their general business. If they lost money in connection with their coal business I will tell you the reason; because of their own error a few years ago when they made a long contract with Sydney people when coal was

higher. Anyhow we are not supposed to take the A. N. D. Company's figures for anything. It is none of our business whether they lose or make.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN — I got those figures and I thought they would be of interest.

MR. CASHIN—We know too much of the history of large corporations in this country. I believe the honorable Member will agree with me that they are making enormous profits and when they show them they only show the profits of the parent company in London. It is history now that the A. N. D. Company was selling their product to another company which they control or largely control in England at a low cost so the other company would show a profit and they a loss.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN — Without wishing to interrupt the Honourable Member might I say that the A. N. D. Company are not selling the parent company at less than market price. It is only made possible for the A. N. D. Company to clear profits by the generosity of the parent company and to-day the A. N. D. Company are manufacturing more paper than the parent company can take, and they can dispose of it only at a low figure. The parent company are paying the A. N. D. a bonus over cost. That contract runs until 1930. After that probably Grand Falls will show a different balance sheet.

MR. CASHIN—I anticipate a further explanation from the Honourable Member. As a matter of fact I anticipate a continuation of yesterday's history of the A. N. D. Company and its philanthropy. He worked with them. He is very closely connected with the company at the present time, and no doubt he is more familiar than any other Member in the House with that company's affairs. I do not care what the A. N. D. Co. are making. But I feel that the concessions granted to this corporation under the present bill are anything but what we should call proper, in as much as I understand that there is a Customs Act in this country, which for all mining purposes ,allow machinery necessary for the erection of a mill, or other buildings in connection with the mining industry to be imported in duty free. If that is so why the necessity of this bill at all? That is the point. I have not heard any individual member in this House say as to why this is necessary.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the Hon. Member why this Buchan's Mine Company want those concessions for twenty years. Practically everything is free now under the mining law. But these people do not know what increases may be imposed with reference to the importation of mining material. And any company that comes into this country tries to protect the capital that it has invested. When the A. N. D. Co. got twenty years in 1905 everyone thought that was a wonderful thing. But even to-day the A. N. D. Co. are spending money on capital account. That is why this company is asking to have a period of twenty years over which those concessions are to extend. They are bringing a lot of new capital into this country. The same thing applies to the International Paper Co. and the Gander Valley Co. They are bringing a lot of money into the country and they want to have the assurance that this Government or any other Government, will not handicap them by any extensive duties. That is why they are asking for a forty year period for repair parts. We were not in favour of any of those things, but it is the best we could do.

MR. CASHIN — Mr. Chairman, in connection with the point that has been brought up that the Customs Act may be changed, but no argument will convince me that this Act cannot be changed. I have heard members argue

about the allowing of material for houses for the town site to be imported duty free, but why should that company be allowed to import material for the construction of houses in duty free any more than I am. That is the point. I am not permitted to-day to import material duty free for the building of a house on the Torbay Road. Because the men out there get cheaper rent are we not in St. John's entitled to just as cheap rent. I have not heard any argument put forward by any member of the Government regarding that. To use the Prime Minister's own words, it is preposterous. It is a crime against the ordinary common people of this country. Because here is the position. We know that they have got a good thing. But what is the country getting out of it. It gets a few days' work at 25 cents an hour. What is that to-day. It is alright for a single man. But for a man with a family it is nothing. We have not got a Government yet who has pluck enough to insist that a minimum wage be inserted in any bill that ever came before this legislature. Take the American Smelters who are operating this mine. Ask any other operators today what they are paying mining men in the United States, and you will be told I venture to bet that they are paying at the rate of fifty cents an hour. And then they got the gaul to come down here and try to tell us that in the United States, they are able to produce minerals cheaper than they can down here. They cannot do it, because they are getting labour here on the nigger's style. Now I am not trying to make politics out of this because there is not a man in my district working in Buchan's Mine. These are the salient features in this bill to-day. I know that there are members on the Government side to-day opposed to this bill. I want to ask the Government in all seriousness what are we getting out of it? We have heard so much about our mineral resources, and that our properties have not been developed and that we should be grateful to these companies for coming in here, in order that they may develop those properties. Here is a company that made an agreement for a great many years in January of this year. I understand that that agreement is to be ratified by this legislature. In the interim further discoveries besides what have already been made, have been made. I understand that one place called Lucky Strike is something similar to the bonanza of the Yukon. We know today that this company has got a good thing. And knowing these facts are we justified in giving them these huge concessions, in view of the fact that we are getting nothing in return. I claim that the revenue is receiving nothing under this act. I would suggest to the Government if they are prone to take the suggestion, which evidently they are not, that a clause be inserted in this bill to the fact that a certain price per ton export duty be imposed on these people, provided that they export the products in the raw state. On the other hand if the company are willing to erect the necessary smelter, which they have promised, a promise so peculiar that people do not take them serious in that respect; if they give the guarantee to erect a smelter then I would suggest that this clause be cut out altogether. But we have not any guarantee in this bill to-day that Newfoundland will benefit five cents with the exception that this will advertise this country to the extent that we are too green to burn. I feel that this bill being introduced to this legislature is a private bill, and that as such it should have the impartial consideration of every individual member of this House, and that as such it should not be considered as a Government measure. Consequently we could have the consensus of opinion

of both sides of this House. We have got to look into the future. We have got to consider that possibly in twenty years time there will not be one man that is here to-day alive, and that possibly our children or our children's children will curse the very people who formed this Act, because I admit that we are driven so far in a corner that every cent of profit derived from Buchan's Mine will find its way into the pockets of capitalists. But I have yet to hear from Mr. Sullivan, who is very much interested in this Bill, to explain the reason I should not be allowed to construct a House and have the right to get the material in duty free as well as that Company. If Mr. Sullivan will get up and explain this to my satisfaction, I am finished?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—The explanation is that this Company gives employment to our people.

MR. CASHIN—And do not I give employment in the construction of my house. Some time ago a meeting was held in the Board of Trade by a certain coterie in connection with this Bill and copies of Resolutions were sent to the Government. If that had been a real public meeting this Bill would have no more chance of passing than a snowball would have a chance of living in perdition. That meeting was organized by those who are getting fees out of this Bill. It is just as well to be frank about it. These are the sort of patriots you have in this country. Why should not any individual be entitled to get material in duty free to construct a house as well as the International, A. N. D. Company or any other organization, and why should these companies get exemption from duty for twenty years instead of five years? There are other people in this House who have as much interest in this country as the members of the present administration. Why not cut out this clause which allows this Company to get in their material free for twenty years. There are members of the Government listening to me this evening and if they had backbone in them they would get up and call the bluff of two or three members of the Government who are continually putting the gun to the head of the Government. I am not opposed to the principle of the Bill, I would suggest in all seriousness that the exemption from duty on material for the building of houses at Buchan's mine be reduced to five years and I would suggest that the Minister in charge of the Bill rise the Committee and put the proposition up to the Company. Supposing the Prime Minister, for argument sake, wants to build a fish store on the south side of St. John's or extend his fish business, is he not entitled to free duty of material as much as the capitalists at Buchan's Mine? It appears that outside corporations can get all the concessions they want from the present administration, whereas the people in the country who have to invest their own money to carry on their own businesses have to pay the piper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have not said very much in connection with this Bill; but the Hon. Member for Ferryland gave expression to the opinion that I was in accord with the view that the clause allowing material for the building of houses in connection with Buchan's Mine duty free should be eliminated. I give it as my opinion that of all the free goods in the Bill that we should allow the one permissible is material for the building of suitable houses. The view I take is this, that the one thing of importance regarding any new concern coming into this country is that they should provide suitable housing for their employees and make their employees comfortable. If you don't provide proper houses for the men, miserable shacks will develop. But a corpor-

ation of this kind who puts up houses in connection with townsite construction do not put them up to make money on the proposition. History has proved that industrial housing has never made money for any concern; on the contrary. I asked the International people what their experience has been in that direction and they told me that in no case had they ever been able to get even any interest returns for townsite building. The better the material that the Company can put into those houses on account of getting it in duty free, the better will they be for the men to live in. I think it would be more economical in the end, besides making the lives of the men more comfortable, and, consequently, I am of a different opinion than the hon. member who has just sat down. Consequently I am very strongly of a different opinion from the Hon. Member who has just sat down, and I do think that we ought to give encouragement to this company to build houses fit to live in and to help them to make the lives of these people comfortable. Now as far as this bill is concerned, last year we entered into an agreement with these people, and we agreed to give them free entry for a period of twenty years. These people have been working on this proposition for fourteen years, and they did not seem to be making a success of it. Then they got the American Smelters, a big American Company, who were a long way off, to come down and interest themselves in this proposition. They did so and they said that they would put their capital in the enterprise provided that they got certain concessions from the Government. It was put up to us and we agreed to it. By that agreement as a Government we propose to stand. I would much rather, and the members on this side would prefer also, that we were giving them concessions for four or five years, but we had to give them these concessions for a period of twenty years in order to get them to come in here. We discussed the matter thoroughly with them, and we have as good an agreement as we could make. It must not be forgotten that there have been big corporations that have been given fifty years free entry of duties. The precedent has been there before, not perhaps in a mining corporation, but it is the same thing. We have got a reputable company coming in here, and as a result of that company coming in, the whole world is now looking to Newfoundland with the mining possibilities that it never had before. As a result we have to-day three or four big corporations already down there taking out options on other properties in that particular vicinity. I think that it is very promising that we have this company in here, and that the concessions are very small as compared with the benefit of having them in here. I only want to say that as a Government measure this has got to stand, and it is not a bit of use the Minister of Agriculture and Mines giving any undertaking to go back and talk this matter over again, because the Government is committed to it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Brown gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Wednesday, August 10th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, August 10th, 1927.

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

Mr. Godden gave notice of Question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of Question.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted and an motion of Hon. the Prime Minister on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Justice a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 206 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companys'" was introduced and read a first time and was ordeerd to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the Resolutions. Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd.," was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be head a second time on to-morrow.

Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting a Bill for the confirmation of a contract between the Government of Newfoundland and the International Paper Company.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I understood from the Prime Minister that this matter would not be considered. I understood it was to come up for discussion on Thursday, so I made preparations for Thursday.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, the Government have no desire to force matters. If I had understood from the Leader of the Opposition yesterday that we were to take an adjournment until Thursday, it would have obviated the necessity of coming here to-day. However, I now move that the House at its rising do adjourn until to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Thursday, August 11th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, August 11th, 1927.

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

Mr. Brown gave notice of Question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of Questoin.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 206 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies'" was deferred until to-morrow.

(Second reading of Bill "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd.)

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—I beg to move the second reading. In doing so I do not think it is necessary to make

any lengthy remarks. The matter during the past four or five weeks has been well ventilated from every angle. So I beg to move the second reading.

MR. SCAMMELL—While not calling for a division I want to go on record as being opposed to the second reading of this Bill.

MR. CASHIN—I want also to go on record as be.ng opposed to this in so far as I have outlined my objections to certain points the other day; twenty years exemption duty clause; allowing in duty free of material for construction of houses.

MR. K. BROWN—I want also to go on record as being opposed to the concessions in that Bill, namely, twenty years per.od and free entry for house material.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the Bill entitled "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd.," was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime M.nister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting a Bill for the Confirmation of a contract between the Government and the International Paper Co. of Newfoundland, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I l stened with great attention, as I am sure did every member of the House, to the speech of the Prime Minister outlining the projects of the Government in relation to Corner Brook paper mills and the contemplated Gander Bay enterprise. The Opposition party realize that because of the magnitude of the sums involved and the far-reaching effect for good or evil on the future of this country very careful consideration must be given to these matters and every possible method adopted to safeguard above all the interests of Newfoundland.

For some time past the public has been aware that considerable difficulties, financ.ally and otherwise, were attending the operation of the Corner Brook enterprise and which necessitated the immediate attention of the Government in order that a solution would be arrived at which would prevent th.s important enterprise from going into the hands of a receivership. The Bill which is now before the House is the result of the prolonged negotiations which have been going on between the Government and the other interested part.es for many months past.

Because of the consideration already outlined by me, the discussion of these Bills is a matter which transcends party politics, and they should be discussed, as I feel sure they will be by every member of th.s House in the broad spirit of real patriotism, with a view, primarily and solely to the betterment of the regrettable position in which the country at present finds itself in respect to the Corner Brook enterprise. If, therefore, in the course of my succeeding remarks, I may appear somewhat severely critical, it is simply and solely because I believe that many of the features of this Bill are not in the best interests of the country.

The Liberal party of which I have the honour to be Leader has already been associated with the opening up of new enterprises in this Colony and I should be false to the spirit of my predecessors, Whiteway and Bond, did I not in the name of the party welcome and assist to this country any corporation or group of capitalists which would open up new avenues of improvement and advancement in our people, providing always that the

basic interests of our common country were properly and amply safeguarded. If, therefore, such mod fications and amendments are made to the present Bill before the House as will protect what I conceive to be essential to the needs of the country, I can promise that they will receive every consideration from this side of the House and that every effort will be made to fac litate the progress of these Bills. The Prime Minister has stated, I think, that these Bills must be put through their final stages within a few weeks. Might I point out to him that any effort to unduly rush the discuss on of these matters would be unwise and improper. Upon his own admission it has taken the members of the Executive Government and the various experts engaged on behalf of the International Paper Company many months to arrive at the conclusions which they have embod ed in the bills before the House; and that it is only fair to the members of this House and to the public that every opportunity should be afforded for full and frank discussion in view of the r far-reaching effect upon this Colony.

The Prime Minister has outlined at length the correspondence leading up to these negotiat ons and it appears therefrom that the Government only at first learned indirectly that negotiations had been commenced over the head of the Newfoundland Government in London for the acquisition of these p per mills. It is somewhat surpris ng that the negotiations in connection with the option given to the International Paper Company were conducted and consummated in London before the Government of this Colony were aware of them. The secrecy and the want of courtesy by the parties concerned would seem to call for the severest censure of all shades of public opinion in this Colony.

Might I also refer to the attempt on the part of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company to compel this Colony without any previous warning to pay the interest on the B Debenture Stock as one which calls for the severest criticism of this House. Viewed in the light of later events it was nothing less than an attempt on the part of this Company to rush this Colony headlong into acqu escence in what had already been agreed upon at London without its consent and approval. In this connection let me also refer to the statement in a letter of the Prime Minister to Mr. McNeily published in the publ c press wherein Mr. Monroe stated that the Nfld. P. and P. Co had paid its interests when it came due; and for which the Prime Minister was immediately complimented for his acumen and energy. The statement that the interest was paid by this Company was critically correct and unfortunately for this Colony only crit cally correct. The House will remember that on Thursday last I elicited from Mr. Monroe the further explanation that this amount was ol tained by way of loan from the Bank of Montreal by the Company upon the security of a contract for 25,000 cords of pulp wood which the Government had given to the Company apparently for the very purpose of liquidat ng the interest on these bonds. It is quite apparent that the Bank of Montreal did not and would not loan this amount to a Company that was financially embarrassed unless there was some further security offered. In the ultimate analysis, the Government of this Colony is really paying a part at least of th s indel tedness and the statement of the Prime Minister is only a sort of half truth.

In the course of his speech the Prime Minister dwells at length upon the resources of the International Paper Company, and wittingly or unwitt ngly conveys the impression that this undertaking has behind it the very large resources of that company. This is incorrect, the contract before

the House is between the International Company of Newfoundland which is separate and apart from the Company he has referred to. It is true that it is owned and controlled by member of the American Company. But there is absolutely nothing in the Bill before us to indicate that the vast resources of the American Company would be behind this proposition in the event of default. Qu te the contrary. The very fact of the incorporation of the Newfoundland subsidiary indicates most clearly that the International Paper Company of America is endeavouring, and most effectively to safe-guard itself from any liability in this respect. If the Prime Minister had obtained the guarantee of this Company, then I would say that he had done a stroke of real business but it will appear as I proceed further that the parent Company is putt ng up comparatively little and that the entire enterprise is being financed upon borrowed capital precisely as the old Newfoundland P. and P. Co. was. I submit that in a proposit on of this character wherein there is so much at stake, the Prime Minister might have stated these facts more clearly and more frankly. The ability of the International Paper Company of Newfoundland to carry out the obligat ons which it has taken upon itself lies in the success or failure of the local Company now making a contract with the Government

In considering this matter we should bear in m nd that the practical result of the Bills now before the House is that they secure to the International Paper Company a virtual monoply of the Pulp and Paper and Power resources, not alone of Newfoundland but of Lal rador. The only remaining power and paper resources of any value in Newfoundland under these Bills become the property of this large Trust through its subsidiary Newfoundland Corporat on. Not alone this, but when once the International has got a firm foothold in Newfoundland is it likely that any other company is liable in the future to dispute its rights to take over the vast timber and power resources of Labrador? In such a case the Internat onal would have the great advantage of being on the spot, and in addition its experience in Newfoundland would better fit it to make a success of a similar venture on the Labrador. Consequently when once this Company has become established in Newfoundland there is virtually no prospect of any opposition or competition to its extending its way over Labrador. This may or may not be a good thing, according as the rights of the people of this country are properly secure l. It certainly w ll not be a good thing for the people of Newfoundland if the contract in its present form is permitted to pass this Legislature. Neither will it be a good thing for this country if one Trust has within its power the means of controlling in any one direction the industrial activities of Newfoundland either here or in the Labrador. I think that in cons dering this Bill the prospect of what may happen in the future in this respect, ought to receive the grave attention of the members of this House, irrespective of polit cs, because this is an issue which gravely affects the future of this Colony and which may be fraught with serious consequences to us in the years to come. Another consideration which I would like at the outset to place before this House is the necessity of carfully scrutinizing every section in this Bill. Although I am only a layman, from a scrutiny of the Bill I can see that the various sections have been drafted by experts for the Company and that very many of the sections are capable of being construed n any sense, but in the interests of Newfoundland. If a Trust of the size of this Company is al le to bewilder and confuse the courts of the United States of America it is not too

much to deduce a similar state of affairs may happen here. It seems to me that very many of the sections could be more clearly and more simply drafted if it should suit the interests of the Company to do so.

The Prime Minister has stated that the Bank of England is willing to cancel a loan of Ten Million Dollars secured by a First Mortgage on part of the property of the Company and to take instead preference shares in this enterprise. I presume that the First Mortgage referred to is that covering the assets of the Utilities Corporation. If that be so then the Prime Minister's inference as to the Bank of England becoming a partner in the industry is not altogether correct. The Bank of England becomes a partner in the industry because it has no other choice under the circumstances. If I am correct in my inference and the assets covered are those of the Utilities Corporation, which includes town site, power plant and steamships and transmission line, it would seem that the International people would very naturaly refuse to take over any part of the enterprise unless the entire enterprise including steamships, power plant and town site was included. The town site and other assets of the Utilities Corporation would be of very little value if divorced from those of its parent company. Consequently the Bank of England, which is a heavy creditor of the Armstrong-Whitworth Company, has no alternative under the circumstances. In addition, unless the properties covered by the "Utility" bonds were included in the assets behind the £4,000,000 first mortgage bonds, even the International Paper Company could not hope to successfully float the issue in the money markets of the world. However, the Prime Minister omitted to state that the Bank of England in exchange for its $10,000,000 of "Utility" bonds would get $2,500,000 in cash in addition to $10,000,000 7 per cent. Preference Shares. A very good deal for anyone to make, particularly in view of the fact that the Armstrong-Whitworth Company, behind whom the Bank of England stands, is in serious financial difficulties.

I shall now refer to the capitalization of the Company as dealt with in the Prime Minister's speech. In this respect let me ask the Prime Minister exactly what capital the International Paper Company is putting into this enterprise. It is true that the mortgage debt is dropped from forty-one million to twenty-five million. This includes the old amounts due by the N.P. & P. Co. This is simply and solely because there is no other alternative. The sixteen million dollar difference has disappeared and we shall be lucky if there is enough equity in the enterprise as it at present stands to protect the ten million bonds guaranteed by our government. The reason for the cancellation of the ten million dollar utility bonds I have already referred to in my previous remarks. The $6,500,000 of Income Debentures are cancelled simply because they have no value whatever. It is the intention of the company to raise four million pounds first mortgage bonds prior to the A. and B. Debentures guaranteed by the British and Newfoundland Governments respectively. Of that four million pounds, one million is to pay off the first mortgage bonds consented to by Minute of Council of our Government last year and at present held by the Bank of England. Let me point out in this connection that we are here called upon to ratify a transaction which according to the best legal opinion of this country is absolutely illegal and does not bind our Government. Let me remind the Prime Minister of an opinion published in the Evening Telegram last spring and said to have been written by the present Acting-Deputy Minis-

ter of Justice for the Government, in conjunction with three other legal minds. In that opinion it very clearly states that the one million pounds first mortgage bonds referred to are not binding upon the Government of the Colony and are not a first charge on the assets of the N. P. & P. Co. as against our Colony. Why then should we give a present to the N. P. & P. or any other corporation of this large sum of one million pounds which we are obliged to guarantee and which constitutes no obligation on this Colony. I submit that before this Legislature ratifies this contract it should be absolutely certain that it is not giving away one million pounds to a foreign corporation, a sum which the people of this Colony can ill afford at this or any other time to give away.

The remaining three million pounds to be raised by first mortgage bonds is I presume the working capital of the company and to be used in paper making machines and fixed assets. There is no indication whatever in the Prime Minister's speech as to what capital the International is putting into this enterprise. This three million pounds is to be supplied by foreign investors for which they are to be paid the regular interest on such class of bonds, and to have a first mortgage on all the assets of the property. This money is not put up by the International Paper Company and I submit that if the International Paper Company is honest in its faith in this enterprise that at least it should put up out of its own resources a substantial portion of the new capital needed to put this enterprise upon its feet. Up to the present there is no indication whatever that the International Paper Company is prepared to put in one dollar of new capital but yet it obtains and demands from the Government of this country a contract that practically exempts it from taxation giving it all that remains of the timber and water power resources of this country and yet if a failure occurs the International will have practically no stake in the enterprise to lose. I have yet to learn what improvement will take place in the Conony's position under the guarantee. No matter how valuable the property the position of third mortgage with $30,000,000 of prior mortgages ahead of it is anything but hopeful.

I should be very glad to encourage anything which may encourage new construction work in this Colony, because it is sorely needed at the present moment, but there certainly is a point at which the advantages to be obtained from such work may be altogether too costly to the people of this country. In addition I should like to know if the fifteen million dollars of new capital is to be expended solely on construction work or if a portion of it is to be paid to the Reids for their Gander River property. If so, how much and under what conditions?

With respect to the exemption in taxation referred to in the Prime Minister's speech, I shall support the exemption from duty of articles necessary for construction work and not obtainable in Newfoundland, but I do think that the clauses in question are altogether too favourable to the Company and I am heartily opposed to the extension of this right. It is both morally and economically unsound for us to legislate for generations yet to come. We cannot and should not attempt to bind them nor have we any right to do so. Is it fair, or is it wise, to place a yoke around the necks of succeeding generations? If the Company is successful and tides over its early years, then it should pay its share in the cost of the Government of this country the same as any other individual. It is contrary to common sense to think that the people of this country twen-

ty or thirty years to come are going to permit a wealthy corporation to escape its proportionate share of the burden that they will have to pay. If the Company is not a success, then further adjustments will have to be made and taxation will have to be adjusted. Let me also in this connection refer to the drafting of these sections which leave many loop holes for the Company. For instance, the Company is obliged to pay duty on lumber of all sizes and qualities manufactured in Newfoundland from timber grown in Newfoundland if such timber can be obtained in Newfoundland, as and when and of what sizes and qualities required by the Company from time to time. From the wording of this section it is easy for even a layman to see how the Company may evade this section upon the ground that on certain times it is not convenient for it to purchase Newfoundland timber. A similar objection would apply to the succeeding section 5, which deals with windows and doors, and ships, boats and barges. It would not be hard for a lawyer from a scrutiny of the bill I am sure to discover serious loop holes in it. I am unalterably opposed to anything which may fetter the legislative powers of the people of this country or its legislature for a period of forty or fifty years. I am opposed to these sections, not alone upon the principle that it takes from the sovereignty of this Legislature but also because it is contrary to good policy and common sense and to our duty to future generations in this country.

I am sorry to state that it is only too apparent that in this contract as in other contracts of the past Newfoundland is making a poor man's bargain with the odds all against him and I appeal with confidence to the verdict of the years yet to come to bear me out in this contention. I am glad to note that it is the intention of the Company to install two extra machines at Corner Brook, but there is nothing new in this. It was contemplated by the N.P.P. Company, and it was necessary that these machines should be installed in order that enough additional output could be made in order to operate the enterprise at a profit. Certainly the country is gaining nothing by making the installation of these two extra machines conditional upon the right to export pulpwood. It was absolutely necessary to place these machines there anyway. They were necessary in order that the mills should operate at a profit and they would be installed whether or not the right to export pulpwood was granted by this Colony.

I am absolutely and unalterably opposed to the granting to the International Paper Company of Newfoundland or to any other corporation the right to export pulpwood from any lands in this country. It has been a cardinal policy of this legislature since the passing of the Anglo - Newfoundland Development Company contract by the Bond administration in 1905 to keep within the Colony pulpwood and other raw materials for manufacture here in order that the people of this Colony may have the full benefit of the splendid resources which Providence has given us. It is both unfair and indecent for this Company and for this Government to depart from this policy. The fact that some slight exceptions have been made in the past does not justify this departure from the settled policy of this country. If the Corner Brook and Gander River enterprises are to operate within the scale outlined by the Prime Minister then we will have pressing need to keep within this country every stick of pulpwood that is now within it. It is unfair and unjust for any company to ask us to sacrifice our timber resources,

If I oppose the granting of this right in an even greater measure must I oppose the extension of this right for a period of fifty years yet to come, and for the reasons which I have just outlined. It is unjust and unfair to generations yet unborn thus to give away what will be their heritage just as much as it is ours. I appeal to members of the Legislature, irrespective of the party with whom they may be identified, to radically amend, and if possible destroy sections dealing with the export of pulpwood which are not and never will be in the best interests of Newfoundland.

I now come to the sections of the bill dealing with taxation. The Agreement provides for a flat payment of $75,000.00 a year for four years and thereafter $150,000.00 per year, calculated before interest. Might I state at the outset that the wording of Section 2 (c) of the Act is unnecessarily confusing. It is clear that it has been set out in the form in which it is for some reason because otherwise it could be very much more simply and more clearly drawn. Might I ask the Prime Minister if he can tell this House why this section is in its present form and, furthermore, why the tax is not in the same form as in the Humber Bill of 1923, that is to say a royalty of $1.00 per ton of paper produced and 25 cents per horsepower. Then, again, why does this section bind and fetter the people and legislature of this Colony in respect to taxation until 1973. I have already objected upon points of public policy to similar sections in other parts of this Act and the objections which I have raised apply in like manner to this exemption. The extension of this privilege for nearly fifty years is unfair and unjust and no self-respecting people are going to be bound by it. I submit that taxation should be based upon the output of paper and upon the horsepower developed as in the Humber Contract of 1923. This is the only fair and reasonable way to tax this Company. If the Company is a success then the people of this country are entitled to a proportionate share of that success. If it is a failure then this country will be obliged to foot the bills anyway. Under the present section if the Company is a real success, as I sincerely hope it will be, then it is not obliged to pay its proportionate share of taxation to the revenue of this country. The consumer and the fisherman and the labourer will be obliged to contribute their proportion but this corporation will not. If this corporation is not a success then this tax will not be paid in that event. If the tax collectable under the Act of 1923 has not been collected from the Corner Brook enterprise, then the failure is with the Prime Minister and those associated with him. The blame, if any, must rest upon the shoulders of his government and not upon the framers of the 1923 contract.

The Prime Minister congratulates himself upon the surrender by the Company of large water powers upon Hamilton River Labrador. I am sorry to say that he has not stated all the facts and that when I state the full facts the country will not look upon the transaction with the same complacency as he seems to do in the speech delivered by him upon the introduction of this contract. The facts are as follows: In 1915 the water powers on the Hamilton River, referred to by the Prime Minister, were granted to the Newfoundland Products Corporation, conditional upon their expending within four years the sum of ten million dollars in and about the works of said company on Labrador. In 1919 the said contract was renewed by Act of the Legislature for a further period of four years. In 1923 it was renewed for a period of five years, so that if the

International Paper Company desire to avail themselves of the water rights referred to in these contracts and situated in Labrador it would be necessary for this company to expend ten million dollars in a short time. Beside there is a legal tangle with a Canadian concern. Consequently the International Paper Co. in giving up these water rights is giving up a privilege that as present is more of a liability than an asset. If the International Paper Company loses its rights to water powers on Labrador it also rids itself of an obligation to expend ten million dollars at an early date. Consequently the Prime Minister, when he speaks of regaining for Newfoundland these water power resources is making an empty boast, and his bubble is quickly pricked by reference to the facts of the case.

I cannot close my observations on this Bill without reference to section 7, which states that "so far as the company finds to be reasonably possible all workmen employed by the Company in Newfoundland in connection with its works under the Agreement shall be of Newfoundland nationality." That clause is not worth the paper upon which it is written. The employment of Newfoundland workmen is made obligatory when the Company, on its own discretion, finds it to be reasonably possible. It merely leaves off where we began. It gives the Company the discretion that it always had to employ whatever workmen it cared to employ irrespective of where they came from. The clause is placed in the contract for the purpose of deluding the unwary. it is deception and surplusage in the worst form and if the Government had any vestige of respect for the people of this country they ought to cease the farce and delete the clause altogether and insert a minimum wage. If the Prime Minister is in earnest then I would suggest for his consideration the insertion of a clause guaranteeing to all persons employed by this Company the same standards of wages as those paid in Canada for work of a similar character. We would not then be confronted with the humiliating spectacle of Newfoundlanders working side by side with Canadians and Americans and obtaining one-half the wages paid these foreigners for the same class of work.

I am sorry to say that the more I study this contract the less it has to recommend itself for adoption by this country. Are these the best possible terms obtainable and is it necessary for Newfoundland to concede terms to the International Company that would hardly be demanded of a South American Republic in the throes of perpetual revolution? Has the Government endeavoured to negotiate a beter contract with any other corporation? I understand upon good authority that several English firms and one Canadian firm were in the market for Corner Brook and that their overtures met with a cold reception.

Let me appeal to members of the Government to view this contract in a broad, non partisan light. It is more important that this country should obtain an equitable contract and ample safeguards, than that this party should be in, or that party out. If the Government will revise this contract and assure the people of this country a square deal as against this foreign trust, then I for one, and I feel sure the individual members of my party as well, will give the Government our wholehearted support and assistance on this matter. The Prime Minister himself must know that this contract ought not to pass. If he has not convinced himself of this fact from a study of this Bill, then I would suggest that he fortify himself by a consideration of the convincing arguments that members

of his party have already used against it. Let me appeal to him, once again, to lift this question out of the mire of party politics, let us approach the question from a business standpoint and let us see if we cannot give Newfoundland something better than "the poor man's bargain" that is now before the House.

I now come to consideration of the second set of resolutions before the House, namely, those dealing with the Gander Valley enterprise. In his speech of last week the Prime Minister dealt with these Resolutions upon the assumption that they were going to be operated by the International Paper Company. Although he did not make it clear in his remarks, I presume the Prime Minister meant the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, and not the parent company. I submit that before this House proceeds to a consideration of this agreement it is entitled to request that this House be furnished with the details of the arrangements entered into between the Reids, who control the Gander Valley Power & Paper Company, and the International Paper Company. The whole of the Prime Minister's Speech in this respect is based upon the assumption that the ultimate parties with whom this Colony will be obliged to deal will be the International Paper Company. It is only fair and reasonable that this House should be furnished with the exact state of relations that exists between the International and Reids. What is the consideration that is being paid to the Reid Newfoundland Company ? Who is paying that consideration, and if the International Paper Company, is that consideration being taken out of the proceeds of the four million pound bond issue, or is it paid by the International Paper Company itself. If the latter case, then the International Paper Company is giving a tangible grant of good faith. If the former, then I submit that the whole transaction must be still more carefully looked into. It may be that the International Paper Company is paying the money immediately and is going to reimburse itself from the proceeds of the large bond issue. If that be the case matters are not very much improved, but I submit that the country in view of the magnitude of the interests involved, is entitled, so to speak, to have all the cards laid on the table and to a full explanation of the exact relations between the Reids and the International Paper Company. Until this information is laid upon the table of the House I am prepared to go further and state that the consideration of this bill should be deferred by the House until that time. It serves no good purpose to go back over the history of the past but the record of the country shows the need of extraordinary caution on the part of this colony when dealing with this project.

I have already stated that the drafting of this bill requires careful examination at the hands of this House if the Colony's interest are to be properly safeguarded. Let me now give another instance. Under the terms of the agreement the Company is to spend upon the construction of a two hundred ton pulp mill at least $500,000.00 per year for the years of 1929, 30 and 31 ,and $1,000,000.00 in 1932, with the option of delaying the completion for two years on paying to the Government a penalty of $50,000.00 a year. This statement of fact which is taken from the Prime Minister's speech, is only correct in as far as it goes. He omits to say that the period of completion is further conditional upon delay due to causes beyond the control of the company This may mean anything and this most certainly gives to the Company a splendid chance to delay the completion of this mill indefinitely. If there are any obligations under the provisions of

Section 14 of this Bill that are binding it is most certainly those which are against the Government of this Colony. If there are any which can be easily evaded it is certainly those which are in the interests of the Company. The Company clearly has the right to delay the completion of the mill if such delay shall have been due to causes beyond the control of the Company. There is absolutely no proper safeguard to the Colony under the provisions of this section that the pulp mill will be completed as out lined by the Prime Minister in his speech, because the Company may from time to time, if it so desires to raise plausible pretext for delay which will come within the meaning of this clause. This clause as it stands to-day must be radically amended, I submit, before it can meet with the approval of this House. With respect to the provisions for the export of pulp wood. They are the same for both mills and I have already placed myself on record as being unalterably opposed to the export of this raw material from the Colony. It is not necessary for me to summarize the arguments against this radical departure from the policy of conserving our raw materials and there is nothing whatever in the arguments before the House that would justify our Legislature in departing from a rule of policy that is suggested by common sense and by the exxperience of the past The greatest assets that Newfoundland and Labrador possess to-day are its forests and unless its forest wealth is carefully conserved, very little will remain for future reserves.

The Government proposes to build a branch railway of approximately thirty miles in to the mill site by 1928. I desire to place myself on record as being strongly opposed to this clause. In 1905, when the possibilities of this Colony for pulp making and paper-making were as yet unknown the Government made a contract with the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co. It was necessary for that Company to construct a rail line from the main line to Grand Falls and from the main line to Millertown Junction. At the time when this industry was in its pioneer stage there was not even a suggestion that the Government should construct a railway for the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., and now when the pulp and paper possibilities of this country have been evidently proved to the satisfaction of the International Paper Company it is proposed that the Government should construct a railway for them to their mill site. I submit that this is grossly unfair to the people of this country. If the Harmsworth interests had sufficient faith in 1905 to construct a railway at their own cost then I submit it is only fair and reasonable that this railway should also be constructed by the Gander River Company, or the International Paper Company as the case may be. It is no argument to say that the company has agreed to pay full interest and sinking fund required for cost of construction of this branch line. If the company is prepared to face the utlimate responsibility then why does it not undertake the original construction of the line It would be advantageous to the company itself and the company could construct the line according to its own ideas. It is a well recognised fact that construction by the Government is not as economical or as well informed as that undertaken by a private company. I could see no argument to justify the building of this railway by the Government, but I can see every reason why this necessary development should be undertaken first and last by the company who is the sole beneficiary from it.

We have had lately before the consideration of the House the Buchan's

Mine Agreement. Did the American Smelters ask the Government of this country to construct the railway leading to their projected mine? If the American Smelters had sufficient confidence in their property to undertake the construction of their own railway at their own expense, then I submit that a "one horse" company like the Gander River Company should also do likewise. It is absurd and grossly unfair to grant to a company of dubious financial standing railway concessions which a larger corporation like the American Smelters would not dream of asking.

Then again, the Gander River enterprise if it is ever operated will be altogether operated, except for a few winter months from the seaboard. That is to say, all shipments, inward and outward will be made from the port of the mouth of the Gander River, where the proposed mill will be established. Consequently the railway will be operated, if at all, only during the winter months and the revenue obtained from operation will hardly be sufficient to pay for the axle grease used.

If the Prime Minister is anxious to spend some money in his constituency, then I would suggest that in conjunction with other members representing northern constituencies, he would devote the money from this futile railway construction project into providing good roads in Trinity, Bonavista and Notre Dame Bays, which to a very large extent have not yet felt the beneficial effects of Mr. Monroe's tourist policy.

I am not surprised at the testimony which is voluntarily offered by the Prime Minister to the fine spirit in which the International Paper Company has entered into the negotiations with the Government. If I were at the head of the International Paper Company I should be inclined to feel as the Prime Minister says they feel at having accomplished a deal in which they obtained all the concession that they require from the Colony without being obliged to give anything, or comparatively nothing in return. If necessary to spend $500,000 to give employment, spend it on roads in different districts in need of roads.

This latter agreement is made with the Gander River Pulp Co., which is controlled by the Reids. Although it has been incorporated for 4 or 5 years with a capital up in the millions, it has as yet only subscribed and paid up **four** shares, of $100 each.

And yet this is the corporation to which this Colony may be obliged to look in the event of default. Where are its assets, and what tangible security free from mortages and other charges has it to offer this Colony for the performance of its contractual obligations.

I have already pointed out that the same state of affairs exists in respect of the International Paper Company, Ltd., of Newfoundland. If the Company defaulted, and such a thing has been known to occur before, then all this Colony has to look to is a property consisting of pulp lands and paper mills encumbered by prior mortgages of $30,000,000. Under these conditions our equity in the Corner Brook enterprises is not worth the paper upon which this contract is written.

I can scarcely yet conceive that any group of sane men, acting as trustees for the people of this country could enter into agreements of the character now before this House and afterwards come here and attempt to justify them. I have thought that as a result of these much-heralded negotiations the Prime Minister would succeed in freeing this Colony from the guarantee given under the 1923 contract, that the capital of that Company would be reorganized, and a new and more capable management installed. Instead of this we are worse

off than ever. Formerly the industry had charges prior to ours of $10,000-000 or an interest charge of $500,-000 per year, and if we include the illegal $5,000,000 1st mortage loan, an interest charge of $750,000. In other words the mills had to make a net profit of at least $750,000 before they could start to pay the interest on our bonds. The annual interest charges under this agreement prior to our 3rd mortgage will be over double this amount or between $1,500,000 and $2,-000,000, and this does not include the amount annually payable into the sinking fund. The conclusion is obvious that under this agreement Newfoundland is taking all the risks and the Company is undertaking comparatively nothing, except the $2,500,000 paid to the Bank of England and in which the Colony does not benefit one cent.

The mere fact that default is made does not mean the shutting down of the Corner Brook Mills. Did the mines at Bell Island cease operations when Besco defaulted in its bond interest? As a matter of fact the National Trust Company since taking charge has paid off all arrears of interest on the 1st mortgage bonds and hopes to settle the remainder in September next. If this Company cannot make a fair contract with the International, let us at least make an honest effort to accomplish something better before making the abject and unconditional surrender of this Colony's interests that is embodied in the Bills now before this House.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to delay the time of the House this afternoon in connection with the able address read to the House by the Leader of the Opposition, as one naturally requires some little time to study the lengthy and detailed remarks of his. However, there are a few points that struck me forcibly and which I should now like to deal with. I want the Leader of the Opposition and his associates to understand that there is no intention on the part of the Government to try and rush this Measure through the House. It is true that there are International gentlemen here proposing to go to London as quickly as they possibly can in order to meet their financiers and exercise their option and it is not desirable that their trip should be postponed for any lengthy period; but there is no desire to insist on rushing matters and every latitude will be given honourable members to study and discuss both Agreements. There was a suggestion that the Government lent the money to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company to pay their interest on the bonds. What actually happened was that we made an arrangement with them to cut 25,000 cords of wood because we found that we were being pestered for employment last winter and to meet this contingency an arrangement was made with the Company to cut 25,000 cords extra for which the Government would go security. It did not embarrass the Government to any extent and had nothing whatever to do with the interest. I want it to be clearly understood that this was purely a transaction separte entirely and if the N.P. and P. Company were to gather by a little money in order to facilitate the payment of interest, we have not paid it. As far as the Bank of England is concerned, they had no other alternative but to accept the security, as offered. The Bank of England had a mortgage on the utility bonds and it was absolutely their property, they could, of course, foreclose the mortgage, but much of the material there, as for instance the town site, would not be particularly valuable, except to a company operating the mill there.

Now with regard to the Labrador water power, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition made a rather absurd statement to the effect that the Inter-

national Company were getting clear of something that was rather a liability. There was no liability, for if the International did not spend ten millions of dollars at the start they would have no right to the property. But under the new agreement the property reverted to the Crown immdiately. The correct date of the last extension .s 1933 and not 1928 as stated by the honourable member. As far as the matter of minimum wage is concerned. the only solution to wages is to increase employment since wages are governed by the law of supply and demand, and the Government are desirous of securing all the employment they can for the people of the country. As to what the International paid the Reids for the Gander property is no concern of the Government's, I contend; but it does interest the country to know if the Reids are being paid out of the three million pounds. The Leader of the Opposition stated that we could do much better than build a railway on the Gander. In that respect I concur, but the country has spent money on worse propositions, because here is a place where a railway will open up a large section and connect the main line of railway with a big enterpr se and I feel sure the member for Fogo will agree with me in this assertion. It must be remembered that railways were built in the past in this country to very very small sections and where there was not nearly the opportun ties offered as are offered in Fogo district.

That is all I wish to say. The other points are matters of detail more or less in connection with the B.ll and can be taken up as we go through the Bill in Committee.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, there is no advantage in arguing these points brought up by the Prime Minister but I want to make myself clear on certa n matters. First of these is the action of the Bank of England. The Bank of England had a mortgage on the utilities of this Company for two million pounds. They could not foreclose their mortgage because the utilities which they had are of no use to anybody standing alone. If they d d foreclose the mortgage and have a forced sale on the utilities on which they had security they certainly would not realise one quarter of two millions. Therefore I said in accepting :n lieu of ten million dollars mortgage in utilities they got two and a half millions in cash and ten mill.on dollars in seven per cent. preference shares. They got as much in cash really as they would have got if they had a forced sale on the utilities mortgage; in my opinion, unless these utilities were bought out by a company like the International Paper Company who purchased the rest of the property and I doubt if the company would buy one part of the property without buying the other and I still contend the Bank of England made a good deal for the Bank and it was about the only course they could pursue, for their own sake. In reference to the Labrador the Prime Minister stated that the International Paper Company have no liabilty, but if they wish to retain the water power on the Labrador they had the liability of having to expend ten million dollars in a very short time and also they would probably be mixed up as far as I can learn in a tangle in the courts with the Dickey concerns with Canada and perhaps they might lose all those water powers. After all the International Paper Company who took over the assets of the Newfoundland Products Company may not have won for themselves the right to these powers on the Labrodar. Evidently they had been mixed up in a law suit with a chance of losing it and in addition they had to spend ten millions in a short time to retain the rights they had. In reference to the minimum wage that is not political. I am s n-

cere; and I would go further and say this I would support something that would make the minimum wage in this country at least thirty cents an hour for any class of labour. No man in this country can live on twenty five cents an hour for labour particularly at the present time when everything costs so high, and every corporation and every industry should have a minimum wage of at least thirty cents an hour to protect the people of the Colony, and any industry that cannot pay thirty cents an hour, that is only a mere living wage, would better not be running at all. I have often stated to members of the party, during the last two or three years, that I would like to see a minimum wage in this country of at least thirty cents an hour, and there isn't any reason Newfoundland working men should not be put on the same basis in any of these industries as the workmen of Canada and America. We know what happened during construction period of the Humber. Men came in from Canada, working side by side with Newfoundlanders, and were getting twice as much wages; in some cases three times as much. I am very strong on the minimum wage, very strong on the people of this country being paid at least sufficient to exist on. After all, if there are fair wages the good reverts back to everybody; those in business; in the Government, and everywhere else. A good many things I mentioned with the object of getting the criticism of the Prime Minister on them so I could be clear about them. I mentioned, in reference to the agreement between the International Papr Company and Reids—I suppose I look on Reids as the Gander Valley Pulp and Paper Company—that these resolutions were giving large concessions to the Gander Valley Pulp and Paper Company, a company with a paid up capital of $400, and we are undertaking here to pass a Bill to give the Company a lot of concessions and they are taking on themselves a lot of obligations to the Government. We suppose the International Paper Company are going to buy out the interests of Reids and take over the Gander Valley Pulp and Paper Company but we only suppose that, and I think the Government and those discussing the Bill should have some idea what are their intentions. Certainly they don't expect us to argue here for days and give concessions to a concern entailing obligations of millions with a capital of only $400. If the railway is constructed and the mill not built, they undertake to reimburse the expenditure. How are they going to do that with a capital of $400? That is all we know about the position. They might have behind them capital of a million, but when discussing the Bill, we should have some information we can speak about and know how we stand, because if we look at the facts as they stand, it is not worth our while wasting time.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman: May I be permitted to ask the Prime Minister whether during the negotiations with the International Paper Company the question of a minimum wage was brought before them?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No. It hasn't been brought before them.

MR. GRIMES—Well, I think it would be a very wise suggestion for the Government to accept, what has been stated by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. That Company should be asked if they would be satisfied to have a clause enacted in this measure providing for a minimum wage of at least thirty cents an hour. Some of the men to-day associated with the International Paper Company have to deal with large organizations in the United States and Canada and a great many of these organizations and particularly amongst the paper makers in Maine I think and some of the Western States have committees appointed for the purpose of

discussing any grievances that arise between the company and employees or if they want to have a wage established it is submitted to this board and they get in consultation with the company and a rate of wage is usually arranged satisfactorily to the company and the men and I don't think in the last several years there has been any trouble with strikes in the United States in connection with this company. And if they had been satisfied in the United States, certain of the States at any rate, to accept a principle of that kind surely there would be nothing out of the way if they were asked to accept a similar principle in this country. The principle of a minimum wage. It has been stated that the law of supply and demand regulates wages; but, that doesn't apply in all cases. The lawyer doesn't allow the law of supply and demand to affect what his income will be; neither does the medical man nor the clergyman nor a number of other professions. They have their own fixed rates applying to everyone whether there is an over-supply of lawyers or an under-supply; and the same with other professions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The same with labor unions. They set fixed rates.

MR. GRIMES—I submit it would be better to have some clause in a measure of this kind that would specify the wage to be received. We can save a lot of trouble. We know what trouble there was in connection with the Corner Brook enterprise. All sorts of things happened during the construction period and if we had some committee or commission or some authority on the part of some body in connection with Government who could deal with these things promptly when a thing of that kind would arise we could save a lot of trouble such as has happened before. We should learn by experience. In reference to a minimum wage we might consider what has happened in other parts of the British Empire. Take Australia and New Zealand and consider what the minimum wage has meant out there. The prosperity of Australia and New Zealand to-day is greater than in any part of the British Empire. They have a minimum wage established in connection with various industries of the country. It is usually agreed on there upon the decision of the Board to deal with these things.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Government doesn't lay down legislation.

MR. GRIMES—No. But they lay down this. They have a wage board that the employee can appeal to in reference to the wages they require or hours of labor or conditions under which they work that they may desire to have changed and there is an opportunity given to meet on this Board and means are provided that they can argue amongst themselves; employer and employee meet with the Board as umpire to hear their conversations and then whatever arrangement is agreed on with regard to wages, hours, or conditions under which they have to work, whatever is agreed on, has all the force of law and becomes binding on both parties and that can remain in force just as long as both parties are agreeable or until they see it necessary to change. I submit that the Government, not having asked the International Paper Company whether they will accept a wage clause in this Bill should do so. Let the suggestion, it is a very proper suggestion, be accepted, that the Government go back to the representatives of the Company and ask them if they are not satisfied to have a wage clause inserted establishing a wage of not less than thirty cents an hour, and if it is put up to them that they are paying workmen in the United States and Canada higher wages, I am inclined to think if they

are reasonable at all they might accept, if put forward in a proper manner. I submit that is the proper course for the Government to folow before we proceed any further with the matter.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman: I would advise the Prime Minister to remember that he is the leader of a Government and that Government is the trustees of the people of this country. Then do get some concessions. You are giving these people considerable concessions, and what are you asking in return? Of course you will answer and say "employment for the people." But that is not a concession and you cannot regard it as a concession, because the man who works is giving value for what he gets. That is the great trouble in this country. I am afraid that we are giving too much value. We are paying our workmen $2.50 a day. That is the general wage. That is a lower wage than is paid by any country in any part of the American Continent. You have to go to Europe to find a smaller wage than that. I think that the Prime Minister should make up his mind before going any further to get in touch with these people. Do not be afraid of doing it. After all we are giving them much more than they are every going to give us. Now is the time to do something for the wage earners of the country. I would impress upon the Prime Minister the advisability of taking immediate steps to try and get in touch with them on this matter. It means an agreement not a corporation. Of course the same thing would apply to any agreement.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—You say that it does not mean a corporation but an agreement. Do you mean to put into the Act.

MR. HIBBS—At least one. So as to get those companies to agree to thirty cents an hour as the minimum wage. All other companies would pay the same wage. However that is a matter for the Government to go into. But the fundamental principle is the establishment of a wage that will give our people an opportunity to live. $2.50 a day is outrageous. If you go to Nova Scotia you will find that the companies that employ labour there give no less than thirty-five cents an hour.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I think that we ought to exchange our views with one another frankly on this matter. As far as I am concerned I deplore the idea of putting in a clause making a minimum wage. I stated that before, for this reason that a provision for a minimum wage means that that becomes the accepted wage. And we know the history of 1923. A minimum wage was taken then as being the accepted wage and we were told that when the workmen looked for more, and those who were in the house at that time will remember, that the contract was based upon 25 cents an hour. I have discussed the matter with Mr. Grimes repeatedly, but we feel that in this country unfortunately the trouble is that so many people are looking for employment. There is a natural remedy in certain sections. They can afford to take certain steps in places like Corner Brook and Grand Falls in their own unions. I think that you will find to-day that so far as these people are concerned, that they are not going to suffer. I feel that unfortunately the unskilled labourer in this country is the only one penalised. The position is due to the fact that you cannot import the skilled man except at the high rate of wages that he is getting abroad. The common workman of this country has not enough avenues of employment to be in a position to dictate terms. We had a case in St. John's itself the other day, where there was certain work going on, and where workmen were offering to go to work at a lower

wage because of the absolute lack of work. And I say this in no spirit of supporting this agreement. I would say it with regard to any contract before this legislature. The notion of starting to fight for a minimum wage is suicidal. We ought to give these people no such idea that we have a standard wage in Newfoundland, which prevails at the present time, and that is twenty five cents an hour. And I think that irrespective of the measure altogether. I think that in any public contract it is a mistaken policy.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the Minister of Justice's views on the matter, I submit sir, that because of the Corner Brook affair, and twenty-five cents an hour being mentioned as a minimum wage is no argument in favour of a minimum wage, though that company took advantage of twenty-five cents an hour, but it is all wrong to say that because a minimum wage is set down that therefore that is going to be the maximum wage. Skilled labourers received more, but the very lowest was twenty-five cents an hour. But surely if you come to an agreement with those companies by which it is understood that no less than thirty cents an hour is to be paid, it does not follow that no more is going to be paid. We have profited by the Corner Brook affair and we are wiser. The workmen there will not stand for that. They paid usually at Corner Brook twenty-five cents an hour.

MR. BROWNE—Why did they pay twenty-five cents an hour.

MR. HIBBS—They could not pay less.

MR. BROWNE—Did they not agree to pay twenty-five cents an hour.

MR. HIBBS—They agreed to pay not less.

MR. BROWNE—There was an agreement outside of the Act.

MR. HIBBS—Anyway I think that that company took a mean advantage, which would be altogether beneath a reputable company. But I do not think that that is an argument against it at the present time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the Hon. Member that I want to bring before the International Paper Company any propositions that are brought up before this Committee by any of the members on the Opposition, and we will represent their views to them. I shall be glad if the company will give thirty cents an hour as the minimum wage. I may say that since I have been in the House I have received a letter from the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Bay of Islands, in which they ask:

(Reads)

I do not think that there is anything in the agreement with the Newfoundland Paper Company to compel them to recognise the unions, but they do. And I have no doubt but that the International Paper Company will be also willing to recognise them. But whether they want legislation to compel them to recognise them is another thing. However I may say that I am willing to bring it before them.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, when my Hon. friend, Mr. Grimes, brought up the subject of a minimum wage, I remembered distinctly that during the discussion on the contract in 1923, that the same subject was brought up by the Attorney General. I was not quite sure whether the minimum wage was put in the agreement then. I was under the impression that it was. But looking up Hansard I find that it is not, but on the last stage of the debate Mr. Higgins said to the Prime Minister of the time, Sir Richard Squires, that it was to be conceded that a minimum wage was accepted. And the Prime Minister replied that this was so. There was the understanding then that there was to be a minimum wage. And a minimum

wage was paid by the company. Now if the Hon. Members opposite contend that conditions have got much worse since 1923, they will see that costs and contracts will be based upon a certain figure. I remember that when I went to Corner Brook at the time of the strike over wages, in 1924, Major Alexander told me that he could not increase the wages for the reason that the cost had been figured out on a basis of $2.50 a day, and that was the biggest argument that they had. The impression was left upon me that during that discussion between the agents of that company and the Prime Minister that the Prime Minister had actually sent a telegram to the Company asking that a minimum wage of $2.50 be et. That is the reason why I oppose the setting of a minimum wage now. I would like to see it for the same reasons as Mr. Grimes, because I would like to see the labouring class protected. But I think that we can take it now on the threshold of a new industry that the labourers' wage is not going to decrease. And we can safely leave the wages problem to look out for itself, for the next few years. I think that the labouring man will have the advantage for the next few years.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. gentleman who has just sat down I do not think that Mr. Alexander was serious when he made that statement that he had based the cost of construction work upon a minimum wage. He might say that, because any person to-day that is running a business must make provision for strikes and increase of wages. Any company operating knows that when there is a clause in a bill that says $2.50 a day is to be the minimum wage, that may last for six months. You cannot say that for a period of two years you are going to base your wage upon $2.50 a day. That would be very poor business. I do not think that Major Alexander had such little knowledge of business as to figure it out on that basis.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Order of the Day was deferred.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to tomorrow, Friday, August 12th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, August 12th, 1927.

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

A petition was presented by:

Mr. Halfyard, from Heart's Delight and other places, re roads.

Mr. K. M. Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Godden gave notice of question.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-mororw.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 206 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies,'" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record once more as being opposed to granting to this Company the right to import free of duty for twenty years and furthermore in regard to sub-section (b) of Section (3) of the Act which gives the privilege of free importation; by this clause is meant that whenever the A. N. D. Company want to extend this right to import articles they have only to notify the Minister of Finance and Customs and it seems to me that you are giving a very wide latitude to this Company. I wish to reiterate my remarks against this Bill and wish to go on record in my contention.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent it was ordered that the bill be read a third time presently, and passed, and that it be engrossed and 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 Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting a Bill for the Confirmation of a Contract between the Government and the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, speaking to the resolutions now before the Chair, I do so with a certain amount of trepidation. I realize the vast importance of the paper industry of Newfoundland and also how it affects the prosperity of this country. We are all very desirous that the pulp and paper indutry of Newfoundland should prosper. We have only to look at Grand Falls as an example of just what that industry can do for the country. The paper mills at Grand Falls are in a flourishing condition and the result is that we have surrounding them a town with very prosperous and contented people. I believe we all desire to see that state of affairs in other parts of Newfoundland and so we are in duty bound when the chance offers itself to bring about a better state of affairs in different communities; to do our utmost to make them prosper. We have the nucleus of another thriving community at Corner Brook, made possible by the installation of a paper company there, but unfortunately this particular plant has had an uphill fight almost since inauguration, and various reasons have been given for its present situation and as to why the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company have not been able to make a big success of Corner Brook. Some of the reasons, in my opinion, are, firstly, that the Company was over capitalized; then, I believe extravagant purchases were permitted of material and supplies as well as extravagance in construction. These are some of the reasons perhaps which have made the operations of the company at Corner Brook result in losses. And now we are faced with the fact that the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company want to transfer their business to another company. Even if we were not financially interested we should naturally have an interest in that transfer; but, since this country is interested in the amount of ten million dollars as guarantors we are not only interested we are vitally concerned, and it is only natural that we should want to find out all the details and everything possible about the position of the suggested successors to that busi-

ness in Corner Brook. For that reason I have asked various questions during the last few days. Members on the Government side of the House will agree with me that the agreement we have before us bristles with contentious points, and I understand that the Government have had numerous meetings of the whole party covering a period of perhaps two months discussing pros and cons and difficult phases of the agreement. It is very difficult for the ordinary man other than a legal man to grasp the full s gnificance of just what these resolutions mean. How do they affect the Government of Newfoundland as guarantors? How do they affect the situation with regard to labour? and so on; and I would suggest that this being such an important agreement that we should view it and not consider it as a party measure. I would like as a matter of fact for certain members of the Government who know the points of contention, know them better than we do on this side of the House to get up in their seats and point them out and explain to us just how they have been satisfied that these resolutions we have now before us are now satisfactory to them. I am sure the country would l e interested in knowing just how the Government has satisfied tself that they are doing the l est possil le in the interests of all concerned in Newfoundland. And I hope that some of the Government members will get up and give us their views on the situation. There are legal gentlemen in St. John's who claim or who have an op nion that this country is not legally liable as a guarantor to the "B" Debenture holders—$10,000 000.00. In fact one or two have intimated that they are sure we are not liable. But I gather from these resolutions if we pass them that there will be no doubt about the matter at all but as soon as these pass we are definitely committed to the "B" Del enture holders for ten millions.

There will be no doubt about that under th s agreement. But even supposing that we are liable as guarantors, the amount of claims which ranked prior to ours was only fifteen millions whereas under the proposition of this new agreement there will be claims amounting to th rty millions. The Prime Minister in his introductory speech the other day dwelt at considerable length on the wealth and influence of the International Paper Company of New York, and his remarks would lead the public to bel.eve that it was that company which intended to take over the assets of Corner Brook and carry on business there. Now I consider Mr. Chairman, that that is very misleading and the public have been mislead; I don't say deliberately, but they have been m s-led into the idea. As a matter of fact the company that intends to carry on operations at Corner Brook is the International Paper Company of Newfoundland. I suppose we can take it for granted that the company in New York will be interested in the Newfoundland company as shareholders and I can quite imagine that they will be interested in possible profits. But I want to say that if the International Paper Company of Newfoundland as a result of its operations at Corner Brook do not show any profits but instead are faced with losses as the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company of New York I am sure will not admit any liability as to guarantee for breaches of the agreement. My object in making these observations is not that I anticipate the failure of the new company. I sincerely hope whatever operations are carried on in connection with this business on the Humber area will be prosperous, for the sake of Newfoundland but at the same time I think it is only right that the people of this country should l e fully aware as to just who comprises the company and what is their strength and what is their abil.ty to

carry on successfully the industry at Corner Brook. As I said a few people, a great many people in Newfoundland, are under the impression that the International Paper Company of New York intend to operate and in addition are under the impression that they are going to relieve Newfoundland of her guarantee. Unfortunately we are still liable and as I said before we have a poorer chance of protection than we had before. The first thing to be borne in mind is that the agreement is with the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, not of New York, a company which has no assets at the present time and if this agreement goes through it will take over the assets for the Humber which may be mortgaged by different issues to the tune of forty millions. So, there will be nothing really available for the enforcement of any breach of the agreement. At the present time I believe an agreement is in existence between the Government and the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company which, to my mind, should not be amended unless strong reasons can be shown for such amendment. At the present time excuses are being given for extra concession. One excuse is the danger of having to close down; another reason is the danger of the Government being called upon to pay principal and interest to B Debenture holders. Then there is the hope expressed of the prospect of obtaining immediate employment. Well; now, as regards the danger of the Humber industry being closed, it has been alleged that the paper industry is in such a condition that the earning power of the mills at Corner Brook is so small that losses are feared and that the present company are not able to carry on any longer and it is naturally a matter of expediency for the Government to find some way out of the difficulty and to see that this important industry at Corner Brook can be carried on, but the Government has not done this. Mr. Chairman, the present agreement contains nothing to compel the International Paper Company of Newfoundland or any other company to carry on the industry, and if this agreement is passed, we are just as likely to be faced with the same situation that we are faced with to-day, and we will be shown, perhaps, some time by this Company, in the same way, a statement showing that losses are too great to justify the company carrying on any further; and as to the danger of being called upon to pay interest and principle to to "B" Debenture holders, these Debentures are secured by the assets of the Company; we went third in order, five million raised last year in priority to the "A" and "B" Debentures and ten million to secure the "A" Debenture holders, guaranteed by the British Government, but now we find that it is proposed to allow the issue of a further twenty million bonds. Five million of this, I understand, will be going to offset five million raised last year. If the Company is going to issue these bonds, our security will naturally be deferred to thirty millions worth of debentures. There is fifteen million in priority to us to-day, I understand, and the Company has power to raise twenty millions more, it seems, when this is passed, that is thirty-five millions, and five millions pays off a previous five millions, so thirty millions ranks prior to our claim of ten millions. Am I right in saying that?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I think it does. I would like to point out, of course, that it doesn't take priority unless borrowed, that is, if they don't use it. The chances are they are only going to add two units in which case they will only use one million pounds at the outside, consequently the other £2,000,000 will be left for, it may be, perhaps, twenty years until they have another unit. They only take the right

to borrow now because they want to be sure of being able to borrow in priority to other securities when they want to, but they can't borrow it except for actual construction of that mill, or utilities.

MR. GODDEN—But, if these twenty millions are raised, the Company will have to earn sufficient to pay interest on forty millions, and if they find themselves unable to pay interest on twenty-five millions, how on earth are they going to find it possible to pay on forty millions? It is claimed that fifteen millions will make the earning power greater, and that is readily understood too, but the Prime Minister the other day stated that there was no arrangement to insure that the fifteen million additional would be spent on the Humber at all. As a matter of fact, the International Paper Company can raise an additional fifteen million on the Humber assets and spend it in the United States or Canada.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Oh, no! There has got to be security for the "A" and "B" Debentures.

MR. GODDEN—Again, if this agreement goes through, what hope have we of immediate employment resulting?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—None.

MR. GODDEN—None! If they increase the Mills at Corner Brook, when they start we can expect some employment for men on construction work, but there is nothing to compel the Company at any time to increase the Mills at Corner Brook. There is an indefinite promise, I grant you.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They get no export rights unless they erect new machines.

MR. GODDEN—There is an indefinite promise, I believe, a sort of indefinite promise to do so before 1933, but they are under no duty to begin to build at any particular date. From what they have stated of the present conditions of the paper market, it looks as if they won't start for a long time, therefore, we have no guarantee that there is any immediate relief in the employment situation as a result of this Agreement going through.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Except if Corner Brook should close down, that would be a very unfortunate circumstance.

MR. GODDEN—I agree that it would be very unfortunate, if it closes down. There is one other point, that is that part of the Agreement in reference to the exemption of the Company from all taxes and royalities except $75,000 a year. When the Income Tax was in force before I believe the A.N.D. Company paid by way of Income Tax and Business Profits Tax $100,000 a year, and if the Humber operations are on a par with those at Grand Falls, we should collect from Corner Brook industry in Income Tax and Royalities a quarter of a million a year more.

In granting concessions like this, it does seem to me, particularly when a company that has been granted concessions is also exempted from the income tax, it seems to be hard on the fishery merchants and the supplying merchants, and others that they themselves should have to pay an income tax. Why should not they be free, as well as new enterprises coming into this country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Of course they are paying the equivalent to the income tax.

MR. GODDEN—I question whether they are paying the equivalent to the Income Tax. That remains to be seen. That is all that I have to say for the moment. I hope that some of the honourable members of the Government will debate this matter. Surely they know that this Agreement is not as satisfactory as it might be. I would like them to debate the matter with us in a friendly way.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there is one point that was made by the honouralle member who has just sat down that I would like to reply to. He said "What was the ability of the company to carry on," and the inference has been thrown that the company has no capital. The Hon. Leader of the Oppos tion referred to the Gander Company as having a capital of $300. That is grossly exaggerated. As a matter of fact the capital of that company is but fifteen dollars. It is only three shares at one pound a piece.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—That was the International Paper Company.

HON. THE. PRIME. MINISTER—That is right it is the Internat onal Paper Co. I just mention it because everybody knows, that that is the way that companies are always started in Newfoundland. You get the office boy and the stenographer to start a company with one share a piece that is not paid for. It is only a matter of forming a company to work. The International Paper Company of Canada was formed in the same way, and they have a capital now of $100,000,000, or somewhere about that. But there is another point that I want to refer to and that was a statement made by the honourable member who has just sat down, namely, that we would be in just the same position, or in a worse position, on account of th s increase of £3,000,000 that should be raised, by the new company. But out of the additional £3,000,000 that is to be raised, £1,000,000 is to be used in the addition of two new machines. This means that instead of being the guarantors of $10,000,000 a part of $25,000,000 on a m ll producing 120 tons a day, the Government will be the guarantors of $10,000,000 part of $30,000,000, on a mill producing 180 tons of paper a day. That is they will take the first million pounds and leave the other two in the treasury, unless they put in the additional machines. In other words by increasing the debt 2 per cent. the production and therefore the profits are increased 50 per cent. Surely it is better to be a part of $30,000,000 in a 600 ton mill, than a part of $25,000,000 in a 400 ton mill. The principle point as I make it is that we will have a company whose experience is undoubted, and who have an outlet for their paper. We have enough now of dealing with companies who cannot find a market for their paper, or who employ the wrong men to manage it or to sell their paper. I am a great believer in generosity, greater concessions to companies that we know perfectly well manage their propositions well, and who will find an outlet for the products their mills turn out. Those are the only two points brought forward by the honourable member, that I wanted to refer to before we go on with it.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Trinity, Mr. Goddon, in his very fair criticism of the contract that we are now considering made an appeal to the members on this side of the House to give some justification for their actions in supporting this measure, I think that it would be discourteous, if some of the members from this side of the House did not endeavour to show that in voting for these contracts, that we are not doing so merely because we are voting machines or party men, but because it is a matter of conviction—that we are voting for something that will be of material benefit to this country. The Prime Minister in introducing these resolutions I think covered the ground as regards the Government's attitude on this very important question. I might tell the honuorable members that the decision arrived at was not reached in a hasty manner, but after the most mature and careful consideration. I can assure the honourable member that every member of the Government was

as anxious as he is to make the best possible bargain on behalf of this country, and particularly in view of the fact, that never in the history of Newfoundland is industrial development more essential. It is all very well to criticise, all very well to pick holes but when one is charged with the responsibility of looking at both sides of the question, and determining the proper course to adopt, then one realises the gravity of the course to be decided upon. It was only this morning that I had an opportunity of reading some of the debates that occured in this House 22 years ago, when a similar contract was being considered with the Harmsworth Co. that later developed into the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., and was the beginning of that great industry that has been operating in this country now for twenty odd years. It seems remarkable that the criticism that was made then, is somewhat in conformity with what we hear to-day. Honourable members, particularly those of us who were members of the House of Assembly at that time can readily recall the outcry from certain sections of the Press. Indignation meeting were held here by some of the most prominent and influential business men in the community. The outcry of the abandonment of the independence of the country was broadcast throughout the land. Newfoundfoundland had a new Czar, Czar Harmsworth; and the very birds in the air and the fishes in the waters, and the animals in the woods were all absolutely controlled by this great octupus that had recently come amogst us, and Newfoundland had been bound with chains from which she would never break clear. Those were the cries that were heard on that occasion. I think that history has shown the absolute absurdity of contentions of that kind, a reverse of what was prophesied has taken place. Surely the history of the A.N.D. Co. is known, it will be found that instead of a curse we have had a saviour in this country, because if we were without the A.N.D. Co. in Newfoundland, to-day, I would ask what position would we be in. At the time they gave concessions to the Harmsworth Company that I know that the Government of the day did not want to give, but the circumstances required that if they were going to make a contract to get these people in here, they had to hold out inducements to them to come, and they came and this country has been the better for it by many millions of dollars. Therefore I look forward to the time when history will repeat itself with regard to the new development that is to take place in the Gander Valley, and the extension and the stabilising of the industry on the Humber. Now we should be absolutely fair, and I am glad to see that the atmosphere of the House shows that it is the intention to take this measure as a national measure and not as a party measure. They feel that the Government is absolutely frank and above board, and will give every available bit of information. I do not know of one atom of information that has been withheld from this House, from the first hours of the negotations right up to the present moment. Honourable members are well aware that for the past ten weeks, the Executive Government has been spending day after day and night after night, trying to solve many of the difficulties. I know that the House appreciates that tremendous advances have been made on the part of the Executive Government to obtain a better contract for Newfoundland than was at first suggested and was cast aside, without any hesitation the first suggestion that was outlined in the contract that was submitted by the International Paper Company, as far as it effected the Corner Brook concern. We did get a suggestion of a very raw deal. There were suggestions made with regard to the terms

of the contract that as a self respecting people we could not accept under any consideration. These people when they were confronted with the views of the Government, on behalf of the people of this country very readily saw, that they could not come in here and make a contract, where all the benefit would be on one side, or endanger in any possible way, financially the future welfare of this country. It was proceeded with step by step. Every feature of the contract was considered to the very utmost limit. Every argument that could possibly be put up, was brought forward to try to get a better contract, and that contract has been gradually made better and better, until to-day I claim, and I am prepared to stand by what I say, that we have here a contract, in the argeement between the International Paper Co. and the Government for the establishment of a mill in the Gander Valley, and the extension and the improvement of the mill at Corner Brook, which is as good a contract as it is possible for anybody to make. Mr. Head, the senior representative of the International Paper Co., was here, a gentleman of very high talents, very clever, accompanied as he is by an expert in woods operations, Mr. Hinman and Mr. Rollins, their legal advisor—three very clever, young, virile, intelligent men. At the start I thought that it was a pity that we had not some expert to advise us with regard to the technical details of this contract. But, however, the Government faced it, and I consider without any practical experience in the forming or negotiating of contracts such as this, of such magnitude, that we have not done so badly. I am perfectly satisfied that we have done as well even if we have had no expert advice from the beginning. Now let us picture the position of this country as it stands to-day. Let us realise that the Reids have been for the last two years or longer, endeavouring, praying, beseeching, combing the continent of America and the continent of Europe, to get somebody in here to take over the Gander Valley properties. They absolutely failed. They have not induced a single capitalist to send a man here to look over their properties. And immediately after that we hear of the break down, financially, of the Corner Brook enterprise. It was top heavy from the start and it could not have been a success. It was over capitalised, and no matter what happened, it could not meet its liabilities. I think any man that understands finances will agree with me on that point. Our own Finance Minister said so from the beginning. He said it would never pay. Fortunately for the Reids the International Paper Company became interested. I say here now, and I think that the credit should be given where it is due, that the man that really induced the International Paper Company to come to Newfoundland in the first place was Mr. Harry Crowe. He was the man that first got them to come down to Hampden, and got them to take it over. They sent an expert down here, and he gave an adverse report about the conditions in Newfoundland, and the timber and pulp possibilities in Newfoundland. Mr. Crowe was very much set back, but determined, as he has been in all things, since he commenced operations here. Photographs were taken, and cargoes of wood were sent, which he has the right of export to the United States. And by ocular demonstration he showed Mr. Graustein that there were possibilities in Newfoundland, that there was wood in Newfoundland worth while—and that there was opportunity for investment there.

Mr. Hinman was sent down, and ever since he came into this country he has been a booster for Newfoundland. He is to-day. And that is the early history of the entering of the International Paper Company into this

country. I think it will be remembered in this House two years ago, that some of these people said that it was a good augury to see the International Paper Company coming in here even if only to put their wedge in here. Which has grown ever since. They are no fools, and they have not accepted anything that is not perfectly sound, as regards their judgment. They have seen the possibilities in the Gander Valley and they have made an agreement with the Reids to take it over, and now they ars asking the Government to confirm that agreement, for the operation of a mill there. Now as I mentioned a few moments ago, members must realize the position of the men charged with the safeguarding of the country's interests, and when they realize the financial situation of the country, where we have unfortunately a deficit in the revenue, a great lack of employment, where our people are not too well off, and where we are confronted every winter, and are called upon to issue large sums of money to give relief—when we saw the possibility of the collapse of the N. P & P. Company's enterprise at Corner Brook—when we saw the possibility of having to meet an interest charge of $500,000 a year, and a sinking fund charge of $500,000 more, or nearly one million dollars a year—when we were notified by the company over there, last June, that on the 12th of July we would be called upon to pay $250,000 interest—and if we were called upon to pay that in July, we would be called upon to pay a similar amount in January next. I have had it on good authority that the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Company would not exist beyond the middle of June as a going concern unless assistance came from some quarter, and you can readily appreciate what that would mean—it would mean putting three or four thousand men out of employment, and in addition to the responsibility of looking after those unemployed to-day we would have those additional men on our hands, and there would be nothing but ruin and disaster ahead of this country. That is what we had to keep in the back of our minds, when we were considering this contract. That is what we had to consider as the alternative of the breakdown of negotiations. I say this now that if the International Company had turned their back to this country, it would be many a year before we would get any company of repute to negotiate any contract. And there is no question about their reputation. I tell you that is the opinion of a great many people competent to give an opinion, that if the International Paper Company, that is recognized the world over as a most influential and most powerful and most successful paper company, were to turn their backs on Newfoundland where for years people have been trying to get somebody to take the least notice of us, then the hopes of getting any companies of repute to come in here would be very remote indeed. Therefore we ought to keep that situation well in mind. And although the possibilities were there and known to those people, that the financial situation of Newfoundland was not strong, we still kept at it, and we still got concession after concession, improvement after improvement, on the original contract until we come down to the contract before us to-day. Now there is one or two features about the present contract as far as I am concerned, that must appeal to the average man. The only disappointing thing about it is that we are not going to get any benefits immediately. But I want to remind the House that we may get it sooner than we anticipate, when I tell you this, that twenty-two years ago a company making a similar contract with the Government of the day, had twenty

years to build the mill. They started operations and they had the whole thing completed and the mill operating in four years. These companies always want a wide margin. They always prefer to obviate the possibility of becoming involved or perhaps of not being able to carry out their contract. The present company has undertaken to erect and extend the mill in six years. I think that in 1933 the whole thing is to be completed. And if the paper conditions of the world, which unfortunately today are very low; the paper market is very bad, but if the paper market improves and the paper is in demand at good prices, they will put that mill there as soon as possible, because they want to give returns for the money that has been invested. And when these mills are completed that is when they have erected at Corner Brook six instead of four as at present, and the two in the Gander Valley, that will make eight instead of four, as at present, and that will mean employment for another four thousand men, and it will mean that the Gander Valley and Humber timber areas will employ eight thousand men all the year round.

MR. HALFYARD—When will that be?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In 1933. They have six years to complete the work or earlier if the markets warrant it. There was a lot of fallacy with regard to the 1923 contract. We had a royalty of one dollar a ton under the 1923 contract. On every ton of paper we were supposed to get a royalty, but we never got one dollar, because the royalties had to come after the payment of interest. They never paid the interest and therefore the royalty was of no effect. The Government realized that if this company should have to pay interest on its debentures to preferred shareholders, and then we were to get the royalty, is it not better to get half a loaf than no bread. We made an agreement and we consider it a good agreement. For the first four years we were able to get $75,000 a year as a tax. No royalty. After the four years we were to get $150,000 a year for the balance of fifty years. Now $150,000 a year is able to take care of the interest on the $3,000,000. Therefore we have an assured income of $150,000 a year that will obviate a great deal of the so-called advantage that they have got for the privilege of importation of articles duty free. Now people in this country are opposed to the exportation of wood. I remeber the day of the Bond Government when the Harmsworth deal was put through. It was almost a sacrilege to talk about the exportation of wood. That it was said, should be kept for our pulp mills and manufactured in the country. But you find that people are coming in here and investing from $60,000,000.00 to $80,000,000.00 in this country, and when they tell us that hundreds of thousands of cords of wood are lost to this country ever year, through being overnature and burnt and so on, then the situation has a different aspect.

The present agreement allows that wood can only be exported provided the mills are running at eighty per cent. of their capacity, and then only from the prescribed areas.

When these bills go through this country will have virtually settled all its problems with regard to paper mills and for that there is every reason to feel satisfied. Sarcastic reference has been made to the formation and registration of the Company. But the registration is only a mere matter of form. When the Harmsworth contract came before this House in 1905 their registered capital stock was only $15. The International Paper Company has outlined a policy and as the parent Company in the United States has a large mone-

tary interest in all its undertakings will see that there is no extravagance or inefficient management and will allow nothing to happen that will likely endanger any of these enterprises. Therefore, it is a great relief to know that the menace that threatened in regard to the Corner Brook enterprise and with the closing down of the mills and the consequent loss of employment for our people have passed, and I feel that we can look with confidence to the operation of the mills under capable management and under the auspices of a company that is second to none in the world. It is a good thing to see big corporations take an interest in this country and its development and it is a good thing to see the American Smelters come in and I feel that any concession given will be justified by the developments which will follow. Newfoundland stands to-day with few industries, outside her fisheries, and any Company coming in here to start projects have to import all they require because Newfoundland is practically isolated from the outside world, and for this reason it is necessary to allow concessions in the way of duty free privileges that will enable them to compete with companies in other countries where requirements can be purchased without any duty charges. Besides it is a serious problem to provide employment for the people of this country, particularly at this juncture, and I am prepared to go to any reasonable length to get employment, if possible, for every man in the country. I strongly recomment these resolutions to the House and I hope that the debate on them will be carried out in that non-partisan spirit which has characterized the discussion this afternoon.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: We have heard a lot about deficits in regard to the Corner Brook enterprise and I do not think it is necessary to go back to 1923 when the Humber deal was going through. The country was told at that time that the Humber deal was going to be of great financial benefit to the people of Newfoundland, but on looking back I feel that the legal lights at that time in the House did not go through the details of that contract properly. After the session of the House of 1923 closed it was found that a Utilities Company had been formed and preference had been given to the claims of the Bank of England in connection with that enterprise, although the Newfoundland Government and the British Government each guaranteed ten millions of dollars for that industry. Now I claim that the directors of both Governments failed to perform the duties entrusted to them because they were unable to get the information they sought when this company at Corner Brook got into financial difficulties. The position this country finds itself in, as a consequence, is that the N. P. and P. Company had between thirty and forty thousand tons of paper on hand which they were incapable of selling and if the Company was wound up this country would have to pay one million dollars a year interest and the sinking fund on the guarantee. This we would be unable to pay and to a certain extent we are forced to accept the terms of the present contract now before the House. Personally, I want to go on record as being in favor of the principle of this Bill, but I do not accept any responsibility for the legal phraseology of it because that is the Government's job. After perusal of the Bill, as I can see it, and in view of all the circumstances, the Government has not done so bad at all. I figure that the International Company can make a profit of four and a half million dollars per year which will give them $1,200,000 net, after providing the interest, etc. The hard-

est part of the contract is the clause giving the Company the right to export wood. However, in order to have the right to export they will have to install two extra machines right away at Corner Brook, which will provide additional employment, and they will have to manufacture eighty per cent. of their capacity, unless they have other ideas in the backs of their heads and in a few years' time will demand rights to cut timber on the Labrador to keep their mills going on the ground that this country is depleted of wood.

I have no brief for the International Paper Company, no brief for any Company, but as I said a moment ago, any technicalities that may be embodied in this contract, the responsibility for them rests on the shoulders of the Government. The principle I entirely agree with because I feel more hopeful of a Company which has had experience in paper works for some thirty years, I think. From the Prime Minister's remarks I think we can agree that they at least would know what they are doing, because whilst I do not want to throw any kind of slurs at the present Company, I feel it is absolutely incompetence from beginnig to end. I might go so far as to say it smells of graft. This outfit that built that Corner Brook plant three or four years ago grafted inside and out. It is no use mincing matters, that is what happened. Supplies enough were brought over there of various commodities to last that Company ten years. They put people in charge who had no more idea of running a paper mill than I have; people brought out from England evidently through friends or through other influences and placed in positions with no more idea of operating a paper mill than the Man in the Moon and they had sufficient supplies in some kinds of equipment to do them for years; but at the time when this contract was going through we were all taking our hats off to them; they were going to be the saviours of Newfoundland; and I regret to say the Armstrong Whitworth Company, a great company and all as they may be and British as they may be, in my opinion, brought this country to the brink of bankruptcy through incompetency and then brought themselves there. Sir Glynn West, Chairman of the Company, has been dethroned because he was incapable. The Company hopes to get along and reinstate themselves and we have got to pay the piper. There is another item which has caused considerable controversy and I would advise the Government to cut out of the contract altogether Clause T. I am not using it for politics because it doesn't affect me politically. My district is not interested in the paper business to a great extent.

(Reads)

That is the insulting part of that contract; put in every contract made with outside corporations during the past fifty years. Now that clause means nothing. They bring in whom they like to. Up to a certain extent these people have got to bring in men who know their business in order to teach our people the business. There is one point I want to make and that is this. They naturally must have an office staff for this industry at Corner Brook. No doubt if they take it over they will make considerable changes and I suggest for the consideration of the Government that they see what can be done for our young people in that respect because I think members on both sides of the House will agree with me that young men leaving school at the present time not intending to take up a profession and not intending to take up a trade, merely wishing to go into a merchantile office find it most difficult to get employment. So, I hope for the sake of fu-

ture generations that the Government will see to it that positions of that nature be given to our people. Another point, with regard to this minimum wage; in the 1923 contract we had a clause with regard to a wage of twenty-five cents and I want to say that Company has since paid more. I happened to be in Corner Brook a few years ago and there was a strike on and the Company had to pay more and payed them, but I would like to point out to that Company this, that no workingman in Newfoundland can exist on twenty-five cents an hour; that that Company themselves pay more wages in Canada; it costs more in Canada to produce the same commodity; and consequently they should pay just as good as they pay in Canada; and it is the duty of the Government to see to it that they are paid along these lines. The clause for a minimum wage has little to commend itself in a certain way because thirty cents an hour might give the Company the idea they don't have to pay any more than thirty cents, whereas they will pay fifty cents if they could get the proper men to carry out the work. The only way to get over the wages part is organization by the workmen in various towns where industries are located; organization by the workmen themselves, agreed to by the Company, just as in Canada and the United States at the present moment.

Mr. Chairman: I think that I have gone over the principal phases of this measure. I did not attempt to prepare anything in connection with it because I look upon the Bill merely from the principle. I look upon it as a case where we had to get out of a difficulty.

I felt that this company would ,at any rate, try to do something properly which the present one hasn't done. I felt that I am a person living in this country, and born in it, and have a right to call myself a Newfoundlander and had no other course open at the present time. I have to accept the measure because the country at the present time finds it cannot afford to throw out the Company, and the country at the present time finds itself unable to pay the interest annually. Our revenue cannot afford it. Therefore we have got to take it whether we like it or not, but on the shoulders of the present Government remains the responsibility for any technicality which may exist in the Bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down I am sorry to see a certain section of the press treating this in a political manner. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman, delivered a very fine address in connection with this problem, and we find the Daily News this morning referring to the speech which Mr. Hickman "read," and going so far as to mention it on two or three occasions. Will the Daily News tell me why they didn't refer to the speech the Prime Minister "read" the other day and refer to the speech Mr. Cahill "read" on Opening Day.

MR. CAHILL—Mr. Chairman: I take objection to that remark. I did not read my speech on Opening Day.

MR. CASHIN—Read speeches are part and parcel of the present Government. Will they refer to the Budget Speech; will they refer to a speech read by a certain individual in the Upper House with sneering dirty references, and I am not afraid to say so. It is time if we are going to have any kind of decent legislation in this country to have a press that doesn't smell. They wish to make political capital out of it. I am going to read the editorial with your permission, Mr. Chairman. If Mr. Hickman has an opinion, surely to goodness, he doesn't have to go to the Daily News to ask whether he is able to express it or not, and if he reads a speech he doesn't have to ask them. He can

ask the privilege of the House.

(Reads)

The public of this country do not trust the present Government and no greater proof of it can be had than the recent by-elections.

During the period when this contract was going through in 1923 members, now sitting on the Government side of the House, supported that measure and are just as much responsible in my opinion to-day for the mess at Corner Brook as the Government that put it through. I was an ordinary common hand in that crowd in 1923, and we never had any legal advice as to whether there was going to be a Utilities Corporation separate from the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company. We had lawyers in our aggregation:

(Reads)

That is nonsense. There was nothing else left for him to do in my opinion. He had to take it or go broke. Not five cents in extra labour comes in under that contract to-day. And I defy anyone in this House to show me. Not one extra man will be to work to-day after this Bill is through, on the Humber or anywhere else.

(Reads)

That is an absolutely political editorial. It is written for the purpose. I suggest to the present administration now that in order that we may have some decent kind of debating of legislation, to go down to those papers and tell them to be decent for goodness sake and to give every man a square show. I do not care a snap of the finger for the whole lot of them. But I want to see everyone get the fair show that he is entitled to. We have just as much interest in this country as the Prime Minister or anyone else. But what interest has that paper in the country. Cut out the patronage that they are getting from the Government and they are gone the other way. They get $50,000 or $60,000 a year for their editorials. And an occasional order for rum labels. And then they talk prohibition. That is going to be the end of my remarks in connection with that. But I would like to see and I feel that the Prime Minister will agree with me in what I say, I like to see fair criticism. I do not mind myself being fairly or unfairly for that mater, criticized by the present press. But fair criticism is due everyone. And if I have a different opinion I am entitled to it. If I read a speech I have to get permission from the Speaker or the Chairman, and I have a perfect right just as much as the Prime Minister has or anyone else. I am going to read one one of those days and I am going to send it down to the News and I will bet you dollars to doughnuts that they will not have pluck enough to publish it, unless I send a check to cover it. And neither will it be written by anyone but myself. So I say in the end of my remarks regarding the Humber, that I hope that you will do the right thing, and may God bless you.

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of pleasure and interest to the remarks of the honorable members of the other side of the House, with reference to the Bill now under discussion, and I had hoped that they would give some new reason why we should not enter into a Contract with the International Paper Company, or at least, I had hoped, that some new argument which had not already been used by the Government in its negotiations with the International Power and Paper Co. would be put forward, so far, no new argument has been put forward which we had not already advanced. I may say, that I doubt if there is a man on this side of the House who is satisfied with the Bill, even as it is now, and when one considers, the demands that were made in the first proposition which was placed before the Govern-

ment, is it any wonder, why we should not all view it with more or less d.s-trust.

Speaking for myself, I can assure the members of the House that I am not at all satisfied with the Bill, even now, neither is the international Power and Paper Co. or the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co. satisfied.

In consider ng the two propositions placed before the Government, we had to give them very grave consider-ation. In view of the great lack of em-ployment in this country to-day and in view of the general condition of this country, we had to ask ourselves would we be justified n taking any chance in jeopardizing the employ-ment of 3,000 people who earn their livelihood in connection with the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. Plant at Corner Brook. The honour-able member for Trinity, Mr. Godden, doubts whether the mill at Corner Brook would close down f negot'a-tions were not completed with the In-ternational Paper Co., Ltd. We had to consider the statement which had been made to us by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. as to their in-ability to continue operations owing to want of capital. What were we to do? Would any Government placed n the position that we are in to-day be justi-fied in even taking a chance. Consider, for a moment, the thousands of men who are looking for work all over the country, consider our own financial position, realiz ng that we are up against a big deficit this year amount-ing to $1,700,000.00, and possibly another deficit next year. What posi-t on would this Government be in if we were called upon to, (as I believe we would be) by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co., Ltd., to pay the interest charges and sinking fund charges in January and July next, which would amount to about $1,000,-000.00. It should make one hesitate before turning down the propositions which were made by the International Paper Company, even if .t is not all that we would wish it to be.

MR. CASHIN—You will agree with me that there is nothing in this Bill giving any extra work?

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—We will come to that later on, it is quite true as the honourable member for Ferry-land states, that there is nothing in this Bill that offers any immediate employment, and that should the Bill go through it will not give any addi-tional labour. I agree w.th the honour-able member that there is nothing in the Bill that offers immediate labour, but if they live up to their obligations, that are outlined n the Bills there will be considerable labour for a very large number of people a few years from now. Is the honourable member prepared to assume the responsibility for shutting down the mills at Corner Brook, and throwing thousands of men out of employment, because we cannot get immediate labour. The Government fought from the time the first Bill was introduced until the present time with the International Paper Company and Gander Valley Power and Paper Co. to induce them to provide immediate labour, and as far back as June 12th, a working pro-gramme was outlined, which would compell the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co. to complete the first Gander Unit in 1931 and the second Gander Unit by 1933. The following is the programme which the Government proposed and which was not accepted.

PROGRAMME FOR YEAR 1927.

Comence grading the Railway to Gander Bay, and grade same as far as possible during the Fall of 1927. Dur-ing the Winter 1927-28, cut the ties and necessary timber for construction required for Railway.

The Gander River Pulp and Paper Co.—To grant the necessary permis-sion to cut free of charge the neces-sary ties, Culvert Timber, Tressle Timber or other timber required for the construction of railway on the

lim.ts adjacent to right of way for proposed Railway.

The Gander River Pulp and Paper Co.—To put up acceptable security to cover the cost of construction work done on the Railway during the period 1927, and to cover cost of necessary ties, Culvert Timber and Tressle Timber, so that the Government will be protected, should the Gander River Pulp and Paper default with their part of the agreement.

PROGRAMME FOR YEAR 1928.

Preparation at Gander to do the following work; build Pier, and necessary sidings at Gander Bay, also to build stores, offices, staff house, hotel and workman's accommodation.

Dam Site.—Build railway deversion from Glenwood, build s ding at the Dam Site, clear the ballast pits necessary for construction of dam, build stores, staff house and workmen's accommodation at Dam Site.

Completion of Railway to Gander Bay, which will mean any unfinished parts, track laying and ballast.ng the line from Glenwood to Gander Bay.

PROGRAMME FOR YEAR 1929.

Gander Bay.—Foundation for paper mill, groundwood mill, and sulphite mill to be proceeded with, the above buildings to be completed and covered in.

Dam.—For water supply to be proceeded with, and town site plans to be undertaken.

Main Dam Site.—Coffer dams to be built and excavation for power house to be undertaken and concrete dam to be built of about thirty feet.

Winter 1929-30.—Logging on flooded areas of Gander Lake to be undertaken, and from 30,000 to 40,000 cords of wood to be cut on flooded areas mentioned.

Season 1930.—Gander Bay, completion of all plant buildings, installation of machinary, water supply and town construction. The necessary holding booms and piers for logs to be provided. Slasher mill and wood piling plant to be completed.

Main Dam. Main Dam to be completed, Hydro-Electrical Machinery to be installed. Transmission Line to be built. Railway diversion at Benton to be completed. Spillway at Soulis end to be completed.

Installation of all logging requirements at Gander Lake, such as booms and piers, etc.

Winter 1930-31. General Logging of 100,000 cords of Pulpwood, on Gander Lake, River and Bay.

1931-33. Completion of installation of second unit.

This programe has been made out by me, and I realize that it is not economical to rush a construction job of this nature. We had an instance of a rushed job at Corner Brook, resulting in the work costing considerably more than it should have done, if a longer period had been allowed for the construction of the Mill.

I was at the construction of the Anglo - Newfoundland Development Co., Grand Falls, the work was done under the supervision of G. F. Hardy, of New York, and the programme which I have outlined is similar to the way the work was done when the plant at Grand Falls was being built, which occupied a period of about four years.

The Government also tried to get the two additional units installed at Corner Brook in 1931.

The Honourable Member for Trinity (Mr. Godden) is not satisfied with the Bill, and is going to oppose it, I judge by his remarks. I might say, that the honourable gentleman has in his possession for the past few days, the original draft of the first bill that was submitted to the Government. I ask him, in all sincerity, to judge the Government by the work they have done since this matter was placed before them. For instance, consider the Resolutions which are now being debated by the House and compare them with the first pro-

position placed before the Government, and I am sure, when he has done so, he will see that the three months' fighting, which has taken place between the Government and the International Paper Co., has brought forth, at least, some good results. It is not a perfect Bill by any means, we have not got as much out of them as we would like to have got. We are not satisfied with the Bill and from what we can learn from representatives of the International Paper Company, neither are they satisfied.

HON. MR. HICKMAN—Would you support another proposition?

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—You ask me, would I support another proposition. My answer is, that if I was assured that it was a better proposition for this country, and those bringing it forward were able to carry it out, and that I considered it was for the best interests of the country, I would do so.

Now, then, I will take the last gentleman, who spoke on this Bill, I refer to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Ferryland (Mr. Cashin). He referred to men sitting on both sides of the House now, who supported the Bill in 1923. I was in the House at that time, and, I sat on the Opposition side, just behind where the Honourable Leader of the Opposition now sits. The Opposition were not dictated to by the Leader of the Opposition; it was not a party measure with them. They had a free hand; and they used their own judgment, or expressed their opinions, and I did likewise. I supported the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company's Bill because, I believed in the future development of pulp and paper in this country. I have nothing to take back with regard to the stand I took when that Bill was introduced in 1923. The Bill as submitted to us, was a good Bill, but, unfortunately, the proposition as outlined in that Bill had not received the consideration that it should have received by the people behind it. . When the Bill was placed before the House in 1923, the capital required was supposed to be about £5,000,000, £2,000,000 of which was guaranteed by the British Government and £2,000,000 which was guaranteed by the Newfoundland-land Government. The proposition was a good one, with a capital of $25,000,000.00. We accepted it in good faith, unfortunately, the plant which was supposed to cost £5,000,-000 eventually cost £9,000,000. There were several reasons, no doubt, why they were considerably out in their estimates and why the work cost more. I think, the honourable gentleman will remember that the Government of the day insisted, that the plant should be constructed in two years. Had the Company been given four years to do the work instead of two, undoubtedly, a considerable amount of money would have been saved by the contractors. Possibly, another reason why expenditure was considerably increased was I think that when the proposition was entered into first, the intention was to build a pulp and paper mill at Deer Lake, instead of at tidal water at Corner Brook, it was afterwards decided that it would be more economical to build the plant at tidal water. I consider they did the proper thing in coming to this decision. Because, otherwise, they would have to rail a considerable quanty of their wood and all their mill supplies over to Deer Lake. Had the mill been built at Deer Lake instead of at Corner Brook, their power development would not have cost them so much. In the first place they would not have had to cut the canal from Grand Lake to Deer Lake, neither would they have had to build such a long transmission line. Further, they had not provided in the original contract for sufficient

paper storage, or wrapping paper machine, or for building town, neither was any provision made for building steamers. I am still under the impression it was a great mistake to built the two expensive steamers that the Utilities Company did build eventually. I am sure that Norwegian steamers could have been chartered to do transportation work more economically.

Because, no provision had been made for the different requirements above mentioned, it was necessary to provide more capital, this was done, by forming a subsidiary Company, and Utility Bonds were issued to the amount of $10,000,000.00, and given to the Bank of England as security for this amount. The Company controlling the Utility Bonds could put the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. into liquidation at any time. It is certainly not good business, to have a subsidiary controlling any part of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. plant. Under this present contract the Utility Bonds have been acquired by the International Paper Company by payment of £500.000 in cash to the Bank of England, and by a further payment in preferred shares amounting to £2,-000,000. The Utility Bonds taken over by the International Paper Company have become additional security for "A" and "B" Debentures. As, possibly, many members of this House, are not aware what the Utilties consist off, I herewith quote for the information of the House what the Utilities which have been taken over consist off.

PROPERTY COVERED BY $10,000,000 "UTILITIES" DEBENTURE.

SCHEDULE.

1. All the lands contained in the Second Schedule of the Corner Brook Land Titles Act of the Newfoundland Legislature (15 Geo. V. Cap. 27) and all other lands, (if any), vested in the Company and situate at or near Corner Brook, Newfoundland, together with all such buildings erections and works thereon as are the property of the Company. Subject to any outstanding leases or rights affecting any portions of such lands, buildings, erections and works. And excepting (1) any portions of such lands which have been transferred by the Corporation to others since the passing of the said Act and (2) the mines and minerals which in the grants of portions of the said lands by the Crown were excepted and reserved.

2. All houses, buildings and erections which have been constructed by or on behalf of or have been acquired by the Company at or near the settlement of Deer Lake, Newfoundland.

3. All lands at Howley, Newfoundland, which are contained in a conveyance dated November 15th, 1925, from Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited (hereinafter called the "Paper Company") to the Company together with all houses, buildings and erections thereon.

4. Two steamers, viz., S.S. "Humber Arm" and S.S. "Corner Brook" subject to any existing charter thereof.

5. One Wrapping Paper Machine installed in the Mill of the Paper Company at Corner Brook.

6. Two Warehouses and Wharf adjoining erected on land of the Paper Company at Corner Brook and adjoining the said Mill.

7. Town site jetty erected on land of the Paper Company at Corner Brook and situate near the said mill.

8. Automatic Telephone Exchange being installed in the Sub-Station of the Paper Company at Corner Brook.

9. Fire protection installation fitted in and around the said Mill.

10. Fire protection standards and works erected in and around the Paper Company's pulp wood storage piles near the said mill.

11. Building No. 28 erected upon land of the Paper Company near the said mill and used as Alum and Size Mill.

12. Four tugs used by the Paper Company in connection with its Pulpwood operations.

13. Motor Launches.

14. License to cut timber transferred to the Company by the Great Northern Development Company by Indenture dated 26th August 1924 and registered in Volume 87 Folios 393-396 of the Registry of Deeds of Newfoundland subject to Vendor's lien for $50,000 being unpaid installments of purchase price.

With reference to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Ferryland, as regards cost of manufacturing. In fairness to the present management, I might say that I have been informed by representatives of the International Paper Company, who have gone thoroughly into the Books, that they found, since Mr. Smith took charge, a considerable reduction has been made in the cost of manufacturing.

Now, as to the first proposals put forward by the representatives of the International Paper Company, I must say that the Government found these gentlemen very hard bargainers indeed, and I can assure this House, and the country that we received no concessions from them that had not to be forced out of them? They did not want to pay Royalty or Income Tax, and it is only during the last few days, that the Government was able to get them to consent to pay Royalty. You will see by the Bill now before the House, that they have agreed to pay $75,000.00 per year, for the first four years, and from that time on $150,000.00 per year until 1973, this was alternative proposal to the first proposition which they made about paying $150,000.00 per year commencing in 1931. The $150,000.00 was only to be paid as long as the Company was under any obligation to the Government as to its guarantee of "B" Debentures. Under the 1923 Act, the "B" Debentures had to be reduced in twenty years, but they could only be reduced in so far as the sinking fund permitted. Under this present Act, the International Paper Company, if they wish to do so could redeem the $10,000,000, in one year or two years or at any time. Should they do so, then they did not want to continue paying the Royalty of $150,000.00 per year. This the Government would not agree to, and they insisted that whether the "B" Debentures were redeemed or not, the International Paper Company should continue to pay the Royalty until 1973, as up to that time we could not impose the Income Tax upon them, after 1973, then, whatever Government is in power will have the right to impose the Income Tax or Business Profit Tax if they want to do so.

The International Paper Company also made an alternative proposal in which they offered to redeem $5,000,000 worth of "B" Debentures in ten years in annual payments of $500,000.00 per year, and the balance of the $5,000,000 need not be redeemed until the Fall of 1973. If this proposal had been accepted by the Government, we were to get no Royalty or income Tax of any kind. I believe, the decision of the Government in deciding to take payment of $150,000 annually until 1973 was a wise one.

Now, with reference to Clause 7, mentioned by the Honourable Member, Mr. Cashin, this was put in to insure that residents of Newfoundland would get all the employment possible, and in conversation with the gentleman who is to be the new manager at Corner Brook, I suggest for all young men that are not taking up professions, but who want to go in for commercial life should get preference in the way of office employment, and that no outside help should be brought in if it could be secured in Newfoundland. I also proposed to that gentleman, that in view of the

fact, that the Company proposed to put in two new machines at Corner Brook by 1933, that it would be a very good thing, if he would select some twenty of our brightest young men on the present pay roll of the Company and take them over to Canada or the States ,and have them trained in some of their mills there, so that, when the new machines were being installed they would have young Newfoundlanders ready to come back to run them. Both the suggestions made by me, were promised every consideration.

Now, with regard to the export of timber, the Government time after time objected vigorously to allowing any export of pulpwood to the International Paper Company. The International Paper Company insisted that they must have certain export rights, when the Government found that they had to give them some export concessions, then, they did their best to tie the Company up so that it would be impossible for the Company to close down its mills in Newfoundland and export wood if they wished to do so. In the Original Contract, as submitted to the Government the right was asked to export 90,000 cords of wood per year from Newfoundland and a similar quantity from the Labrador for the Corner Brook plant. Now, under the present Contract they have to put in two new units at Corner Brook before they are allowed to export one cord of wood, and furthermore, they have to operate their Mill to 80 per cent. capacity, otherwise they will not be allowed to export wood the following year. They wanted the Government to permit the export of wood for 50 cents per cord, the Government fixed the tax at $1.00 per cord and to be adjusted after twenty years. After twenty years, the Government gets 5 cents per cord in addition to the $1.00 per cord, for every $1.00 that paper goes above $65.00 per ton F. O. B. the Mills. I hope, and anticipate, that, in twenty years from now, paper will be $100.00 per ton F. O. B. Mills. The International Paper Company asked for Reservations to be made on the Labrador, of 4,000 square miles for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company's Mills at Corner Brook, on which they agreed to pay $2.00 per year rental and no bonus of any kind. Under the 1923 Act, the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, acquired any rights which the Newfoundland Products Corporation held under the 1915 and other Acts, this gave them the right to about 3,000,000 horse power on the Hamilton River, provided, that the sum of $10,000,000, is spent on the Labrador by 1933. The International Paper Company suggested that the expenditure of $10,000,000 in Newfoundland should offset this, and give them the rights to the water powers on the Hamilton River, or that an expenditure of $5,000,000 expended in the Labrador would retain those rights. The Government was very firm in this, and decided that no concessions whatever would be made with regard to the timber lands on the Labrador, and that, furthermore if they wanted to hold their water power rights on the Hamilton River $10,000,000 would have to be spent on the Labrador according to their contract. You will notice now, that the Government succeeded in getting the International Paper Company, to give up any rights which they might have had from the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company to water powers on the Labrador.

The title to the Labrador has but recently been settled and the future of the Colony with regard to it has not been decided upon, but a possible disposition of the areas by sale or otherwise to Canada has been suggested, and some negotiations took place about it before the boundary was decided upon. The future of La-

brador, is therefore, a matter of inter-Imperial importance, which ought not, at this juncture to be prejudiced possibly by any alteration in Status of private and public rights in areas. I think you will agree with me the wood supply in the United States Mills will find it impossible to continue operating. Canada, on the other hand, has considerable reserve, but possibly not so much of a reserve as many of us had been led to believe. The production of paper has gone up since 1917 considerably, and to-day 7,000 tons of newsprint more is being turned out daily than was manufactured in 1917. That means, that considerably more wood is being used, on the other hand, we must remember, that considerable destruction is caused annually to Canada's Timber resources. Look at the loss annually in Quebec by forest fires, also consider the damage done by the bud worm, beetle, etc. The destruction by bud worm, forest fires and by blown down timber is enormous. And, furthermore, the cost of getting wood to the mills in Quebec is increased annually, owing to the fact that they have to go back further and further for their pulpwood. In some instances, I am told, it takes them nearly two years to get the wood to the mills. They have not to do this in Newfoundland, nor will they have to do it for many years. When we consider this, is it not reasonable to suppose that the price of pulpwood is going to increase considerably, if the cost of pulpwood increases ,then, naturally the price of newsprint F. O. B. mills is bound to increase, and I think I am right in assuming that twenty years from now, newsprint, which is selling at $65.00 per ton F.O.B. mills, should sell for probably $100.00 per ton F.O.B. mills.

The policy of the International Paper Company for many years has been to "acquire pulpwood." It was so under the presidency of the late Mr. Dodge, and it is still so to a great extent under the presidency of Mr. Graustein. The policy of the International Paper Company has been to turn their uneconomic paper properties in the United States of America into power propositions, or to make other grades than newsprint, and to increase their newsprint plants in Canada, Three Rivers and later, on the Gattineau. The International Paper Co., in my opinion, are not looking at the next three or four years ,they are looking much further ahead, and I am convinced they are putting every dollar they can get into timber lands, beause the believe there there will be a tremendous return on their investments 20 years from new, and any person or corporation who is fortunate enough to own timber areas in twenty years from now can make their own terms.

The International Paper Company came down here, and amongst other concessions looked for, as I said before land on the Labrador to be given them for $2.00 per year rental per square mile. While at the same time they bought timber lands in Canada and paid a bonus of from $400.00 to $500.00 per square mile to the Quebec Government and in addition a royalty of from $2.75 to $2.85 per thousand feet board measure on every foot cut off the limits. Is it any wonder we fought so hard for better terms. I leave it to you now, and ask you in all seriousness, and as Mr. Cashin stated, leave out politics; do you not think we made a considerably better bargain than was outlined by the proposition, first placed before the Government. Remember we had to deal with three expert men, men whose business it has been to negotiate contracts for the International Paper Co., and we were just ordinary every day men. On the whole I do not think we did so bad, in the first proposition they wanted 99 years lease renewable for 99 years on the same terms. Certainly, it would not mat-

ter to members who are now here what happened in 99 years time, but it was up to us to see that our heritage was preserved, and hence, the Government's refusal to insert the Clause in the present Resolutions allowing them to renew their lease in 99 years.

If the International Paper Company are satisfied that paper can be made by the International Paper Company in Newfoundland at as low a cost or lower than it can be made in Canada, why do they want to take pulpwood away? And after paying all taking away expenses make it into paper somewhere else. If the International Paper Company is to have a railroad built for it, exemption from taxes and considerable duties, exportation of pulpwood privileges, would not the Government have to be prepared to give similar concessions to other paper mills, which may be established or are already established in Newfoundland. There should be no legislation passed which would discriminate between large manufacturers in the same line of business. I want to tell the House and the people of Newfoundland the problems of the Government as I see them. They involved the threatened liquidation of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited, the possible loss of a deal with the International Paper Company, unless we agree to their demands, both of which weigh more now because of unemployment and of our financial position. The International Paper Company knows this, and therefore have pressed all the demands they can think off, hoping at best to get most of them and at worst to get all they really need.

As to whether the Government could interest outside corporations in Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. Ltd. proposition would be a matter of speculation, and for this, a good deal of time would be necessary. In the present case the Reid Newfoundland Company, is in the Newfoundland Products Corporation and therefore, in the Labrador concessions, it controls the Gander Valley proposition. Apparently, the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. Ltd. interests including the Banks, together with the Reid Nfld. Company have worked together for months in negotiations with International Paper Co. to bring about the present proposals now before the Government. The Newfoundland Government was not asked to participate until recently, it is difficult, therefore, to say how the Newfoundland Government can induce others to compete with the International Paper Company for the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company's properties. The Government of Newfoundland does not control them, nor does it control the Gander, and it would have to get the Controllers approval and help in finding another customer, a very difficult proposition. The options which the International Paper Company secured from the Bank of England, the "A" Debentures holders, and the Trade Facilities they could exercise without our consent, in which event, they have to pay off all, and realise this Government from its guarantee of "B" Debentures, or they would not get any duty or taxation or export concessions. The International Paper Company have big resources, and big interests, if they want to make a deal. it will be very difficult to get other people to come in and compete with them. But if the International people want this deal, so much the better for Newfoundland, then it is up to the Government to make the best possible deal it can make with them. In the interest of Newfoundland we have done our best, and I hope the future will show, that by getting the International Paper Company in this country, it will be a great benefit to it.

Referring once more to statements that have been made by several of the speakers who proceeded me, as

to no immediate employment accruing from the Bills now before the House. As I stated previously, this was not the fault of the Government, because we have done everything that we possibly could since negotiations started, and the predominating note at every interview that we had with the International Paper Co. representatives was to endeavour to get some immediate labour. I have already referred to the programme of work which was outlined and submitted to the International Paper Company in connection with Gander Development about June 12th. This had for its object, considerable employment commencing in 1928, we waited several weeks after submitting this report to the Representatives of the International Paper Company before we received any reply from them. Up to that time ,the only promise we had succeeded in getting out of them was that they would spend $100,000.00 per year commencing 1929. The Government felt that $100,000.00 would not mean very much to take care of the tremendous number of people in this country who are looking and will look for employment. It was pointed out by Members of the Executive that here in St. John's last year that that amount was spent in relief work, and that unless we could receive some assurance of a much larger amount of money being spent in labour within the next couple of years, at least, it would be useless to discuss the Bills now under consideration.

After about six weeks negotiations we succeeded in getting the Representatives of the International Paper Company to agree to expenditure on the Gander, in connection with contsruction work, of $500,000.00 in 1929, and $500,000.00 in 1930, and $500,000.00 in 1931 and $1,000,000.00 in 1932, and not less than an expenditure of $6,-000,000.00 by 1933. By which time the first unit must be completed, if the Mill is not completed by 1933, the Gander Valley Power & Paper Company ,will have to pay a penalty of $50,000.00 per year until 1935, and if the Mill is not completed by 1935, they forfeit all the expenditure they have made, as well as all rights to timber lands and water powers acquired from the Government. Now, as to immediate labour that this country will get, there will be the construction of thirty miles of Railway from Glenwood to Gander Bay, this work will probably start in 1927, as soon as the option has been exercised. The railway has to be completed by 1928, then of course, after that, the expenditure by the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company commences on the lines that I have previously outlined.

The Hon. Member for Trinity (Mr. Godden) in his remarks, said, there was nothing in this Bill to compel the International Paper Company to carry on, after they have started. Well! The International Paper Company have already made advances to the Reid Newfoundland Company, Ltd., in cash, and as soon as their option is exercised considerable cash payments have to be made, and further annual cash payments in the next four years. Surely a Company that puts large sums of money into the development propositions, are not going to throw away that money and will try to get returns from their mills. The Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, and the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, are Subsidiary Companies of The International Paper Company of New York. This Company, so far, never fell down on any of its undertakings, and I see no reason why we should suppose that they are going to fail in carrying out the two propositions in Newfoundland.

With reference to the Export of wood from the Gander Limits, I think from what I have heard that any timber taken away for export from those

limits, will have to be replaced by the International Paper Company, if required by the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company later on. This shows that the Reids are interested in having the Paper manufactured in the country and not allowing the export of wood.

As to the timber reserves on the eastern water shed of Newfoundland I have no reason to doubt that there is not sufficient wood on the eastern water shed from Cape Norman to Trinity in Bonavista Bay to provide not only a four hundred ton mill, but a six hundred ton mill for the next eighty years.

Now, with regard to rights on the Labrador, which the old Company had, some have made little of the fact that the Government has been able to persuade the International Paper Co. to relinquish any rights they might have in the tremendous water powers on the Hamilton River. What the value of the Water Powers on the Hamilton River is can hardly be estimated, but having, at least, 3,000,000 horse power, on the Hamilton River is a big thing to give up, no doubt many will say that they did not own this Water Power, that is quite true, but by the expenditure of $10,000,000 by 1933, they could acquire those rights, and the suggestions contained in the first proposition placed before the Government it shows that the International Paper Co., was keenly interested in retaining the rights to this valuable asset, and they certainly have not relinquished their rights without practically being compelled to do so. In years to come, the Water Power Rights on the Labrador, will very likely be of great potential value, if we tried to dispose of Labrador as a whole, we would not be able to make the same bargain if we did not control the Water Power Rights. I contend, that the Government has done very good indeed in getting this matter straightened out, and once again, getting back the control of those tremendeous Water Rights on the Labrador. While, I am referring to this, now, I might say, that in the past, this country, has never received anything like what it should have received from its natural resources. We have got nothing for our Water Power rights and practically nothing for our Timber, I hope that when the next Government comes in, they will take steps immediately to amend the present Crown Lands Act, and see that new Laws are made regarding our Timber Lands, our Water Powers and our Mining Laws. With reference to our Timber Lands and Water Power Rights, we cannot do better than follow the example of Quebec. While, on the other hand, Ontario has very good Mining Laws and we could not do better than follow their policy.

Talking about the Duty Clauses which have been discussed while the Resolutions were in Committee, I have here with me this evenng, a comparsion of Tariff of Canada and Newfoundland, some of the articles under our Tariff are a little Higher, and then again, some others under the Canadian Tariff, are a little higher than ours. But if you take the Canadian British Preferential Tariff and compare it with ours, we are getting a higher duty on spare parts and other things in connection with Paper Mills than they are getting in Canada today.

Now, with reference to the discussion that is taking place about £4,000,000 First Mortgage Bonds, which are to rank ahead of "A" and "B" Debentures after this £4,000,000 is raised, £1,000,000 of it will be used to liquidate the £1,000,000 First Mortgage Bonds, this you all know about, none of the balance can be used for working capital, except the two new Units are built at Corner Brook, in which event, $1,000,000.00 can be used for working capital. Any other working capital required by the Interna-

tional Paper Company in Newfoundland, will have to be raised on their floating assets, or be provided by their parent Company. The balance can be used to acquire assets in connection with Corner Brook Plant, that will be additional security for "A" and "B" Debentures.

As I said in my remarks this afternoon, possibly this Bill is not all that one could wish, but there must be give and take, we have driven as hard a bargain as we possibly could, and do trust that time will show it is a better one than many anticipated.

It is true, that we have not been able to bind them down to build a Mill on the Gander before 1933, or to build an additional unit at Corner Brook before 1933, I feel certain that if there is any anticipation of the Paper Market improving work will start at a very early date. Further, I have been informed that in connection with the Corner Brook Plant, immediate expenditure within the next twelve months of probably $1,000,000 is necessary, and hope that within the next year or two that the International Paper Company of Newfoundland will have to expend in connection with the Corner Brook Plant the sum of $5,000,000.00 or $6,000,000.00 in construction of the new Units at Corner Brook.

Many have asked why is it necessary for hurrying this Legislation through? If we wait, we probably could get others to take up the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company proposition? Possibly we could, it is easy enough, to get men to operate the Mill and make paper and it might be possible to get a Corporation to provide the capital required to get control of the Corner Brook Plant, but might we not then be in the same position, as the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company is in to-day, they can make the paper, but they cannot get a market for it. The International Paper Company is well organized and they are in a position to dispose of any paper which they may manufacture.

MR. CASHIN—What does t cost the Newfoundland Paper and Power Company to manufacture?

HON. M. SULLIVAN—I do not know I should say about $45.00 per ton.

MR. RUSSELL—$40 00 is generally understood.

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—I do not doubt your word, Mr. Russell, that is, I do not doubt that you have been informed that paper is being made for $40.00, but I regret I am not satisfied that paper is being made at that figure, because if paper is only costing $40.00 to manufacture, and at the price they were selling it for there would be no trouble about paying the interest.

MR. POWER—$45.00 or $46.00 is about the average I understand.

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—The Bank of England, Armstrong - Whitworth, and others connected with the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company are anxious to get out of the hole they are in as best they can, cutting their losses and preparing to start in again, with investments somewhere else; that is all very well for them; but it is not all very well for us. The British Government and the Newfoundland Government have liabilities of £2,000,000 each. It is very true, £2,000,000 may not be very much to the British Government, as they are responsible for so many Guarantees, the Newfoundland Government, on the other hand, cannot take our loss of £2,000,000 without being greatly disturbed.

I can assure you when the Government was notified that we would have to meet the interest on $10,000,000.00 "B" Debentures in July, and that next year according to the Act, we might be called upon to pay the sinking fund as well as the interest charges which would mean $1,000,000.00, our finances being in the condition they are, you can easily imagine how the Govern-

ment felt, and in the event of having to meet those obligations what a great blow it would be to this country.

MR. K. M. BROWN—Might I ask what it costs the Grand Falls Company to manufacture Paper?

HON. M. S. SULLIVAN—I cannot tell, and if I did know, I would not be at liberty to do so, as it would be a confidential matter. I know, that in 1912, it cost about $30.00 per ton, but at that time wages and everything else was considerably cheaper than at present.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to go into any further details, in connection with Bills now before the House, at any rate, not this evening. Perhaps, during the debate, there may be some questions arise, then, if necessary, I could say a few more words.

In conclusion, I would wish to congratulate the Opposition, on the spirit in which they are dealing with those two important measures. It is refreshing to see that they are not dealing with them in a political manner. I am sure, like ourselves, the members on the Opposition side of the House know what it means to this country at the present time to get those industries going, and I feel sure they all have the interest of Newfoundland at heart as much as we have, and that they will assist us in every way to make the best bargain we can with the International Paper Company.

As I said previously, I am not satisfied with the Bills, but under the circumstances, I am going to support them, because, I believe the International Paper Company are the best Company we can get at the present time, on the other hand, the International Paper Company are evidently anxious to come into Newfoundland. We want them here, but if we were not in the position we are financially, and the necessity for labour being so great, we would probably be in a much better position to make a very much better bargain than we can to-day. However, it is, as it is, and we can only make the best of it under the circumstances.

The House then rose till 8 o'clock.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Government has awakened to the fact that if we are not to remain here until Christmas we have got to get down to business and have some night sessions, but it was rather a surprise to the members of the House when it was said that the Committee would rise until eight. I am sure this House is indebted to the Hon. Mr. Sullivan, the member for Placentia and St. Mary's for the very informative address which he delivered to-night. I think it would be in order following the custom obtaining during the last two or three sessions that we adjourn until the honourable member's speech is printed and I trust the Daily News will treat him with the same courtesy as with others who have made important speeches on these resolutions because I am sure it would be interesting not only to members of the House but also to the general public to know what the Government has attempted to do.

In approaching the resolutions we have to govern ourselves to some extent by the remarks made by the last speaker. The Newfoundland Power & Paper Company is in a bad mess. The Armstrong-Whitworth Company is in a bad mess and the Newfoundland Government is in a bad mess, I am not anxious to be critical from a political point of view but I could elaborate on that and ask what has brought this country to the position it is in to-day. Is it by the wise policy of the present Government? Anyway that is by the way. I hope we will approach these resolutions in a way above party politics as politics are generally regarded. It is recognised as the duty of His Majesty's Loyal Opposition to criticise any measure brought before this House to be leg-

islated upon and if we criticise these measures I hope it will not be in a destructive manner; but our arguments will be advanced in the spirit of the duty devolving upon each one of us to perserve the colony's interests in the best manner we can. I really do not know whether we can accomplish anything or not. As to the condition of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, it is a deplorable condition. With regard to the continuation of operation of that company it is said to be impossible. The condition of the country financially and with regard to employment at the present time is deplorable and then the pressure no doubt that is being brought to bear indirectly upon the Government by the Armstrong-Withworth Co. and the Bank of England in connection with money they have invested in the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company—all of these things make a combination of circumstances that is regrettable. In consideration of this we have this important point. Can we as a country gain by deferring the passing of these resolutions. If I were sure that we could gain anything that there would be any benefit to the interests of the country I would certainly use every effort to withhold and defer the passing of these resolutions, even if we had to stay here longer than it is desirable. The chief thing no doubt that concerns this House and the country, is what will the country gain by throwing out these resolutions and waiting for some other Company or some other party to come here with another proposition. If we could balance our Budget; could find employment for our people so that they could provide for themselves and those dependent on them without appealing to the Government for the dole or employment that does not give remunerative returns perhaps we would all approach this question from a different angle or in a different manner, but if the N. P. & P. Co. would default and the Company be placed in the hands of a receiver and put on the market to realise what it could we would have to find ten million dollars just as sure as we are here to-night. If a new company could satisfy us that beyond doubt it could operate and make the business a success we would certainly protest against these resolutions being ratified at this session of the House. We must have faith in some company. In listening to the remarks made by the honourable member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, I was reminded of the statements made by the introducer of the resolutions in connection with the Armstrong-Whitworth Co. in 1923. We were told then of the vast resources of the Humber with regard to timber and water power; we were told what a cord of wood would cost; what paper could be manufactured for and we could see millions of dollars coming into the country. Figuring out that the income of the International Paper Company would be $4,500,000.00 and the expenditure $3,200,000.00 there is $1,300,000.00 surplus. But the Government director of the Company tells us that paper is not being manufactured for forty dollors but nearer forty five or forty six. So figuring that out it brings it down to a profit of only four hundred thousand.

MR. SULLIVAN—Figuring on six hundred tons at Corner Brook instead of four hundred, the inference is the cost of wood goes down. The overhead cost is too much for four hundred and it is distributed over six hundred. Quite possible it would manufacture six hundred tons at forty dollars.

MR. HALFYARD—I hope they will, when we are starting new companies we always look on the bright side. We have also got to look at the other side. The honourable member for Placentia and St. Mary's spoke of seventy five thousand dollars annually instead of a royalty, and a hundred and fifty thousand I think he stated after 1933.

I understood from the honourable member there was an alternative proposition that the company redeem five million of our "B" Debentures after ten years and remove our liability.

MR. SULLIVAN—They would not pay us any royalty then. Redeem five million and the others would not be redeemed finally until 1973 but if they redeem five millions in ten years they would not pay us any royalty.

MR. HALFYARD—Looking at it from a broad business point of view I would prefer the alternative of redeeming five millions because if it comes to the worst at five per cent. interest we would have to find two hundred and twenty five thousand per year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—If they can't pay seventy five thousand for four years and a hundred and fifty thousand afterwards the mill can't operate.

MR. HALFYARD—It was rumored that we were going to be relieved of our liabilities.

MR. SULLIVAN—We thought to get the parent company to guarantee the whole thing.

MR. HALFYARD—With regard to the agreement of 1923 some people are inclined to blame the Government of the day in some way or other in connection with it but I am glad to find that the matter is not being discussed from a political point of view and Mr. Sullivan thinks after all as bad as it is at the present time that the agreement was alright that is from the point of view of legislation, as it was adopted by this Legislature. Thousands of people are clamouring for employment all over the country and under such circumstances no good would be gained by throwing out the Resolutions. If we could balance our Budget and could find employment in any another direction for our people, we could approach this question, perhaps, from a different angle than we have to do to-day. Now the 1923 contract was not so bad after all and what happened after the Legislature dissolved that year was not the fault of the members of that Government as they had no control over the construction of the mill. I would like to ask Mr. Sullivan, who was the Agent for the Government, to give us an explanation of the Agreement that was entered into with the N.P. and P. Company respecting the cutting of that extra 25,000 cords of wood last winter? The correspondence tabled regarding this matter would impress me that the Government had not lived up to their agreement, although they were very glad to get that Company to cut that extra 25,000 cords of wood to relieve the unemployment situation. If the Government made that bargain, they were supposed to live up to it. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will read the correspondence to the House. The correspondence dates from November 4th, 1926, up to July 20th, 1927 and it shows that when the Company cut a certain number of cords of wood they asked the Government for advances and the Government, although knowing that the Company were in a bad state financially, refused. Here is the correspondence that exchanged between Mr. Smith, manager of the N.P. and P. Company and the Prime Minister:

In the course of his speech the Leader of the Opposition asked some pertinent questions as to the relationship of the Companies that we are now dealing with and possibly we could get some enlightenment on the subject to-night. Mr. Hickman referred to the interest paid by the N. P. and P Company and asked if the Colony was liable for this amount. If I understand the position correctly, the International Paper Company have intimated to the Government that if these Resolutions go through they will look after the interest paid by the N. P. and P. Company. Correctly speaking, it was the

Bank of Montreal that advanced the money to the N. P. and P. Company to pay the interest and the Bank accepted as security the 25,000 cords of wood to liquidate the loan. It appears that the International Company are putting up a bluff and they are bolstering up the cause of the Government to try and get this deal through this Legislature and it is quite possible that we may have to pay that interest yet. Viewing this matter from a cold business proposition, Newfoundland will be in a worse position than before as regards liability, even though we are dealing with a bigger corporation, because where we were held liable for five million dollars before we will be liable for fifteen million dollars in the event of the International Paper Company going to the wall, and it is not outside the bounds of possibility to suppose that they would go into the hands of a receiver, through bad management. It was thought a grand thing for the N. P. and P. Company to relinquish any lands and water powers they had on the Labrador, but in the course of debate we find that they did not have a clear title to them until they spent ten million dollars there If this agreement is ratified now, the nternational Company, knowing that we are shareholders in that big concern at Corner Brook and that we own the Labrador, will naturally expect to get control of the Labrador to cut wood there, in the event of a shortage of wood in this country in the years to come. That is why the International Company are talking so much about exporting wood. They have us and they know it and it is questionable if we do not have an offer from them in the future for the purchase of Labrador. I understand that lawyers outside this House say that we re not liable for the five million dollars that the N. P. and P. Company got from the Bank of England on demand.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: There is one point that I want to make clear to the hon. member who has just sat down and that is that the International Company started with a big advantage as against any competitors. It has got to be remembered that this Corner Brook proposition according to the telegram of the Secretary of State, in reply to mine which said that he had made every effort to find somebody to buy it and that he could get nobody but the International. The message said: "Advise you to make a deal with the International We made a deal with them and we gave them this option." That Canadian concern to which the hon. member referred, I have no reason to suppose are any less anxious to get into the proposition. But it must be recognized as we recognize that we could do nothing until the option was cancelled that was given by the British Government. Before we can make any deal with the Canadian concern we have got to let the International go, and if they go they may not come back, and we may not be able to make a satisfactory arrangement with other people. Consequently we have attempted to deal with the International because they have the option, and everybody recognizes that they have the option. I think that the British and the Canadian concerns have been very much behind hand, as they might have known and as all the world knew of the position of thing in Corner Brook and why did they not come in and give the same proposition as the International Company. The International proved themselves more alive to the game, as they possibly are in the management of its businesses.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered

the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to Monday, August 15th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 15th, 1927.

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

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice that he will on Thursday next move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means

On motion of the Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the second reading of the bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 206 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies'," was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting a Bill for the Confirmation of a Contract between the Government and the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: Before we go any further with the matter before the Committee I would like to say to the House that there is at the present time in St. John's a gentleman who arrived by the train to-day. He represents that he is here in connection with a concern in England. The name of the concern in Haes and Company These people are proposing to make a deal with the Government over the Corner Brook property. He says this concern have a proposition to make and also they have behind them the Midlands Bank. They are prepared to make a deal for this; will take over our obligations of two million pounds and will not ask for exportation of any raw material; all will be manufactured here; and I might say that I had a conversation with this gentleman a few minutes ago. That is about all the information I got from him; but he tells me he has bona fides behind him and can gives us everything necessary. I bring the matter before the House for what it is worth. If there is a proposition I suppost it is no trouble for the Government to find out if it is genuine and whether in view of that it would not be in the interests of the country to have this thing deferred. I presume the Prime Minister is open to make the best bargain possible for Newfoundland, and that is what we are all interested in. I questioned the gentleman as much as I could in reference to what he had behind him, and these were the facts he gave me. He is willing to confer with the Government, lay all cards on the table and tell eactly what the proposition is and what is behind him. In view of this I think we might for the sake of a day or two consider the proposal and find out just what it is, and what is behind it. He stated there would be no need for any closing down of the Corner Brook plant, operations would be carried on as usual, and there would be no loss of employment in connection with it.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman: I would like to support the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that the Government take a day or two to explore the matter and find out just what is in it. We want to make the very best deal possible, and I am sure the Government have been working hard for the last two or three months to try and make the best possible deal with the International Paper Company. As the Prime Minister has described there were various propositions, and eventually after two or three months the Government made the best bargain possible with the International Paper Company. Now we are about to ratify that but just before it is ratiled there comes another representative who on the face of it appears to be offering something better I think that is very good reason for delaying this legislation for a day or two and finding out whether or not the proposition is a better one. If it is not better; if after exploring the matter and getting all the information possible the Government is of the opinion that the International agreement is better I think both sides of the House will be very glad to support what is the best. One of the things I think surely we should consider is the matter of having our liabilities on the guarantee taken over. That would be a great thing and I do think that for another company to come in now and relieve us, everything else being even makes the situation such that the Government should at least give the matter consideration. It may be argued that they are coming at a very late time of day and that is true; but I think everybody will agree with me that it may be the conservatism of Englishmen. Canadian and English newspapers have been much exercised over the fact of the International Paper Company coming in and monopolising a great part of the natural resources of the country and after all I suppose it is only natural for British capital to wake up.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have been three months as it is well known to the country negotiating with the International Paper Company and during that time there has been no lack of publicity ab ut he matter. We were told by the British Government, the Trade Facilities, and Bank of England that every effort had been made to get somebody interested in this proposition and the last practical hope was the International Paper Company. They gave them an option and until that option expires with the International the British Government can't deal with anybody else. The option is open until September 15th. It quite possibly is renewable, it certainly is open until September 15th. I have told the House before we had a proposition put up to us by a Canadian concern which I believe to be just as strong as Haes and Company but this Canadian company recognized that they were not in a position to deal with the matter until the International Paper Company had gone out. If we turned down the proposition of the International then these people might come in but they felt and I think everybody else felt that they had to get an option from the British Government before they could deal with us and that couldn't be got until this had fallen down. It might be argued that the option is subject to our approval or that it is no good before that, but at the same time if we disagree and don't ratify that option and don't make a deal with the International Paper Co. then the International Paper Co. will withdraw and it is all open again to somebody else. Somebody may argue that the International are bluffing and don't mean what they are saying but they have told us over and over again that as soon as we decid-

ed, or if we turn down the proposition and started to deal with the Royal Securities or say anybody else they would leave here and that would be the end of it for them and we decided in the best interests of the country, as we saw it, to make a deal with the International. Our view was that quite possibly the British Government and British interests might not give the same option again One may well argue if they gave it to an American Company they would to a British but on the other hand it may be argued that they gave too good a concession and they are not going to repeat it if the first falls through. If the International have got a soft proposition it makes it all the easier to deal with them. If we say we won't carry out a deal with a company that has got a soft proposition we may be in a much more difficult position with a new company which has not done so well with the people on the other side. We have got them to agree to paying a royalty of seventy-five thousand for four years and a hundred and fifty thousand after and I frankly believe we couldn't have got a royalty as good as we did if they didn't feel that they had got a very good proposition from the other side.

After three months we are now in the position that we have signed a contract with the International Paper Company and personally I feel that when I have signed a contract as a member of a government I have signed it and the government I sign for has got to stand or fall by it. I think that is the position members of the Government are going to take. I see no other. What more can a Government do than try to make the best deal it can, then after some months' negotiations an agreement is arrived at and signed, and they stand by it. Would it be a fair thing after that to go out and look for somebody else to do better? I don't think so. I don't know who Mr. Haes is, but it seems to me he might have been a good deal earlier than he was. Where was Mr. Haes when the Bank of England and Armstrong-Whitworth interests were beating London to find somebody to make a bid for this proposition? Why didn't he come forward then? Why didn't he step in ahead of the American interests that got the option? As far as this Bill is concerned now I feel that if Mr. Haes came to me with a better proposition, it would make no difference that I am wedded to this proposition; that we as a Government have signed it. That is the way I feel about it. I haven't consulted members of the Government about it but I must feel that when a Government has signed an agreement, they may endeavour to get better terms; get some alteration after signing it, but I feel more or less bound by the agreement, and one may only argue with them afterwards for some minor concessions that don't affect the agreement in any large way or affect the whole substance of the Bill. I have no brief for the International. I would much rather see a British company coming in; but I think the country can very well see the position we have been in in connection with this; the International coming out from England with strong recommendations from the British Government that these were the people to deal with, and that they were the only people interested; we spend three months negotiating and trying to get the best terms and in the meantime nobody else turns up The only people who seemed inclined and gave an indication that they would be interested in this proposition if the International fell through were the Royal Securities, through Mr. Killam and he was first into the proposition to give what assistance he

could as a financial man and one acquainted with this particular kind of agreement. With regard to him and Lord Beaverbrook I may say that I had a message from the High Commissioner to the effect that he had come from an interview with Lord Beaverbrook in which he said that he understood Lord Beaverbrook was the person who advised the Royal Securities to make advances in that connection and when I mentioned that in this House Lord Beaverbrook denied any connection with it through the public press in England. So on the whole Mr. Killam was merely a financial adviser having my confidence as being a person who could have got a group of financiers behind him, but we thought the best thing for the Government was to close the deal with the International Paper Company who are a very large company with a very good name in the paper business and can find a ready market for the paper. Personally I feel great confidence in them because of the fact alone that on the report of the British Government the Bank of England took common stock in the company in exchange for what they had a mortgage on. Instead of foreclosing their mortgage they took common stock. You may well say that the town side wasn't of much value and it wouldn't have covered their account if they had sold it but it ought to be remembered that somebody must take up the business and start to work it and somebody is going to get a bargain in the paper industry at Corner Brook and they would require a town site and consequently ought to be able to give a fairly good price for it. Now for a large portion of these assets the Bank of England have been satisfied to take common stock in the International Paper Company of Newfoundland.

I don't see that there is any object in delaying this legislation, because as a Government we must stand behind the agreement we have made.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate everything that the Prime Minister has sa d. I know the position he is in; but it is my duty as a representative in this House of Assembly, my duty to the House and Country to lay before the Prime Minister and the House any good proposition that I hear of in the interests of this country. Now I don't want the Prime Minister to think that this gentleman who came here came at my request or solicitation. I didn't invite him here at all. I d dn't know anything about the gentleman. I had a conversation with him this afternoon just before I came to the House, when he asked me what was the postion of the Bills. I told him and then I asked him every question I could think of with reference to the financiers behind h m and the ability of the people and whether their proposition was agreeable to the Bank of England and Colonial Office; what they proposed to do. He assured me that the firm behind this deal were Haes and Company. It is not Mr. Haes who is here. His name is Gerardio. He would be no less pleased and more pleased, I dare say, to g ve the information he has to the Prime Minister, than me; but, the Prime Minister states they have made a contract and having made the contract they have to stand or fall by it. Well, the Prime Minister brought a contract here in the Leg slature last session, signed, sealed and delivered and he didn't stand by it. He did not put the contract through but threw it from the House. I refer now to the contract made with the British Empire Steel Corporation; signed, sealed and agreed to. The reason why that was done was because it was a poor contract; did not meet with the approval of the House; did not meet with the approval of the public; it was a poor deal for Newfoundland; and if the Govern-

ment or Prime Minister is justified in throwing out a contract with the Br.t-ish Empire Steel Corporation because it was a poor deal for Newfoundland they are justified in waiting a few days to see what this gentleman has got and see what possibil.ty there is of our being relieved of that ten million dollars liability. We will be called on to pay it whether the International takes it over or not, is my opinion. The International Paper Company is a local company formed here in Newfoundland and its ability to carry out obligations here depends upon itself and whether it makes a success of the industry here or not and with forty m llions of bonds to pay interest on as part of their expenses I doubt very much whether the Government will not be called on in two years time to pay the interest on the ten million dollars which they have guaranteed and if we are not called upon to pay the interest it will be because this country or whoever is in the Govt. at the time will have to give further concessions to them to get them to meet the interest; will have to give away some of the Labrador or something of that kind. That is my opinion. The International are not buy ng this. It is the local company and if they find the local company can not carry on they are not going to keep the local company going. It is all very well to figure how much paper six machines can manufacture and at how much you can manufacture with four, and at how much you can sell with four, and then show profits; show profits cover overhead expenses and interest but very often these figures are very misleading in the end. I know the Government has spent a good deal of time. I know the Government must have been worried to death over this thing; two or three months with sessions in the House in the afternoon and in the night Executive meetings discuss ng the proposition of the International Paper Company; but after taking three months I think that a few days more won't make much difference. This option which the International Paper Company has with the British Government expires on the 15th of September. Well, to-day is only the 15th of August and it is a month from now until them. They certainly can cable to say whether they will accept the option or not between now and the 15th of September. I have no objection whatever in making any change beyond making the best deal for the country. I am not interested in Haes and Company any more than the International Paper Company. It is not because a few days ago I criticised the Bill which was my duty to do; it is all very well for the House to hear one side, they must hear the other side; it is my duty to critic se as much as I can to show up the other side; but that is no reason why I am opposed to any good deal going through in the interests of the country. When this proposition was put to me as I said before I realised that what information I have I have to give to the House and it is not my desire to have any further negotiations with the gentleman at all. It was the Government I referred him to right away, and I told him I was only a member of the Opposit on and it was the Government who were making the deal and if he had any proposition—something worth while thinking about I was quite ready to communicate with the Prime Minister and lay the proposition before the Executive Government. Now he tells me that the people associated with him are very well able to dispose of the paper manufactured in England. I asked him why they did not come forward earl'er with this proposition. I said the British Government, the Armstrong-Whitworth, the Bank of England were all looking for somebody to take up the proposition. They said it was only recently that they began to realise what a proposition it

was and real se what a snap the International Paper Company is getting. The International Paper Company certainly s getting the best snap any company ever got. That concern is coming in, taking over Corner Brook without any capital. Ten million dollars guaranteed by the Government and ten million by the Trade fac lities have been left into the company and they can put on a mortgage in front of these covered by all the assets of the concern, plant and everything in connection with it, to raise further monies. It would certainly be no trouble to put on a mortgage. Any man could raise ten or fifteen millions on the plant at Corner Brook f given the whole plant, utilities and everything; and the International Paper Company are getting the best proposition they or any other company ever had. Well, now, it is my duty to lay this thing before the Prime Minister and I can not for the life of me see why he and the Executive Government cannot meet this gentleman.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, I quite understand the Leader of the Opposition taking the stand he has because after all he thinks we should make the best possible deal, but on the other hand we are still tied up and tied up pretty cleverly. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows I presume that the International Paper Company have an option from the Bank of England and Trade Facilities. Their option is renewable at the instance of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. Now, I am not a lawyer and I do not know, so I speak subject to corrction, but as far as I can see if the International Paper Company want to exercise that option the Newfoundland Government may have nothing to do with it. They can exercise their option irrespective of anything we may do, all they have to do is pay off the ten millions of Debentures and they can go ahead and exercise their option. If that proposition is so good as we think, and are satisfied that it is a good proposition, then it stands to reason that if there was any interference by us, they might exercise their option on the lines on which options were taken, and forget the negotiations that have been going on here for the last three months. This Government cannot enter into negotiations with anyone else until this option expires. The Newfoundland Government does not control the "A" Debentures, or the Bank of England. I would be very glad to see a much better proposition made for Newfoundland, if it was possible to do so. It strikes me as being very fishy the way that gentleman has come down here. I do not know who he is. First intimation that I had of him was when his name was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. Does it not strike one looking at it from a business and a sensible point of view, that if any concern was sending a representative down here to Newfoundland to deal with the Government over a proposition of this magnitude, is it not reasonable to suppose that they would send some notification to the Government. That is the way that it strikes me. Possibly that gentleman may have all the money that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says that he has behind him. But he came down here to enter into a deal with the Newfoundland Government and he knew that this bill was now before the House and would not one be led to suppose that the first thing that he would do would be to get in touch with the Prime Minister. I presume that the Prime Minister had no knowledge of his offer except what he received from the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I may tell the honourable gentleman that gentleman came to me for information. That is all.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman: This is of course new to us members, and

it seems to the members on the Government side as well. Mr. Hickman has just mentioned about Mr. Haes coming in here, and that he is prepared to offer a better proposition than the International Paper Co Then if that is the case and this man or his company are prepared to take over our liability of $10,000,000, why I think that everything possible should be done, so that we may have a chance to get rid of that liability. It seems from the Prime Minister's remarks and the remarks of the Hon. Member for Placentia, Mr. Sullivan, that this House and the Government are tied hand and foot over this bill with the International. I want it to be distinctly understood that I did not get up for the sake of holding up this House. I wish that it was closed one month before it opened. I want that to be known right here now. But as a member of this House I want to say this that it would not delay the session very much if the Committee was to rise, and the House adjourn for a day or two, and let this man see the Prime Minister and the Government, and find out what proposition that he is prepared to offer. If he offers a better proposition then why not accept it and if necessary wait until the 15th of September until the option of the International Co. expires. It is better to do that than to put through this deal and not get clear of our liability. As I said before I do not want to see this session prolonged, but I do want to see this country get the best possible deal, and so perhaps the Prime Minister and the Government would see fit to adjourn this House and meet this man and see what kind of a proposition he has.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman: Just one other word. I appreciate the position that the Prime Minister and his Government are in. And personally I may say that I sympathize with him. I do not think that anybody on this side of the House want to embarass him I am sure that he realizes that there is a great responsibility on his shoulders at this time. And I think that the International Co. will realise that as soon as anybody. I do not think that they will break of negotiations if we defer this matter for a day or two. The Prime Minister is leader of a party, the Leader of a Government. He has got to do his best in the interests of the country. He is the trustee and the chief trustee of the people of this country. He has got a big job on his hands.

MR. BROWNE—All trustees have equal duties.

MR. HIBBS—However I suppose that the greatest responsibility is on the shoulders of the Government. I sympathize with him in this position. But I do say that he is taking a great responsibility on his shoulders if he refuses to interview this man or this company, on the request of the Opposition. I think that the members on that side feel the same. Surely a day or two does not matter, very much And there is other legislation that we may put through. But if bye and bye you discover that you have made a mistake perhaps it will be too late. With regard to the Trade Facilities Board and the Bank of England one would gather from some of the speakers of the Government and particularly Mr. Sullivan, that they were all, everything. But I want to say here that this is a Newfoundland concern. It is of more concern to Newfoundland than to the Bank of England or the Trade Facilities. What is their interest compared with ours? This means the weal or woe of this country. Perhaps one hundred years from now it may affect Newfoundland and not these people. It is absurd to talk of Newfoundland being scared if these peo-

ple do not do so and so. I think that we are prepared to stand by these people in making the best deal that we can, but I am prepared to say now that the present administration would not have put the same deal through, if it had not been for that sledge hammer that is held over their heads. The liability that would put the country out of business, almost financially if they were called upon to meet it. We are trying to avoid it. And suppose that another company comes along and even at the last moment makes an offer, why not stop and consider it. We do not want to make political capital out of this. It just happened that we became informed first. But I do not think that the Opposition are trying to steal a march on the Government. Go and talk with that man, and whatever credit can accrue from this proposition take the credit for it, but do your best to find out just what that proposition is

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: I wish to make a few remarks but I propose to avoid any reference to the legal position, because that is a complicated matter. But there is one thing that we must bear in mind and that is, that we merely want to be certain that there will be no misunderstanding on any action that we may take regarding this matter. That we who have been for some time concerned about the decision of making a contract are now concerned with the contract that is going through. We naturally want to make sure that nothing we do is going to stop this contract from going through. Generally I think it will be agreed that if this is the best thing that can be done then I think that we ought to take care to see to it that no act of ours is going to break it off. In other words the position is this and I say it in the most respectful way to the Leader of the Opposition that he does not attempt to guarantee that there is any foundation in this proposition. He only contributes it as a matter of information. I have heard suggestions from people that are going to do things for this country, originating as far as the individual is concerned in good faith, but we found that they were not based on any substantial foundation. We have had an example of that within the past few days and even if the method of approach of that gentleman, who had come here with advances from a company, had come to us in a business like way, and the Government had been communicated with, even then, in his case, he has found his way out here on a fool's errand. He has been misinformed about the concessions that he could get. He has been concerned about the liability too much. He came out here under a false delusion. The gentleman referred to here perhaps had someone tell him that he was quite safe in coming out here on such a business. What I am a bit concerned about is that we should see to it that we are not going to do some foolish thing, that will give a bad impression to those people watching our progress. I feel that in signing this contract to-day and then without any substantial reason starting to monkey with it, we are taking a possible chance of at once, these people beginning to lose faith in any Government representing this country If we had before us today in this House a genuine authentic proposition, even then as the Prime Minister has said, we could not consider it. But we certainly would be somewhat excused, if we gave some thought to it. But surely it is a serious matter to consider the idea, having entered into a contract; having considered negotiations, and the whole world having the notorious knowledge that this matter was be-

fore the British public, and then because one of us no matter who he may be in perfectly good faith, announces that there is some man who says that he can get money, and lots of things for us, therefore we have posibly by this contract given the impression to these people that having discussed this thing and having signed it we are only going to use it as a convenience to wait and see if anyone could give us a better one. The Leader of the Opposition will recognize that as quickly as any one in this House being a business man.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I think that we are making a lot of fuss over a very little matter. This Mr. Gerardio who has arrived here has never communicated with the Government, and now just as we are bringing this matter before the House, important as regards time and everything else, and we come in to discuss it, with the intention of putting it through if it is good legislation, we are delayed and held up because somebody says that he can get money and knows all about the paper business. I think that it is absurd. If this gentleman was to come into my office, this afternoon, and I was there, and he asked me straight was there any use talking about this proposition, I would only have to say "No." "It is already disposed off." If you can get an opposition party strong enough to defeat this bill, then we go out and somebody else puts the proposition through for Messrs. Haes & Sons. We have made an agreement with the International Paper Co.

MR. HIBBS—You do not regard this as a party measure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is a Government measure. We have spent three months considering it. And now we have come down to the final point and we have said that we are agreed on it, rather than have the International go out. It is the very best that we can do. I do not mind telling this House that the other night some of the members of the party said that they were not going to be satisfied with this, and that we should get $150,000 every year from 1928. I went to these International gentlemen who happened to be in the ante-room and I said to them "Are you satisfied." They said "No, count us out." Place yourselves in the position of the Government, see these people go out the Narrows, then hear somebody shouting that we have lost the International, that they have gone away, and that the country has got a black eye. We have been dealing with a proposition and the whole world knows that we have dropped it. Is anyone else going to take it up. That is the responsibility that we have got to consider. I said before that I do not believe that there ever was legislation that received more consideration from the Government side of the House, than this measure has. For three months, day and night we have been at this proposition. We have come down to the point of making an agreement with these people after all these negotiations. And we have been satisfied with the agreement as made. There are indications from a section of the opposition at least, that it is in favour of it.

MR. HIBBS—Would you name those members.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would rather not do that. I have not been told who they are, but it has been indicated to me that there is a section of the opposition that are in favour of this bill. That possibly has rather induced Mr. Head and his associates to go away, feeling that this legislation was pretty well agreed to. As far as the Government are concerned it has got to be agreed to, because we could not go back on our agreement. It would be rather serious to-morrow if we were to sign an agreement and then to go back entirely on it. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition has made a comparison

with the fact that we went back on our agreement with Besco. We did not go back on that agreement. Besco was perfectly satisfied that we had reasons for refusing to put through the legislation as it was brought in. We certainly did not start to make an agreement with somebody else. This is a different thing altogether. It has been suggested that we should drop all negotiations with the International who has an option from the British Government, let the option expire and then look around for Mr. Haes.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—That is not the position.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is the position. In order to start negotiations with this gentleman that is here, we should have to wait until such time as the option given by the Bank of England and the Trade Facilities has lapsed, until the International Co. has thrown it aside and refused to exercise it, and then Haes & Sons would have to ask the Armstrong interests to give them an option. I doubt whether they would give them the same proposition for the reason that they have under this agreement created for themselves a big interest in this country, which they took, only because they had faith in the management of a successful and well managed paper company.

We have confidence in these men. What do we know of Mr. Haes, or of the men that he may have behind him. More than probable that it would be another Armstrong and Whitworth Co. There has not been much said about them in this House, but I want to say this, that they have lost their money, but if there is anybody that benefited by the investments that they made it is the people of this country. We have got a mill and a town site. They cannot carry them away. And as a result this country is better off to-day, but the Armstrong-Whitworth Co. has gone to the wall themselves over the enterprise, and I think that they deserve every sympathy and every consideration for their sportsmanlike attitude in coming out here and putting their money into that proposition. However that is by the way. Here is a bill now that has for its object the bringing of the International here, a strong, capable, monied concern, which I do not think will ever be likely to allow the Government to be called upon to pay the interest on those bonds. I hardly think that that is possible, because they have got at Corner Brook $40,000,000 worth of assets for $25,000,000. I think that they are bound to make a success of the enterprise. For that reason the Government after they had agreed to guarantee the bonds, decided to ask them to give us the royalty instead of the guarantee. I think that we are better off. If we get this $150,000 to the end of 1973, we will have a useful lot of money rolling into this country every year. It is a very different proposition from what it was in 1923. Then you had the idea that they they were going to put up a mill for $20,000,000 and it cost $40,000,000. Now you have got a mill that cost $40,000,000 for $25,000,000. Now you have got a company that knows the business of making paper, instead of a company that knew nothing about it. For that reason I urge that we go on with the bill, and do not take any notice of Mr. Gerardio, because if he came down to my office to-morrow, I would have to take the attitude that I could not deal with him, as far as I was concerned.

MR. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject that is arousing so much discussion this afternoon. It is quite obvious to anyone who looks back over the past few months, and is aware that these matters were engaging the attention of the British Government and this Government, particularly when we consider that the person to whom the Leader of the Opposition re-

ferred is supposed to come from England, that he must be a very ignorant man, if he was not aware of the opportunity to put forward his proposition to the Government before this. It is rather late in the day when the agreement is signed by the Government and placed upon the Table of this House of Assembly, to come forward with an entirely different proposition, and then not to come direct to the Government but to approach casually the Hon. Leader of the Opposition without producing any credentials. I think that the Government are in honor bound to stand by this agreement, no matter what favorable proposition this stranger may bring.

Supposing we were to turn down this agreement we have already signed with the International Paper Company, what would people think of us? Could we not turn down any other agreement if at the last moment a more favourable proposition came along? Why, we might carry on these negotiations for ever. I submit that the Government should stand by the attitude they have taken. I believe the Executive Government have worked harder on this contract than any other Executive Government ever did before, and they deserve a lot of credit for it and more credit than they will ever get. I feel sure that the present Executive have been the hardest worked Executive that ever sat in this House of Assembly from the way they handled and carried on the negotiations leading up to this contract, and I do not think that the charge of graft can be laid against any of them. I think, Sir, that the present discussion is entirely out of order. To turn down a proposition on which a signature has been put would be an unthinkable thing to do, and I am surprised at the Hon. Leader of the Opposition suggesting that we should abandon this contract. If another proposal came along and he put his signature on it in favour of it, I am sure he would not think of abandoning it afterwards. I must say that any further discussion along these lines cannot lead us very far because we are only talking in the air. We have entered into this contract now and we have to stand by it.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the strictures of the honourable member for St. John's West who termed the gentleman who came here representing Haes & Company as ignorant because he was not aware of what went on in England the past six months. I ask in all fairness in the light of what the public has discovered and if the Prime Minister himself is not also aware of, if the greatest secrecy was not thrown around this whole business? This Government had nothing to do with the Bank of England exercising any option. It was never done with our consent. It looks to me as though the Bank of England had something bad, as they thought, on their hands and they wanted to get clear of it, and the Americans were on the job and took it. But I do insist that the greatest secrecy surrounded this whole transaction.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I expected the Prime Minister or some member of the Executive Government to reply to me, but it appears that Mr. Browne, the member for St. John's West, seems to think that he knows more than anybody else in this House, judging by his frequent interruptions and if he would not be interrupting members as he has been doing there would be far less acrimonious debate in this House. I know that his attitude has been resented by members of his own Party. He said that the Government entered into an agreement with the International Paper Company. Yes, they did, they entered into an agreement subject to the ratification of this legislature, and if there is any benefit to be derived it is the duty of this legislature to consider the best proposition. The agreement has

the signature of the Colonial Secretary on it, as representing the Government, but the Bill itself is subject to the ratification of this legislature. If the Government intends to bring in agreements and legislation and compel everybody in this House to agree to it, what is the use of members who represent thousands of people in different parts of this country being here? The position I take is no different as to rejecting that proposition from the International than the position the Government took two years ago when they rejected the proposition of Besco, of Bell Island, in this House. My position this afternoon was to convey to the House the information I received. The gentleman, representing Haes & Co., did not come to this country with my knowledge or approval. He came to me and asked me how to approach the Government on his proposition. I suggested that he see the Prime Minister and I did not want to have any further conversation with him. The Government were the right people to see with reference to this deal or any other deal that comes before the House. I think I have made myself clear and I want to put myself on record that whatever the House does, we, as the representatives of the people, on this side of the House, will have to take the responsibility.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, The member for St. Barbe mentioned that this whole transaction had been shrouded in secrecy from the beginning and I am inclined to agree with him. The member for St. John's West also intimated that if other parties were interested in the business of Corner Brook they should have come to the front long ere this and made their offer. The great trouble is that people outside of Newfoundland know more about agreements and options that exist than we in Newfoundland do. I asked the question the other day in this House as to what option existed and the Prime Minister's reply was to the effect that the only one he knew of was one given to him in confidence, and, therefore, could not be made public, but he gave me the privilege of reading it. People outside of Newfoundland know more about these things than we do and what is given to Newfoundland and the members of this House in confidence is a matter of common knowledge to people outside this country. I have before me an article from the "Montreal Gazette" of August 9th and I purpose to read a portion of it for the benefit of these members who have not seen it. Here is what it says:

(Reads)

Now that convinces me that what is given to the Newfoundland Government as confidential is public knowledge to people of the United States and it seems altogether unfair. Our local newspapers are doing their best to give the public all the news they can with regard to that agreement and it does seem unfair to them that such information, as I have quoted, should be withheld from them. There is one point in particular I want to bring out and that is that by putting up two and a half million dollars in cash, the International will receive the entire common stock, which has a face value of twenty five million dollars, and can acquire the whole of the assets of the Humber and that of the Gander. One or two members have intimated that while they are not in accord with this agreement now before the Chair they support the principle of the Bill. I do not know what principle they refer to, because the only principle I can apply to this agreement is that of self-protection for the people of Newfoundland. I was very much gratified to hear Mr. Sullivan's remarks on Friday last when he admitted that he was not satisfied with the agreement and that the only reason he was supporting it was that it was the best in his opinion that could be done. No doubt he has

worked hard in connection with this proposition. Now I am wondering if this agreement is really the best that can be done with the International Paper Company. I refer now as to our postion as guarantors. Has the British Government been asked in order to effect a fair deal as regards Newfoundland to have (pari passu) "B" Debentures rank equal with "A" Debentures? I believe that if they were asked to do that they might consider it and if the British Government have not been asked I would suggest that such be done. My own atitude towards these Resolutions to-day is that the only people who are going to benefit by them are the International Paper Company. They are getting a mighty good thing out of it for a very little outlay. I am quite willing to be convinced that this was the best that could be done, but as things are now I am not convinced, because, as the "Montreal Gazette" states, if this Bill in its present form goes through the legislature the International Paper Company will control practically all our water powers and timber areas, and, as has been said by the Colonial Secretary, it settles for weal or for woe the future of the pulp and paper industry for this country. I feel that if there is a possibility of getting other offers than those made by the International they should be looked into. The whole situation is peculiar, particularly as the International Company have the power to renew their option which expires on September 15th. The option is very indefinite. Therefore, if the Government is not prepared to consider offers from other parties, I would suggest that the best thing to do is to shelve these Resolutions now before the Chair.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say that only a week ago I received these Bills and I have not had the time or the opportunity to study them as other members have had. Therefore, if I say anything in connection with these Resolutions that is incorrect I would like to be made right because it is neither my intention or desire to make any wrong statement, nor do I want to view this thing in any party partisan manner, but rather do I want to discuss it broadly and solely as a Newfoundlander whose home is in Newfoundland and one who aims and tries to have the best interest of Newfoundland at heart at all times. The Prime Minister said he understood this afternoon that some of the principals of the International Paper Company had gone from Newfoundland with the understanding that some members of the Opposition were supporting the Bill. Now I want at this juncture to disassociate my name from those members, because my desire is to see that the best bargain possible is made for Newfoundland. At the present time, in my opinion, I do not consider that this is the right sort of an agreement that we as Newfoundlanders should accept, and I want to give my reasons as briefly, as concisely and as intelligently as I possibly can. I would first like to ask the Prime Minister has the Government a financial statement of the affairs of the N.P. and P. Company?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Then I think that we as members of this House representing the people of this country should have that financial statement showing how the accounts of the Company stand. Is the Prime Minister prepared to table that financial statement for the information of the House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, we are perfectly willing to table any information we have in that connection.

MR. ASHBOURNE—We have been told that there has been a considerable lot of money spent at Corner Brook and I judge that the Government is in a position of having a statement from the International

Company so as to be able to size up where and how that money was spent at Corner Brook and spent to a greater extent than it should have been. Now, whoever is responsible for that large expenditure at Corner Brook is a point that should not be lost sight of. However, I am very pleased to know that the Government has a financial statement from the Corner Brook authorities, but I am sorry that the Prime Minister has not seen fit to lay it before the House, because very considerable hinges upon it in my opinion. As I understand the situation, the Armstrong-Whitworth Company was given the contract to construct the Humber mill and that beyond the construction they were not greatly interested in it, except that after it was built they might be inclined to sell it to some one to operate. But their main work lay in the construction of the mill. I do not know who the shareholders of the N.P. and P. Company are, but I do know that the Reids are interested to a certain extent. Now it seems to me that we as a country in dealing with the International Paper Company, of New York, must readily recognise that we are up against big interests who are down here, not for the sake of Newfoundland but for the sake of what they can get out of Newfoundland in the way of paper. It would be just the same as if any member of this House or any business firm in Newfoundland went to America to-morrow to get a contract with the American Government. We naturally would not be interested in seeing that the American people got the best of the bargain. So it is with the International Company who came here to get the best bargain possible from the Newfoundland Government.

We would not be interested in seeing that the American people were getting the best of the bargain. On the other hand we would naturally like to get the best of the bargain ourselves and so looking at in from the ordinary natural aspect it is only right to say that the International Paper Company came down here looking to get the Corner Brook properties at as good a bargain as possible and to get as good concessions from the Government as they could. My argument is borne out in respect of that contention by the fact, as I understand it, that at first they were looking for certain areas on the Labrador and as we see by the present Bill the Government finally got them down to something less, so that they are not getting any areas on the Labrador. Now I think myself that the International Paper Company being a large corporation has made perhaps twenty or thirty such agreements as this one now under consideration to our one, and naturally they are in a better position to safeguard their interests than perhaps we as members of the House of Assembly are to look after the interests of Newfoundland, because after all in this Bill and both Bills there is sufficient matter and detail as would require, to my mind, a considerable time for a lawyer going into the technicalities of the Bill to satisfy himself that the country's interests are safeguarded, and that is why, in my humble opinion, I think the Government would have done well to have got some expert advice on the Bill; some expert legal opinion. It might not cost a big sum and even if it cost a little money to my mind it would be money well spent to conserve the interests of the Colony. I don't believe that we should be frightened into an agreement or into a bad bargain with the International Paper Company just because we happen to have over our heads this fear of having to meet the interest on our "B" debentures; the debentures which have been guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government. It seems to me that it is a good point to consider that if we found ourselves with

the mill at Corner Brook on our hands and not enough timber to keep it going then I consider that we should be rather up in the air about it but on the other hand we find that we are the only people in North America to-day that have any loose timber, any timber unsold; the only parties in North America; and rather than not having sufficient timber reserves, to be sure that our mill at Corner Brook will be kept going we have the greater reserve of the Labrador; and that is a point I contend that we should not lose sight of that we develop Labrador for the people of Newfoundland, that Labrador be retained for the benefit of Newfoundland and not for the benefit of speculators. Unfortunately the history of Newfoundland to a large extent has been that where concessions have been granted that after a few years the hard luck story is put up and after a time further concessions are sought for. Now, are we sure, do we feel confident that after a few years the International Paper Company won't come to us and say "Here, we are unable to pay the interest and you have got to give us the Labrador." Shall we be in that position? These are points which come to my mind and which I want to bring forward for the benefit of the House. These mills must have timber. We must look forward to the future. Only to-day I received a letter with regard to the matter of forest depletion. It is as I understand it an extract from a British Columbia paper, a Victorian paper, the Daily Commerce. It is not signed by any signature except the name of Frank D. Barjum is down below. To my mind coming as it did when my mind was dwelling upon this matter of forests and timber it came with rather particular emphasis. It says:

(Reads)

I have read that because to my mind it is worth reading and worth considering. I said once before on the floors of the House this year that as far as I am concerned I did not intend to give my approval that another stick of timber should be exported out of Newfoundland in its raw state and even to-day I see no reason why I should alter or change my attitude in that regard. I maintain that that company should be compelled to manufacture our wood here in Newfoundland. What is the attitude of the ordinary man to-day on the streets? He is against any more wood being allowed to go out of this country in its raw state. I think members will find the great majority of the people are against the granting of any more wood to go out of the country to be manufactured abroad. I believe to-day if a plebiscite were taken in this country on the matter that ninety per cent. of the people of this country would be against any more of our wood being exported in the raw state, and that is one argument I have against this contract, that fact that we are allowing our raw wood to be exported. Now I would like to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister what reason the International Paper Company have given to the Government as to why they want to export this pulp wood each year. What reason did the International Paper Company give you?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— The reason the International Paper Company want the right to export wood as explained to us is that when the prices go up in some years, and a timber man holds up the International for higher prices, there being a scarcity of supply, they think that by bringing up a hundred or couple of hundred cords of wood to America they will be able to check the determination on the part of these timber holders to put the prices up. The very threat they think of that much wood coming in at one time

when some particular individual may be holding them up would be sufficient to serve the purpose, even if they didn't have to export any wood from here at all. At the present time they are not desirous of exporting wood. They went so far as to ask us to let them off the exportation of wood from the Hampden lands this year and they are only paying fifty cents a cord for wood exported from there whereas they have to pay a dollar in the future. According to the Bill they have the right to export wood from the Hampden lands at fifty cents a cord and they asked us to let them off this year and we said no, that we wanted the industry at Hampden and that we wouldn't let them off, that they would have to go on exporting.

That is the position that we found ourselves in. They are not so desperate to-day to get a Bill through in order to rush wood out of the country. They do not want to do it. I really believe that I am justified in saying that they only want this right, to use it when it suits them to do it. That is the reason that they gave us and I think that it is one explanation.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: I want to thank the Prime Minister for that explanation. It is exactly as I had figured it out before, myself. But why should we Newfoundlanders have our wood sacrificed in order to protect the company from the payment of a certain price, in order to compete against the price of paper in the States. That is the point that I would like to see cleared up. I would like to hear the hon. members opposite give us some justification for that. I have not heard any argument to justify it up to the present. The idea is that if bye and bye timber areas in Canada cost the company more than they do here, and if the price of pulp is so high that they are held up, then they will say "We have the right to export pulp wood from Newfoundland," and then they will send up here and export our pulp wood in order to keep the mills in the States and Canada going. They will use Newfoundland as a buffer in order that they may serve their own interests as against the Canadian and American wood. Here in Newfoundland what do we find. We find that we have superior timber for the making of paper. I am told that our spruce is of a very fine fibre and is excellent material for the manufacture of paper. As I said before, I have yet to be convinced that the Government has any right to give away or allow to be exported, our pulp wood in the raw state, in order that it may be manufactured in these countries. Could the Hon. Mr. Sullivan tell me how many cords of wood it takes to make a ton of paper.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—About one and a half or one and a third cords.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Let us say a cord and a half. Under this bill they have the right to export a half cord of wood for every ton of paper that they export from the additional machines, at Corner Brook and the Gander, which will be four, capable of turning out one hundred tons per day. That will be four hundred tons per day, and working 300 days that would be 120,000 tons of paper. Now that we are allowed to export a half cord of wood to every ton of paper, that will be 60,000 cords. Now take for instance that a cord of wood is worth ten dollars. That would mean to the country $600,000. As against that if it is manufactured into paper it is worth at least four and a half times as much, as it is in the raw material, and that would be about $2,700,000. Therefore the country is losing thereby over $2,000,000 by the exportation of wood in the raw state. There is something to digest. Now the contention that I want to urge against these resolutions is

this. Let the International Paper Co. of New York come in here and stand behind their guarantees. It is not reasonable to suggest that these companies may be in a position bye and bye that they may not be able to pay the interest on the railway or certain other demands which they are obligated to pay under the agreement. As I said before my desire in speaking to these measures is to try to improve them if possible and to point out the points as appear to me, in the interests of the Colony of Newfoundland. What is the use of looking for guarantees from a company whose assets are heavily mortgaged. Now as regards the £4,000,000 which this company can raise upon the "B" debentures as security and the "A" debentures as well. They can go and raise £4,000,000 ahead of our bonds. For which £1,000.000 is to be used to pay off the $5,000,000 bonds of the Bank of England. Now my argument as regards getting the International to stand behind these companies in case these companies have obligations, and bye and bye they find that they are not in a position to meet the interest charges like the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, and cannot carry out its contracts with the Government, because it seems to me that a company whose assets are heavily mortgaged, may not be in the position to meet, or fulfil all its obligations. I want to know whether or not the International Company of New York intends to put any cash into this company beyond the $2,500,000 which is going to pay the Bank of England. Can the Prime Minister inform me as to that point.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I do not think that they are bound to put anything more in it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Have you any idea of what the Humber people or the International people will pay the Reids for their property. We find as we take it now that they can raise £4,000,000 ahead of the "A" and "B" debentures. One million of which is to pay off the Bank of England prior lien bonds. Of the remainder they can take $2,000,000 and build two additional 100-ton machines. That is the idea is it not. Now how do we know what they are going to spend the $3,000,000 for.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—You may be sure that the trustees will know what they are going to spend it for. They are English and they are going to see to it that their interests are protected over there. They are not going to have the expenditure uncontrolled.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Is there any obligation on the part of the trustees to see that this money is spent, and that full value is got for it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The trustees for instance will not allow them to buy mortgaged lands on the Gander, and put it in as security for the "A" and "B" debentures. You would not expect that.

MR. ASHBOURNE—On the other hand have we any control over the value that they may pay for the land, or can they pay any value they wish for the land. That is the point that I want cleared up and I would like to have some clear statement on the point.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I may say that there is no question about it. That is a matter for the trustees who have got to see that good security is found, for the International Humber proposition is only used for that purpose. Some of this timber can be bought if valuable to the Humber proposition, but the security that has to go in behind the "A" and "B" debentures has to be to the satisfaction of the trustees. If any of the money is to be used for the purchase of lands then the trustees have got to be satisfied that they are necessary lands for

the purpose of conducting the enterprise.

MR. ASHBOURNE—What about the price?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — That is their business to see that the price is satisfactory. But in any case we may be sure that the International will see that the price is right. We asked them what they wanted such a huge amount as £4,000,000 for. It seemed to me that they only required one-third to put in the two extra machines. They said that they wanted that to cover the extension that may take place on the mill in twenty years. They are hopeful that they will be able to put six extra mills in Corner Brook.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Is it the intention to link up the Gander with the Humber under this $3,000,000?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Not that I know of. But there may be some lands purchased from the Reids that would be of more value to the Humber than to the Gander proposition. If so the property can be acquired by the Humber Company if the trustees are satisfied that these lands should be acquired to feed the Humber proposition. And as some of the Reids lands have some mortgages on them, they certainly cannot be bought with any other money.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, here is a point that I would like cleared up. The Prime Minister says that some of the money may be taken to pay the Reids for some other lands, because some of the Reids' lands being mortgaged cannot be sold to this company. But if the mortgage was paid off then the person could buy them. I am glad that I brought up this point because I must admit that I am not very clear on it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Suppose that in the course of time these lands became a very valuable asset to the Gander proposition, it would not matter very much whether they were there as security for the "A" and "B" debentures or not, as long as they were good security.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The point is are we sure the company is going to raise the four million pounds? If they do not, they may be in a bad financial state for a few years and we have no guarantee that this company will not find themselves in the same position that the N. P. and P. Company found themselves in. Then again, there is another point I would like to have cleared up and that is in respect to the paying of that one million pounds to the Bank of England. Can the Bank of England claim that, and were they right in taking the first mortgage without the consent of the people of Newfoundland? It seems to me that if I have a certain property as security and I am taking the position that the members of the House of Assembly represent the people of Newfoundland, then nobody has the right to alter any security except the House of Assembly. This five million dollars in bonds were placed on Corner Brook without the consent of the House. It is true the consent of the Executive Government was had, but is that legal? I have before me here a part of an editorial article that appeared in the Daily News on April 7th, 1926. Here is what it says:—

(Reads.)

Now that is the point I am debating at the present time. Are we liable for the ten million dollars as to "B" debentures? But whether we are or not, if people place an additional amount or takes a security on our assets without our consent, are we liable to honour that amount raised upon our security?

I maintain, Sir, that this matter should not be rushed through hurriedly. I am well aware that the Executive Government have been working on this contract for months. Although the House has been in session for over three months they have not had the

opportunity of going into this proposition as thoroughly as is desirous in the interests of the Colony. Therefore, I say that any time we spend debating this matter will not be time spent for nothing. Another point that appears to me that the Government would do well to consider is the possibility of this country being a bald rock within a few years. The Government should also have insisted on provision being made in the agreement whereby the company would have to re-afforest Newfoundland, because if all our trees are going to be cut out of Newfoundland our very climate will be altered. It takes forty odd years for natural re-afforestation and we should use every means to see artificial re-afforestation carried on, no matter what the natural abilities of Newfoundland are in that regard. I maintain that if all our forests are gone, by and by we will have no water; our mountains will not be able to hold the water; our climate will be materially affected, so that I want the Prime Minister to make it necessary for this company to re-afforest. Now why is it that sections twelve and fifteen of the Crown Lands Act are held not to apply to this Company? Is it the intention to clean out all the timber that is in this country and then look to the Labrador? We have pulp mills here capable of turning out nearly a thousand tons a day, so that ere long this country will be denuded of its timber, and then this company will say to the Government, "You got to give us the Labrador."

With regard to railway ties, I would like to ask the Government what have they done in this agreement to conserve land for the cutting of railway ties? I think this is a serious mattter and provision should be made in this agreement before it is too late for renewals of the railway line, in addition to providing ties for original construction. When the railway was built, as I understand it, every fifth mile was given to the Reids. Now, of course, to-day we got a railway of our own, but we have no land practically on which to cut our ties. I consider that any titles of land that have lapsed should revert back to the Newfoundland Railway. I think this is a point well worth the attention of the Government, as the number of railway ties cut per year now is hundreds of thousands short of what used to be cut years ago.

What timber reserves have we here that will provide that, and why has the Government only now begun to make timber reservations to provide for and protect the requirements of the railway.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—All the areas that adjoined the railway reverted back to the Crown.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Does the Prime Minister consider to-day that you have sufficient areas now owned by the Crown to ensure ample supplies of ties for the railway?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—On the railway we have not.

MR. ASHBOURNE—It is very doubtful whether you have them available at all.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have enough for a few years yet.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Here is a point that you can take up with the International. Get them to guarantee that they will allow us to cut for our railway sufficient ties to protect us.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is a very good point that has already been taken up not only with the International but with every other company in the island. They will not let outsiders go in and cut ties because there is a tremendous amount of waste. It is better to make a contract with the different companies to supply so many railway ties per year.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Here is a point that seems to me to be sound. During the last few years a considerable amount of poor relief has been re-

quired. Why should not the Government give those people who have no employment the opportunity of working—cutting railway ties.

To my mind the people of Newfoundland to-day want to go fishing. They do not want to go into the country working at timber, or logging. They would rather go fishing. That is where I maintain that the Government should encourage the fisheries, and it should be the first interest and the principal interest of the Government to look after them. On the other hand everything is left to mere chance as regards the fisheries, and they hope that by and by things will still continue on an even keel. The Prime Minister in a speech the other day pointed out that the Government will get a revenue from this of at least $1,600,000 per year. I presume that that argument was based upon the fact that the people perhaps will have a greater earning power. But I maintain that if a man goes into the country his earning power may be increased to a greater extent than if he goes to the fisheries, but it is very doubtful whether or not the revenue of the country will be increased by taking a man from the fisheries and putting him into the country. A man goes into the country and he earns $2.50 a day, which he has to spend on food, clothes, etc. But when he goes fishing he has to buy certain other requirements, lines and twines and oil clothes, by which he is contributing a certain amount to the revenue, and I believe that that argument of the Prime Minister may look very good on the surface, but I do not think that the man who goes into the country will eat any more than the man who goes fishing; therefore I do not see where the increased revenue is coming from as spoken of by the Prime Minister. And I think that the chances are that conditions are going to repeat themselves as regards getting Canadian lumber jacks in here.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What about the number of men that are looking for work and are not at the fisheries?

MR. ASHBOURNE—Are there many men unemployed?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I fear so.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Well I know that as far as Twillingate is concerned that everybody I think that can get to the fisheries is fishing at the present time. I maintain that to-day there should not be much unemployment when there are fish to be caught around our shores. And by and by we will find that Canadian lumber jacks will be coming down here and cutting timber in the fall of the year instead of our own men. I think that we as a Government should see to it and insist on having our own men get as much employment from the cutting of this timber as is possible. 1 know that it can be argued from the standpoint of the company that they did not want to be so tied up, and not be able to take them by and by, because there are not sufficient men to cut as required. Why is it that this company cannot make money and cannot pay its guaranteed bonds and interest? It seems to me as a layman that if that company with all its facilities cannot make money. what company can? I understand that the A. N. D. Co. last year made money, and why is not the Corner Brook concern able to make money? I see from the bill that the company must provide ties for the railway on the Gander, but there is nothing there as regards replacing them once they are used up. That is an important point, that if they build a railway down there that they should provide to replace any that was required from time to time on that Gander railway. Now last year I spoke about placing Lewisporte on the main line of the railway, and I do not know whether my suggestion was taken seriously, but I would like now to bring that point

to the attention of the Prime Minister, as Lewisporte is in close vicinity to Botwood and other places up north. I gave that suggestion for what it was worth. I was sincere in my suggestion because you can realise that considerable loss of time is occasioned by passengers having to go to Notre Dame Junction and wait half an hour for an express, and also the passengers getting off the express have to wait a considerable time before getting to Lewisporte. I therefore thought that it would be advisable to place Lewisporte on the main line. The members of the Railway Commission must know that a considerable amount of coal goes to Lewisporte each year, and thousands of tons have to be hauled over the railway to Bishop's Falls. If Lewisporte was made the end of the western division it would not be necessary to haul the coal to Bishop's Falls.

I understand that the Prime Minister this afternoon is not inclined to consider any other agreement or any other parties; not inclined to discuss this matter with any other party no matter how good a contract they might have to place before the country. I am afraid that I cannot agree with the Prime Minister in that regard because I believe as regards this proposition being one of such great importance to the Colony that we should not lose sight of any opportunity whereby the Colony might be benefited. The more discussion that we have on this Bill; the more ventilation that is given in this House and outside, I maintain the better bargain we should be able to get for the Colony. I want to thank the House for the hearing given me. My only intention is to try and improve the bargain for the sake of Newfoundland, because it is my native country and I hope to live here for some years yet, and I want to see Newfoundland get the best out of this that it possibly can get.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining Order of the Day was deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, August 16th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 15th, 1927.

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

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committe of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap 206 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies'" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting a Bill for the Confirmation of a Contract between the Government and the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: It is not my intention at this juncture to make any extended remarks, but yesterday in the course of my remarks in figuring up the value of the number of tons of paper to be exported I made an error in value. The value I mentioned of $2,700,000 was not sixty thousand cords but sixty thousand tons. I would like to

correct that and say it was $1,800,000 I should have given as the value of the exported article at $10 a cord making the amount of $1,200,000 a year loss to the country. With regard to this matter it seems to me it is a very important point because the difference between value of the timber in its raw state and when manufactured is so large that for the period of years it is permitted them to export between forty and fifty years it will amount to forty or fifty millions and I would urge on the Prime Minister the fact of this large exportation of forty or fifty millions worth going out of this country over an extended period of years should not be lost sight of. No doubt the Prime Minister has figured out the same as I have the amount which the Colony will lose by having the wood go out in its raw state and as I said yesterday that is one of my main contentions in arguing against the Bill.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister if he could tell us what was the proposition made by the Royal Securities Corporation of Canada in connection with this property?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In answer to the Leader of the Opposition, there was no proposition made by the Royal Securities. The Royal Securities like everybody else, as I said, recognized we were not in a position to deal with them until the International option had expired. They felt satisfied they could not do business with us until then. Even if we turned down the International, the International would be within their rights, holding an option, to have paid off our "B" Debentures and exercised the option. Meantime, the Royal Securities said they were prepared, if we failed with the International people, to do business with us, and Mr. Killam of the Royal Securities met Mr. Graustein in New York and had a little talk, as I said, largely in a friendly way to help the Colony at my request, and he telegraphed to his agent here that he had agreed with Mr. Graustein that he would have nothing more to do with the proposition and he would be perfectly satisfied in the Colony's interests if the International paid half the bonds in 10 years. That, as I told you, we afterwards exchanged for the payment of a royalty which we thought would be better.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: Just what is the meaning of the word interest there. It looks to me as if the word income is very vague and the word interest is not as fully defined as might be the case.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I cannot say that this clause has been carefully gone through, by lawyers because as I explained in my opening speech the clause appears to be a little bit difficult to understand, and it is worded to take care of the possible income tax that the parent company may have to pay to the United States. But our lawyers have assured us that there can be no question about it, that we would get the $75,000 and the $150,000 in due course in preference to everything else. That interest clause looks to me to be doubtful in as much as, if you borrowed money from the Bank you have got to pay the Bank interest before everything else.

DR. MOSDELL—Did the Government consider putting in any qualifying phrase there.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The Minister of Justice did not consider that it was necessary. I do not know but that we might take it into consideration again.

DR. MOSDELL—If the use of the term in this connection means that we are as much safeguarded as we can possibly be, then I suppose it is

just as well to let it stand as it is.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— That is the advice that we have. We are safeguarded as much as we can be in the words "Deduction of interest."

MR. ASHBOURNE—Deduction is a different thing from payment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— You have to deduct before you pay it. They cannot give any consideration to interest before the payment of this.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman: I think that the clause about the 20 per cent. payment is useless.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: Perhaps it would clarify matters to some extent if I read the explanation of the clause which was given us by the International themselves to show their reasons for putting it in that way:

(Reads)

In other words it merely means as far as we are concerned that we will get that $75,000 for three or four years and after that $150,000 and we will never get more or less.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: Just one other word of explanation. In clause B of the same section there is provision that seems to give preference to the holders of debentures, stock, etc., who are domiciled outside of Newfoundland. These holders being domiciled outside of Newfoundland are exempted from certain taxes. Just what is the explanation of that. Is there a distinction drawn there because of the difference in residence. It looks to me like discrimination.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: If there was an income tax, anybody in Newfoundland would come under it, and anybody living outside Newfoundland would not come under it. So we felt that this meant that the company would practically be paying an income tax, as anyody holding stocks and bonds in this country would have to pay it, we thought that it would be rather impossible for the Government to tax their dividends earned in this country. It would mean that on top of the $150,000 they would be paying a further income tax.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman: The point I make is that the Newfoundland holders of bonds or debentures do pay an income tax, whereas the holders of debentures domiciled outside of Newfoundland only pay in respect to the company itself. If there is a reasonable explanation I think that the Government are only too willing to advance that explanation. Otherwise the feeling is that there is discrimination in favor of the company against the ordinary Newfoundlander who may have purchased stocks or bonds. I dare say that the Government are in a position to explain that away.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— Mr. Chairman: There is nothing further to add to what the Prime Minister has already said. The position was that under the old Act all stocks and shares were exempted from taxation. I do not see how you could collect from those outside owners of stock anyhow. What would happen would be that the individual owners of shares in the main International Co. would not be registered here, and as a result it is impossible to follow them up. That is the trouble. I take it here that all the interest of any shares would be pooled. This clause here so far as we are concerned is simply clarifying the old position.

MR. HICKMAN — What difference does it make whether they are pooled or not. For instance if I am a shareholder in a company in England, then before they send me out my cheque they deduct the income tax.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— So far as we are concerned in this country we could not get at the individual shareholders. We could only get at the ninety shares held by the company itself. These in turn may be split up into hundreds of shares as far as the passing out of the dividends is concerned.

DR. MOSDELL—This is something that has been adopted by the Government and not insisted on by the company.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE— It has been the result of joint drafting and alteration. So far as this particular clause is concerned it was drafted largely, as a result of the decision on the part of the company to give a contribution of $150,000 in lieu of royalty.

MR. HICKMAN — Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if there was any effort made to get the International Paper Company to take over the obligation of the Newfoundland Government respecting the two million pounds under the "B" debentures? On page 20 of the agreement clause (6) says: (Reads)

It seems to me to be a very easy matter for the International Company to go out and raise six million pounds instead of one million pounds because all the assets at Corner Brook which they will give as security must be worth at least six million pounds and take over the liability that the Newfoundland Government have there out of the extra two millions. I think any other company except the International, taking over this, no doubt, would drive a hard bargain.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman: I would like to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that one of the chief features the International made against borrowing money to pay off the "B" debentures was the fact that they would have to pay more interest than we would have to. Money can be borrowed on better terms with Government guarantee than otherwise. Then again when they first mooted this question of borrowing money the parent company demurred because liability would be on the parent company. They were prepared to pay off those bonds of two millions out of the four millions; but I want the Leader of the Opposition to understand that they could not borrow money in the general market to-day at the same rate as they could borrow on our guarantee bonds.

MR. MROWN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Prime Minister what is the position of the International Paper Company regarding their recognition of labor unions over at Corner Brook? I fear that the International are opposed to labor organizations. I have a letter in my possession now from Corner Brook about that subject.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member for Twillingate I may say that I wrote the organization and I told them that I had an interview with the International Paper Company's representatives here, who pointed out that, whilst they could not have anything determined by legislation to the effect that they recognised labor unions, everywhere they have gone they have worked in harmony with labor and would do the best they could here. In most cases, I think, they have adopted the system of open shops, but I do not think that prevents them from working in co-operation with labor organizations if labor organizations can work with them.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman. I think that is going to be the one thing in which the International Paper Company is going to cause a lot of trouble. They are a Company that do not want to recognize unions at all. About six years ago they had the employees

of twenty five mills on strike in the course of twelve months for the simple reason that they did not want to recognize ordinary labor. As soon as this Company starts to disregard representatives of unions and union men themselves at Corner Brook it is likely going to bring about trouble for the Company. I hope it will not happen. But I repeat that this Company seem to be hard-hearted towards the laboring man. They use them as machines, and machines only. I trust that no grievance occurs in that direction, but if it does occur it is going to go through. The deal that is now before the House is the worst ever perpetrated upon the country since the '98 contract. It is going to go through the House and we as representatives of the people are going to be responsible for it, and we are going to be cursed by our children and our children's children for putting through one of the rottenest deals in the history of this legislature.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, when the Directors opened this question we insisted on having two local Directors on the Board at Corner Brook, instead of one, as before; but they volunteered the information to me that it is their intention to have most of their Directors from here composed of experienced men to advise them on local conditions. For instance, Mr. J. P. Powell, who had been on the Directorate of the N.P. and P. Company from its inception, has been suggested as a member of the new Directorate. The whole idea is to get men here to form a local Directorate that can give assistance to the people at New York. One man will be at the head of the local Directorate butI do not know who that will be; but I do know that the object of forming the local concern is to satisfy local conditions, and I feel quite certain that every effort will be made as far as possible to work in harmony with labor unions formed at Corner Brook as long as demands are reasonable.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that Mr. J. P. Power is the best manager that could be got for Corner Brook, and, if he had been in charge there before, there would not be any money wasted and thrown away. I hope that when the International Company comes in that the Government will see fit to advise the Company to engage the services of Mr. Powell as manager, because he is one of the cleverest men in the country as far as that kind of work is concerned. On the other hand, if we are going to have two directors on the Humber now, as stated by the Prime Minister, I hope that we will get, at least, as much information in this House as we got from the Director we had last year as to the doings over at Corner Brook.

DR. MOSDELL—Can the Prime Minister tell me in respect of that £1,000,000 of first mortgage debenture stock, is any part of that amount remaining or has it all been expended? I think it is a matter of importance whether all of that is spent or unspent.

MR. RANDELL—I would like to ask if the financial condition of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company has been laid before the House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I want first to welcome back to the House the honourable member for Trinity. We are glad to see him back after his long voyage. In the second place I want to tell him I have sent down this afternoon for the financial statement, which was presented to us by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company and any further information that is requested we certainly will obtain for the House. With regard to Dr. Mosdell's question I don't think I have a statement of that. I don't know whether Mr. Power the Director of the Company has any knowledge of the exact amount ex-

pended of that one million pounds but I understand most of it had been expended. We can get a statement in connection with that.

DR. MOSDELL—With respect to modifications in the A and B Debentures in respect of B Debentures particularly, is t up to the Governor-in-Council to decide as to modifications? Clause 7.

(Reads)

Under the old agreement there was a lot of comment and controversy on this matter and has the Government considered it the proper thing to keep to the language of the old agreement in that respect and leave the decision on the quest on of modifications to the Governor-in-Council rather than putting it up to the Legislature?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It will be noted here that it is expressly provided as follows:

(Reads)

It is not as in the old Act. This clause is only for th's purpose that if we discover something trivial, and about which there is nothing material, then in that case the Governor-in-Council can do it.

(Reads)

That protects it thoroughly. In other words the Governor-in-Council cannot increase the loan in any respect or alter the status of the A or the B debentures. Or any issue prior to that. The only effect of this clause is that instead of having to call the legislature together for a more nominal thing that does not affect the substance of the issue, we are able to get that done by consent in writing. I wish the House to be definitely assured on that point. The only object of this clause is that when we get over there it may be essential to get assent as to the date of issue of the bonds.

(Reads)

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like the Attorney General to give us an opinion as to the right of export of pulp wood, from the Reid Lands.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact it is a moot point to-day. The contention is set up that from fee simple lands export may be made. But that does not take account of the laws that may be enforced from time to time, because as a matter of fact I have printed here for submission to the Executive Government, a bill with regard to the exportation of timber from Crown lands etc. I do not mind saying to the House now that it is with the idea of covering that point and limiting the exportation in future specifically to such exportation rights as may be granted by special act of the Legislature. Under the 1927 and 1928 acts the Governor-in-Council has the power to permit the exportat on of timber. It is felt here now that with these big companies coming in here that we ought to control absolutely and limit this to such exportation as is done under the special act of the Legislature. If that act is submitted in the course of a day or two the only exportation of timber that can take place from Newfoundland if any. will be under these acts. It is exported at the present time under the agreement that exists in the northern portion of the Island. With reference to the question that the honourable member asked as to what was the position in law to-day with regard to the Reid lands, that is a moot quest on. The suggestion is that the Reid lands being fee simple lands have the right of export. But as I say it has never been put into effect. No exportation has ever been done and the point has never been tested. But t has been contended by them that they have the right of export. The Reid Lands as a matter of fact are simply held under fee simple. And in the terms of those grants there certainly is nothing referring to exportation in them. And the submission that has been made s that from these fee simple grants they have the right to export. And the

argument that is used is that the law of export is a law against Crown lands. It is to clear up that point that we are bringing in this specific legislation.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, it is open to doubt then as to whether the Reid Newfoundland Co. has the right to export pulp wood.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, am I correct then in concluding that the Government has taken up the position that the Reids had no such right to export, under the clause regarding the exportation of pulp wood from the Gander areas inserted in the Gander bill, because there is a clause there providing that the Company shall at the request of the Government cut wood and shall have the right to export it.. Well then there were general laws in existence regarding the exportation of timber from the Reid's lands that should not be necessary.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —We have been taking the position that we do not recognize any such right. That is not saying that it is perfectly sound in law, as it has not been pronounced upon in any court.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, there is another point that I think should be brought up. I bring it up now because the Prime Minister made a statement regarding the advance from the International to the Reids. I am not quite clear as to what the purposes of that advance were. Of course if it was for the Reids for their own purposes, it was not my business to enquire into it. But it has been suggested that it was for the purchase of lands that they had in the Gander territory in respect to which the International were interested.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member, I may say that the point was brought up by somebody the other day as to whether the International having got this legislation through as far as Corner Brook was concerned might drop the Gander altogether, and we would hear no more about it. I just quoted that it was a fairly good indication that the International were honest in their intentions towards these bills seeing that they had loaned the Reids $300,000 as against these lands for their own specific purposes. But it shows that they are interested to that extent already, before they have exercised their option at all. I think that they have given a fairly good proof of their bona fide in connection with that.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, there is a question that I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Mines. My information is that there is a large area of land in Bonne Bay in respect of which the rental lapsed, and the land has been allowed to remain in the possession of some private French Canadian Co. who is paying the rental.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member, I may say that that is not so. There is no rental being paid by any people for any area of land in the vicinity of Bonne Bay, or anywhere else as a matter of fact. There has been an area of about a hundred square miles that was formerly held by some Canadian Co. They owed a rental on it and the area was cancelled. That area is now being sold for a bonus. I think that the bonus is in the vicinity of $10,000. The Canadian Co. who held that land repeatedly refused to pay up and they owed only five hundred dollars. The Department has now cancelled the lease and sold it to other parties for about $10,000.

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 without amendment and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect thereto.

On motion 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 Prime Minister a Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the International Paper Co. of Newfoundland, Limited, was introduced and was read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting a Bill to Amend the Act 15 Geo. V. (1924) Cap. 2, entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I would gather that after these Resolutions are ratified by the House the Executive Government will have to satisfy themselves as to the bona fides of the Gander Valley Paper Company to carry out their terms of the agreement before they can issue a Proclamation and this legislation will have no effect until the issue of that Proclamation. But even if the Executive Government can satisfy themselves to issue this Proclamation, still we are giving the Reid Newfoundland Company an extension of time to continue negotiations to effect a sale of their property. We are giving them three years longer to carry out their agreement made on August 16th, 1924. Now was that section asked for to be embodied in these Resolutions? Even if these Resolutions are ratified here and something arises to prevent the Company from carrying out their terms of the contract, then the Executive Government, I submit, cannot carry out the terms of these Resolutions either because the Reids have to be given an extension of time to effect the sale of their property on the Gander.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Executive Government would have no power to give them any extension, because if they do not exercise this option they have to start afresh.

MR. HALFYARD—There is some doubt about it anyhow, and the inference is one that we are not sure, after all, that the terms of this agreement will be put into effect.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Reids wanted us to make a special Act at first and then they felt that anything might happen within a few months, so they took no chances, and anything we have done here in these Resolutions was simply at their request.

MR. HALFYARD—In speaking to these Resolutions I would like to refer to the terms of the agreement which obligate the Government to build a railway of thirty miles long. I understand that if the Company, after the Government had conformed to their obligations as to the terms of the contract, fails to live up to their agreement and they default that they are to refund to the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars. If I remember correctly, I think I asked a question here, if the Company defaulted, how could we collect from a Company that had no money of its own and that had mortgaged all its assets with regard to water power and timber ,and I think the Minister of Justice stated that there was provision in these Resolutions in case the Company defaulted and that in that event their water powers and timber limits would revert to the Colony.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is covered in Clause one on page 4, which says:

(Reads)

MR. HALFYARD—Speaking in general terms under these Resolutions I suppose the obligation of the Government to build a railway and operate it has exercised the minds of the Government for some time. I think that is the most objectionable feature in the Resolutions that we have to spend in the neighbourhood of a million dollars to build a railway and then we have to operate it. Now the capital expenditure of building a railway is a large sum; but then if we have to be encumbered with another branch which may cost us $50,000.00 a year. However, I do not see that there is much to be gained by further debating and criticizing the Resolutions. If the House is satisfied and the Government is satisfied that it is in the best interests of the country to pass these Resolutions, that returns will come directly and indirectly from this large outlay of money and that it will mean more employment for our people, I suppose the only thing we can do is to take a chance on it; but I venture to predict that when the accounts are shown later on that there will be a different story told, because we have enough of white elephants already on our hands in respect to branch railways and the like.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Does not the hon. gentleman think that if we have a good industry it is not worth while to build a railway?

MR. HALFYARD—But we are obligating ourselves to a large expenditure of money before we get these people to do anything, but if the mill was there it would be a different matter.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —If the mill does not operate the Company will have to pay for mill and railway and all.

MR. HALFYARD—I fully appreciate that the Government is very much exercised over that obligation after getting those people to build this railway and we are in a most unfortunate position that we cannot see our way clear to suspend the ratification of such drastic Resolutions, as we have before us, until we get better terms. I quite appreciate what the country is up against with regard to unemployment and what will suit for the immediate present, but, of course, we have to look ahead and be governed by the obligations we have undertaken in the past. I hope the Government are sure that they have made the best bargain possible in this contract, but I am sorry that the International Paper Company did not take this deal up with the Government eight or ten months ago, instead of starting negotiations three months ago as they have.

I feel quite sure that the Government should have appealed to the country under these resolutions, and then if they had the country behind them, they would have more ease of conscience in connection with this important undertaking that they are entering into at the present time. However that is by the way. These duty clauses are something similar to the bill just passed and I don't suppose it is much use wasting time over them. But now as to the liability in these resolutions. We have a liability in connection with the Humber that was created in 1923. The Gander Co. may have to assume a liability in a few years time perhaps, though I hope that it will not happen. Somebody may be in here criticising the actions of the Government of 1927. "Why were they so foolish as to build a railway costing $1,000,000 and now they have to pay for the operating expenses." However that is a matter for the future and I hope that it will not turn out that way.

MR. RANDELL — Mr. Chairman, before this is read I would like to voice my protest against it. I have been out of the country, and I have

not had sufficient time to look over the bill, therefore I am not conversant with its construction. But at the same time I want to make it quite clear to this Assembly that, here and now, I am not in accord with putting in any more branch railways in this country. We have had bills of this kind coming into this House within the last three or four years, and putting through what they thought was a good deal for the country, and in a year or so they come back whining and asking for a fresh deal. That is what has happened with nearly every measure of this nature that has gone through this House, and here we are asked in those two bills to go deeper into debt, to build more railways, and to go further into the hole than we are now, and I want to say here and now that I am not in accord with it. I feel that the Government made a mistake last year in the case of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. Instead of allowing them to get more money you should have let them alone. You passed legislation for them in the beginning and guaranteed their bonds, and helped them to start that business, and the next thing we know is that they are coming back and asking for something else. If that company had gone into the hands of a receivership last year we would have been better off. It is inconceivable that a plant that cost $45,000,000 would not fetch $20,000,000. If it had gone into the hands of the receivers we would have got $10,000,000 out of it anyway. Now we are going further into the hole. In this bill they are asking us to build branch railways and I am not in accord with it and I want it known throughout the country. I know very little about the bills now before this House, but I do know that they are not good for this country. You may talk about giving labour, but you may pay too much for the labour. You may pay so much perhaps that the future generations will curse the day that we passed this legislation. That is how I feel about it. These people are coming in here and asking for all kinds of franchises and help from the Government, and the next thing that we know is that they are back again looking for something else. We have an instance right here in St. John's in case of the telephone company. They had what I consider a good franchise. Then they come back to the people of this city and want to increase their rates. That is an example of what is going on in this country as long as I can remember. Invariably the people of this country get the raw end. As I said before, while I do not know enough about these bills to comment much on them, yet what I do know about them I am not in accord with.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the construction of that railway in the Gander Valley, the assumption is that there will be enough traffic in connection with it to pay the operating expenses. I would like to know from Major Sullivan, when the A. N. D. Co. started up first what per cent. of the traffic going over that railway went into Grand Falls and how far did it help to augment the revenue of the railway.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Grand Falls is a different matter. There will be more traffic go out of Grand Falls because it is inland than out of Gander Bay, which is a seaport.

MR. GRIMES—Then when you have the competition of the steamship lines it appears to me that you are not going to find that the Gander railway is going to pay.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—You will always have the pulp wood haul from other sections of the country.

MR. GRIMES—You anticipate then that there will be enough paper hauled over the Gander railway to help towards paying the expenses of the railway. Now I can understand

the traffic that it may have during the winter months, but it is the summer season that I had in mind. Of course it means that practically during seven months of the year you will have the competition of the steamship lines, and I was wondering whether the Gander railway would be able to compete against them.

MR. HALFYARD—You think that Gander Bay will be a shipping port.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I say that it may be a terminal also for steamers.

MR. HALFYARD—I do not believe that will ever happen. The Government will try to use their own transportation service by railway and steamship. I feel quite sure that somebody could put a steamer on the outside route. You will never get any people worth while to flock into Fogo district as a district with a branch railway and some sort of an old "Susu" service. Fogo district wants a steamer like the "Home" which can perform a splendid service as she is now doing. I believe that even without a subsidy the Government could get a steamer like the "Home" to go on that service when the railway is built. However, I fear that the Government will not make this system pay unless they have full control of all the transportation services of the country and with no outside competition.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, before the last clause of the Resolutions is read I would like to point out to the Committee that I took a note of the suggestion made by Mr. Ashbourne yesterday in connection with the cutting of railway ties over a period of years for renewals, and while we are not making any alteration here in the Resolutions now, I think that when the Bill comes up for discussion in Committee we will have an amendment put in to cover the point that the honourable member advocates.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, at this stage I just want to go on record as registering my opposition to these two measures, as, in my opinion, they are not in the best interests of this country. I defined my attitude yesterday to the House and I pointed out why I could not support them. I regret that more discussion has not taken place in the House on these Resolutions, but probably when the Bills come before the House we shall have an opportunity to hear these matters, which are of such vast and vital interest to this country, discussed at greater length and in a manner which their importance merits.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had passed the same without amendment and recommended that a bill be introduced to give effect thereto.

On motion this report was received and adopted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister a bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd." was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to Thursday, August 18th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, August 18th, 1927.

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

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals.'"

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee

of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — Mr. Chairman, in submitting my fourth Budget to the Committee of the House on Ways and Means, I think perhaps the best way to clarify the Colony's financial situation so exhaustively discussed this year, is to place before honourable members a complete review of the Government's activities since its inception to office in 1924.

Due to my having assumed office in June, 1924, instead of the usual time, i.e., the fall of the year, my task is much simplified, and it will not be a difficult matter for honourable members to not only follow the facts as explained but they will be enabled to keep permanent records to hand for purposes of such favourable or adverse comment as their opinions may respectively decide.

As pointed out last year, the Revenue and Expenditure of the Colony for 1924-1925 showed a surplus of $347,003.23, or $71,505.23 more than was estimated by me on the 8th of April, 1925. This was the first surplus shown by the Colony since the fiscal year 1919-1920.

The salient points in respect of the year 1924-1925 may be indicated briefly by the fact that the revenue marked an increase of $1,381,519.00 and the expenditure a decrease of $585,952.22, showing an improvement over the previous year of $1,967.471.59.

From the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General, tabled by me a few weeks ago, it will be seen that the Expenditure on Current Account for the year 1925-1926 amounted to $9,865,167.34. The Revenue for the same period reached the figure of $9,752,551.28, leaving a deficit of $112,616.06 to the debit of the Colony on Current Account,—a deficit which included the sum of $30,719.55 overdrawn on account of the Customs Department legislative votes. This overdraft was disallowed by the Auditor General and Supp'emental indemnity was taken for the amount only a few days ago when the House dealt with Supply.

As compared with the previous year, the Revenue of which was swollen by arrears of duty paid, the amount collected was less by the sum of $30,637.18. The expenditure for 1925-1926 increased $428,982.11 over that for 1924-1925. In this increase are included an amount of $253,481.13 on account of Interest on the Public Debt and the $30,719.55 Customs Overdraft already referred to.

The summarized statement showing how these figures are obtained may be seen in the Appendix to the Speech.

In my Budget of last year I had looked for a small surplus of $61,-552.39, but the considerable drop of $206,000.00 on account of Customs collections at Corner Brook and Deer Lake, the decrease in collections of $46,881.44 on account of Crown Lands and $28,939.47 on account of Telegraph Revenue would not permit us to balance accounts for 1925-1926. I had expected the large decrease which took place in the collection of Income Tax arrears but overlooked the fact that the Customs, Crown Lands and Telegraph Departments collected some arrears in 1924-1925, which, of course, were not available for 1925-1926, and which, naturally, made the 1924-1925 Revenue abnormal. In the case of the Crown Lands the sum of $45,235.40 was received from the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company as an extra bonus of twenty-five cents an acre on timber lands at Gander Bay.

Before dealing with the Capital expenditure for these years, and in order to preserve the continuity of the financial record in such a way that the House may follow it, I pro-

pose to submit the following estimate of Revenue and Expenditure on current account for the present fiscal year 1926-1927:—

ESTIMATED REVENUE 1926-1927

Customs Revenue	$7,300,000.00
Postal Revenue	367,000.00
Telegraph Revenue	175,000.00
Crown Lands Revenue	108,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps	50,000.00
Liquor Sales	350,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures	5,000.00
Fees Public Institutions....	55,000.00
Broom Department Penitentiary	4,000.00
Taxes and Assessments....	70,000.00
Bank Tax	73,000.00
Death Duties	80,000.00
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	88,000.00
Income and Profit Tax Arrears	28,000.00
Miscellaneous Revenue	100,000.00
	$8,853,000.00

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE 1926-1927

I estimate the expenditure for the fiscal year 1926-1927, under the Heads of service indicated, to be as follows:—

Interest on Public Debt....	$ 3,580,000.00
Finance Department	345,000.00
Colonial Secretary	190,000.00
Justice	375,000.00
Education	952,000 00
Public Charities	620,000.00
Marine and Fisheries	460,000.00
Agriculture and Mines	115,000.00
Public Works	1,225,000.00
Posts and Telegraphs	1,190,000 00
Customs	580,000.00
Tax Assessor	14,000.00
Old Age Pensions	117,000.00
Board of Pension Commissioners	630,000.00
Audit Act (Section 33 b) for unseen expenditure	180,000.00
Total Estimated Expenditure	$10,604,000.00

With an expenditure of $10,604,000.00 as above and an estimated revenue of $8,853,000.00. there will be a profitable deficit at the end of the fiscal year 1926-1927 of $1,751,000.00.

Replying to repeated adverse criticism made during the present session of the Legislature, I may say that this statement has been prepared with the same particular care which has characterized the estimated figures for the two years preceding. The closeness of this calculation has been made possible by the fact that most of the Revenue and Expenditure accounts close on June 30th, promptly, and beyond the usual balances receivable up to September 30th on account of Revenue, and those bills of expenses for the previous year, which are late in being collected, or presented for payment, as the case may be, we have little more than a month to run before we will be practically in a position to make a definite pronouncement with regard to the 1926-1927 accounts of the Colony. However, as I have already said, this is a close estimate and it is my own personal opinion of the financial result at the end of this year's transactions. Discussing the matter with the Auditor General a few months ago he was at that time of opinion that the deficit would be somewhat less than the figure at which I have placed it. But in my opinion it is better to err on the score of being well prepared for all eventualities now than to delude ourselves with hopes that may not be realized.

A study of the foregoing estimate of Revenue shows our principal source of income (the Customs) at an estimated decrease for the current

year (as compared with 1925-1926) of $490,553.62, and compared with 1924-1925 Customs collections dropped from $7,996,972.55 to $7,300,000.00, which we hope to get for 1926-1927. The total estimated decrease, therefore, on account of Customs collections as compared with 1924-1925 is roundly $700,000.00.

The explanation of this considerable decrease is to be found on reference to the following comparative statement of Imports for the fiscal year 1924-1925 and 1925-1926 — the 1927 figures not yet being available:

	Dutiable	Free	Total
1924-1925	$20,554,502.00	$15,850,172.00	$36,404,674.00
1925-1926	16,737,073.00	10,815,232.00	27,552,305.00
Decreases	$ 3,817,429.00	$ 5,034,940.00	$ 8,852,369.00

As will be seen from this statement the value of dutiable imports showed a decrease of $3,817,429.00. Taking an average thirty per cent. **ad valorem** rate on this amount, we account for a direct duty loss of $1,145,228.70. And when this estimated direct loss is compared with the actual loss of $800,000.00 to which I have referred, honourable members will be able to form some idea of the intense efforts being made by the present administration to collect every dollar possible in connection with our Customs revenue. And this is not the case only with the Customs but with all Departments of the service. When I state that only last year we collected the huge sum of $182,100.09 Income Tax arrears due since December 31st, 1924, the sum of $9,531.14 on account of Business Profits Tax long overdue and the amount of $2,262.26, old debts on accounts of the Manufacturers' Sales Tax, the House will appreciate the fact that no stone is left unturned in our efforts to balance accounts

While the dutiable articles decreased $3,817,429.00 as above stated, the value of Free Imports for the same period fell from $15,850,172.00 to $10,815,232.00, making a total decrease in Imports for the year 1925-1926 of roundly nine million dollars.

This enormous decrease in the value of Imports both free and dutiable is explained by the practical completion in the latter year of construction work at Corner Brook, Deer Lake and Humbermouth by the Armstrong-Whitworth Company, Limited, and the other subsidiary companies.

As a striking illustration of the effect of the termination of these operations, I would point out that Imports from the United Kingdom decreased about four million dollars in 1926 as compared with the previous year, while Canadian Imports fell, roughly, seven hundred thousand dollars in the same period.

Another explanation of the decrease in our Customs Revenue collections is the fact that revenue arrears amounting to thousands of dollars collected by me found their way into the 1924-1925 and 1925-1926 accounts in the same manner as the Income Tax arrears to which I have already referred. In this respect we are so much worse off, as nothing in the way of arrears was available during the current year. This will, of course, be obvious to honourable members when it is remembered that the policy of the present administration is to deal fairly to all and permit political favours, so-called, to none. In pursuance of this policy the Government has continually pressed for all arrears of revenue due in the past and not permitted any laxity with regard to current collections.

The third and most satisfactory reason for decrease in Customs collections is the declining prices of

articles of import in the principal markets of the world. Most of our imports being dutiable on an ad valorem basis, it follows that when prices of commodities fall in foreign markets the decrease is immediately reflected by our revenue collections in Newfoundland.

I am loath to inflict the following array of figures on the House, but I think it very necessary in order to develop an argument in reply to statements frequently made by honourable members on the other side, namely: that the present administration is unduly taxing the country in the way of tariff impositions. As a matter of fact, the value of free imports into this Colony was approximately forty per cent. of all imports during the year 1925-1926. The official figures are:—

	Value
Dutiable Goods	$16,737,073.00
Free Goods	10,815,232.00
	$27,552,305.00

The following is a list of the principal items admitted free of duty last year which may be of interest to the House. It is taken from the Customs Returns for 1925-1926 and should serve to dispel any erroneous impressions which may have been caused by the ill-informed criticism to which I have referred:—

Flour	361,232	barrels	$2,922,496.00
Salt Beef	43,157	barrels	816,030.00
Pork	20,849	barrels	630,160.00
Outport Coal	101,876	tons	538,643.00
Kerosene Oil	1,100,000	gallons	132,745.00
Gasolene	1,249,293	gallons	274,675.00
Fruits (from Spain)		....	31,171.00
Tomatoes and Onions (from Spain)....		....	25,539.00

In addition to these there are also admitted into the Colony duty free, machinery for Mining, Paper Making and many other items with which I will not weary the House.

Furthermore, I would instance the low rate of duty prevailing on some articles in every-day use by the majority of our people, such as:—

Peas	1c. per lb.
Beans	1c. per lb.
Rice	1c. per lb.
Oatmeal	1|3 of a c. per lb.
Rolled Oats.... ....| 1|3 of a c. per lb.
Hams	10 per cent.
Bacon	10 per cent.
Tongues	10 per cent.
Sugar	2c. per lb.
Tea	7c. per lb.

Add the five per cent. Sales Tax, which the present Government applies to invoice price only and formerly chargeable on invoice value, plus duty, plus freight, and you have the total tax collected on the food supplies enumerated above.

These, together with flour, pork, beef, kerosene oil, gasolene and fishing gear form at least eighty or eighty-five per cent. of the articles in common use by the average family in this country, and this fact should furnish sufficient evidence to prove that the bulk of our population are not labouring under such a heavy burden as some honourable members would have us believe. Moreover, with lower prices prevailing abroad, as pointed out a few days ago by the honourable member for Twillingate, Mr. Grimes, the duty on all ad valorem goods shows a corresponding drop, so that the total landed cost of these commodities is reduced considerably.

While on this question of over-taxation, I should like to refer to a matter in connection with the administration of the Revenue upon which I

have had to submit to severe criticism. I refer to the stand taken by by me in tightening up the Customs collections received through Parcel Post I may say that no new regulations in relation to Parcel Post Customs were instituted by me. I merely insisted upon the strict fulfillment of existing regulations, a course which was only my bounden duty as Minister of Finance and Customs. In my judgment the law in regard to Parcel Post Customs nad been so ineffectually carried out as to cause serious loss to the revenue (as I shall presently prove) and to be a detriment to many of our people who are endeavouring to carry on business in a legitimate way. Perhaps the best way to demonstrate the justice of my position on this point is to give a simple illustration:—

The ordinary citizen desires to present his son or daughter with, let us say, a watch or jewellry of some kind. He purchases it from the local jeweller, who very naturally had to pay the regular tariff rates of duty. Another citizen, more astute, writes abroad for a similar article which he has noted in a catalogue. This reaches him at Christmas time, gets through the Customs Parcel Post as a present and the gift is finally presented without paying duty. Here we have a straight example of injustice running in three directions, namely: to the ordinary merchant struggling to do business on the street, to the person who has purchased his duty-paid present from the merchant, and lastly to the Colony which loses directly in proportion to the duty loss sustained

I suppose the Finance Minister who carries out the law in this respect strictly, especially at that great gift-giving time Christmas, is considered by most people a heartless, callous sort of person, but a little thought should convince the wise that he is really protecting the very people who condemn him. I can assure honourable members of this House as well as my friends all over the country, that it is no pleasure to me to enforce the duty on Christmas presents. It is merely a duty, and not a particularly pleasant one at that.

The illustration given above may be applied to furs. dresses, toys and innumerable other articles that one can call to mind. From my observation in connection with the foregoing, it is only those who have the command of ready cash and are thus able to buy from the Mail Order Houses, that derive any advantage. Their poorer neighbors, who are not in such a desirable position financially, pay their Customs duty through the regular avenues of trade. Very often, of course, there are genuine Christmas gifts, presents to the old folks, etc. from relatives abroad and of little or no commercial value. When this has been plainly evident I have invariably used the discretionary powers at my command as Ministerial Head of the Department.

The matter of Christmas presents had, however, shown such glaring examples of injustice that I felt my first duty was to protect those who paid their lawful Customs taxes and to see that undue advantage was not permitted to one class at the expense of another. That my enforcement of the existing Parcel regulations proved as fruitful as it was necessary, the following comparative statement shows: The figures need no comment as they are eloquent in themselves.

1923-1924	$148,250 35
1924-1925	177,582.08
Increase of	$29,331.73

All that has been said upon this subject applies with equal force in the matter of luggage examination, and while some inconvenience may have been experienced in the course

of carrying out the regulations, yet I feel that the explanation above given should command the favourable consideration of the general public.

EXPENDITURE 1926-1927

The estimated increase in expenditure over 1925-1926 of $738,832.66 was caused by Interest on Public Debt, the cost of bye-elections in Burgeo, Fortun Bay and St John's East, maintenance of Highways and the distribution of Relief under authority of Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act. The original Estimates of last year providing for an expenditure of $9,773,-236.84 had to be supplemented by the sum of $815,106.54, which was provided by the Legislature last week.

There seems to be an unanimous spirit in the present Assembly to deprecate any increase in expenditure, and personally I have done all in my power to foster this view point. Every effort is being made by the Government to keep expenditure to the minimum figure, but I can assure Honourable Members it is not such an easy matter to keep within the votes provided as one would like. Financing this country is not the sinecure it was when I had the honour to first sit in this Assembly. At that time the total expenditure for Newfoundland was no bigger than our Interest charges of to-day, and while it is true our Revenue collections were very small yet they sufficed to cover all demands. We had no Railway problem in the sense that we have it to-day. There was no Naval and Military Pensions to provide. The War Debt Interest did not exist and the Finance Minister had not to worry about Interest guarantees. Our fisheries were stable and the markets flourishing and the very thought of the "dole" was repugnant to all men with a sense of independence. However, we have faced periods of depression like this before and emerged even better off than ever, and from all the present indications I have the faith that the Colony will make safe harbor within the next few years.

LOAN EXPENDITURE

I now beg to refer to the expenditures on Capital Account made by the Government since it took office. A more detailed statement appears in the Appendix to the Budget, but the following list will suffice to show more briefly how careful the Government has been to see that satisfactory results have been secured to the Colony for the expenditure involved. These

RAILWAY.

assets are self-evident and I submit them for the information of the House:—

Steam Coaches	$ 37,204.32
Ballasting Railway	117,225.01
Rolling Stock Railway ..	443,431.49
Railway Buildings	11,976.01
Re-railing	775,978.53
New Locomotives	94,416.20
Bridges and Trestles	37,042.36
General Purposes	780,000.00

From the above it will be seen that everything possible has been done to put the railway in such a condition as to maintain an effective and efficient service. One can now travel over the road in safety and accidents and delays of such frequent occurrence only a few years ago are now unknown, a fact which bear witness to the value obtained from the expenditures incurred on this account. We can now say without fear of successful contradiction that the railroad was never in better condition than at the present time. Fuller particulars of its financial and other activities will be referred to later on in the Speech.

HIGHROADS—$2,135,000.00.

It has been a recognized fact for years that the most wasteful head of expenditure was that of Roads and Bridges. And this was one of the matters to receive the early attention of the present Government. In the course of the past twenty-five years millions of dollars have been spent on Roads

and Bridges, for which in too many cases very little value has been received. The "special grant" had become a by-word amongst us until not a few of our people began to regard the allocation of road money as a sort of fund to be distributed among them at stated periods, and for which they were not expected to give any return.

From a determination to combat this pernicious system and in order that something in the way of good roads and permanent bridges might be constructed, was born the idea of appointing a non-political Commission to supervise the building of bridges and highways.

That this was a progressive step and a move in the right direction, anyone acquainted with the old system of handling road moneys must agree. The result of two seasons' activities has proven the wisdom of the Government's course in this matter. I have no hesitation in saying that the work accomplished by the Highroads Commission is far superior to anything of its kind attempted in this country heretofore. Better value has been obtained for the money spent. Better roads and bridges have resulted. Means of direct communication have been provided where none existed. Transportation of all kinds has been facilitated, and the many tourists visiting the country this summer have been afforded an opportunity of travelling by motor to many of the natural beauty spots in Newfoundland.

Just here I am happy to be able to say that rooms in the Newfoundland Hotel have been booked months ahead, and the Management reports a very brisk and profitable trade. In this connection I think that Hon. Members must now agree that no matter how hostile we may have felt towards the guarantee of interest on this splendid building, the Government's faith has been justified, and that the Newfoundland Hotel may be regarded as a future annual asset to the Colony.

That a measure is not popular does not prove that it is not a wise and proper one, and I submit to Hon. Members of the House that the Government by introducing this road-building policy has taken the first really progressive step in developing the country since the railroad was built in Newfoundland. It is the first bona fide attempt to advertise our natural scenery in an effective way. We may issue folders and attractive pamphlets as we will, but if visitors are unable to secure easy access to forest and stream it will be all in vain. To put it tritely, there is no object whatever in advertising except we can deliver the goods. This is a motor age; we must have good roads, and what we are doing now should have been done years ago ,and in my opinion might have been done with proper and efficient supervision of the millions already sunk in road building in the past.

I am told that the only mistake in our road-building policy was a political one. In all other respects the Highroads are a splendid success. Individual critics inform me that the colossal mistake was not to permit this considerable amount of money to be handled under the old system of grant distribution. In other words, gentlemen, it seems according to the critics that it would have been wiser to have divided this large sum among the several districts, to share it amongst our political friends and let the main highways go to ruin: that we should pander to the grafter and the shirker in order to ensure our future political success. Well, Mr. Chairman, if this has been really a mistake I fear we must plead guilty. But, sir, I have yet to be convinced that we have even made a political blunder in this matter. I have more faith in our people than to think

for a moment that they wish their money wasted under the old patronage system. In a word, I believe that the majority of the people of Newfoundland are fair and square enough to prefer honest expenditure with something to show for it than lavish, wasteful expenditure bringing no adequate returns.

Other assets of lasting benefit to the Colony are reflected in the amounts spent on the New Dry Dock and Freight Sheds ($1,975,000) and the acquisition of the S.S. "Caribou" ($495,759.55). I feel that all parties will endorse the justification for these undertakings. The old Dock was not only obsolete in its physical dimensions but was in such a dangerous state of disrepair as to be regarded as a menace to the safety of that section of the city, and the Freight Sheds, when reported upon by the Engineers, were practically in a state of collapse. With few exceptions the piles had been rotted away in the centres and it was only a question of months when the Sheds would have caved in.

The sum of $169,770.88 has been charged to Loan Account in respect of Labrador Boundary Expenses, and considering the tremendous importance of this case and the valuable interests involved, it will be easily appreciated that such an item could not be charged to the current account of the Colony. We have acquired new territory which has been the subject of expensive litigation for over a quarter of a century, and thus an annual liability has been converted into a real asset at last. I shall revert to this matter again but I must say here that I feel sure that honourable members were gratified to learn that the Colony's interests were being so protected by legislation that speculators would not steal what had been so hardly won.

For the other items, such as Lighthouses, amounts spent on public buildings, postal and telegraph extension, roads and bridges, I would refer honourable members to the financial statements contained in the Appendix. All the Loan or Capital account expenditures are detailed there and will no doubt be of interest to the House.

In addition, however, to the items referred to, there will be found under the heading of Loan Expenditure a considerable amount of liabilities left by the late Government. These old debts had to be taken care of by a charge on Capital expenditure. One alone (the deficit for 1923-1924) amounted to $1,620,000.00. Another item was the unfortunate Housing Scheme for which a bill of $61,384.10 was presented to the Government immediately on taking office. Yet another was the balance of $200,000.00 due on Pit Prop Account, for which a special Resolution of the House was passed authorizing the Auditor General to pay $1,000,000 of the total indebtedness on this account from Loan 1922; the above item represents the balance.

Two other old debts which had to be liquidated were the amounts due on account of the S.S. "Lobelia" and S.S. "Watchful ($77,906.32), and a balance owed the Bank in respect of outstanding accounts of the old Road Commission of approximately $13,000.00.

Moreover, railway bills amounting to over a quarter of a million dollars called for immediate liquidation. To meet these and other outstanding liabilities the present Government had exactly $187,210.61 to the credit of Surplus Trust Fund. I merely cite these facts so that honourable members will appreciate the problems facing the present Government when taking office.

To see that the best value was secured for all expenditures incurred has been the key-note in connection with all capital undertakings established by the Government. I respectfully submit that they represent a sub-

stantial consideration deposited to the credit of the National Sinking Fund, the value of which can only be realized as the years go by.

RAILWAY.

The earnings of the Railway in its operations for the year 1926 showed a decrease of $361,910.19 as compared with 1925 while the operating expenses increased $23,377.35 during the same period. The bulk of the loss in Revenue was caused by decreased passenger and freight earnings, largely consequent upon the conclusion of construction work at Corner Brook and Deer Lake. Snow fighting included in the Maintenance Expenses, is accountable for $45,000.00 of the increase in Expenditure. There was an additional $39,000.00 spent on Road-bed improvement to provide against possible derailments, the total expenditure for the year on this account being $115,000.00. Maintenance of Equipment showed a decrease in expenditure of $22,460.96 and Dry Dock Expenses fell over $25,000.00. The Management claim that it has been found necessary to continue ballasting the track, but that the results secured will mean lower operating expenses eventually, as well as ensuring safety for the travelling public. In 1922 37,208 cubic yards of ballasting was distributed; last year 102,912 cubic yards and in 1925 122,840 cubic yards of ballasting were used. During the last four years, one million four hundred and sixty-three thousand dollars have been spent on improvements to road bed alone, all of which was taken from the Railway earnings.

The unfortunate part of the Railway business is that during the War years the road-bed was neglected, with the result that when taken over by the late Government practically the whole system was in such a state of collapse that it had to be made over. To show what little was done with the road-bed, I need only point out that while we have had to spend in the last four years over one million four hundred and sixty thousand dollars, the 1915 to 1918 period showed that only $635,000.00 was spent,—hardly enough to ensure the safety of the travelling public. There was also paid from Railway Earnings $101,000 for repairs to Buildings; for renewal of worn and broken rails during the past four years, $126,000.00; for renewal of ties, $285,000.00; for repairs to bridges and culverts during the same period, $124,000.00. I am glad to be able to assure Honourable Members that the conditions obtaining when the Railroad was taken over by the late Government do not apply at the present time. Road-bed, buildings, rails, ties, and all other items connected with the system are in excellent condition. I am informed by the Management that there is every indication that results next year will show considerable improvement. With the prospect of new industries looming ahead and increased freight and passenger earnings in sight, I am very hopeful that the present large annual deficit will gradually decline. In fact if the projects under consideration by the Government materialize there is every reason to believe that the Operating account of the road will soon show the same healthy condition as obtained in 1924 when we were able to declare a surplus in connection with our Railway and Steamship Service. As a matter of fact, the Operating Account of the Steamers show a surplus even this year, but that is very small compared with the loss on the Railway end.

The total Revenue received by the Railway for 1925-1926, including the Dock Shop, the Dry Dock and Steamship Service was $3,009,290.19, while the Expenditure for the same period reached $3,753,087.57, leaving a deficit of $743,797.28 as a result of the operations of the Road for the year. The total mileage run during the year was

one million and twenty-eight thousand eight hundred and eighty-five. The freight hauled in tons amounted to 321,717 and the number of passengers carried was 239,084.

A comparative statement of the Operating Revenue and Expenditure Account for the years 1925 and 1926 will be found in the Appendix attached hereto.

CURRENT EXPENDTIURE 1927-1928

In the Appendix to the Speech is a comparative summary of the Estimates of Expenditure for 1926-1927 and 1927-1928. The House has been asked to provide the sum of $10,061,-103.01 to carry on the Public Service during the coming year. It will be noted in connection with these Estimates that a special effort has been made to curtail the votes of the several Departments On the other hand, we have endeavoured to make provision for all requirements. Otherwise we would only be swelling the amount of next year's Supplementary Supply by the amount short estimated. Honourable Memebers will of course appreciate that we cannot prevent the necessity for supplementing votes to some extent. as it is humanly impossible at the beginning of a year to provide for every contingency that may arise. There has been no occasion however for the present Government to seek those huge indemnities on current account which have been required in the past.

With the exception of Interest on Public Debt, Customs Preventive Service and Customs Drawbacks, there have been no outstanding increases in the votes asked for the coming year. The total increase in original estimates over last year as brought down last week amounts to roundly $287,-866.17, of which our Public Debt Interest accounts for $249,976.33. It will thus be seen that the net increase in actual service votes has been only $37,889.84.

To show more particularly how this increase of $287,866.17 as between the Estimates for 1926-27 and 1927-1928 is arrived at, I beg leave to submit the following list indicating the departmental increases and decreases, viz:—

	Increase	Decrease
Interest on Public Debt	$249,976.33	
Finance Department		$ 12,366.15
Colonial Secretary's Department		600.00
Justice Department		3,504.50
Education	31,050.00	
Public Charities	28,922.15	
Marine and Fisheries	2,720.00	
Agriculture and Mines	3,000.00	
Public Works		139,343.91
Posts and Telegraphs		7,552.75
Customs	135,565.00	
Total Increases	$451,233.48	$163,367.31
Total Decreases	163,367.31	
Net Increase for 1927-28 over 1926-27	$287,866.17	

The large increase in Customs Estimates is caused by raising the votes for Refunds from fifty thousand to one hundred and forty thousand dollars. This is to meet application for drawbacks on material for ship-building. materials to be used in the manufacture of boots and shoes, besides the

ordinary refunds due to clerical errors. I may say here that the Customs Refund or Drawback Account is an item of expenditure that is hard to estimate closely. Misinterpretations of the Tariff and clerical errors in computing duties are continually cropping up Moreover, manufacturing refunds vary considerably. Very frequently, also, Customs duties are paid under protest pending competent interpretation of the law and in the event of the Importer or Consignee gaining his point, an application for refund has to be taken care of. All drawbacks of this kind must be paid from the Customs Refund Account. This very fact accounts in no small measure for the overdraft of last year in the Customs Department, insufficient funds having been provided to cover the Department's requirements in this respect, with the result that the item of overdraft had to be included in the 1926-1927 Supplementary Supply, thus increasing the current expenditure of the fiscal year 1926-1927 by over $30,000.00. In order to avoid repeating this mistake, the Deputy Minister of Finance has asked for enough to cover all requirements during the year 1927-1928. It is quite possible of course that the full $140,000.00 estimated for the coming year may not be needed and in this case the current account of the Colony will be so much to the good.

The Customs Refund account may be cited as an illustration of the principle adopted by the Government of covering current requirements as far as possible in the original estimates. For years past the practice has been to short vote many of the Services, but now an effort is being made all over the Service to make the original estimate the final one and thus obviate the necessity of seeking large amounts in Supplementary Supply

The decrease in the Public Works Department is mainly due to the dropping of the Special Grant for Roads and Bridges of $150,000.00 and an increase to Repairs to Public Buildings of $47,900.00 together with sundry smaller increases and decreases which no doubht have been noted by Honourable Members when the votes for that Department were under consideration by the House. It must have been gratifying to note that decreased votes were asked for in connection with our Asylums and Hospitals.

I do not propose to detain the House much longer over this subject as the details of the 1927-1928 Estimates have been explained already when the House was in Committee on Supply. In the light of these explanations I feel that Honourable Members are satisfied that every effort is being made to keep expenditure at as low a figure as is consistent with the proper conduct of the Colony's affairs.

In connection with the subject of expenditure, it should be remembered that over half the revenue collected, that is to say approximately five million dollars, it at once absorbed by three Heads of Expenditure alone. When we have taken care of our annual Interest, our Naval and Military Pension and the Education Grant, all of which are items of paramount importance, the House will readily appreciate the difficulty confronting any Government in the administration of the Colony's affairs just now. In common with the whole Empire we threw our whole resources into the Great War and were proud of the privilege, but to-day as in the Mother Country where the Chancellor of the Exchequer is faced with a thirty-six million pound deficit, we are staggering under an extremely heavy post-war burden well nigh insupportable and it is the duty not only of the Government but of the whole country to do everything possible to lighten that burden. It will be easily seen that after the three items of expense above referred to are provided for there is very lit-

tle room for lavish or wasteful expenditure.

REVENUE 1927-28.

I estimate the total Revenue from all sources for the fiscal year 1927-28 to be the sum of $9,229,000.00, made up as follows, viz:—

Customs	$7,800,000
Postal	380,000
Telegraphs	180,000
Crown Lands	120,000
Inland Revenue Stamps	50,000
Liquor Profits	350,000
Fines and Forfeitures	5,000
Broom Dept. Penitentiary	4 000
Taxes and Assessments	70,000
Bank Tax and Trusts	70,000
Fees Public Institutions	50,000
Death Duties	50,000
Miscellaneous Revenue	100,000
	$9,229,000

On reference to the Supply Bill passed by the Legislature a week ago, it will be seen that the estimated expenditure on current account for the coming year will be approximately $10,074,395.24. As already indicated a concerted attempt will be made by all the expending departments to keep within the votes specified and it is hoped that balances may be available on certain of the service sub-heads to offset others which may possibly show overdrafts.

With a total Revenue as above of $9,229,000.00 and an estimated Expenditure of $10,074,395.24, the operations for the coming fiscal year on current account will show a deficit of approximately $850,000.00.

This is the position as I see it at the present time, but in addition there is our unfortunate situation in connection with the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company, Ltd., whereby we are liable for the payment of Interest on the "B" Debentures of that Company guaranteed by the late Administration and representing an annual outlay of the considerable sum of (for the present year) two hundred and sixty-seven thousand dollars. This would be a very serious situation indeed but for the fact that legislation is now pending under which the International Paper Company, a world-wide known corporation, undertakes to assume the Government's liability in this respect. Moreover, if this legislation is ratified by the House, besides taking care of these "B" Debentures, the Company is prepared to pay in Royalties $75,000.00 annually for the first four years and for the forty-two years following the sum of $150,000.00 a year. They are also required under the proposed legislation to install two new units at Corner Brook with a daily capacity of two hundred tons. This means employment for from fifteen hundred to two thousand men and as a consequence largely increased earning power in the country. As a quid pro quo they are seeking certain concessions from the Legislature which will have to be considered in due course.

Then we have the Gander scheme under which it is planned to install a new mill beginning with a two hundred ton daily capacity with the possibility of extension to four hundred ton daily production. This will mean the eventual employment of another twenty-five hundred or three thousand men.

In addition to these two items I would ask the House to consider the immense possibilities connected with the development of Buchan's Mine. It is impossible at the present time to predict the effect that the opening of this new industry will mean to the earning power of the country. In my judgment, however, the effect on the revenue in the event of ratification of the industrial legislation now pending, will be such as to enable us to meet the 1927-28 deficit which, under present conditions, is bound to occur.

The great evil in this country in the past has been that the earning power of our fishermen has not been sufficient to produce the required revenue. With the advent of these new industries, however, one can only come to the conclusion that our problems in this respect have been solved. Our people will then be in a position to prosecute the summer voyage as usual and when the voyage is over in October, another avenue of employment is available in the woods and mills for the winter months in cutting pulpwood and other work associated therewith.

With the reputation of our people for adapting themselves to new conditions, one can only conclude that the enforced five months' idleness of our fisher-folk will soon be a thing of the past and that the earning power of the country will ere long be doubled.

No matter how long or short my tenure of office may be, as Minister of Finance and Customs I have only one opinion with regard to our present Tariff and that is that I do not feel justified in increasing the taxes of our people. I think that with the establishment of these new industries and our consequent increased earning power, the Revenue and Expenditure of the Colony will soon reflect the healthy conditions which existed in pre-war days.

In the matter of estimating Revenue and Expenditure, I have taken great pains to discover to Honourable Members the posibilities as they presented themselves to me, and despite the rather caustic observations of certain critics in this House, I feel safe in saying that there is no unprejudiced student of our fiscal problems but will agree that closer estimating as regards Revenue and Expenditure statements has not been made in recent years. To prove this contention I cite the fact that the 1920 Budget anticipated a Revenue on current account of $11,020,000.00. The actual Revenue received was $8,438,-039.85, a difference between the estimate at the beginning of the fiscal year and the total amount actually collected at its close of $2,582,960.15 And so it went on from that year up to the advent of the present administration. Year after year surpluses forecasted in the several Budgets resolved themselves into huge deficits. The first real surplus since 1919 was declared by the present administration in the Budget delivered by me on July 28th, 1924 On that occasion I estimated the Revenue likely to accrue during the coming year (1924-1925) at $8,938,000.00, and drew the attention of the House to the fact that I had made a considerable addition to the estimate of my predecessor. The actual Revenue collected that year was $9,783,188.46, or $845,-188.45 over the above my estimate. It is only fair to say that I had been at that time only a fortnight in office, and was not therefore intimately acquainted with the detail work of the Finance and Customs Departments. Furthermore, the tremendous amount of arrears which went to swell that years revenue abnormally was not included in the estimate for that year. But the particular point I wish to draw to the attention of the House in connection with that Estimate is that instead of over-estimating as had been done for years previously, I was really under estimating the possibilities of revenue collections. In plain words, instead of making the revenue for that year larger than it possibly could be, I committed the pardonable mistake of being too conservative. It was perhaps in the hope that this desirable condition of affairs would continue that my estimate for 1926-1927 of last year was based.

Honorable Members will appreciate that no Finance Minister can say definitely and with unquestionable

authority that he is going to collect a certain number of million dollars in Revenue and will spend exactly the amount as estimated by him in any year. If there be such a man, he would certainly be a lineal descendant of the seers and prophets of old. But I have a grave suspicion that the line is now extinct and that these financial experts are no longer with us. Well, we cannot all be perfect in our calculations and I have already pointed out to the House that much graver errors in estimating Revenue and Expenditure have occurred in past Budgets I only hope that my successor in the Finance Department will be able to keep as close to the facts in his several estimates of Revenue and Expenditure and I feel in that event he will have secured the confidence of all unbiased members no matter what their party affiliations may be.

While on this subject I should like to refer to a charge made some while ago that the House had been deliberately misinformed with regard to the accounts for the fiscal year 1925-26. It was charged that in answer to a Question on the Order Paper, I had reduced the deficit for that year from $2,500,000 00 to approximately $112,-000.00. That this is absolutely untrue I have proved to the House on a former occasion and for verification of the 1925-1926 deficit I now refer Honourable Members to Part 1, Paragraph 1, of the Report of the Auditor General as tabled in the House.

When such statements are broadcasted from the hustings or political platforms, one can easily discount their significance, but such unwarranted accusations emanating from Honourable Members on the floors of the Legislature can only be regarded as gravely mischievous to the interests of the whole country. I can well understand that youth is inclined to be impetuous but when the country may have to pay for such hasty and unfounded conclusions it becomes a serious matter indeed.

A similar accusation was made in the Canadian House of Commons last year against the Hon. James A. Robb, the Canadian Minister of Fniance. I do not think I can do better than quote his answer as the views expressed in his speech coincide exactly with my own:

"May I, before dealing with the "outcome of the coming year, ask the 'indulgence of the House for a mo-"ment to a contention advanced last "Session in this Chamber, that the "reduction of the debt was arrived "at by a departure from the practice "heretofore followed in dealing with "Loans. My reasons in referring to "this matter in the Budget Speech are "not so much in the interests of the 'party to which I have the honour "to belong as in the interests of all who make up our nationa. life. The "attack at the time was weakened by "the fact that no two critics seemed "able to agree on just how many mil-"lions were involved.

"Criticism of the public policies of "any party is expected, but to step "aside and charge an administration "with altering the method of keeping "our national records for the purpose "of showing the financial position of "the country to be other than it real-"ly is, brings with it a danger which "I am sure is not fully realized by "those carrying on such propagan-"da. . . . .

"If we require to go to a foreign "market for loans to be used in the "development of this country, I sub-"mit there is danger that our credit, "now at its highest point, may be "damaged and that we may be called "upon to pay higher rates for ac-"commodation."

It will be thus seen that irresponsible legislators are not confined to Newfoundland.

With regard to the charge made against me, I may say that while I

do not pretend to be a finished Accountant, yet I am sufficiently informed to analyze the several Revenue and Expenditure statements aced before me. Moreover, if the Auditor General's Report as tabled in this House states that the deficit on current account for 1925-1926, after including an overdraft of $30,719.55, is $112,616.06, surely Honourable Members will not accuse me of dictating that gentleman's Report. Why it is ridiculous to think that Mr. Berteau would permit any Finance Minister to juggle the official statements intended for the information of the Legislature. He is an independent official responsible only to the Legislature. He can only be dismissed for cause and then only with a two-thirds majority of both the Legislative Council and House of Assembly. That such a charge is utterly absurd I leave to the good sense of the use and my only regret is, that in the interests of the country, the charge was ever made.

I am pleased to note from the Trade figures supplied me by the Deputy Minister of Customs that our total Exports for last year amounted to $27,563.213.00, an increase in value over the previous year of $3,0[illegible]3,027.00 and exceeding our Imports for the same period by the sum of $10,908.00.

The following statement shows the value of our principal exports as tabled in the Customs Returns laid on the table of the House during the present session. It will be seen therefrom that our Fisheries still hold, in the matter of values, a big lead in the economic life of the Colony.

Products of the Fisheries	$14,548,829.00
Products Agriculture ..	15,442.00
Products Forest	535,370.00
Products Mines	1,937,695.00
Products Local Manufactures	8,590,143.00
Old Metal	140,775.00
Miscellaneous Exports ..	777,242.00

COD FISHERY

Our Cod Fish exports for last year as compared with 1925 increased 201,364 quintals and this accounts for $1,620,000.00 of the increase in value of Exports above referred to. From the latest reports available one of our keenest competitors in the fish markets of the Mediterranean is meeting with extremely hard times. It is reported that a remarkable scarcity of fish exists in Norway the present year and that lack of bait and exceptionally stormy weather has been a great hindrance to the prosecution of the fishery there. Moreover, the number of men engaged in the industry has fallen from eighteen thousand to eleven thousand this year, a fact which has had the effect of shortening their catch, according reports of May 20th last, by approximately twenty million fish as compared with the same date last year. Under these conditions the price of codfish should surely advance during the coming season, and I am of opinion that those who have prosecuted the fisheries vigorously this year will receive remunerative returns for their work.

COI LIVER OIL.

Exports of Cod Liver Oil rose from 77,484 gallons in 1924-25 to 169,645 gallons last year, an encouraging state of affairs which we should like to see in connection with all the products of our fisheries. The figures for 1923-1924 show that only 41,389 gallons of Cod Liver Oil valued at $31,-462.00 were sent to market. This means that in the short space of two years the quantity of Cod Liver Oil exported from Newfoundland has increased four-fold and the price had advanced from seventy-six cents to one dollar and sixteen cents per gallon.

There are reports also of a shortage in Norwegian Cod Liver Oil but

I understand from reliable sources that there was a balance of approximately 20,000 barrels left unsold from the production of last year and this with the 66,000 barrels said to have been made this year, means that we cannot hope for an advance in price this year.

It is pleasing to note that our Cod Liver Oil industry is coming into its own and is at last receiving the serious scientific attention it deserves. Splendid demonstrations of its vitamine value given recently in Canada attracted considerable attention. As a matter of fact these demonstrations were so appreciated that a request has been made by McGill University to have them repeated for the benefit of its students and of the medical fraternity of Montreal at an important Conference to be held there shortly.

This seems to me to be advertising of a most valuable kind and if the proper care in Oil Inspection is continued, our Cod Liver Oil should in the near future become a medicine of international importance. I may say that every encouragement has been given by the Government for the gradual expansion of this industry and the tremendous advance in export values as shown by the Trade figures seem to have justified the Government's policy in this direction.

In my Budget Speech of two years ago I recommended a concerted effort on the part of those interested in the industry I advised the institution of a publicity campaign so that people everywhere might be educated as to the real medicinal value of Newfoundland Cod Liver Oil and its proved superiority in vitamine contents over other oils similarly prepared, and in this connection I drew attention to the results obtained by incessant advertising of other medicinal preparations the values of which were the subject of unfavourable criticism by famous members of the medical profession.

When I repeat that last year's exports showed an increase of 128,256 gallons over two years ago and that the price advanced from 76 to $1.16 per gallon, honourable members will agree that my faith in the industry has been more than justified.

SALMON FISHERY.

The Salmon fishery generally showed a sharp upward curve, the exports of Pickled Salmon amounting in value to $130,825 for 5,300 tierces. In 1921-1922 there were exported 5,696 tierces at a value of $125,060.00, which means that last year our pickled salmon fetched roughly $24.60 per tierce as against $22.00 per tierce in 1921-1922, and only $20.00 per tierce in 1924-25.

The exports of fresh salmon amounted to 1,041,252 lbs at a value of $144,896.00 as compared with 613,448 lbs. in 1924-1925 valued at $82,004.00, an increase over the previous year of 427,804 lbs.

SEAL FISHERY.

The exports of Seal Skins fell from 149,222 to 132,509 in number with a corresponding drop in value of $89,927.00, and I regret to say that the oil exported also declined in value. The exports of Whale oil, however, almost trebbled in value. 1,690 tuns fetching $209,650.00 being marketed last year as against 682 tuns in 1924-1925 at a value of $87,324.00. From the Trade figures furnished me I note that the Whaling Industry is showing extremely satisfactory progress, and I am sure it will be an agreeable surprise to the House to know that last year we received more remunerative prices for our Whale Oil than for over twenty years past. With the exception of the years 1904-1905 and 1906 when our Whaling Industry was in the heyday of its prosperity, there has been no year equal to last year's whaling values, and as honourable members will note on reference to the Trade Figures in the appendix of the Speech, the exports have risen year by year from a value of $4,203.00 for five tuns

of Whale Oil in 1921-1922 to 1,690 tuns valued at $209,650.00 last year. Here we have the revival of an industry which in 1905 was worth $535,000.00 to this Colony dropping gradually to the miserable sum of $303 in value sixteen years afterwards and now by gradual process again climbing in another six years to $209,000.00. This is a very interesting fact and I am sure we all trust that the good luck which marked the industry in 1925-1926 will attend it in the future.

The Herring Fishery showed no marked increase, the figures being practically the same as last year.

The increase of approximately 30,000 tons of Paper exported last year as compared with 1924-1925 is accounted for by the increased production at Corner Brook and Grand Falls, and we may look forward confidently for a steady increase from this source. The export value of our paper last year was $8,383,322.00 as compared with $6,272,836.00 in 1925, and $4.646,583.00 in the fiscal year 1920-1921. The export of Pulp which was valued at $175,325 was 11,147 tons last year or practically 1.500 tons less than the previous year.

LABRADOR BOUNDARY.

Since the last session of the Legislature another tremendous asset has been secured to the Colony in the acqquisition of the long disputed Labrador territory.

Although much has been said and written on this question I cannot refrain from expressing the general satisfaction which I am sure this House feels as a result of the favourable decision handed down by the Privy Council After two or three years of litigation, during which the matter had become generally regarded by this country as a vehicle of patronage for the legal fraternity, this contentious question has been settled for all time. And I a sure that there can be only one opinion as to the single-mindedness of the Government in connection with the Labrador.

May I be permitted to add my personal congratulations to Hon. Mr. Higgins on the successful completion of this celebrated case during his tenure of the office of Minister of Justice. Sir P. T. McGrath, who has handled the historical, geographical and other aspects of the dispute, has told us of the splendid co-operation of both Mr. Warren and Mr. Higgins in pressing the case forward; and I feel, as Finance Minister, that it is not out of place in this Speech to offer both for myself and the Government our hearty congratulations to those three gentlemen. While we all recognize and appreciate the eloquent exposition of the case as given by Sir John Simon, even the gentleman himself stated that the result attained would have been impossible without the splendid team-work his Newfoundland colleagues, and the painstaking service given by our British counsel, Messrs. Burns and Berridge.

With equal modesty, all these gentlemen tell us that but for Sir John Simon's great ability the result might have been very different. Which view is the correct one is not for me to say, but we are all united in the opinion that the thanks of the country is in no small measure due to all.

The economic value of this immense territory (roundly 110,000 square miles in area) has now become of considerable importance. Water power and paper developments are rapidly depleting the available forest areas in the neighbouring continent, and industrial companies are now being forced further afield in order to secure their requirements. And so it is that we find companies like the Nfld. Pulp and Paper Company and the International Paper Company establishing their mills in the heart of their timber holdings, in what was hitherto considered a wilderness. The gradual encroachment of corporations

interested in water powers and pulp and paper into the more northern sections of Quebec certainly enhances the value of this newly won territory. The area now legally belonging to Newfoundland, including some 60,000 sq. miles of spruce forest, is valued at approximately $200,000,000. We also have control of the Hamilton River and other tributaries, the water power of which exceeds that of the mighty Niagara. It is agreed that the Hamilton River can develop nearly 7,000,000 horse power, practically half of the total power available in the whole Province of Quebec.

What this means to the people of Newfoundland it is difficult for the ordinary person to conceive, but that it is an asset which will increase in value year after year is without question. Whatever its value may be financially, the Government has hastened to reassure the country as to its disposal. A bill introduced during the present session of the Legislature secured all the newly-acquired territory from the encroachments of speculators, reserving it for the profits of the country as a whole. Millions of dollars which should have gone into the national funds have in the past been sent to the United States and other countries, filling the pockets of speculators who held title to our Crown lands in payment of a nominal rental. This fact was remembered in bringing down recent legislation in connection with the Labrador, and the country can have confidence that insofar as the present administration is concerned the door is barred against speculators who do not contract for immediate and satisfactory developments of these areas.

MINERAL RESOURCES.

In my estimation, Mr. Chairman, the future salvation of this Colony lies in the development of our mineral resources. These, in conjunction with the fisheries and the pulp and paper industry, now represent the mainspring of our economic life.

I am of the opinion that the subject of mineral development has never received in the past the energetic and serious attention which is given it by our wealthier neighbors For years, since the death of Mr. James P. Howley, this legislature voted annually a geologist's salary without appointing a geologist, and it remained for the present administration to appoint such an official in the person of Mr. H. A. Baker, F.G.S., F.R.G.S. Mr. Baker is a Doctor of Science of London University, and comes to this country with all the qualifications that a Fellowship in the Royal Geological Society means, and that we all know is an eminent distinction. He was only invited to Newfoundland in the month of June, and when I say that he was engaged in field work and under canvas within two weeks of his arrival I think it will be admitted that this gentleman made no delay in getting down to work. Despite the short time at his disposal I am informed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that considerable exploration work has been undertaken and that Mr Baker's reports are of the most optimistic nature. As an example of the prospects I need only cite the haematite iron deposits at Bell Island, estimated by scientists of the past at 4,000 000,000 tons. We have always been impressed by the potential commercial value of these huge deposits but Honourable Members will I am sure be amazed to learn that the Government Geologist's estimate states that these deposits should certainly contain several times 4,000,000,000 tons. He places the minimum tonnage at 27,000,000,000 and the maximum at 65,000,000,000 tons of ore, a supply of raw material sufficient for generations yet to come.

In addition to the Bell Island iron

just referred to Mr. Baker was most optimistic regarding the prospects of a higher grade of haematite deposits over several sections of the mainland and the Peninsula of Avalon. He states that these latter deposits contain 61 and 62 per cent. metallic iron as compared with 53 per cent, metallic iron contained in the Bell Island deposits. This information might appear on the face of it rather cold comfort were it not for the fact that some of the large steel and iron interests of the United States and Canada are becoming interested in Dr. Baker's pronouncements.

I should like to ask honourable members to consider the developments of Buchan's Mine in the Red Indian Lake area by the American Smelter and Mining Company in conjunction with the A. N. D. Company. Here we have a new avenue of employment opened which should be instrumental in stopping the exodus of many of our people who for years have been forced to leave the cou in quest of employment. I am hopeful that with the advent of new industries of this kind Newfoundlanders will no longer have to leave home for want of work but that plenty will be found for them to do at remunerative wages in our own Island

At the present time the men behind some of the greatest mining and smelting operations the world over have their attention focussed on this country simply and solely through the favourable advertising which 'his mineral discovery at Red Indian Lake has given us. During the past few months this area has been visited by many men of prominence in the mining world, and I have what I consider to be reliable information to the effect that the area in and around the Red Indian Lake section bears a remarkable resemblance to the mineralized area of Northern Ontario. The history of Northern Ontario, from a mineral point of view, is that at the end of 1925 the gross value of the mineral output of that small section of the great Dominion of Canada amounted to millions of dollars.

During the coming autumn. also through the efforts of the Govern ment, there will visit Newfoundland one hundred of the biggest mining and smelting men of the world, and I understand arrangements have been made now by a local committee of private citizens working in conjunction with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines with a view to placing before these mining and metallurgic capitalists and prospectors what we have to offer to the outside investor.

I submit, Mr. Chairman , in the light of these pronouncements of a man qualified to speak with authority on minerals, and the unusual attention given to the matter as evidenc ed by the proposed visit just referred to, that the Colony has every reason to be hopeful as regards the future mineral development of this country. As I have already stated, I am of opinion that the future prosperity of the Colony depends on the establishment of new and profitable industries. Time was when the whole Colony practically lived by the Fisheries, but that day is gone. Our standard of living has advanced during the past forty years and with that advance has come a commensurate increase in the cost thereof The Fisheries can no longer support a population without being largely supplemented by other sources of income. Other fields of activity must be developed such as those to which I have referred.

To those who are inclined to be pessimistic I may say that they have my earnest sympathy I have had moments of despondency also, but from the indications shown above, I feel that we should take heart again and look carefully forward towards the future.

I might remind honourable gentle-

men that our financial condition is no worse, comparatively speaking, than that of the great Motherland, where Mr. Churchill is, as I have already told you, struggling with a thirty-six million pound deficit. Western Australia in addition to loan expenditures of over four million pounds sterling and an increased Public Debt of five and one half millions sterling, has also declared a deficit on current account of practically one hundred thousand pounds. An anticipated surplus in Queensland, Australia, of eleven thousand pounds resulted actually in a deficit of two hundred and sixteen thousand pounds on current account together with a loan expenditure of four million eight hundred thousand pounds and increased Public Debt obligations for the year of over five million pounds sterling. When it is considered that these expenditures and deficits are in pounds sterling and not our dollars and cents, it will be readily seen that we, as compared with the greatest part of the British Empire, are not so badly off after all.

I may say here that it is my intention to introduce a Loan Bill within a few days to cover the deficit on current account for the fiscal year 1926-1927 and to provide for our requirements in connection with the deficit on the operation of the railway. Provision will also be made for certain requirements which shall be enumerated in the Bill. The amount estimated by me to be required to meet the several services is five million dollars.

I may add that in connection with this proposed loan every effort will be made to estimate as closely as possible the amount of these requirements and the necessity for same.

At the present time I am not in a position to give the Legislature full particulars of the exact component parts of the proposed Loan or the amount required for each as I have been unable to go fully into the matter, but when the Loan Resolutions are presented to the Legislature, these particulars will be clearly, fully and specifically stated. At present I estimate that I shall require:—

For Deficit Current Account 1926-1927	$1,950,000.00
For Railway Deficit 1926-1927	760,000.00
For the Gander Railway..	900,000.00

In order that they may be available if Honourable Members should desire to consult them, I have attached to this review several financial statements taken from the Auditor General's Report on the Revenue and Appropriation Accounts together with others that may be of interest to the House. The following is a list of the statements in the order in which they appear in the Appendix hereto:—

(1) Statement of the Public Debt of the Colony on May 3, 1927.

(2) Statement of the Expenditure of the 1924 Loan.

(3) Statement of Allocations from the 1926 Loan.

(4) Comparative Statement of Revenue for the five years from 1921-1922 to 1925 1926 (inclusive).

(5) Comparative Statement of Expenditure for the years 1924-1925 and 1926-1927 showing increase and decrease (as the case may be) under the several Heads of Expenditure.

(6) Comparative Statement of Trade Statistics of the Colony from 1920-1921 to 1925-1926 (inclusive).

(7) Comparative Statement of Savings Deposits in Newfoundland as at December 31st each year from 1922 to 1926 (inclusive).

(8) Statement showing Life Insurance Premiums paid by Policy Holders in Newfoundland, giving value of new Policies issued and the total Insurance in force each year for years 1923, 1924 and 1925.

(9) Statement of Earnings and Expenses of the Newfoundland Railway

from July 1st, 1926. to May 31st, 1927.

(10) Comparative Statement of earnings and Expenses for the years 1925 and 1926 showing deficit for the year 1926.

(11) Comparative Statement of the following items from 1910-1911 to 1925-1926 (inclusive).

(a) Original Estimates and Supplementary Supply.

(b) Expenditure under Special Warrant (Sec. 33 Audit Act).

(c) Revenue and Expenditure on Current Account each year.

(d) Surplus or Deficit as the case may be.

(e) The Public Debt as it stood at the close of each year.

(f) The charges paid for Interest on Public Debt.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to propose the following resolutions, viz.:—

RESOLVED:—That the Act passed in the fifteenth year of the reign His Majesty King George V., Chapter 34, entitled "The Revenue Act, 1925" and subsequent amendments thereto, be further amended in manner following:—

In Section 26 thereof, second last line, strike out the words "by a Customs Officer" and add to the section as follows:—(a) The Governor in Council is hereby authorized to make such Rules and Regulations as appear to the Department of Customs necessary to enforce the proper marking of oleomargarine, butterine or similar substitutes for butter, tobacco, cigars and cigarettes before they are entered for consumption in this Colony, such markings to be made by stamps, or any other method that may be ordered, at the cost and charge of the importer.

SCHEDULE A.

Item 76. Insert the word "British" between the words "the" and "West."

Item 76. Add "Vinegar, when imported by Herring packers for the purpose of packing herring—free."

Item 96. After the word "Oak" in the second line, add "and Douglas Fir."

Item 148. Substitute 20 for 14.

Item 184. After the word "Needles" add "Surgical Gloves."

Item 253. After "Cream Colored Ware" add "Brown and Cane Ware."

Item 254. In third line after "and" add the word "like."

Item 274. Strike out "and parts thereof."

Item 342. Add after the words "Baling Wire "Metal Core Caps and Metal Strips."

SCHEDULE B.

Item 351. Add under the head of "Goods" — "Glass bottles Labels that cannot be manufactured in this Colony and Special Cartons for enclosing bottles." d Under the head of "When subject to Drawback" add "when used by manufacturers for the bottling of cod liver oil for export upon satisfactory evidence being produced to the Department of Customs of the exportation of the same."

Under the head "Portion of duty (not including special duty or dumping duty) payable as drawback" add "100 per cent. of the duty paid."

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I want to make myelf clear on one point in connection with the Budget that has just been read by the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs. I regret to have to term the Budget something similar to that which the Leader of the Opposition termed the Speech

from the Throne, when he said in part that it should be bordered by black and then it would serve as the obituary notice of the present Government. I think that it would serve the country as an obituary notice at the present time of its financial condition. I would like to make some reference to the statements regarding the statements made in this House this year ,as applied to the deficit. That evidently referred to me because I think that at the time that the Speech from the Throne was being debated in this House that from the figures given me by the Minister of Finance himself, that I made certain assertions. The Finance Minister in delivering his Budget this afternoon took occasion to refer to such statements as being mischievous. The statement which I made at that time was made with his own figures. And if the Finance Minister or those associated with him saw fit to table incorrect information in this House, then they have got to put up with any statement made regarding the financial matters. At the present moment I have not the figures on my person, but I propose at the next meeting of the Committee to produce the exact figures tabled in this House by me, and these figures will show conclusively that either deliberate wrong information was given or that after the assertion was made that neither the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance or any members of the Executive Govt. made any attempt to contradict the assertions made by me until I forced it upon them, and then it was done by a certified statement by the Auditor General which was not worth the snap of the finger. We are told this afternoon that this country is in a very fine condition, in comparison with England on account of the Minister of Finance bringing in a budget showing a deficit of £36,000,000. But I would remind the Hon. the Minister of Finance that the British Isles as constituted to-day, has an aggregation of 50,000,000 people, which means a deficit of three dollars each. Whereas the deficit brought in by the Minister of Finance and Customs this afternoon, brings it up to ten dollars per head, as compared with three dollars per head for the British Government. Surely whoever was responsible for putting that clause in the Budget Speech, ought to rinse his head before coming in here at any future time and comparing this country to England. With regard to Mr. Robb, the Canadian Minister of Finance making a statement that damaging information or rather, that the statements made by the Opposition with regard to the financial condition of a country which found it hard to secure money ought to be discountenanced, it is evident now, according the Budget Speech this afternoon that the settlement of the Labrador Boundary question, has put this country ahead to the extent of $200,000,000. Even if it were such a despicable character as to speak of the Budget as being cooked again, and that everything in it is incorrect, and deliberately incorrect, that Newfoundland to-day which has received judgment in the Labrador Boundary case and that the Minister of Finance is now able to go out and to-morrow or the next day, secure a further loan of $5,000,000 at par, and that it will be unnecessary this year to accept a tender of 96 5-8 when a tender of 97 is turned down. I shall defer any further remarks that I have to make until I am able to deal with the Budget from beginning to end. I trust that after I am finished with it that I shall have proved conclusively to the Government, who evidently have not seriously studied the affairs of this country, that the Budget Speech did not tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth, but that it told it in part, and in part only. I would also like to draw the attention of the

Committee to the fact that in part the Budget lead this country or the public of this country to believe that the Humber Bill relieved this country of all liability and responsibility in connection with the £2,000,000 liability, that part in my opinion is deliberately inserted to get the public to believe that Newfoundland is no longer responsible for the £2,000,000 B debentures on the Corner Brook property, whereas it is actually just as responsible as three years ago when this country authorised the issue of those bonds.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on Monday next.

On motion the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Second reading of the International Power and Paper Co. Bill.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, before the motion for Second Reading of this Bill is made I have a request to make to the Executive Government. I think it will be admitted that this contract is probably the most important and most far-reaching that ever came before this House, and, because of that fact, it demands extremely careful consideration, not merely in Committee, but throughout all stages of the Bill. The agreement itself is an extremely involved one. It is one which I fear only a competent lawyer can understand; it is one which is largely incomprehensible to the ordinary layman; it is one which has had the careful examination of the International Paper Company for a period of twelve months; and it is one which has had that careful consideration by those eminent legal men through the various stages which have taken place from the time these negotiations were first started. The members of the Government have had the opportunity of carefully considering this matter for some months and they have had also the privilege of following it up to the present moment; but so far as gentlemen on this side of the House are concerned that has not been the case. We have had no knowledge of the agreement up to a couple of weeks ago, and, personally, unfortunately because of an intermittent illness through which I have passed during the last few weeks I have been unable to give any attention to it whatever. I was confined to my home for a considerable portion of the time. However, I feel that the Executive Government would not desire to rush through a measure of such great importance, a measure fraught with such tremendous consequences for good or for evil to this country, without giving every member of the House an opportunity to duly consider it. I have not had that opportunity. I am the only lawyer by profession on the Opposition side of the House and I would like to be given some little time to consider this measure. This is not a simple Bill. It is not a straight-forward agreement whereby one can sit down and judge on each section. On the contrary before any reasonable, intelligent estimate can be formed of the benefits or otherwise of this agreement to this Colony, it is necessary to take into consideration that there are Acts of Parliament connected with it that began in 1915 and ending in 1925. I do, therefore, sincerely ask that the Executive Government defer this matter until this day week. We have plenty of business to go on with to occupy the attention of the House in the meanwhile, and I take it that when the debate does take place on the Second Reading that no time will be lost. I understand also that the

Company's option does not expire until September 15th next, so that no damage can accrue to the Colony or the International Paper Company by the delay I suggest now. I do not know at the present moment whether I am going to vote on the Bill or not, but if I have to vote on it this afternoon I will have to vote against it, because I cannot, as a representative of the people of this Colony, vote conscientiously in favor of the principle of a measure which would involve this Colony into heavy financial obligations and unless I have the information before me to show me what I am voting for. That information, I submit, I have not to-day. That is my reason for asking that the Second Reading be deferred until this day week and that courtesy I think the Executive Government will willingly accord me.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, I have already intimated to the House that there was no desire on the part of the Government to unduly rush this or any other measure through Committee stages, but I have also stated on several occasions that in connection with this Bill we should not attack it until we all understood it, and in order to do that it was necessary to debate it as constantly as we could until the measure was through. I am sorry that the health of the hon. member for Port de Grave did not permit his attendance in the House when the debate on the Resolutions was going on, but I cannot consent to the proposition he puts forward this evening. I think it is a most unreasonable request. Over a week ago these Bills were distributed and every sitting member here has gone through them clause by clause, except the hon. member for Port de Grave, and while I regret that he did not have ample opportunity to consider these Bills, at the same time I do not see any reason why a couple of days would not do him to become conversant with the Bill now before the Chair. He is a lawyer and ought to be able to grasp the substance of the Bill quicker and more intelligently than the ordinary layman in the House. Any matters in connection with the legal aspect of the clauses of the agreement must promptly show themselves to him; whilst from a commercial standpoint the agreement has been gone through and given consideration to by every member of the Opposition outside of himself.

I am perfectly willing to defer the Second Reading of the Bill until Monday next, but I would not be satisfied to postpone it any longer. Members of the House on both sides I think are desirous of getting the House closed after such a protracted session. The clerks and other officials are also tied up here and are anxious to be released, so that whilst the Government are desirous of giving every possible consideration to matters coming before the House, yet we are not desirous of postponing this present measure for another whole week. I, therefore, move that the Second Reading of this Bill be adjourned until Monday next.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to tomorrow, Friday, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, August 19th, 1927.

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

A Petition was presented by:

Mr. Ashbourne, from Black Islands, re a well.

Hon. Minister of Justice presented the report of the Select Committee on the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Patents."

On motion this report was received and adopted.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice and by unanimous consent it was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals'" was introduced and read a first time and was 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 that the Legislative Council had made an amendment requested by this House in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting Crown Royalties."

On motion this amendment was read a first time.

On motion this amendment was read a second time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that this House had concurred therein.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE — These additional estimates for 1927 are as follows:

(Reads)

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask if these pensions have been computed according to the terms of the act passed last year?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes.

DR. MOSDELL—In connection with the list of pensions I want to bring to the notice of the Government just now the matter of a pension for the post office official of English Harbor West retired last year, named George Gould. I was assured his name would be in the supplementary list. He gets about a hundred a year of a pension I think and a couple of days ago I received a letter stating that he hadn't received the last quarterly payment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —There are two or three cases of mail couriers who have done good service and have got pensions from the Department, but a lot of these couriers don't come under the provisions of the Act. I think it will be found in a case like that that the payment is being made out of contingencies of the post office. There are two or three cases. I think possibly that is one.

MR. SCAMMELL—I want to make reference to a similar case in St. Barbe. I have had some correspondence in connection with the matter already but I didn't get anything like a satisfactory reply. It was a man who has been working for thirty years. I was rather hoping he would be considered for a pension and be included in this list. There is another case, that of the post master at Harbor Deep and it is one worthy of notice. They are getting nothing now and it would only amount to a couple of small pensions. Both of these men I think were in the service probably twenty five or thirty years. The first man's name is Coates, the mail courier at Eddy's Cove. I cannot recall the name of the other man, but he is post master at Harbor Deep.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —I will take a note and look into the matter.

DR. MOSDELL — Mr. Chairman, there is another case I would like to call attention to, in relation to Mrs. Elizabeth Burke, the widow of the former light keeper at St. Jacques Island. The facts in connection with

the light house are rather tragic and the tragedies have occurred in connection with the discharge of business. The husband of this lady lost his life in trying to save the lives of a couple of people in danger, who as a matter of fact were drowned; the boat proceeding to the rescue was run down by a Government steamer and the lighthouse keeper going to the rescue lost his life. Some time after that two children bringing supplies to the lighthouse were drowned. Quite recently a son has died and the widow of the former lighthouse keeper finds herself in rather straitened circumstances. These circumstances are almost without precedent. Personally it strikes me as being absolutely a deserving case and one that might be dealt with without setting any precedent. I hope the Government will see its way clear at least to make a small allowance to meet the case. If an allowance were made of say two hundred dollars I am sure it would be showing appreciation for services done by the family of the lady and be something to help her along in her declining years under those circumstances brought about by faithful discharge of duty of members of her immediate family.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, I might say that I brought that matter at the request of the Honorable Member to the Executive Government and found that we had no power to make an allowance in such a case. And whilst we all appreciate and feel that it is a very unusual case, and as it culminated after a series of tragedies that this woman is certainly deserving of all the charitable consideration possible, the Government felt that if the House would make the motion that they might make an allowance, but they did not feel like establishing a precedent on their own account.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions regarding the retirement of Mr. Bradbury. First as to the cause of his retirement, the name of the person who has been appointed to his place and the district to which he belonged. Mr. Chairman, was the number of years he was in the service taken into account? He was in the service some years ago and then the position was taken from him, and afterwards he was reappointed again. He was 21 years in the service altogether.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, yes, the number of years of service were actually considered.

MR. RUSSELL — Then apparently the position was taken away from Harbor Grace and given to a person in another district. Might I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who received the appointment and why it was transferred?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman ,in reply to the Honourable gentleman, I may say that Mr. Butt of Bay de Verde has been appointed in his place. As far as I am concerned personally, I was authorized to make the appointment ,anyway. Hr. Grace had nine out of eleven. I think Bay de Verde certainly deserves one at the present time. They have been looking for one ever since I went there, but there was no vacancy until recently.

MR. RUSSELL — Mr. Chairman, I notice that the tendency is to take all that you possibly can from the district of Harbour Grace. I want to say this, and I think that the Colonial Secretary will bear me out that while possibly the district of Harbor Grace may have a few more men in the position of lighthouse keepers, yet I say that the other districts more than even up in other positions. I think that the tendency is to take from Harbor Grace. There is charity bestowed on a great many now, but if we take away those positions the people will simply have to look to the char-

itable institutions. I did not know anything about Mr. Bradbury being retired and I certainly did not know that the position had been given to anybody else in another district. Every man has got to look out for his own district and his own people, and I certainly do not think that it was right to take that position out of the district of Harbour Grace, because it happens to have a few more lighthouse keepers on Labrador than the other districts. Because what we gain in that respect we lose in other respects. I have noticed that the men of the district of Harbour Grace get very little work comparatively speaking, in connection with the railway, compared with the men in other districts. That is one case in point and I do not think that it is fair to take away the positions of lighthouse keepers on Labrador from the district of Harbour Grace unless it is intended to carry out the policy of the Department of Marine and Fisheries and appoint natives to look after those lighthouses there. But to take the position from a man in one district and give it to a man in another, I do not think that is square.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if all his lighthouses have been built recently.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—They have been all built this summer.

MR. HICKMAN—Could the Minister tell us who built them?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—The contract is not very large. It only takes about seven or eight days, and it only takes a couple of men to build them.

MR. HICKMAN—Who built the lighthouse at Draw Bucket Tickle?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—That cost seventeen or eighteen hundred dollars and was built by a man from St. John's. He formerly came from Bonavista Bay, but is living in St. John's now.

MR. HICKMAN—I wanted to get that information to back up the argument by Mr. Russell that while, as the Minister considers Harbor Grace District has perhaps one or two more lighthouse keepers than there may be from other districts, we find that the men from Harbour Grace District do not get the work of building these lighthouses. Out of the seven appointments, I do not suppose that there are any from Harbour Grace. I think it is unfair to remove an appointment from Harbour Grace down to Bay de Verde. I suggest that the Minister if he has not made the appointments for the other lighthouses, consider Harbour Grace in one of the appointments and even up.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, I am glad the Leader of the Opposition brought this matter up because sometimes when a person gets up and makes certain statements and does not know whether the statements that he is making are correct or not ,it gives him a chance to rectify himself. I am sure, as far as a man from Harbour Grace being removed and replaced by a man from Bay de Verde as a lighthouse keeper on Labrador, I had nothing to do with it personally, but still I claim that what was done was justifiable. The man who built the lighthouse at Draw Bucket Tickle was a lighthouse keeper himself for some five or six years. He left his job and came here to St. John's to live. He thoroughly understands the machinery of fog alarms, and he is a good carpenter as well. I want to inform the Leader of the Opposition that 90 per cent. of the men under my control down in the Department of Marine and Fisheries are all Harbour Grace men. I will tell you how they got there. Mr. Piccott was a good friend of Conception Bay and he blocked the place from corner to corner. I am glad to say that only

those that have died or gave out through no fault of their own, have left. The others are still there and they are all good men.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen that the Minister referred to are permanent officials and there are few men if any employed from the district of Harbor Grace building lighthouses. What happened in the past is not going to supply the needs of the people to-day. As I stated before, while certain districts are lacking in certain forms of employment, they make it up in various other ways. As a matter of fact you can say all that you like about the district, but there are comparatively few men employed on public works in this district compared with numerous other districts in this country. It is true that Mr. Piccott was a good friend of the men of Harbour Grace, but that was years ago and we cannot live on the past. The men from Harbour Grace are just as deserving of consideration in connection with employment on public works, and in civil service positions as the men from any other district. However, this is a matter that the Member for Bay de Verde had a great deal of influence in getting the transfer made. But I still contend that it is unfair, and if you intended to retire Mr. Bradbury I think that a man from Harbour Grace should have been put in his place.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I cannot let the opportunity pass without taking exception to the insinuation that Harbor Grace is not looked after. I claim that it is as well loked after as any district in the island. We have been unceasing in our attention to the people of Harbour Grace, and I do contend that they get their fair share of everything that is going. I do not want any impression to get abroad that Harbour Grace is being discriminated against. I explained about Mr. Bradbury when he asked to be retired. I spoke to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about getting another man in his place, and he said that he had promised that the district of Bay de Verd would be given the first chance when a vacancy occurred. Harbour Grace has a large proportion of lighthouse keepers on the Labrador. I think that it is the best proof of a man's sincerity when he recognises the claims of other people. I would expect the same consideration from any other member of the Government if I were to say that Harbour Grace has not a fair opportunity of getting its share of the patronage that the Government has to give, but I do say that in season and out of season when there is anything to be given out by the Government Harbour Grace gets its full share, and nobody in this House knows that better than does Mr. Russell himself. I know that when he was Minister of Public Works we heard very little about discrimination in favour of any other district. I do not say that to his discredit. I say it in admiration of the zeal for the ditrsict that he represents, but we must always remember that there are other people to consider, and I do not think that Harbour Grace has anything to complain of as far as Government patronage is concerned.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with a lot of things that the Colonial Secretary has said about the district of Harbour Grace, but at the same time his remarks may be taken in a general way. The men of Harbour Grace have had considerable work given them in the district itself in the way of ballasting on the railway and road work and things of that sort. I was particularly referring to things of a general nature throughout the country, and particularly to positions in the civil service. The Colonial Secretary referred to my enthusiasm in connection with the men of the district

whilst I was Minister of Public Works. I had the enthusiasm, but in a great many cases that was as far as I got, and it will be found that others were always getting inside the Minister and putting their enthusiasm into practice whilst my enthusiasm was enthusiasm alone. That is the difference between the enthusiasm I exhibited on behalf of my district, and that shown by other members who got employment for men of other districts. I got very few men employed on the hotel for instance.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—All Harbour Grace men worked on the hotel.

MR. RUSSELL—I was speaking of myself. I did not get them there. Some other person got them there. Anyway I protest against this.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, in reference to the discussion that has taken place I do not think that it is fair that those men should be sent down there to Labrador. They go down there for four months of the year and we have to pay their passage up and down. If we were to appoint local men to those positions it would be much cheaper. I do not see why Harbour Grace should get all the lighthouse keepers sent down there.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for the reception that he gave to our request for three new lighthouses for the district of Fortune. The people there have been agitating for three new lighthouses. I appreciate his acceding to that request for these new lighthouses. They are really indispensable and a wonderful aid to navigation.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, Now that the Additional Estimates are tabled, I would like to ask when the Loan Bill is going to be introduced and if any portion of it is going to be allocated for the purpose of constructing roads and bridge throughout the country? I would also like to know who is responsible for holding up highroads work, as my reason for asking this is that certain heelers of the Government are deliberately circulating propaganda to try and injure me politically, which they cannot do? Some of those loud whisperers have not got the intuition of a cat and I am not half finished with them yet. We were promised in this House some time ago by the Prime Minister that districts that did not get their proportionate share out of the million dollars that was voted for public works last year and districts that did not get the benefit of the highroads the past few years would get preferential treatment out of this year's loan. We were also led to believe that the Highroads Commission when it was inaugurated by the present administration would function as a non-political body. But what has happened? They did practically all the work and spent over two million dollars in one area and neglected the rest of the country. Last Fall they began building a road to Bay Bulls and after working there for a month operations were suspended and have not been resumed since. Why? Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the straight question, is it because of the attitude of any member of the Opposition that this highroads work is delayed or not?

THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, surely the honourable member for Ferryland must know that a Loan Bill has to be passed first and money cannot be spent on highroads or on anything else until it is voted by this House.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, as I have previously stated, my idea in connection with the money to be spent on road work is that it should be distributed pro rata, and that whilst the expenditure of the money will be under the control of the Executive Government, recommendations would be considered from

members as to the most needed portions of the various districts in which the expenditures are made.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, why is the Loan Bill not introduced? It could have been done a month ago. Now I would like to ask again is it because of members of the Government or the Opposition that the Loan Bill is delayed so long? I have been pressed hard by my constituents asking if the highroads are going to operate in my district this season and I want to known definitely if it is or not? It is all very fine for the Prime Minister to get up and tell us his idea of how money should be distributed in the various districts but how was the million dollars that was voted by this House last year for public works in the different districts spent? The district of Ferryland not alone did not get its share, but did not get even the price of a stick of chewing gum out of it, whilst other districts got money thrown at them in galore. Burgeo and LaPoile got $20,000.00 for political purposes in connection with the Bye-Election there; Fortune Bay district got $10,000.00 for political purposes also; the Labrador Boundary lawyers got $100,000.00; Mr. Duff got $10,000.00 to do work in Carbonear; $100,000.00 was given out in pauper relief; St. George's got $30,000.00 and various other amounts were handed out to different districts, but Ferryland got nothing, simply because Cashin happens to represent it. You could not afford to give the people of Ferryland district who are producers in this country what they are justly entitled to, but you could manage to bring a heeler named Green to Cape Broyle and make a job for him there where he has made himself an absolute nuisance. And this is what the present Government calls economy, and we were told that we are holding up this House and stopping work from being carried on because we expose the wrong doing that is going on within the Govt. ranks. The whole Government stinks with rottenness and corruption and the next thing one will have to wear coming in here is a gas mask. It is high time to have a cleansing of our public affairs and have a decent and representative Government installed in office to guide the future destinies of this down-trodden country, and is it any wonder that people are clamouring throughout the length and breadth of this Island for such a change to be brought about. I was told that the reason the district of Ferryland did not get its share of the one million dollar loan last year was because I left the Government on the Highroads Bill. Well than what is the use of me making recommendations, although the Prime Minister told us a few moments ago that recommendations would be considered by the Executive from the various members in connection with this year's loan? I have driven from St. John's to Placentia over a road that cost the country half million dollars to construct, and Placentia town produces nothing to the country whilst the district of Ferryland which has been flagrantly discriminated against produces, seventy five thousand quintals of codfish each year. The whole road should be built for a thousand a mile, and probably as good as that we have got down there for five thousand. When I venture an opinion in this House, members of the Government, with and without portfolio some of them, immediately proceed to say that this fellow Cashin is a bully, and his district does not deserve anything. Why are my people discriminated against? That is what I want to know about. I will resign to-morrow if it is my fault, as intimated by the Minister of Justice to an outstanding gentleman of my District. They will not say that to my face, they say it behind my back. We voted five million last year—one million for public works, I never saw it or heard tell of it. It is no use, I have

no public press behind me, there is no free press in the country, they are bought. If the Government ceased tomorrow doling out patronage to the public press, they would immediately set on them like dogs, and tear the very hearts out of the present administration, but so long as the present administration sees its way clear to throw out one hundred thousand a year patronage to the public press, then they are the best administration that ever held office in Newfoundland since responsible Government. That is the history of the past three years, and I am wasting my time here this afternoon, perhaps wasting someone else's, but I want to get it off my chest. I want to let them know that while I have been fairly quiet during the past few weeks, I have not died altogether. I have not received a satisfactory answer regarding what may happen, but if I gave them a certain amount of taffy I suppose, and let them know what fine fellows they are and not mean it, then my District might have an opportunity of getting some of the money they are throwing away all over the country. I want to know right now why it is that Ferryland District has been discriminated against? Why it is you can build roads in the wilderness, costing seven, eight and ten thousand a mile, and I cannot get five hundred a mile to build in Ferryland? Members of the Government side probably representing Northern Districts will say that they have got no roads in their Districts, that is none of my business, and when $2,000,000 was passed, Ferryland was entitled as much as any other part of the Avalon, but Placentia and St. Mary's got a paving, so to speak, from here to Placentia. Do they deserve it any more than the people of Ferryland? Not a bit, and that road does not lead into the productive part of that District either. Other parts of Placentia Bay haven't got a road for a goat to walk on. I feel Mr. Chairman like standing here this afternoon from now till doomsday abusing the Government, but I don't feel also like wasting time talking to an aggregation that will go out probably and raise money to-morrow and pay a deficit with that money and forget that there is such a place in existence as Ferryland District, and next year perhaps one of them may go out and tell the people I am responsible for the Highroads not going through Ferryland District this year. Why should they discriminate against my District. People are here fighting for their own Districts, I am going to have an afternoon fighting for mine, but I have not received satisfaction, and I don't expect it.

MR. K. M. BROWN—Before the Committee rises, since I was absent from the House and could not get in before, I would like to make a few remarks, if I might be permitted. On additional estimates I was going to ask if the question of giving an extra amount of money of $10,000 towards Twillingate Hospital has been given any consideration by the Executive.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—We have decided that we are not going to increase the vote this year.

MR. K. M. BROWN—Well that is a very bad thing, to say that an Institution like Twillingate Hospital has got to go out of business in November this year on account of not being able to get enough funds to carry on. I think that is a crime. A Hospital taking in half as many patients as the General Hospital, St. John's, cannot get this $10,000, and the General Hospital receives $20,000 a month, and the Twillingate Hospital for the whole year received the large sum of $15,000. The hospital cannot be kept going without that $10,000. Pauper patients cost the hospital over $11,000 for the first six months of the year, and they cannot get an additional $10,000 to keep going, and the St. John's General Hospital with all due respect to it, as it

deserves it, got over $20,000 a month. People go to the Hospital from St. Barbe, Twill ngate, Fogo, Bonavista, almost all over the Northern part of the country, and if the Government decides to grant the additional amount in order that the Hospital may continue it will be a relief to the St. John's General Hospital, as it is at the present time, yet to-day we have to oe content to sit down and see that Hospital closed down in November for want of funds. I cannot hold my seat as a member of the House and allow that to go ahead. It is unfair, very unfair, not only to Twillingate but to every Northern District in the country. Pedhaps the Government have not taken the matter into consideration, and given it all the consideration it deserves, and I don't want to be too harsh in my critic sm this afternoon, and I ask now Mr. Chairman that if this thing has not been given the consideration it deserves that it be taken up mmediately by the Executive Government and I hope before a few days the Government will be in a position to inform me that the amount asked for has been granted, if not I shall find it necessary to have something more to say in this connection.

MR. HIBBS—I was disagreeably surprised to find that the request by Mr. Brown and other speakers, made on behalf of Twillingate Hospital, had gone unheeded. I took it for granted that when additional estimates came in that the Minister of Finance would have provision made for that. It is not a bit of good our deceiving curselves. If we do not pay for that hospital we will pay for some other hospital. It is false economy. That hospital there is performing a wonderful service, not only to the d stricts in the immediate vicinity of Twillingate, but to all the districts throughout the Northern sections of the Island. As a result of that hospital operating there for the past three years there have not been many people coming to St. John's. There is no reason as far as I can see from either an economical or from a remedial standpoint why that grant is not being given. When one speaks of this one runs the risk of being charged with increasing the expenditure. But that is not the case. We on this side of the House are anxious to cut down expenditure. But do not begin with Twillingate hospital. If you have got to close up that hospital I would regard it as a calamity. That is what has got to happen according to a letter that I received somet me ago from the Superintendent of that hospital. That is unthinkable. I do ask the Prime Minister and the Government generally and I particularly direct it to the attention of the Finance Minister who is sympathetically disposed to this, to consider it. We have to find that $10,000. It is for a good cause, for an economic cause.

MR. MOORE — Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the honourable member in connection with that hospital. I understand that it has 28 beds. I did not know that it was of that attitude. If you are going to close a hospital of that kind for the sake of $10,000, you are going to have the hospitals here taxed far more than it can support. An institution like that should not be allowed to close. You have spent money on things that have not been as much deserving of consideration as that hospital. I give my hearty support to that. Now may I ask the Prime Minister again that if this vote goes through that he will look after the road in Ferryland district. Because if not we will have to write you again as we have had to in the past. We have written in the past and we have got no satisfaction whatever. I would like to be in the position of being able to say to the people there this week that that road is going ahead.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Chairman, I cannot say anything more than I have already said

about the distribution of this money. Last year you got a road built at Bay Bulls, but I got nothing built in my district. I only mention that to show that there has been no attempt at discrimination against the Southern Shore, or any other district as far as the Government is concerned. I am perfectly satisfied that a road down the Southern Shore is as necessary as a road to Placentia. Probably more so, but whether we build the whole road or a bit of it or to what extent of money we can go as far as the proportion of the grant for Ferryland district is concerned, these are things that we must decide upon before we can do anything. There may be requests coming in from the member for Ferryland to have five or six large concrete bridges built there, and until the matter has been given great consideration I do not see what can be done. But I know that as far as my district is concerned that one good road in Bonavista Bay is better than thousands of dollars spent all over the place simply repairing roads. Consequently I think that we are immensely better off in having a good highway from here to Placentia than a patched up road from here to Ferryland.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, my contention s this, and if he is at all honest he will get up here and say in this House that last year $150,000 was voted and Ferryland District did not get its share. The other districts got lots of money. Burgeo got $25,000 for instance but we only got $350 for a bridge in Witless Bay. Was not that discrimination. If you cannot call it discrimination I do not know what you can call it. Now it is well to know that motor cars tear up a road more than horses and carts and carriages do. With the result that this road of ours is in a dilapidated condition. The people blame me for it because I happen to be opposed to the Government. There may be something in that, but if that is the case it is so small that it is hardly worth talking about. Now is it my fault or the Government's fault. It is the Government's fault. They built new roads through certain sections of the district and it was absolutely a waste of money. It was almost as well that they had thrown the money over the wharf in some respects, as far as any direct benefit was derived from it. Other good roads have been rebuilt. I am afraid that as far as my poor old district is concerned that it cannot expect very much from this Government.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word to what has already been said about the desirability of assisting as far as we can the maintenance of the Hospital in Twillingate. I do say, because seventeen years of my life were spent in that district, and because I am intimate with the requirements of the people in that section of the Island as well as other sections, that I agree with what has been said by the other speakers, that for every dollar that is allocated to be spent in caring for the patients at the Hospital at Twillingate that must mean an equal saving in the St. John's institution. For that reason I think that the Government will and are giving their sympathetic consideration to the request of the people of Twillingate. Now, while I am on my feet I want to occupy the time of the House for just a few moments, to make a few remarks with regard to what has been done for the district of Placentia and St. Mary's during the term of the present Government. The honourable member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, referred to the expenditure of public monies and to the 84 miles of road that were built from St. John's to Placentia, which according to him produced nothing. At least we produced some very fine women in the town of Placential and some very fine men also, and we need not be ashamed of the

part that they have and are playing to-day in Church and State. There was a time when Placentia was one of the most important industrial centres .n this country. Unfortunately like many other places, because of the decline in the Bank fishery and because of the commercial disaster that met the country in 1920, the town declined, but if it d.d the people of Placentia were not those who received the enormous amount of money that is supposed to have been handed out to the people of St. John's as pauper relief. A large number of the residents of Placentia had to leave the country. But they sent money home to support their families. Now I have every respect for any honourable member who gets up in this House who plays the advocate for the d strict that he represents, but I do not think that any member in advocating the wants and requirements of his own district, should speak disparagingly of his neighbours. And I do not think that it does h s cause any good. As far as I am personally concerned I am always ready to give a helping hand to any district on behalf of the people that I represent. I do not want to occupy the time of the House but I could not let the opportunity pass without giving my support to the request for the grant for the Hospital at Twillingate, and in a few words to refute the charge that I cons der an insult to the people of Placentia.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that I offered any insult to the people of Placentia, but I made a comparison of my district, which I have the honor to represent, with other districts, that they have got more in proport on from the Government than the district that I have the honor to represent. And not alone that but I say that the members of the Government have gone out of their way to intimate to the people of my district that because of my being opposed to the present Government was the reason that roads were not put through my district. I did not cast any reflection on the d strict of Placentia but I say here now that my district produces something, and these roads are going through sections of districts n this country that produce nothing. It is not my fault that they are not producing. I cannot help them.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Cha rman, before the Committee rises I would like to add a word to what has been said by Mr. Brown and Mr. Hibbs, with regard to a matter that requires further consideration on the part of the Government, towards a more substantial grant for the Hospital at Twillingate. In any case .f the Government are not prepared to give consideration to the recommendation of the Superintendent yet they ought to even matters up by treating Twillingate Hospital on the same basis as the General Hospital in St. John's. I fail to see why there should be d scrimination on that point because hospital accommodation is very much the same as regard the actual cost in dollars, whether you are dealing with the Hospital at St. John's or Twillingate. I do not propose to stretch this point further. I feel that we can leave it to the common sense of the Government to deal with th s proposition. But I feel that it is incumbent upon us to let the Government understand that we feel very strongly on this matter and that we cannot afford to let Twillingate Hospital close down. Last year during a stay there I was the guest of Doctor Parsons, and I had a chance of going through that institution. I was agreeably surpr sed at all that I saw there. Those members of the House who have had the privilege of seeing that institution will reiterate all that I say in that connection. And those who have yet to visit it will be agreeably surprised when they see what an efficient institution it is. There is nothing further to add to what has been said, but I trust that if the Govern-

ment are not in a position to add to the grant by an increase of $10,000, that at least they will treat Twillingate Hospital in the same way as the General Hospital is being treated. I urge upon the Government therefore the ser.ous consideration of either of these aspects.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I want to thank the honourable member for Ferryland for the very pleasant remarks he has made in regard to Placentia District, because after all it is really pleasant to be given credit as he has done for having done something for the district. I have nothing to take back w.th regard to what I have said, or said should be done in the interests of the district since we have been in office. Are we not entitled to it? What did we get in the past? Did we do anything wrong .n giving St. Mary's Bay road connection? The honourable member seems to forget that there is a railway at Ferryland, and St. Mary's Bay was cut off, and we tried to look after their interests there and we are going to do so. If there is a loan raised we are going to look for our per capita share. Sections of Placentia got nothing. I am going to see the money allocated for public works used for pul lic works, and I am perfectly satisfied to see the money distril uted on a per capita basis, and perfectly satisfied to leave it to the w shes of the District as to how the money is spent. I don't say that I am going to advise or recommend the Government to spend money where it may be wanted unless value is got for it. Ferryland District for many years has nothing to k ck al out. They have got a railway costing the Colony something considerable every year in the railway deficit, but I do think Placentia and St. Mary's has been badly neglected for many years. I don't think it is right. I wouldn't abuse you for getting anyth ng for Ferryland.

MR. CASHIN — The honourable member for Placentia and St. Mary's comes in here and says that my District has got a lot in the past, what has that got to do with me? Can he tell me why they took $1,000,000 last year and I wrote the Executive Government and they told me that I had got my share, and I didn't get anything out of it. You get up here playing politics, but why d.dn't I get my share of the loan, explain that. I am not trying to play politics. I don't have to. Why didn't Ferryland District get its share? I'll tell you why, because your revenue was short, and you had to rob what was voted in here to pay it. Mr. Sull.van has been getting up the last two or three days making speeches against his own Government. He insinuated that Ferryland got its share. It hasn't since I have been a member and it is entitled to its share even though I may have left the Monroe Party.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Cha:rman, I would like to add my support to the plea put forward this afternoon with regard to Twillingate Hospital. As we are well aware, and as I stated here a few days ago in the House, it is mid-way between St. John's and St. Anthony, and serves a large number of Northern seaports, and from information we have received we are led to b el eve unless some assistance is forthcoming for the Hospital the chances are they will have to considerably curtail, perhaps close down. I would like to add my support to what has been said in that behalf, and I would ask the Government to consider this matter. There is another matter I would like to br.ng up at the same time, and that is that I think the resident Doctors there should be given the right of way to the Hospital and allowed to visit their patients there. I want to give my support to that request.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Cha rman, I don't think that the Government is ignoring the request made this afternoon with regard to

Twillingate Hospital. It is a matter of concern. Some three years ago, my first recollection of a grant to them was the giving of $10,000 towards construction, and afterwards an annual grant of that amount for the Hospital, and the following year, or that following, I think, Dr. Parsons came to St. John's and made representations to the Government that the income from patients in addition to the $10,000 from the Government was not sufficient to meet liabilities, and at that time the Government I think added $5,000 to the grant. Now the Committee of the Hospital at Twillingate has made two propositions—one of an additional grant of $10,000, and the other is that we pay for pauper pat ents, as is done at the General Hospital here. Personally I am absolutely against the latter proposition, because I think our experience here with regard to pauper patients is such that we don't want to repeat it in another part of the country. That is a thing we are up aga nst here and we are trying to change conditions in regard to that, and the Government is hoping to get a Medical Supervisor capable of handling matters of that kind. What will happen I am afraid in Twill.ngate if we took the suggestion of the Board of Directors would be, that a large numl er of people getting treatment and paying their way, when it became known that the Government was paying for patients, would not pay, and with no lim.t placed on the amount I am afraid we would have a repetition of what has happened at the Hospital at St. John's and liability would be involved and we would not know what extent it would reach. That is the reason I am not in favour of agree ng to pay for pauper patients. The Committee has asked for $10,000, that is a large increase from what was originally granted, that is $25,000 instead of $10,000 when it started about three years ago. I am not disputing the necessity. Unfortunately, people in the country are not as farsighted as they might be. They think it is a very fine idea, or ideal, and so it is, to put up a fine l uilding for charitable purposes, l ut often they loose s ght of the fact that the running of it is equally important. However, that is not going to remedy conditions, and I think that the estat lishing of the Hospital in Twillingate is a splendid thing for the people in the Northern parts of the Island and Labrador, and this matter is such as should receive the utmost consideration of any Govt. It is not alone a place used by people of the Northern parts l ut I know of other parts also. People from my District want to go down to Twillingate Hospital. I suppose there .s someone they like to go to there, particularly able in some particular line. If that is so, it is all the more to their credit, and shows what a great assistance it must be to the people in that part of the country. I think the House w.ll agree that when Government moneys are to l e spent, that there should be some sort of Government supervision. To-day the Government has no knowledge, has no conception, of how that Hospital is working—I mean from the efficiency standpoint, except what may be heard from private individuals or the general pul l c, but I am strongly of opinion that we should at least have some medical authority going to the .nstitution at least once or twice a year to have some idea of the way the Hospital is working, not that I think it is necessary, or that there is any doubt to be cast on the ability or efficiency of the institut on under the present management, but I think that it is a matter of public duty for the Government to see to it that moneys are spent properly. I would like something to l e done to have some supervision, l.ecause where it s a question of pul lic moneys I think it is our duty to see how the money is spent.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice and by unanimous consent the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Patents."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, the Bill is in the main an explanation of our present patent law which was found to be imperfect and difficulties were arising. The Government is not bringing in any additional machinery in respect to this Bill, nor any additional cost for patent work, as we realise that we cannot have examinations of patentees as they have in other countries. Generally, the experiences of the past have been availed of in this measure. It has been prepared with the co-operation of outside members of the legal profession whose opinions were sought on the matter. The Bill provides that a patent has to be registered here within twelve months after it is patented abroad. With the advent of Buchans Mine and other like industries it was felt that it would be possible for some one to come forward with a patent taken out years ago and not registered here and bring it into operation. The Bill provides that opportunity will be given to hear objections that might be raised. Up to the present no action could be taken except through the courts. Provision is made in this Bill for the extension of patents by the Supreme Court in cases under certain conditions, in a line with the English practice on this point, and hereafter a patentee will be in a position to get positive protection from the Supreme Court, whilst the Bill also provides a way of arguing without going to court. Another provision in the Bill protects the public against unreasonable demands, adopting a principle now in force in England. Other sections of the Bill are either from the old one or are improvements in the verbiage. Some amendments that were brought into the Bill since Second Reading are the result of the deliberations of the Select Committee.

I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, move the reading of the first 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 same with some amendments.

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent it was ordered to be read a third time and passed and that it be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to Monday, August 22nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 22nd, 1927.

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

A Petition was presented by Mr. K. M. Brown, from Botwood, re Coastal Service.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: Is there not a formal resolution to be put in connection with these Estimates. My point is this that I asked the Colonial Secretary on Friday if he would consider a couple of pensions, and there was a question

that I wished to address to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported a Resolution, which was read a first time as follows: Additional Estimates, 1927-28, $27,328.48.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: This is the very thing that I have been trying to impress on the members. Here is a resolution calling for $27,000 additional estimates, and I want to know before that goes through if the Colonial Secretary will take into consideration the representation that I made to him as regards the two pensions, and also I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what he is doing in connection with the lighthouses at Flower's Cove and Hooping Harbor.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I may say that both lighthouses have been recommended.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to see provision made for those two lighthouses in additional estimates. You have been able to get in three for Fortune and I do not see why you cannot get two in for St. Barbe. I do not know whether the member for Fortune Bay stands in special grace with the Government, but I believe that the Minister is big enough and broad enough to overlook even opposition when it comes to doing something that I believe is in the interests of the mariners of the country. I have asked for lighthouses for several places and while I understand that there is some doubt as regards the advisability of building them there, I am not aware of any definite reason why the lighthouse at Flower's Cove should not be granted. If you can find it convenient to place three in Fortune, surely you can give St. Barbe one. I say here now that that vote ought to be included in this resolution before the Speaker put it to the House. I am going to ask the Colonial Secretary whether he cannot settle these pensions for me. There is a resolution before the Chair for additional estimates, and here on Friday afternoon while they were going through I asked the Colonial Secretary if he would be good enough to take into consideration the granting of two pensions, for two old wornout postal officials in the District of St. Barbe. I asked him because I presume that he is assuming the duties of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs who is absent through illness. The same afternoon the member for Fortune Bay asked for a pension for a woman in St. Jacques and it was granted without question. I asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he would be good enough to grant a lighthouse in Flower's Cove and I cannot get satisfaction, notwithstanding the fact that he granted three for Fortune Bay. Now I want to know why the District of St. Barbe is being discriminated against? Is it because I have been an outspoken opponent of the Government or is it because I did not frequent "speak easies" and "quiet corners" with members of the Executive Government? What I am I am and it is not in my make-up to be different politically. I speak as a man and I think my district is as much entitled to a square deal as the District of Fortune Bay. I want to know from the Colonial Secretary why I cannot get these two officials referred to pensioned?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker: I think I have already told the hon. member for St. Barbe that I would take the matter up with the Department of Posts and Telegraphs, and I think I might also remind him that I told him that all such matters got to be submitted to the Treasury Board. Only this morning I took the matter up with the Department of Posts and Telegraphs and I found that the Minister

was very ill at his home. I do not think there is any necessity for the insinuation that the hon. member's district is being discriminated against as I feel sure that his representation will be attended to within the next forty-eight hours.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: If the Minister and Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs had been on their jobs for which they are paid to do by the taxpayers of this country, there would be no necessity to urge this matter at the last moment. I have been agitating about these two pensions for the past two years. When I asked the Deputy Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, in the absence of the Minister, about this matter he knew nothing about it and was unable to find my letter to the Minister. Now if the Colonial Secretary in the presence of a crowd of witnesses gives me the assurance that the matter will be straightened out within the next forty-eight hours, I will accept his word, because I never had occasion to doubt his word. With regard to having these two pensions going before the Treasury Board, I would like to know if Mrs. Burke's pension went before the Treasury Board, rather was it settled in the twinkling of an eye in this House after it was asked for by the member for Fortune Bay. I would also like to get an assurance from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to the erection of these two lighthouses at Flower's Cove and Hooping Harbour.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker: This request of mine was not made in respect to my district; but in respect to Mrs. Burke and no application was made to the Treasury Board on her behalf. I simply wrote the Executive Government for her and the matter did not come within the purview of the Act at all. The matter was brought up here in the House and referred to the Colonial Secretary for attention. That is all that happened in respect to that letter.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: I would like to say that the idea of discriminating against St. Barbe District never once entered my mind. If I thought that a lighthouse was needed in Englee in St. Barbe District to-morrow I would put one there just as I would put one in my own district. Very often a man in Bonavista Bay might need a lighthouse or a fog alarm in some other district more so than in his own. Three weeks ago Mr. Scammell asked to have two lighthouses established, one at Flower's Cove and one at Hooping Hr., and you will find through the reporters' box that I stated that they would be erected, if the circumstances at these places warranted such aids to navigation. Now I am keeping that promise that I made. I enquired of Captain Norman as to the necessity or suitability of a lighthouse at Flower's Cove and he informed me that he did not see the wisdom of having a light there. In fact I took that same matter up two years ago with the fishing captains and fishermen generally on that coast and they told me that they did not think a light at Flower's Cove would be of any service. With regard to a lighthouse at Hooping Harbour which is very necessary, I have instructed a man named Squires to proceed there and erect that lighthouse. The cost of the erection is not mentioned in the Additional Estimates because we did not think it necessary, as we have a few thousand dollars left over from last year's grant to cover that expenditure at Hooping Harbour. There was an application also for the upkeep of a keeper there. I have written Capt. Norman on this matter asking him for his opinion on the subject.

The said Resolution being read a second time, it was moved and sec-

onded that the House concur therein, and the Resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 204 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies'" was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order the Hon. the Prime Minister moved that the bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract between the Government and the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Ltd.," be now read a second time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: In moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to say that the Leader of the Opposition on the opening day of the debate on this question—and that he had the very best of intentions I have no doubt whatever—referred to a gentleman named Gerardio, who was here representing Messrs. Haes and Sons, of London, and that this gentleman had the confidence and backing of the Trade Facilities, the Bank of England and other influential people on the other side of the water. Since then I have had enquiries instituted and I find that Messrs. Haes and Sons deny all knowledge of Mr. Gerardio and they state that he is not acting for them, also the Trade Facilities, the Bank of England and the Department of State for Dominion Affairs are equally emphatic in stating that they have no knowledge of who he is. It therefore appears to me that this gentleman is somewhat of an imposter and that he has entirely misrepresented himself to the Leader of the Opposition.

I, consequently, Mr. Speaker, beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker: I do not intend this afternoon to make an extended analysis of the Bill now before the House for second reading for the reason that I admit quite frankly I am unable to intelligently discuss it. Anyone who has examined the Bill closely will at once appreciate the fact that it has been drafted by expert lawyers; lawyers whose particular business it is to advise corporations such as the International Paper Company and to draft for them agreements of this character. Now I do not know whether my intelligence is of a lower order than that of the average lawyer, possibly it is, but I find that I cannot rightly and intelligently discuss the Bill before the Chair, and I propose to waste but little time in discussing the matter. The agreement, Sir, as I have previously said, is an extremely involved one, couched in very technical language and portions of it can only be interpreted by reference to various previous Acts on our Statute which have passed this Legislature in previous years, beginning in 1915 and ending in 1925. There are Amendments, and Amendments upon Amendments in certain portions of these prior Acts which must be read in conjunction with the Bill now before the House, and I frankly admit that it would take me a month to assimilate the various matters to be found in the Bill and these Acts in order to be able to give any intelligent opinion as to their purport and probable effect upon the future of this Colony. In my opinion, Sir, this is the weightiest piece of legislation which this House of Assembly has ever been called upon to consider and because of that fact I do think that the undue haste which has characterized

the proceedings of this Chamber on many occasions should not be permitted on this occasion. The International Paper Company have been considering this matter probably for the past twelve months; the Government of the Colony have been considering it possibly for the past three months; members of the Opposition, with the exception of myself have had an opportunity to cursorily consider it for the past three weeks; but the general public who have to pay the piper, if there is a piper to be paid, have had no opportunity at all of considering it. I did hear the Prime Minister, some two or three months ago from his position on the floors of this House make the statement that his Government was so deficient in numerical strength in this House that he felt they were not strong enough as a Government to introduce drastic legislation. Well, to the simplest minded man this present Bill is drastic, if ever there was drastic legislation brought before this Assembly. I say, Sir, the public have not had any opportunity whatever to discuss this matter or to assimilate its provisions in any way. The only information they can get upon the matter is from the Government press and the Government press is naturally—and I do not say this in any derogatory sense—not likely to be prejudiced in its utterances against the administration which it supports. I do not believe today that five per cent. of the population of this Colony have had the smallest opportunity to in any way consider what this Bill means to Newfoundland, and I have sufficient knowledge of the measure to make the statement that I am satisfied that, if this Bill becomes law, that law will be fraught with grave danger to this Colony. Now I do desire to draw the attention of the House to this clear and indisputable fact that so far as the Bill itself is concerned—and with the private arrangements between the Government and the International Paper Company I have nothing to do—there is absolutely no connection whatever between the Government of this Colony and the International Paper Company of New York. This agreement that we have before us was made by the Government with the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Limited, a company whose capital is four hundred dollars. I say, Sir, that this Bill is being unduly pressed. It is possible that this Bill may prove the panacea for all our ills, but the evidence has not proven it to my eyes from my examination of the Bill itself, and it is because of these facts that I protest against the rushing through of a Bill which is of such grave purport to this Colony. I have further ground upon which I base my objection to the passing of this Bill at this session, and it is this. Over a month ago I tabled certain questions in this House asking for certain information. Amongst other things I asked whether or not the Government had taken the opinion of experienced counsel upon the question of Newfoundland's liability in connection with the prior lien bonds. I asked further that the name or names of such counsel should be given and that a copy of the opinions so cabled should be tabled. I was refused that information on the ground of public policy. I say now, Sir that it is due to the country before this deal is consummated that the people of the Colony and this House should have that information. I asked further for the reports of the various directors who have represented this Colony upon the Board of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. That also was refused me on the ground of public policy. What could be more in the interest of public policy than

that this House should be in possession of the fullest information with reference to the financial position of the N. P. & P. Company before entering into a deal of this magnitude, and that information was also denied me. I believe, and I speak subject to correction, that the parties interested in that project at the Humber on the other side of the water took good care to ascertain fully in their own interests just what the financial position of the N. P. and P. Company was. Have we ever done the same? Do we know the actual financial status of the International Paper Company or are we dependent upon statements handed to us by the representatives of that Company whose interests are in opposition to our own. In my opinion, this agreement should not be adopted by this House until we have an independent examination into the affairs of the N. P. and P. Company in order that we may ascertain what the true financial position is. Let me draw attention to a very serious matter. Under the Act of 1923, the N. P. and P. Company were bound to keep their liquidated assets, after paying outgoings, up to the sum of a half million dollars each year. I wonder how much of those liquidated assets they have to-day. And if they have not got those liquidated assets, then they have broken their agreement with this Colony. Now I come to the fourth objection which I must register to the hurried passing of this Bill. I am not satisfied that the Government of this Colony has made every possible effort for the most favorable adjustment of this unfortunate position before bringing this measure before us. They have dealt with no one but the International Paper Company and so far as I am aware no effort or attempt has been made to deal with anyone but the I. P. Company. No attempt has been made to interest any capitalists other than the American capital represented by that corporation, and surely if the I. P. Company are prepared to consider the matter they are not the only people in the civilized world who have funds at their disposal and who are satisfied to make a dollar if there is a dollar to be made. I do not believe that the I. P. Company is the only avenue through which this apparently—and I use that word advisedly—bankrupt institution, namely the Nfld. Power and Paper Company can be saved, and I am not carried away by any of the startling rumours about the mills at the Humber closing down if the Company goes into liquidation. Whether the mills go into the hands of a liquidator or not they still must operate. The loss that would be sustained by the closing down of these mills would be tremendous. Bell Island is still going on and Besco is in the hands of a receiver. Any industry of that magnitude must go on. The matter we are discussing this afternoon, Sir, is a very grave one and it's gravity is such that never before in the history of this Colony did any measure require so much time and thought, not so much on the part of the Government because they do not possess all the brains if one can judge by their record, but on the part of the public at large. I believe, Sir, that the Bill should be left in abeyance until the next session of the Legislature. Why rush it through now in the dying hours of a four months' session and before anybody has had a reasonable opportunity to grasp the involved proposals that arise out of the Resolutions. I assume that this House will be called together again some time next Spring. It ought to meet in the early spring, if we are to finish the session because it must be remembered that on July 9th, 1928, this House of Assembly dies au-

tomatically by Act of Parliament. Then will be time enough to pass this present measure, if it is to be passed. Then everyone who has to vote on the measure will have an opportunity to read it and consider it, get advice on it and discuss it; and the great public of Newfoundland will also have an opportunity to assimilate its various provisions. We have no public opinion upon this Bill to-day; no public opinion whatever; and without the force of public opinion behind you, you are constitutionally wrong in passing a measure of this kind. There is no mandate from the people of Newfoundland to the Government to pass this measure. You do not know what the people of Newfoundland will have to say about it. I will go further than that and say I doubt if you know what you are letting the people of Newfoundland in for, and you are doing it without their authority. Does it occur to Members of the present administration that while they may pass this Bill, while they may by force of brute majority inflict this piece of legislation on the people of the Colony, that it may not be they who will have to deal with the conditions that will arise out of it. It is one thing to pass a piece of legislation in the House. All it requires is what I have termed a brute majority. It is an entirely different matter to deal with conditions that will be brought about by that agreement if it be not entered into after thorough investigation, due consideration and the ascertaining beyond a reasonable doubt that it is in the interests of the Colony. For these reasons I must oppose the passage of this Bill this afternoon. I do not feel that it would be just for me to vote for it. I informed the House on Thursday last I think it was, that I did not know whether I would vote for it or against it and that until I had more information my position in this House would compel me to vote against it. I will go further than that to-day and say that after the short time which I have had to consider it I have come to the conclusion not only that I must vote against it but that I must go further than that and now, Sir, propose in amendment that this Bill be read this day six months.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I beg to second the amendment just proposed by Mr. Bradley. I am fully convinced in my own mind that as regards my position here that I cannot accept the responsibility at this present time for the passing of this Bill and making it effective upon the country. As I mentioned before, when the resolutions came before the House in Committee of the Whole, I thought I considered that the features of this Bill made it appear that Newfoundland was prepared to pay a stiff price in order to allow this Bill to pass before the House. The arguments presented here this afternoon by my honourable friend, Mr. Bradley, have been well taken and in the interests of the country. I feel that I am now taking a step in order to safeguard the interests of the country in having this Bill deferred for the present time. As has been stated, this Bill is the heaviest piece of legislation that has come before this House for some time, and in my opinion it is the heaviest piece of legislation that has come before the House since I have had the honor to hold a seat in this chamber. I think that we as a House of Assembly cannot overlook the fact that there has been called in this town a public meeting at which I understand there was a representative attendance, and it has been suggested that for the present this legislation be deferred. I heartily support that suggestion and second the amendment as put to the House by Mr. Bradley.

MR. K. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, some few days ago in this House the Prime

Minister made a statement that Mr. Head, one of the International Paper Company officials who was here trying to put this deal through, left here with the understanding that several of the Opposition were going to support this Bill. I asked the Prime Minister at that time to name the parties who had pledged themselves to support the Bill but for some reason or other he didn't care to do it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I don't know them.

MR. BROWN — Well, they must have gone to Mr. Head privately and told him that they were going to support the Bill; but I want to go on record as being one who didn't lead Mr. Head or any other person to believe that I was going to support the Bill. As a matter of fact I never saw Mr. Head or anybody in connection with the International Paper Company. This is, as Mr. Bradley has stated, the heaviest piece of legislation that has ever passed this House or came before the House, and I want this afternoon to go on record as being absolutely opposed to the passage of the Bill now before the House. I do so in the interests of my constituents and of the people of this country generally, and I support the amendment proposed by Mr. Bradley.

MR. GODDEN—I also support the amendment now before the House. I do so, not thoughtlessly, because I have given some little attention to the resolutions presented to the House; and with the short time at my disposal I cannot satisfy myself that the contract suggested between the International Paper Company and the country is in the best interests of Newfoundland. It is to my mind anything but that. Our position as guarantor will be much worse if the contract is entered into. There is nothing in the agreement as far as I can see that will render the postiion in any way better than exists at the present time under the present management or ownership. I believe in my own mind that this contract is to the detriment of Newfoundland. I support the amendment.

Mr. Bradley moved and Mr. Ashbourne seconded the following amendment: "That this Bill be read a second time six months hence."

Upon the amendment being put the House divided, and there appeared for the amendment, Messrs. Brown, Godden, Bradley and Ashbourne (4), and against it, Hon. Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Sinnott, Power, Puddester, Cahill, Linegar and Browne (16).

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion being put the House divided, and there appeared for the motion, Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Sinnott, Power, Puddester, Cahill, Linegar and Browne (16), and against it, Messrs. Brown, Godden, Bradley and Ashbourne (4).

So it passed in the affirmative.

Whereupon the Bill was read a second time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, acording to rule 314, it is provided

(Reads.)

Under that rule I would make the motion this afternoon that rule 303 be suspended and that we send the Bill to Committee of the Whole on tomorrow.

MR. BRADLEY—Rule 303 says:

(Reads.)

The effect of the present motion will be to suspend the operation of section

303, requiring the Bill, after the second reading, to be sent to a Select Committee with a week's interval, for the consideration of any petitions for or against the proposition.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the passage of this motion. I cannot do otherwise in view of the position I have taken in connection with this measure. It is merely further and conclusive evidence of the undue haste with which the Government is attempting to rush this piece of legislation through this House, Why, may I ask, why should we suspend the rules in connection with this matter? Is anything going to fall on us unless we rush the measure through immediately? These rules were formed for a purpose; to protect not merely this House and its members but the people of this Colony against undue haste in legislation, and I say, sir, that an attempt of this kind I can characterise as nothing more or less than disgraceful. A measure which involves the reduction of Newfoundland security from second place to fourth, which means that whereas we are now second mortgagors for ten million dollars, with a prior mortage of ten million dollars, if this legislation passes, we will then be mortgagors for ten million dollars with thirty million dollars ahead of us, and we are asked this afternoon to suspend the Rules of the House, to do away with the ordinary and regular procedure of this House, in order that the Government may rush the measure through the Legislature. I say again that I can characterise it as nothing more nor less than disgraceful.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be only right to make some explanation why the motion is made to-day, in deference to the hon. member who probably was not here when the matter was taken up. When the Bill was introduced, as a matter of fact, the question whether or not it was a private Bill was considered, and the House felt that Rule 314 referred to now should be brought into effect. It was unanimous, as a matter of fact, on the occasion in agreeing to bringing in that rule to waive the requirement for one one month's notice. The waiver was more serious, perhaps, than members appreciate, and I may state that to-day's motion is only exactly in line with the House's action.

MR. BRADLEY—I am perfectly well aware of the fact that the rules were suspended on that occasion. That suspension was granted for the purpose of getting the measure before the House as soon as possible. That was an honest and reasonable attempt to facilitate the Government. There could be no object in requesting the Company to publish the usual month's notice in the daily newspapers. These notices never do give any information worth talking about of measures to come before the House. The circumstances warranted it and the Legislature considered merely the protection of the interests of the Colony, but now the measure is before the House, and I for one intend to oppose a motion to allow legislation to go through without that due consideration for which our rules provide.

Hon. the Prime Minister moved and Hon. the Minister of Justice seconded, that, pursuant to the provisions of Rule 314, Rule 303 of the House be suspended in relation to this Bill, and that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the motion Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Sinnott, Power, Puddester, Cahill, Linegar and Browne (15), and against it Messrs. Brown, Godden, Bradley and Ashbourne (4).

So it passed in the affirmative.

Whereupon the Bill was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, Hon. the Prime Minister moved and Hon. the Minister of Justice seconded that the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geo. V., (1924), Cap. 2, entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd.'" be read a second time.

MR. BRADLEY—I do not propose to delay the House by repeating the observations I have made on the motion for the second reading of the Corner Brook measure as I raised points dealing with the principles underlying both bills then, and I would simply reiterate what I said then, and I move the amendment that this Bill be read this day six months.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I beg to second the amendment.

Mr. Bradley moved and Mr. Ashbourne seconded: "That the Bill be read a second time six months hence."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment Mr. Bradley, Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Godden (3), and against it Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Sinnott, Power, Puddester, Cahill, Linegar and Browne (16).

So it passed in the negative.

Whereupon the original motion being put, there appeared for it Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Sinnott, Power, Puddester, Cahill, Linegar and Browne (16), and against it Mr. Bradley, Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Godden (3).

So it passed in the affirmative, and the Bill was thereupon read a second time.

Hon. the Prime Minister moved and Hon. the Minister of Justice seconded that, pursuant to the provision of Rule 314 and on account of urgency, the provisions of Rule 303 be suspended in relation to this Bill and that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the motion Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Colonial Secretary, Hon. Minister of Finance, Hon Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Duff, Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Public Works, Messrs. Sinnott, Power, Puddester, Cahill, Linegar and Browne (16), and against it Mr. Bradley, Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Godden (3).

So it passed in the affirmative, and was ordered accordingly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (1916) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals'" was deferred until to-morrow.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, August 23rd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 23rd, 1927.

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

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice that he will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the raising of a sum of

money on the Credit of the Colony for certain public purposes.

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to .ntroduce a Bill respecting certain Retiring Allowances.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of Question.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committeee of the Whole on Supply was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Comm.ttee of the Whole on Ways and Means was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 206 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies'" was deferred until to-morrow.

(Second read ng of Bill "An Act to Amend Cap. 129 of Consolidated Statues 1926, entitled "Of Crown Lands Mines and Minerals.")

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I beg to move the second reading. In explaining the Bill I would like shortly to state it is merely an inclusion in the Crown Lands Act of a provision regarding export from Fee Simple Lands. It has been suggested that at the present moment those who own lands in fee simple have the right to export wood and the Government is of opinion that this point ought to be cleared up by the Legislature. I merely make the motion for the second reading. That is all the Bill is. It merely adds to the provision in existence under Cap. 129 where the holder of timber or pulp license under lease cannot export. We make it now that the holder of a fee simple grant cannot export. Off hand I would say that the persons to whom it applies might be the Reid Nfld. Co., Ltd. possibly, I don't know, the A.N.D. Co. and the Anglo-American Telegraph Co., Ltd. So far as I can gather these are the only people affected. It has been suggested also, the two new enterprises we have Bills for to-day, except as has been provided were given rights under a special Act.

MR. K. BROWN—I take this opportunity of saying a few words in connection with the Crown Lands. I would like to know how much money is owed the Department on royalties. I know I can't find out here just now, but I understand some money is owed the Department of Agriculture and Mines for royalties on various lands throughout the Country, and I would like to get that information. I think a man in my District owes a good amount to the Department. I might say now I am not definitely in favor of royalties. I have had communications from several mill owners saying that they can't make two ends meet, and they have to pay royalties, and if I am here when the Bill is tabled I would ask that royalties be cut out altogether. There is another matter I want to take up this afternoon as I might be out of the House when the Bill comes to the Committee stage. It is in connection with Ford Island where timber was reserved in the interests of the fishermen for fishery purposes only. Last year I asked that a small sum of money be put in the Estimates to pay a man to look after that Ford Island. I have a letter and if I read it to the House it would be astonished to know what is going on, on that Island. Even the light-keeper is cutting timber on that Island. It is reserved for fishery purposes only and the place has been cut out and the timber gone into Drovers' mills, Brown's Arm, and being manufactured. I just mention that because I would like the Government to take the matter up and see that this Island is protected, and people are not allowed to go in and cut wood to sell it. I hope that the matter will be taken up and given every consideration, and that if it is at all possible a man be paid to look after that Island in the interests of the fishermen because as soon as that timber is cut they have no other

place to go to look for timber for fishery purposes.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —May I ask whether that part of the District has represented the matter to the Agriculture and Mines Department.

MR. BROWN—I really cannot say whether the fishermen have done so or not, but they have done so through me. I have taken the matter up with the Minister and last year when I asked that a vote be put in the Estimates for that purpose he supported me. I asked for that and he said that it was only right and that he would like to see a vote put in, in order that a man be stationed to watch the Island.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, in reference to the matter of the cutting of timber on Ford Island I can bear out all my colleague has said in reference to the cutting of timber, which it is very hard to find out as to the use being made of it. Factories or mill owners who use it do so for the making of cooperage stock and so it is considered by the Department of Agriculture and Mines that it is not a breach of the law for timber to be cut and used for this purpose, as this cooperage stock has to do with the fisheries. At the same time I think with my colleaguee that to have a man down there to see if timber is going out other than for cooperage purposes, would be a very good thing, because, if so, there would be cut from that in a short time all the timber and very little will be available for the making of fish casks, or drums or anything of that kind, and people would have to go a long distance to get timber for those purposes, which will mean increased costs. I trust the Government will take due notice of what has been said and ask the Department to investigate and find out just how far timber is being cut other than for cooperage stock.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Speaker, I remember last year when this matter was before the House. Unfortunately the Minister is absent just now. I think that there was an enquiry. I feel that an investigation is been made. I will make it my duty to acquaint the Minister if he is here during the sitting.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (1926) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals'" was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract between the Government and the International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Chairman, there are a few small amendments to this Act mostly suggested by those who have had the legal end of this Bill to consider. They are entirely legal technicalities. Perhaps the Minister of Justice would be good enough to explain them. I must confess they are not all clear to me.

(Reads)

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I would just like to say this is merely to make sure. It will be remembered the Prime Minister referred in his speech to substitution for mortgage stock being taken. This now makes it clear that the mortgage is released absolutely and the mortgage doesn't continue on the property. The amount covered by that has to take over other security. It is merely to remove any possible doubts. The first one is our own request. Nos. 3 and 4 are requests that they have got from the other side to clear up the wording of the old section. They are requests made by the

financial people over there. It can't affect us at all.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—These amendments are such as are not understood in a minute and such as the Prime Minister himself it appears doesn't understand, and I don't think we should be in a hurry to go ahead w.th them in connection with such as important Bill as this before the House.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —These numbers 3 and 4 have been referred to as precautionary requested by the other people concerned in the Bill. They cannot affect us and that is why we didn't have any objection.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the argument of the Leader of the Opposit.on is a very reasonable one. I don't think we ought to go ahead with them unless everybody is perfectly satisfied that there is nothing really committal. The first amendment is our own request. I understand that is satisfactory. I think that those others might stand over and I can get a fuller explanat'on to-morrow.

This is a memorandum in connection with the amendment to sub-clause 5 of "M" given me by the Justice Department:

(Reads)

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, with regard to the point that has just been raised, I may say that so far as I can gather the position :s this that there will be no new issue of the "A" and "B" Debentures, but there will be supplementary issues necessary to cover the floating charges and these will affect both "A" and "B" Debentures. The subject of the clause is to enable, as is set forth in the memo which is supposed to explain :t.

(Reads)

In other words the floating charge cannot be registered because it is not a specific charge.

(Reads)

The object of putting that in is merely to make clear that the power to create a floating charge is given so as to remove that doubt. I may say that I have been informed by the Internat onal that this is the point that was raised on the other side. They think that the act as it stands to-day is clear enough but they want to have no complication in the matter of raising any floating charges that may be required under the act. The explanation of the th.rd amendment is that the Crown timber licenses are at the present moment held by the old company and not by the new one, and it is merely to clarify that postiion. The Prime Minister explained the other amendment. I am asked to state that the reasons for these amendments are made at the suggestion of the counsel on the other side who think that possibly there may be some dispute on the point.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I notice in the News of to-day that there is an explanation given with regard to the proposed .ssuing of fifteen or twenty thousand new Debentures. It refers to section 4 sub-section 6.

(Reads)

Now I have heard the question whether the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. can out of the proceeds of such stock regard the assets that they have passed to the New Gander Valley Co. as fixed assets free of mortgage. When that fifteen or twenty thousand dollars is raised, will it be devoted to the Corner Brook property only, and they will not use any of that to buy lands on the Gander. That is the question that has been asked.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—They could build mills but they could not purchase lands with :t.

MR. HALFYARD—You are quite sure that that refers to Corner Brook only.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, we are quite sure

Because under the agreement with the Reids that cannot happen. It so happens that the Government in addition to the assurance given by the language of the clause itself, the Government has definite knowledge of an agreement between the International Company of New York and the Reids on that point.

MR. BROWN—Is there anything in the Bill about that.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The position that the Government was concerned about was that wherever they bought lands they went in as security for the "A" and "B" Debentures. But it so happens that we know that they cannot adopt any other method of financing the Gander because of their agreement with the Reids. But so far as the country was concerned the main thing that we were bothering about was that wherever they invested money it went in as security for the "A" and "B" Debentures.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman: After careful observation of what has transpired during the last few days and judging by the information before the Committee, in connection with the International Power and Paper Co. agreement everything points to the fact that the Government is merely playing a game of chance. On the other hand the International people protected as they are by a staff of technical experts, have in my opinion made an agreement with the Government which is 99 per cent. favourable to themselves. The Government apparently are taking too much for granted, and are hoping against hope that the Company will do something which they are not bound to do under the agreement. I do not wish to be regarded as a doubting Thomas, but I see nothing in these Bills that resemble a business man's agreement as far as the Government and people of the country are concerned. Never in the history of this Parliament has legislation of more far reaching importance been introduced, and the only assurance that Newfoundland will benefit anything by this agreement is being based purely and simply on hope, the Government in this connection may be correctly termed a "Band of Hope." If we pass this agreement holus bolus, and the Humber plant is taken over by this company we have absolutely no guarantee that there will be one man more employed as a result of the transfer.

The Prime Minister says that it is only reasonable to expect that the International Paper Company will do so and so, but in this age most unreasonable things sometimes occur. I very much fear that when the International people secure the strangle hold on the Colony's natural resources that they will do very much as they please.

While it is difficult to interpret correctly the many legal phraseologies of these agreements, I candidly cannot see any justification for supporting them in their present form. The Prime Minister a few days ago referred to an assurance given by members of the Opposition that they would support these Bills, fearing less I should be numbered among these gentlemen to which the Prime Minister referred, I wish to make my position clear, and to say, that no person has any control or influence over my opinions or decisions in this connection. I am convinced that the Government is trying to force through a one sided deal and the bargain is a bad one for Newfoundland.

The Humber deal of 1923 has been criticized by men who would never muster enough of enterprise to start a Humber or a Gander development in a century. I want to go on record as a defender of the policy that made that great development possible. The Government of Sir Rich-

ard Squires at that time was faced with a condition of affairs never paralleled in this country before or since. To find a solution required energy, brains and courage. The deal has proven highly advantageous to Newfoundland and if the very worse happens regarding our guarantee the country is still better off by several million dollars. Admittedly there was far too much money spent on construction and the overhead is consequently much too high, but this error cannot be placed at the door of the Government that enterprised the original scheme. The management since operations began may be faulty and may have contributed to losses, but the Squires Government that created the Humber had no hand in its practical operation, nor was that party in office during the years that the N. P. & P. Company have been making a mess of the business. The Monroe Government has reaped the benefit of the Humber enterprise but have not taken interest enough in its operation to demand a statement of the Company's accounts by independent auditors in order to ascertain its present standing.

The Government have accepted at face value everything that has been told them. Under the original guarantee the Company's position with a second mortgage, was safe, but that security was destroyed by a subsequent act of the present Executive. Our position to-day with $30,000,000 secured ahead of our guarantee renders the Colony's security in my opinion a very doubtful one, and certainly reveals nothing for the Government to feel proud over. Mr. Chairman: I make the assertion here this evening that there is not a half dozen members in the House who understand what the numerous clauses in these agreements really mean. They consist of such a mass of complicated technicalities that it is impossible to interpret any one section on its merit as it may be affected by some other section in some other previous agreement passed in 1915, 1923 or 1925. The whole thing is so involved that if this Chamber was comprised of the proverbial Philadelphia lawyers it would tax their brains to untangle the mystery.

The position of the Government in connection with these agreements were very well exemplified in the attitude of the Prime Minister this evening, when he brought in certain amendments to these Bills, and endeavoured to railroad them through the Committee stage. Mr. Monroe admitted his inability to grasp their meaning, and when questioned he in despair said, "Perhaps the Attorney General will be able to explain the meaning of these amendments, for I am sure I cannot."

MR. MONROE—But I was then referring to the amendments.

MR. HIBBS—I know you were but you and your Government were inclined to rush them through although you admitted that you did not understand their meaning. Is that the way you intend to handle legislation in this House. Why, Sir, even the Attorney General was equally puzzled and when attempting to explain said, "As far as I can learn the object of the amendment is so and so." I repeat, Sir, that these measures are the biggest questions that the Legislature has had to decide, and has it been handled in the intelligent manner in which it should? I do not wish to be regarded as a pessimist but this legislation resembles nothmore than the famous Reid Deal of '98. A very distressing picture has been painted of the Humber enterprise under N. P. & P. Company management, and we are told that the mills must close down and the country will have to meet its liability under the guarantee unless the sweeping concessions which the In-

ternational people demand are granted, but what asurance have we that conditions will be better under the new management. When first the International Paper Company approached the Govern ent with a drafted contract, the proposals were so outrageously unreasonable as to call forth from the Prime Minister the statement that the proposition was preposterous. As negotiations went on the Government endeavoured to whittle down the concessions demanded, to a point when they could bring the agreement before the House of Assembly, with some hope of putting it through, yet with all their efforts they have committed themselves to a very bad bargain for the country and there is not a member of the Government to-day but is conscious of this fact. The Honourable Mr. Sullivan, the Minister of Justice, and even the Prime Minister himself have stated that they would like to be putting through a better contract for the country. And no doubt but that feeling is experienced by every thoughtful member on the Government side of the House. And yet, Sir, in spite of that feeling of gloom and despair the Government stubbornly insist on putting through these measures without even getting the benefit of expert opinion and advice. On the other hand we find arrayed on the Company's side, a staff of practical men, technical experts with the highest qualifications in the matter of drafting agreements of this kind. Their job is to look after their Company's interests, and that they have done that perfectly well is evidenced by even a cursory perusal of these complicated and one sided documents now before the Committee. The Government, it is regrettable to say, with all due respect to its personnel, is not sufficiently equipped with the same expert knowledge of corporation law. In face of these facts there is little wonder that even the members of the Government themselves have such little faith in these agreements which they are blindly putting through. Mr. Chairman, I am the last person in this Chamber to oppose any measure of a constructive nature. If the present agreements with the International Paper Co., provided in clear terms an industrial undertaking that would relieve our present unemployment situation, I would be the first to support it. If this contract undertook to relieve us of our guarantee in connection with the Humber enterprise, then I would welcome it. If I could see in this agreement with the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company any immediate assurance of an industry being created in that section, then it would be my bounden duty to assist its passage through this Chamber. But we have no such guarantee and candidly I am very skeptical of what is going to happen when once concessions on the Humber are secured. The Gander Valley Power and Paper Company consist of the Reid Brothers and one or two others, the only capital in sight is four or five hundred dollars which has been subscribed by these gentlemen for the purpose of incorporating the Company. We are giving these same people here to-day still further concessions to enable them to make a deal with the International Paper Company to whom they have given an option on their properties. Whether this option will be executed or not it is a matter that we have no assurance of, the very fact of no assurance being given, no watertight agreement being made invites a suspicion that the Gander enterprises is merely used as a lever to induce the Government to give more concessions in connection with the Humber. When the Humber Legislature becomes law, as I presume it will, the International Paper Company can snap their fingers at the Government of this country as far as the Gander Development is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister appears to be influenced largely by the hope that there will be a Gander Enterprise. We of the north have been looking forward to the creation of this industry for a number of years. The timber wealth of the Gander areas is unquestioned, the water power by which the hydro-electrical energy can be developed is also a certainty, and we have felt that this industry is due to the people of the North. The people of Fogo District, whom I have the honour to represent in this House, have been anxiously awaiting the day when this new industrial scheme would be developed. On their behalf I have experienced the "hope deferred which maketh the heart sick," and just when we thought we had reason to believe that the realization of our hopes was in sight, we are confronted with this uncertain and msytifying contract. The whole business is, on its face, so alarming that public opinion has been aroused as it has rarely ever been before throughout the City and Country. In the last few days we have witnessed a mass public meeting held in the Casino Theatre. This meeting has been convened by very reputable citizens, many of whom are, or have been, strong supporters of the present Administration. Among the leaders of the movement are many eminent professional men, who are moved solely by a desire to see Newfoundland, which in many similar cases in the past has been styled "the sport of historic misfortune," get a square deal. I was present at that meeting and can say that it was largely attended by very representative citizens. A suite of resolutions was passed at this meeting and sent to the Government, but up to the present time I have not heard what steps the Government propose to take in dealing with same, I feel however, that it is not a matter that the Government can lightly ignore.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Are you authoritatively informed that these resolutions came before the Government, I did not see them.

MR. HIBBS—Then the duty would devolve upon me to read these resolutions to the House since the Government has not heard of them before.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—May I ask the Hon. member before he reads them if there were more than twenty men at that meeting who knew what these resolutions were about, and who knew what they were voting for, if they did vote for them.

MR. HIBBS—The Prime Minister is not very complimentary to the people of St. John's, for I fail to see anything in these resolutions, that a man of ordinary intelligence would not understand. Mr. Chairman, the Resolutions passed at that meeting are as follows:

"RESOLVED that the agreements between the Government and the International Paper Company, Limited, of Newfoundland and the Gander Valley Pulp and Paper Company, Limited, be not further proceeded with until the following information is tabled and published in the newspapers.

1. "All correspondence with the Secretary of the State for Dominion Affairs, The Bank of England, Armstrong Whitworth Company, The Newfoundland Power and Paper Company Limited, and the International Paper Company whether marked or designed "confidential" or not.

2. "A statement of the affairs of the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited, audited by independent auditors appointed expressly for that purpose by the Government.

3. "A copy of the option from the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company, Limited, to the International Paper Company.

4. "List of the holders of the priority Bonds and the "A" and "B" Debentures.

5. "For what purpose is permission sought to issue $20,000,000 bonds in priority to the "A" and "B" Debentures giving figures and details.

6. "Copy of the option from the Reid Newfoundland Company, Limited, and Mines and Forests Newfoundland Limited to the International Company.

7. "An opinion from counsel out-side of Newfoundland as to our legal liability on the "B" Debentures.

8. "For the purpose of comparison, a statement showing what the International Company have paid and are paying by the way of purchase, rent, royalty and taxes on the Gatinean River and the North Shore of the St. Lawrence and in other parts of Canada.

"RESOLVED that the resolutions be published in the daily newspapes."

Mr. Chairman, you will observe, I am sure, that the questions asked in those resolutions are very reasonable, and the Government should have informed themselves upon these various points before daring to bring such Legislature before this Chamber. No information of value to the country should be withheld. The deal is in itself a gigantic one, a deal that will affect posterity in this country, and for that reason every detail in connection with it should be intelligently laid before the committee before they are asked to discuss it. There is another grave aspect of the situation to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. The Government which is trying to put this deal through is exceedingly weak both morally and numerically both in this Chamber and throughout the country, and, we should hesitate before permitting it to pass a measure of such far reaching magnitude. Never in the history of Newfoundland has there been a contract fraught with so much evil possibilities, and never was there a Government to utterly incapable of coping with it. The International Paper Company of Newfoundland Limited, is merely a subsidery company of the International Paper Company of New York, and the total capital subscribed to date is in the neighbourhood of four pounds. The International Paper Company of New York of which you have heard much from the Prime Minister, is not taking any chances in this Newfoundland venture. It may be true that they possess hundreds of millions, but this agreement does not provide for any expenditure by them in Newfoundland. The Newfoundland Paper Company must stand or fall on its own legs, if it succeeds and makes money the parent Company benefits, if it fails and loses money then the New York Company is not responsible, and the capital they will use is to be raised on securities which we are giving them. So it is useless, nay, deceitful, for the Prime Minister to try to dazzle our eyes by flaunting before us a picture of this wealthy International Paper Company.

Another word with regard to the Gander, this agreement suggests that a 200 ton paper mill may be erected here with n 6 or 8 years, even if this prospect is realized it would be a long, long wait to say the least. But you have no guarantee of ever having the Gander developed as a result of this agreement, and if the Prime Mnister in his own private business capacity, was entering into an agreement, I venture to assert that he would not be satisfied with such a deal. There is no intelligent person to-day but feels that if the Liberal Admin stration was in power since 1924 that the Gander enterprise would be a reality before this date. The wily clever manipulators who conduct the International Paper Company business has smothered the Government with propaganda, all meant to boost and enhance their own interests, and it has worked splendidly until the Government are persuaded that the International Paper Company is the only star in the In-

dustrial firmanent.

I feel very keenly the disappointment of my constituents in Fogo District, when the contents of this agreement are revealed to them, for it contains very little hope that any immediate developement will result. Before concluding I want to direct the attention of the Minister of Agriculture and M nes to the fact that when the 1924 Agreement was made the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company was given certain rights, to the lands within a radius of 10 miles from Barry's Brook, which flows into the Gander River near its mouth. This large area covers the North and South side of Gander Bay, and ncludes Victoria Cove and other settlements on the North side. The settlers in these sections are therefore prevented from expanding and developing the Agricultural possibilities in the r own settlements. In view of this fact, I would suggest that the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company be called upon to decide as to what side of the Harbor they propose for a townsite, in the event of a mill ever being erected there. If the towns te is to be on the South side then the people of the North side of Gander Bay should no longer suffer this unfair handicap.

And yet another matter that I would call the Prime Minister's attention to, is the discriminat ng manner in which skilled labourers in the mills at Grand Falls have been treated since the Humber Industry has been in operation. An advertisement in the local paper last year called for paper-makers and machine tenders, and the announcement was made n that advertisement that "persons already employed at this work in Newfoundland need not apply." This constituted a gross discriminat'on against Newfoundland workers, who had become trained operators at Grand Falls. And the case is more glaring st ll when you take into account that 40 cents per hour more was being paid for a certain class of technical work at Corner Brook, over and above that paid at Grand Falls, and the Grand Falls employee is deprived of the advantage of competing for this wage. I would like to know if the Government is aware of these facts, and if so what steps, if any, were taken to prevent this unfair treatment of Newfoundlanders employed at Grand Falls.

Before I sit down I would urge the Prime Minister to secure for the Country a better deal than that contained in these agreements. He should insist upon the International Paper Company, since they are to secure the plant at Corner Brook wh ch cost forty-five million dollars, for a paltry two and a half million, taking over the country's liabilities of ten millions. This can be done, as Mr. Hickman suggested, by the Company ra'sing six million pounds instead of four, and use the extra two million pounds for the liquidation of the debentures. If the Government succeeds in removing this liab lity from our shoulders, then I would feel it my duty to support the measure, although I would still be dissatisfied with the Gander Proposition. I shall await to hear what the Prime Minister has to say, before I make any further comments upon the b lls before the Committee.

MP HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I have already covered the resolutions pretty fully but I want to say now that I am like the Hon. Mr. Sullivan who recently said that he was not satisfied with these deals. I also am not satisfied with them. I would like to see the liabil ty of this country taken away. I feel sure that some day we will be called upon to meet our ol ligations unless something is done at the present time. I see no reason why this company or anq kind of corporation should be financed on money guaranteed by the Newfoundland Government. If I have to go into a venture of any kind I have to do my own financing. I cannot get any assistance from the

Newfoundland Government even though I need it. It is most unusual for a corporation like the International to come into Newfoundland, and not be able to find sufficient money to buy out the Company which they are taking over. It is a most unusual thing. Anywhere in Canada if a company was sold, the other company would find sufficient money to buy it out. Take for instance our own local Electric Light Co. When it was taken over by the Royal Securities, they went on the market and raised sufficient money to buy out the company and to pay the owners. I fully believe that if the International Co. were compelled to do so that they would find sufficient money to buy out the obligations of Newfoundland or what is known as the B Debentures for which we are the guarantors. I propose to make an amendment to this bill, in clause 6. I feel that it is my duty and that it should be done by someone.

(Reads)

It is an easy matter for the International Paper Company with all the assets that they have behind them in Corner Brook enterprise to raise from the public £6 000,000 as well as £4,-000,000. I know that the argument will be put up that they have to get the consent of the British Government. But when the British Government or the Trade Facilites Board, the Armstrong-Whitworth Co. or the Bank of England made their deal with the International Paper, they did not consult Newfoundland. They gave an option to the International without consulting us at all. At the time that they gave that option they did not know what would be the demands of the Newfoundland Government. One would naturally think that the first demand of the Newfoundland Government would be that she be relieved of her obligations, as guarantors for $10,000,-000. I propose to amend that.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I need scarcely point out to the House that it is impossible to accept any such amendment. In the first place there were some members of the Opposition that suggested that we might have asked the British Government to make the A Debentures pari passu with the B Debentures, and so put both classes of the debentures together. But the proposition of the Leader of the Opposition is practically to put the B debentures ahead of the A debentures. Or in other words to permit the local company to borrow an additional amount of money, which of course comes preferential to the prior debentures and then to use that £2,000,000 to pay off the B debentures. Naturally the A debenture holders would not stand for that for one instant. I think that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition understands that, being a business man just as well as I do. Under no consideration would the A debenture holders who have got a prior security bought as prior security, and taken by them at a lower rate of interest as prior security, allow the Company to raise an additional amount of money to pay off the junior security. It is a proposition that could not be put forward to the British Government or anybody else. I have contended in the House here before that if anybody has benefited from the building of the Corner Brook mill it is Newfoundland. Newfoundland got the mill she benefited by the labour and the mill is still there. The British Government lent £10,000,000. They put up the guarantee and took as security, preferential bonds. They took the risk, for no other purpose than to help us out. If we had not that guarantee that money could not have been raised.

MR. HIBBS—The money was spent in England.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It was not altogether spent in England. A large portion of it was. Of course that it was induced the British Government to do it but the British Gov-

ernment would not have done it for any foreign country. They did it to help out one of her own Dominions. To do this anyway it would be necessary to br ng in a Bill into the British House of Commons, and if to-day I was a member of that House and a Bill of this nature was coming before the House, I feel that I would have to take the view "Why should we do any more in this connection. We have guaranteed their bonds granted them to give work in England and England wants it as badly as any place. But why should we be asked to do anything more." That would be my argument, and I believe that it would be the argument of every member in this House, if he sat in the British House of Commons instead of in this one. And as much as I would like to accommodate the Leader of the Opposition in connection with this Legislation, I cannot accept the amendment that has been put forward.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I just want to add another word. This point was brought up when we were in Committee on the resolutions and the excuse that the Prime Minister gave at that time was that it was easier to raise money on a Government guarantee than on their own. This led me to believe that the Government were assisting the International by allowing them to use our money that we had guaranteed to save them from going on the market and borrowing money, on which they would have to pay 7 per cent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That was the propos tion, that the International should pay off the B debentures.

MR. HICKMAN—As far as the holders of A debentures go it does not make any difference to them whether they are given third place or fourth place. The A debentures are guaranteed by the British Government both as to principal and interest. It looks to me as if you are trying to protect the Brit sh Government. The Prime Minister started by referring to the debenture holders and then wound up by defending the British Government. They would want to have their security, naturally, on the assets of the company but what do we care about them. They made a deal without consulting Newfoundland, and then why should we have any consideration for the people who do that. That is why I think that my argument was sound in making the amendment.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, there is another point that I would like to call the attention of the Committee to and it is that there seems to be confusion between those two bills as regards the exportat on of pulp wood. In section 6 of the Humber Bill in speaking of the right of exporting pulp wood it says.

(Reads)

In section five of the Gander Valley Bill on the same subject it says:

(Reads)

I think that in the Gander it also included the four mach nes at Corner Brook now, and then that means that from the Gander areas a half a ton of pulp wood is allowed to be exported for every ton of paper manufactured, including the four machines at Corner Brook now.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Charman, the two bills tend to get a little bit confused in as much as we are debating the two bills together. I have brought in some amendments in connection with the Corner Brook agreement and I have some amendments to bring in in connection with the Gander. And one amendment is for the purpose of covering the very point that the honourable member for Fogo made.

(Reads)

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Chairman, I have nothing particular to say regarding the amendment brought in by the Leader of the Opposition. At the same time I feel justified in asking all sorts

of concessions from the Bank of England and the British Government because they gave their consent that an option should be given to the International Co. of New York. They gave the r approval to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company regarding that option without considering Newfoundland, and I believe that it is because of this option that no tangible or firm offers have been received from any other source. Frms that have any idea of bus ness at all hesitate and will not come forward and make offers to set the pace for another corporation which has the option. Because of that sir, I feel that I must support any suggestion that would perhaps help to defeat the ends of this agreement. What this Chamber lacks sir is courage. We hear members in this House get up and say that they are not sat sfied with it and that the only reason that they have for supporting the agreement are that they believe and are afraid it is the best that can be done. They have not pluck enough to say, "This is not good enough. Do your worst." If they did we could effect a better deal, I am sure. I say to-day, sir, that if this House refused to pass this Bill with the International Paper Company we would have the thanks of the future generation.

Mr Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill 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 Bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V. (1924), Cap. 2, entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, there are a few amendments in connection with this Bill and which I do not think are objectionable in any way to the House. The first one is that if the Gander Company should acquire the Corner Brook property they will not get any increased export rights, as suggested by the member for Fogo. Therefore, I think that is only protection to the Government and there is nothing contentious regarding it. The second amendment is in clause 4 and is in accordance with the suggestion made by Mr. Ashbourne, namely, that the Company is called upon to provide ties for renewals on the Gander branch railway for a period of thirty years. The Bill only provided to allow ties to be cut during construction; now it provides that for thirty years we can get renewals in that respect. Clause 5 is to protect the company from penalties under the Crown Lands Act for not building saw mills pending the erection of the mill. The last proposed amendment is for the purpose of protecting a limestone quarry at Cobb's Arm for its present owners, as there was a question raised as to whether his rights were being infringed on. These are the four amendments since the Resolutions were read. I hope there is nothing contentious in respect to them and I would submit that they be read again when the Bill goes into Committee.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman, in the event of the two companies acquiring the two properties there is likely to be an interchanging whereby they could doubly export that amount of wood, and I think there should be no doubt left as to what is meant by this first clause in the amendment. I think it would be more

clear to have it specifically mentioned the town of manufacture instead of the words "in the Colony", because there is a doubt in mind as this Bill is now in the event of the International amalgamating with the Gander Company.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member's point is well taken. The place of manufacture should be distinctly defined, as at present all a company has to do is manufacture 120,000 tons of paper anywhere in the Colony.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Clause 6 of the Corner Brook and clause 6 of the International agreements say:

(Reads.)

"manufactured in the Colony".

HON. MR. CRAMM—I am not very clear as to the pulpwood export rights under those contracts. The position appears to be this: If for instance the Gander Valley Company acquires Corner Brook they will have the right under the Gander contract to export a half cord of wood for every ton of paper exported by that company from the Colony, including Corner Brook and any other mill which they might erect. Also, if they acquire the Corner Brook Company they would probably acquire that company's right to export. It would consequently work out that the company would have the right to export a half cord of wood for every ton of paper exported from Gander Valley, and a cord for every ton manufactured at Corner Brook. The same effect would be produced by the Corner Brook Company acquiring the Gander Valley. If a new mill was started by either company the additional export rights would apply, and I am quite sure this was not the intention.

MR. CASHIN—Do I take it what the company and Government want is, if they extend the mill at Corner Brook that when they export half a cord of wood for each additional ton manufactured over 120,000 tons that the Bill be expressed so that if they go to the Gander Valley and are cutting over the two properties they won't be able to go there and export half a cord of wood for every ton manufactured. As I read this it is to protect the country and is putting us in the position if one company purchases the other's rights they won't be able to export in respect of the same timber under two contracts. Consequently, if the clause goes in after section 5, if the Corner Brook mill acquires the Gander, really the total amount of pulpwood to export from the Gander will be half a cord for each ton of paper manufactured there over 400 tons a day, and the same applies at the Humber.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think the object of saying "in the Colony" is, if a third mill is put up they would not be allowed to export any wood on account of that mill. Personally, I feel perfectly satisfied that the clause is worded for the purpose really of exporting from a third mill if it is put up. Personally I cannot see the difference in putting up another mill to cutting wood in Green Bay and taking it from Green Bay down to Corner Brook and shipping it there. If they were turning out the same from three mills as two. I would be just as satisfied to give the concession for three as two.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Surely that is not the policy of the Government to encourage the exportation of raw wood.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am not talking of policy. The clause here is a question of rights, and I think the Committee better rise to fully consider the matter.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

again on to-morrow.

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

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising to adjourn until to-morrow, Wednesday, August 24th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, August 24th, 1927.

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

A petition was presented by Mr. Hickman, from Carbonear, re employment.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the order that the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract between the Government and the International Paper Company, of Newfoundland, Limited," be read a third time was rescinded and it was ordered that the Bill be again referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: It will be remembered that in clause 6, page 23 of the International agreement, it read:

(Reads)

We have the same clause in the Gander export rights, and therefore we put in an amendment to the Gander Bill to make sure that they have no right to doubly export that wood. Now instead of putting in the words in this International Bill:

(Reads)

It will now read at Corner Brook, instead of in the Colony. So that they can only export that much wood from Corner Brook and the same thing in connection with the Gander, the original amendment is not necessary, and the two bills are clarified in that respect.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them re-committed and had passed the same with a further amendment.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered with unanimous consent that the Bill be now read a third time and passed and be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

RAILWAY BILL

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker:—While I shall make the formal motion for the second reading of this bill now, I am quite agreeable to have it deferred to another day, if the members so desire it. I would like to say here that the delay has been due to the consideration of the fact as to whether the bill ought to be more extended in form than it now is. I would like to state to the House that we had in contemplation a more extended bill than the one now before the members. It will be noticed that all that this does is to fall in line with the idea that was considered some time ago that future railway building ought to be controlled. At the present time under the section 206 of the Consolidated Statutes, it will be seen that it only applies to what are called actual railway companies in the real sense. It has no significance whatever to private railways. In other words the railway act today has no bearing whatever on railways operated under the control of the A.N.D. Co., in particular from Millertown Junction to Millertown and from Buchan's to Millertown Junction. What we did desire and what we had been giving consideration to

was not alone the controlling of all future railways, whether private or otherwise, being in the hands of the Governor in Council, before construction, but we hoped to make some general legislative provision with regard to the public rights on the railways already under operation. The matter was however a bit involved. These people got their rights as private railways operators and we feel that the point immediately of concern, and which arose out of the discussion on the Buchan's Mine Resolutions, was the ensuring of the fact that the haulage of freight over the Newfoundland Railway would not be interfered with. That is the object of the present bill. I might therefore say that the legislation now says:

(Reads)

In other words what we endeavor to do is to comply with the point raised very properly on the other side, as to whether railways could be built indiscriminately without control. I move the second reading purely because it is on the order paper but if the members desire it can be deferred. However I think that if the members are agreed to accept the principle of the bill, the details may be left to the Committee.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the remarks that I have to make have much to do with the bill itself. There is for instance the question of existing railways. Supposing in time the Government should desire to alter the running rates over these railroads, or to make arrangement for the carriage of freight. They have no power to do so now I understand, and this act gives them no such power. There has been a great deal of discussion with reference to Buchan's Mine being an open town. A Committee in the Legislature are dealing with that question now. The Company may agree to declare it an open town. But what value is that if an independent man is not able to get his freight hauled to that town. The Company may decide to discriminate against a certain business man and in favor of another business man, and then this Government has no power to give that man against whom the Company are discriminating, assistance in respect to getting his freight hauled over the independent line that now connects the main line of railroad with the town section. There is another feature that appeals to me as objectionable and that is the ommission from the bill of the rights of the Legislature as to the construction of railrays. There are of course quite a few cases where it is desirable that the Governor in Council should be empowered to act immediately on application such as in respect to logging railways, or railways in connection with mining operations. But I think that where any great big question comes up, of the building of an extension line of railway, that this Legislature ought to authorise the construction.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I cannot imagine the Governor in Council taking on himself such power to do it.

DR. MOSDELL — While in the points that I have made I am not objecting to the principle embodied in the bill yet I do object to it on the score that there are some general principles that are not covered by the bill, and my intention was not to make any extended remarks but to call those facts to the attention of the Minister of Justice, so that perhaps he would be able to discover ways and means of meeting those objections.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker: I have in my hands that bill which I hoped to present to the Legislature, and which is more extensive. But I wish to say that we

felt that the point immediately to be grappled with was the fact that we had given concessions to Buchan's Mine largely based upon the idea that the railway was going to get increased haulage. That was the point which the Colonial Secretary drew particular attention to a point which most of the members subscribed to. That being so so far as the present measure is concerne d it ensures that point. Buchan's Mine is supposed to be under development. Railways only go from Buchan's to Millertown Junction and from Millertown Junction to Millertown. No other railway can be built now if we pass this act. Therefore for that reason the Newfoundland railway is ensured of traffic from Millertown to Buchan's. The second point was subscribed to. Of course I speak now in a personal way. I am not binding the Government. I do think that we ought to give serious thought to the idea that where there are private railways, that the public rights ought to be protected, and I have endeavoured as far as I see it to draft an enactment that will be reasonable. We recognize that those people who build railways as private railways naturally find it difficult to subscribe to the idea of confiscatory legislation. But at the same time occasion arises when public utilities got to be designated evn though they were principally created for private interests. The House may accept my assurance that the bill in its present form is the result of giving consideration to what may be serious at the moment and we think that we ought not to ask the House to pledge itself so.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker: I do not propose to delay the House, but that point was well taken by the Hon. Member for Fortune who raised the point originally. The Attorney Gen'l with commendable shrewdness brought in a bill that is very simple in its form, and meets certain contingencies, but I do not think that it is adequate to meet every contingency, that may arise, with regard to private railways. Take Buchan's Mine railway for instance. I do not know what authority the Minister of Posts may have to appoint a postman with powers to convey the mails from the Government Railway to Buchan's Mine, or what authority he may have to send express parcels or mails over the International Railway. It will be necessary at the next session of the Legislature to bring in a more comprehensive bill with regard to this point. I do not anticipate that there is anything that is going to take place to embarass the Government but I thing that in the near future sufficiently wide legislation should be passed to put beyond the possibility of a doubt the powers of those operating private railways, and what the public rights are. I think that the bill to-day while it will meet the present situation, yet it will be felt that legislation ought to be brought in that will take all circumstances more fully into consideration.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Ament Chapter 206 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies'" was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 14 Geo. V. (1924) Cap. 2, entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power & Paper Co., Ltd.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I think that we discussed these amendments pretty fully yesterday, and I think that I convinced the House that there is nothing of a contentious nature in any amendment that is proposed here.

(Reads)

We dropped that, and instead of saying for each ton of paper manufactured .n the Colony we say for each ton of paper manufactured in the Gander Valley. I think that covers that point. As far as the other clauses are concerned they have been explained yesterday. I do not think that Mr. Ashbourne was in the House when I called attention to clause 4 which gives the right to the railway to get ties for thirty years from the International.

MR. RUSSELL — Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Prime Minister if he can give the House any information as to when the construction of the Gander railway will be commenced?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Cha rman, I cannot answer that definitely because the Government has not given it any consideration. But it will be a matter of consideration whether it should not be started this fall, if we find the employment of labour advisable or necessary. If not next Spr.ng.

MR. RUSSELL — Mr. Chairman, then there is no prospect of any immediate work there now. While I am on my feet I would like to ask the Prime Minister another question. Is it the intention of the Government to perm t the International to cut pulpwood in the Gander section this year, particularly in the burnt section?

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—There is, when this Bill goes through, the right of the Government to ask the International to allow the cutt:ng of certain portions of wood, if we wanted it cut. But that would not be before next year, if we did ask it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time and passed, and that it be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Committee of the Whole on the B.ll entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (1916) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals'" was deferred until to-morrow.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to to-morrow, Thursday, August 25th instant, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, August 25th, 1927.

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

Pursuant to order and leave granted and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister on behalf of Hon. Minister of Finance a bill entitled "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances" was read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker: in the absence of the Finance Minister and if there are no objections we might go into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means this afternoon.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: Personally I feel that when we are dis-

cussing Ways and Means we should have the Minister of Finance and Customs in the House, as he is responsible for the document now before the House for discussion. Furthermore, I do not believe in saying anything behind a man's back that I am not prepared to say before his face. Then again the daily press will not publish anything only what the Government members say. I therefore, move that this order stand deferred until such time as the Finance Minister is here himself to give answer to the questions asked regarding the various items contained in the Budget.

On motion the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. 206 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: I do not know whether it is necessary to add to what I have already stated on the second reading of this Bill, except there are a couple of verbal insertions that I have made in a few of the sections. As I have already intimated, the object of this Bill is to make it definite and certain that any railway construction in future whether on private lands or otherwise shall be subject to the consent of the Governor in Council. The cause of the delay of this Bill, as I have previously pointed out to the House, was due to the fact that we had intended to bring in a Bill in a more comprehensive form and to further extend the general amendments to the Railway Act regarding the building of railways for railway purposes. I therefore, beg to move the reading of the first section of this Bill.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: As the effect of this Bill is so far-reaching, I would like the hon. gentleman in charge of it to give a little more explanation as to what is involved. The Bill provides that "No railway shall be constructed in this Colony by any person or Company whatever, whether a railway company as defined in this Chapter or not, without the consent in writing of the Governor-in-Council, which consent may be given upon such conditions as to the Governor-in-Council may seem proper." It appears to me that there might be a tendency to misinterpret the rights given to the Governor-in-Council. For instance, it may be presumed that the Governor-in-Council, after certain conditions have been fulfilled by any person or Company, could make another such arrangement as was made under the Reid Contract, and I think it would be desirable to have provision made so that any right granted would be subject to the ratification of this Legislature.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: All this Bill does is merely to apply to private railways. Our general Act passed some years ago deals practically with all railway companies in the real sense and it was passed in a form as if we were going to have a number of railway companies operating in the country. The A. N. D. Company's railways from Grand Falls to Botwood and from Millertown Junction to Millertown did not come within the scope of the old Act. Under the present Bill before us no company can build a private railway even on their own land, without the sanction of the Governor-in-Council. It is obvious that no Executive Government is going to set out to accept the responsibility of granting an important contract for railway building, without special en-

actment for it by the Legislature, because the Act itself distinctly says:

(Reads)

The reason why the present Bill is found in this form is that in case a company desires to put in a siding or short spur line on their own lands and having no general carrying rights, obviously they would have matters tied up waiting until the Legislature would meet for an enactment and it was thought desirable that the Governor-in-Council should be in a position to grant the permission pending the opening of the Legislature. In other words, the Bill covers the necessity for the construction of short railways connecting parts of an industry. As far as haulage rights and running rights are concerned, the public really have no rights over the private railways of the A. N. D. Company. For a number of years the A. N. D. Company worked in harmony with the Reid Newfoundland Railway in exchanging freights, etc., and I think it is only fair to say that the A. N. D. Company have carried on and served the public faithfully, despite the fact that the public had no rights whatever over their railways. The Bill was introduced to meet a point raised in the discussion of the Buchan's Mine Bill. Concessions were given in the Buchan's Mine contract because of the haulage of freight which would come to the Newfoundland Railway and the present Bill ensures beyond peradventure that the Newfoundland Railway shall not lose haulage on freight to the Buchan's Mine area or to any other new industrial points by the possibility of the establishment of further railways.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY— Mr. Chairman: I have endeavoured to follow the discussion; but the fact must not be lost night of that this enactment is purely of a temporary nature and it is done for the one purpose, and that is to prevent any company, who may apply for the right to build and operate a railway from getting any such right, without the permission of the Governor-in-Council. It is very desirable that we should have our own railway protected and a proper enactment made to cover every possible contingency in that direction; but, as I pointed out yesterday ,we have no power to commandeer railway cars, for instance, for the use of post offices.

We are more or less subservient to the whims of people operating private railroads between different places. From Bishop's Falls to Botwood for instance we are at the whims of the A. N. D. Co. to take passengers, freight, mails and anything else as far as I can gather. I think th s is an intolerable position to be continued. Particularly in view of the fact of the great development taking place in the interior of the country this perhaps may be more important than appears on the surface. At this late date in the session it would be impracticable to bring in a measure covering all aspects of the case. As the Minister of Justice int mated to the House, this is not the Bill originally intended but merely one provision to be enacted so that the Governor in Counc l will have some powers to control should there be any person or company about to erect a railroad that may not be considered in the public interests. With regard to the suggestion that we make this conditional on being ratified by the Leg slature, that, in my opinion, would defeat entirely the object of that Bill, because if we gave permission to some company to build a road they would say when the permission was contingent on something else that they could not take the chance of building a railroad on that authority. Therefore I think that it would entirely defeat the object. However I am strongly of the opinion that we should have legislation enacted next session to deal with

those points and cover every possible contingency that might occur.

MR. BROWNE—

(Reads.)

The words "railway company" as defined in the chapter. There is no definition of "railway company" in the chapter. The only definition is a definition of "a company". It may be considered that it is a railway company but the only reference to a railway company is found in the title to the chapter. So to have sense in the context it should read "word 'a company' as defined in the chapter."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —We will make it that. Cut out "railway" in the second line. I can see no harm in this being put in. Members will follow the text.

(Reads.)

I take it the only object would be if the Government gave railway concessions it would give the House an opportunity to see, and if the House didn't like them they could turn them out. The reason why I don't want the idea of ratification: take a foreign company coming here viewing everything with suspicion, if they go to the Governor in Council and are told they will have to wait until the permission from the Governor in Council is ratified they may not build the railway. I think that will cover what was wanted really. I think what was wanted was some accounting to the Legislature by the Governor in Council.

DR. MOSDELL—That doesn't meet the point, and if we would not be in the position of having the Legislature say "Yea" and "Nay", I would prefer not to have that put in because if a railway were being built it would be a matter of common knowledge and the terms could be asked in the House. Why I was anxious to have the Legislature in the position of having a deciding say in respect to any such agreement, though it would be only a matter of form in small industrial railways, was that it would be placing a very large degree of control in the hands of the Governor in Council. That is why I was asking to have some check and to have "ratification" put in.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —It would make it valueless. This is practically in the nature of a temporary enactment to deal with the situation for the moment. It seems to me we have got to give consideration to those other points. I suggest leaving the matter to stand as it is.

MR. GRIMES—I understand from the Minister of Justice this amendment applies to future private railways. Will it apply to Buchan's Mine?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —No. Buchan's Hine is already under construction. It is built. So that the House will have no misunderstanding as to the reason why the Bill is introduced, I may say we had prepared with regard to private railways two special sections. I will read them now merely for the information of the House, because in the light of the attitude taken my own feeling is if there is any possible objection we do not go ahead with it. It is really only done because it was suggested in the House that there ought to be a provision.

(Reads.)

We had that provision with regard to any railways in the future built for private purposes. With regard to the three railways in existence at present we had this provision.

(Reads.)

The reason why that amendment was not proceeded with was because very serious complications arose as to the position that the A. N. D. Co. were likely to be placed in. The matter was too important for the Government to be in a position to decide without a good deal of consideration, inasmuch as any claims might be made, first as to actual right, and sec-

ondly as to the conduct of business and the interference which would be brought about in connection with it. Then it was felt as the main purport of the discussion some time ago was merely the stopping of competition with the Newfoundland Railway, that this amendment met that point. Now if there be any feeling that there is anything about the legislation any way dangerous why we need not enact it. We might let it go as it is, because I don't think we are going to have railway building going on over night. I think it is safe to say by the time the Legislature next meets there will not be many people building railways, so there is no terrible rush about it, it was only because the discussion brought forth the point.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to disagree with the Minister of Justice in his suggestion to withdraw the Bill. The very point considered dangerous in the Buchan's agreement in my opinion is covered by that Bill, and from the very start I took a stand in this House with regard to conserving the interest of the Government Railway, and I say now if you withdraw the Bill between this and the next time the Legislature meets you may find that under Buchan's agreement you, will have a railway under construction that will entirely cut off the Newfoundland Railway from all transportation as far as Buchan's Mine is concerned. I feel myself if I am the only one in the House I will vote for the passage of that Bill.

MR. GRIMES—I am quite in accord with the position taken by the Colonial Secretary. I think that the amendment to the Act as proposed here should pass through the House for the protection of the railway. Between now and the next session of the Legislature we don't want to be up against a problem that may have a serious effect on our own railway transportation in this country, but when the Minister talks about interference with the private rights of any company I think, Mr. Chairman, public rights have also to be considered. When a company is operating a railway which it got by consent of this Legislature along with a lot of other concessions that they ought to be open to reason, and ought to be prepared to consider public interests in this matter. Reference has been made to Botwood railway, Millertown railway and Buchan's Mine and public rights have not been protected in the past, particularly in regard to transportation of freight over the lines of the A. N. D. Co., and it may happen in connection with the Buchan's Mine proposition unless this Bill goes through to give the Governor in Council the right to look after those interests in connection with transportation. They may build, possibly, at Buchan's Mine between now and next year. Now I would like to ask the Minister this—in view of the position at Botwood and elsewhere, cannot there be something done within the next few months to have the matter taken up with the A. N. D. Co. by the Government to see if some satisfactory arrangement cannot be made with regard to perishable foodstuffs and other food traffic.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I think it would be a very reasonable case to put to them.

MR. GRIMES—Well if the Government is prepared to go that far, it would be a very good thing for the residents of Botwood and Millertown and Buchan's Mine. I am fully in accord with the section. The position I think put up by the hon. member for Fortune is well worth considering, and if it cannot be seen that the Legislature should ratify whatever decision the Governor in Council may come to, I think it ought be seriously thought of to see what can

be done between now and the next session of the Legislature to protect in every way possible our own railway and the rights of various people doing business there.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I regard the amendment as being a distinct step in advance. I quite agree the amendment to the Act has given a large measure of protection we did not have before but I had this sort of thing in mind when I voiced an objection to the Governor-in-Council having those powers, that, for instance, at Buchan's Mine only a short length of railway would be necessary to be built by the Company to connect it with their own lines, and if permission should be given by the Governor-in-Council to build a short length of railway that might not appear to be very important it could in such a case have a very great effect on our own railway.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in the provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes (1916) entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: I would like to state shortly, as far as this amendment is concerned the essence of it, in fact the whole of it, is applying to fee simple lands the present provision of the Crown Lands Act with regard to people holding timber or pulp licences. Section 43 at present reads:

(Reads)

The section is merely now added to my the words "fee simple." Therefore, the position is where a fee simple holder of timber has property we are for the first time having this put in to law which has really been the understood policy of the country. The export of timber has been prohibited and all we are doing now is removing that position from any doubt as regards those who hold fee simple lands.

DR. MOSDELL—Have they been set- ask the Minister of Justice what lands are held in fee simple?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Offhand I would say mostly the Reid Newfoundland Company.

DR. MOSDELL—Have they been setting up the contention that they have the right to export?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Well they have. They set it up when they heard of this legislation.

DR. MOSDELL—I had this in mind that possibly the option between the Reids and the International might fall down. I am trying to look at the question purely from the standpoint of the right or the presumed right that this company has obtained. Would the cancellation of any presumed right lessen the value of the property, in the event of the sale to some other company.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: I do not think so. In fact I can say to the House this, that on that very point in discussing the matter of exportation of timber with the International they themselves admitted that they had not gone into the question of the absolute right of

exportation from fee simple lands. They admitted as far as they were concerned that they presumed that in order to get the right of exportation of timber there would have to be particular legislation for that. So that the Honourable Member will see in that their viewpoint, and it seems natural that they did not consider that they had in their favor any legislation that would give them a right of dickering with the Reids' land. I do not think anyhow that we would want to approach this House with legislation of a confiscatory nature, but I take it that I can speak for the Government this thought, that we do not want it to be felt for one moment that this is legislation aimed at a breach of faith in anything done with the Reid lands. I do not think that it will have any such result.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: There is another aspect of this which rather appeals to me, that if the option between the Reids and the International should cease the Reids then, if this amendment goes through the House, are in the position where they cannot get an outside company to come in and they can then only dispose of the wood to the company. From that standpoint the Reids then are in an awkward position. They have had a sort of run of bad luck in connection with Corner Brook particularly, and people should be rather slow about bringing in hardship on a company that has incurred losses to such an extent. So looking at it from that standpoint we want to be sure that we are not putting them in an awkward position which may result in an eventual loss to them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The Reids are opposed to that legislation. It is only right that I should state that. They regard it as interference with their rights, but we must also not forget the fact that the Reids have been very well considered.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: This then is an expression of policy of the Government to prevent the export of raw material as far as they possibly can. With that policy I am entirely in accord, but I think it is only fair that we should look at the other side too.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and 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 this House that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting Education" with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time.

On motion the amendments were read a second time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council accordingly.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to to-morrow, Friday, August 26th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, August 26th, 1927.

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

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the Government if it is their intention to introduce a Bill this year regarding the whaling industry, and, if so, might I ask when the Bill will be introduced?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker: In reply to the hon. member I may say that the Bill is now in the hands of the printer, and, in all probability, notice will be given asking leave for the introduction of the Bill at the next sitting.

On motion of Hon. Minsiter of Finance the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the hole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I propose to make a few remarks in reply to the Budget Speech delivered by the Minister of Finance and Customs, Sir John Crosbie. I feel I will not be encroaching on the rules of the House when I ask permission to read my comments on that document.

(Speech not available)

(Reads)

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I was hoping that the very exhaustive speech made by Mr. Cashin in which he openly and fearlessly criticized the Budget Speech would have elicited an immediate reply from the Finance Minister; but, perhaps, physical disabilities may account for the reason of his not replying. During the course of Mr. Cashin's remarks he referred to the fact that two and a quarter million dollars was spent on highroads with n the past two years. Now the Prime Minister asked the question, did not the hon. member think that money had been wasted in the past on road building. A similar question may be asked of the Prime Minister now, has not this huge amount of money spent on highroads during the past two years been wasted? Do we actually believe that a hundred per cent. value has been received by this expenditure of over two million dollars? Certainly we all know that blunders and blunders of the grossest kind were made in connection with that expenditure. Blunders were made and admitted by the management of the Highroads Commission. It is generally admitted that roads have been built in this country that should not have been built in the light of our financial condition, whilst there are other places throughout the country where roads are in an impassable condition and no effort has been made to put them in any kind of decent condition. Look at the blunder that was made by the Highroads Commission in connection with the Hodgewater Road, which cost $15,000.00 a mile to build; then take the Whitbourne-Colinet Road, which cost between $7,000.00 to $8,000.00 a mile to complete. The Whitbourne-Colinet Road is simply a connecting road, and comparatively few people live at each end of it and even now it is only used mostly as a motor road. I do not think that the Prime Minister appreciated the amount of money we voted for roads in the past as compared with what was voted and spent on highroads. I find in the Estimates that altogether the sum of $170,708.00 is allocated this year for all the local roads, main lines and railway connecting roads throughout the country, and then we hear talk of money having been wasted in the past under the old road board system. Why the different electoral districts would not have anything to waste by the time $170,708.00 is divided up amongst eighteen of them. Now the member for Fogo who has quite

a knowledge and experience of road-making tells us that the Highroads Commission spent 150 times as much on a mile of main roads as the total grant for all main lines, local roads and railway connecting roads. Still, desp te the fact that the Highroads Commission is functioning and spending money on highroads, this House has voted this year this $170,708.00 and the special grants are being sent out to the road boards and commissioners just the same, although some of us have stacks of requests for money to build bridges that have fallen down. If past Governments made an allocation of $250,000.00 for the building and upkeep of roads and bridges throughout the country in one year, and when there were no highroads, that money was scattered all over the eighteen electoral districts. as a matter of fact we want $500,000.00 to fix up the bridges and the roads in districts where the people live outside of highroads. Therefore, it has not served any good purpose by broadcasting to the world that we have been parties to graft and extravagance by making allocations to road boards and commissioners, because the same obtains at the present time under the Highroads Commission.

I presume it is unnecessary for me to make a set speech on the Budget as the ground was practically covered by the member for Ferryland (Mr. Cashin), from a financial point of view. Personally, I would regard the Budget Speech as a manifesto because the Finance Minister has taken the trouble to go back to the year 1923-24. As the member of St. Barbe intimates, the only thing lacking about it is that the Finance Minister's picture is not on it and the document is little different from a repetition of the criticisms of the doings of past Governments. It tries to excuse the present administration in that they are no worse than those that went before them, but I think that is a very lame excuse. The Finance Minister gives a comparative statement on page 38 of original and supplementary revenue and expenditure on current account. Now when Supplementary Supply was asked for the Finance Minister tried to excuse himself then by going back to what past Governments had done and he took in three years, from 1922 to 1924 inclusive, to show that the average Supplementary Supply asked for was $1,000,000. In 1922-23 it was $1,054,739.77 he said, but on looking that up I find that $400,000 of that was credited to the Liquor Control Department. That was when the Government had to stock up in order to get the revenue. Now it is a Department that gets the duties and the profits from the liquor, so that if you subtract that $400,000 from the $1,054,739.77 you get $654,739.77. The next year 1923-24 Supplementary Supply was $713,639.92. In 1924-25 it was $505,905.51; whilst in 1925-26 it was $532,657.67. There is nothing in this Budget Speech that we have cause to congratulate ourselves on in this House and nobody knows that better than the Finance Minister himself. The present Government since 1924-25 have increased their deficit by $1,167,814.77 and the Finance Minister in his present Budget estimates that at the end of the fiscal year 1926-27 a probable deficit of $1,751000. If we subtract the 1924-25 expenditure from the 1926-27 expenditure we get $1,604,000. That is the history of the present Government regarding expenditure. The Finance Minister thought he did very well in regard to his estimates in that he said he was not a superman and he excused himself for being out in his estimate of last year. The Budget of last year was dated May 18th, 1926, just six weeks before the

financial lear closed and the Finance Minister then estimated a surplus of $500,000; but now instead of a surplus we find a deficit of $1,751,000.

Then, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance and Customs says that he has tried to estimate as nearly as possible. Certainly he has; no reason why he shouldn't try to make a correct estimate, but what in the world has that to do wlth our financial position. Just as well to go one million away from the true situation as five cents. It has no effect on the Government's trying to balance accounts. The Finance Minister makes a statement he is hoping to balance his budget, but what is the object? The object is to try and arrange for revenue to meet expenditure. Mr. Chairman, the Finance Minister brought in estimates with a deficit of $850,000. Does that affect the policy of the Finance Minister and of the Government in arranging taxation? It should. It ought. Just as well be two million out as five cents. It has no influence on the policy of the Government trying to cut out that defic t. We are told as an excuse that the British Government will have a thirty million pounds deficit, but if I remember correctly they arranged to meet that deficit, but we make no attempt to meet the deficit, and the unfortunate part is we can't see where our revenue under the same taxation as last year will be such that our deficit will be any less June 30th 1928, than 1927. That being so, it is going to reach next year somewhere between two and three millions. We don't want to be financial wizards to reach that conclusion; only want ordinary common sense. With conditions facing us at the present time and considering the revenue producing powers of the country, we can't see where we are going to be any better off in ten months' time than we were at the end of June, 1927. The Budget Speech, Mr. Chairman, is fairly well written. The language is simple, which is commendable. Some of us can't get down to simple language in phrasing our comments on various matters and I compliment the Finance Minister on the aspect of the speech. In some respects the Finance Minister has been frank. He has shown the terrible conditions obtaining in the country at the present time and yet he has failed to balance the Budget or do anything to lighten the burdens of the people or keep the country in a solvent position. The padding about what has been done in the past and about the future is only so much padding and camouflage, if you wish to accept those terms. Mr. Chairman, I might be inclined to give the history of the present Government and go back to 1923-1924, as the Minister of Finance did in connection with this pamphlet; and what do we find reviewing the actions of the present Government? Take the Governor's speech of 1924. This Legislature in 1924, following the usual programme, had to be opened by the reading of the Speech from the Throne. The Speech was put in the hands of His Excellency and he had to go through the form of reading it. We find it was the intention of the Government of that day to carry on an inquiry into Government departments. There was going to be a clean up and keep clean policy, and the inquiry:

(Reads.)

All gone to the four winds of heaven. The Government for a few months after that talked about it, considered it and thought, well, perhaps, it wasn't practical politics to pursue the course in that very virtuous statement and have a thorough cleaning of public departments to bring parties to book for any and all wrongdoing. Another thing, we were the crowd that spent money not wisely but too well. We were said to be guilty of squandermania. One department of the Government anyhow was going to effect a saving.

(Reads.)

Well we know what happened to that. A Bill was prepared, tabled, considered for a while and thrown out. No saving in public printing or advertising, on the contrary, it has gone on worse than ever. The Auditor General dealing with that refers in his report to a Government Department.

(Reads.)

The poor old Marine and Fisheries has got to be the goat for a great many other departments it seems. I know they were guilty of irresponsible actions down there and I dare say some other departments of the Government were equally as bad. Good intentions, but nothing done. When it came down to doing something which would require some steadfastness, persistence, some influence was brought to bear and the legislation after being brought in the House was cut out;not put into effect. There was one thing the Government did that it referrcd to in that speech.

(Reads.)

That was one thing we got from that speech as outlined in 1924. I don't know if that is regarded as part of the clean up and keep clean programme, but any how we have a new Liquor Act. What is the result of that? Well I don't know how we could get along without the receipts from liquor Counting in the railway, we have pretty nearly three millions of a deficit, and only for the income we have received from liquor we would be another $845,000 in the hole. The only department of the Government succesfully run is the liquor department. We ought congratulate ourselves on that; and another thing was in the duty on death; from the estate duties we got an increase. An increase from liquor and an increase from estate duties; and only for the natural loss of life and the unnatural misery and indirect loss of life from the liquor policy we would have been one million worse off. The volume of business increased in the liquor business, but at whose expense? The expense of the people unfortunately who can't afford it.

(Reads: Volume of business.)

(Reads: Amount of sale of rum; other kinds.)

That amount from the sale of rum, consumed mostly by those who can't afford it. That is the worst feature of it, and the business is increasing. Isn't that awful for a business like that of the Liquor Department that doesn't give comfort and happiness and contentment?

(Reads.)

The Board conducted 358 prosecutions, an increase of 113 cases over last year, and we were going to cut out illicit trade of liquor We were going to lessen the number of prosecutions, fines and forfeitures; but we are increasing. Fines and forfeitures, seventy-five per cent. increase.

(Reads.)

That is the result of the Act of the Legislature of 1924. This is nothing to congratulate ourselves on. We should not make it easier for the people to get liquor. If they drink, let them drink, even if the revenue suffers.

Now we come to the 1925 Speech from the Throne.

(Reads.)

I only have to repeat the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in this House and at this session. He stated that there is a vote for agriculture, but that he as a Minister of Agriculture has no direction as to how the vote is to be spent. He can spend it how he likes. He said that he was in a very awkward position. Nothing has been done with regard to an agricultural policy by the Monroe administration since their inauguration into office.

(Reads.)

That was carried out and then the income tax was repealed. Well the income tax was repealed but we have

not got back to the old days of comfort yet. We are no better off by having it repealed. We saved the banks doing business in this country $50,000 or $60,000, and we saved the well-to-do people of this coutnry $200,000 or $300,000. But we cannot afford it. We cannot afford to do without the income tax or the bank tax. Therefore I do not consider that the policy of the Government was wise in that respect. If I am informed correctly, every province of Canada has a surplus and those provinces that have not a surplus have a much reduced deficit compared with last year. The Federal Government and also the Provincial Government of Ontario are considering debt retirement. Nobody knows better than the Minister of Justice what they are doing in the United States. They are actually trying to do that in the Old Country, although they have a deficit there. It is no use in comparing ourselves with what is going on in New Zealand and Australia. Make the comparison with our next door neighbours. We are in a regrettable condition with regard to our next door neighbours as to our financial condition. In 1926 we were going to repeal another Act.

(Reads)

What happened to that. Somebody tried to interfere with the employment of a few men in connection with the loading and the unloading of a few cases of whisky, in Newfoundland. They had good intentions. But there must have been some very conscientious men in the Government at that time.

(Reads)

Whoever made that suggestion to the clerk of the House when the Prime Minister was drawing up this Bill They imagined themselves somewhere must have had a very bad dream. in the presence of a crowd of people who were suffering as the result of having imbibed too much liquor. They thought that they were not any longer going to be a party to this free distribution of liquor.

There was going to be a new contract subject to the confirmation of this House between the Government and the companies operating on Bell Island. We know what happened to that. When it was brought in there was objection from both sides of the House, it was thrown out, and a tentative agreement goes on at the present time with regard to the work of the companies on Bell Island. I would remind the Finance Minister of his good intentions. I notice in the Budget of 1924 that the Finance Minister says:

(Reads)

The results have proven absolutely contrary to what the Minister thought that he could enforce. Expenditure has not been reduced to meet revenus. Absolutely nothing has been done with regard to reducing expenditure. If there is any paragraph in the Budget that would intimate than an attempt has been made to reduce expenditure then it is misleading. Every vote with scarcely an exception is increasing from year to year . The Finance Minister knows that what I am saying is absolutely correct, though he hoped when he introduced his first Budget, that although there was an increase that he would be able to live within the vote. But he had to come in and get $1,500,000 Suplementary Supply. The next year there was another increase in the original estimates, and then Supplementary Supply had be be brought in again for another half a million. Last year there was still a further increase and he had to get $850,000 for Supplementary Supply. And arguing form that point of view your regime has been an ignominious failure. But in 1927 on the eleventh day of May, His Excellency the Governor was asked to read a speech, and there is a clause here which says:

(Reads)

We are hardly clear of the Legislative when that proposition is thrown to the four winds of Heaven, and still we have a deficit in 1927 of $830,-000.00, and yet on the eleventh day of May when that was read to this House we thought that we would get some revenue to go against our expenditure by reenacting the income tax. Where are we and whither tending. We have actually as legislators fallen down on our jobs. We are taking the line of least resistnce. I know that to do something to try and balance your Budget you may have to do an unpopular thing. But it must be done. What have we done since this legislature opened. One bit of legislation that I regards as reactionary, and that is in respect to the Education Act. I may be alone in my opinion. It is absolutely unnecessary and that new Education Act will be no impetus to education. The present administration was going to cut out expenses in connection with the public charities. And in the Auditor-General's Report for last year there was an increase of $48,-700.

(Reads)

Some say we are drifting, we are not drifting, we are steering for it. We are not trying to divert ourselves one bit. Here is what I have to say to urge against the present administration w th regard to their policy. They spent two million dollars on roads for motorists. Now does that benefit the fishermen or the labouring classes. Who used motor cars? Not the fishermen anyway or the ordinary labourer. If these roads were built through communities they would serve the fishermen in their need for transportation as well as the motorists that would be alright. The bank tax was reduced. How does that benefit the fishermen? They may be benefitted to the extent of fifty thousand dollars which was the difference as between that collected last year and this year. The income tax saved to the monied people of the country two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand dollars, we cannot afford to do without that. We cannot afford to reduce taxation, and that leads me to another thought with regard to this tariff. I contend that there should not be anything imported into this country without paying duty on them, even if we adopt the same system that obtains to-day with regard to free importation. But let the collecting go on in the Custom's Department to that everything that comes into the country will be taxed accordingly, and if you are going to give a rebate let those that receive that article bring an invoice showing how much was spent on it, and what it is being used for, and perhaps in that way we will save hundreds of thousands of dollars, but let everything be taxed. Now this is not an original idea of mine, but if everything was taxed, and if the different companies doing business in this country and the different manufacturing concerns that are allowed free entry, if they had to pay duty and taxes accordingly, then the tariff would show absolutely just what concessions these companies are getting. It would be an eye-opener for the people of this country, and perhaps an eye opener to capitalists coming in here seeking concessions from this financially poor country at the present time. I think that the person who made that point contributed a very valuable suggestion. Now I do not want to be personal, but if I were on the hustings in Trinity District, or in any any other district, and I was talking of the Budget Speech or the Speech from the Throne s nce 1924 and if I was making reference to the present Governmen on what they had done I could

not help referring to the income tax. Who has been relieved of large sums of money as a result of the income tax being repealed? Who are the wealthy men in your Government? We certainly have to admit that neither the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance can be regarded as a poor man. It is generally conceded that they will have to pay the income tax, ranging anywhere from five thousand to fifteen thousand. But what did these men do? These men repealed the income tax. Why did they do it? They said that it bore harshly on the clerks on Water Street. I will then go back on the Speech from the Throne in 1925 and I would say:

(Reads)

But what a comfort have we derived from the repeal of the income tax. We have received no comfort from that. But who has benefited by it? I suppose the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister are benefiting by it. They are wealthy men, and yet by doing this the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister and other well-to-do men of the Monroe administration have placed themselves in an unenviable position by enacting legislation that would indirectly give them returns of thousands of dollars whereas general taxation cannot be reduced. Now I am not attributing dishonest motives to any member of the Government, of the House, or a member of the civil service. I am just finding out what the general electorate and the country are thinking and what an awkward position such legislators are in when they have to appeal for re-election. Can we wonder that the actions of legislators are open to criticism? Men holding high positions in the Government and at the same time are directors and shareholders of such corporations do not create confidence, no matter how honest they might be, but for the repeal of the income tax I do not excuse the Government one iota, particularly in view of the deficit of three million dollars that faces us next June and because of the fact that we were told in the Speech from the Throne on opening day of this legislature that there was to be a re-enactment of the Income Tax Act. The income tax obtains in Canada, the United States and Great Britain, even though they have surpluses; and the least I thought was that this legislature would be asked to continue this income tax again, even in a modified form. I believe that you could collect a quarter of a million dollars from people whose net incomes are over six thousand dollars a year. It is said that there is a lack of confidence in the Government and I am trying to point out where that lack of confidence originated, where it is being engendered and how it is getting more and more evident from day to day. Indirect benefits are being derived by corporations as a result of legislation passed by this House; banks doing business here are benefitting indirectly to the tune of tens of thousands of dollars by the repeal of legislation by this House; whilst the poorer classes of the community have their burdens increased and the load of taxation is no lighter, if not worse, than it was in the past. The Government have catered to the political opportunist who changes his policy from week to week in order to keep a vacillating and defunct Government in power. Similarly the Government change their opinion just as often and we do not know what they are going to do the next month, and pronouncements in the Speech from the Throne are apparently not worth the paper they are written on. I do not know what pressure has been brought to bear upon the Government within the last few weeks whereby they could not

carry out their proposed intentions with regard to the re-imposition of the income tax. If financial conditions had improved during that time, there would be an excuse, but the very contrary has happened as shown in the Budget, and I therefore cannot understand why the income tax was not enforced. We want revenue; and is it any wonder in view of the financial statements made i n the Budget that the personal and political friends of the present Government are asking "where do we go from here?" in private conversation and in the public press. An intimation to that effect appeared in an articles in the "Evening Telegram" recently and that article wound up by inferentially stating that we are not fit to govern ourselves and asking business men to get together in a combined effort to get us out of this slough of despondency. Take the Education Act which I opposed. That Act did not command the support of the best supporters of the Government and of those who are supposed to know something about education. Even the Leader of the Government in the Upper House tried to get somebody else to introduce the Education Bill in the Legislative Council, but if he was free and untrammelled he would have torn it to shreds. He was absolutely opposed to the principle outlined in that Bill with regard to it being any good for the advancement of education in this country. I have asked myself the question, and I suppose other members in this House have done likewise, what are we staying in the House of Assembly for? Anything we have done outside of the Corner Brook and Gander industrial measures could have been done just as well by the Executive Government. I console myself somet mes with the thought that I am not responsible for the actions or inactions of the present Government, but I regret to see absolutely nothing being done here to try and remedy the present financial condition of the country. How long this state of affairs will continue I do not know, but I would rather be away from here than have any responsibility as a member of the Legislature. That is how I feel about the whole matter now; and if the Prime Minister and Finance Minister are willing to sit down in their offices and content themselves as responsible Ministers of the Crown with the policy outlined in this pamphlet I am sorry for them. Those who are holding down good Government jobs are not finding fault with this Government. They are not being interfered with in any way. Their salaries will be paid supposing the Labrador has got to be sold to pay them. The same expenditure regarding other branches of the public service will be continued supposing the Government has to go to the money markets to borrow money to pay it. Well is that statesmanship? Can we wonder that the actions of legislators are open to criticism? Men holding high positions in the Government and at the same time are directors and shareholders of such corporations do not create confidence, no matter how honest they might be, but for the repeal of the income tax I do not excuse the Government one iota, particularly in view of the deficit of three million dollars that faces us next June, and because of the fact that we were told in the Speech from the Throne on opening day of this Legislature that there was to be a re-enactment of the Income Tax Act. The income tax obtains in Canada, the United States and Great Britain, even though they have surpluses; and the last I thought was that this Legislature would be asked to continue this income tax again, even in a modified form.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn until Monday, August 29th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 29th, 1927.

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

Petitions were presented by

Mr. Halfyard, from Hant's Harbour, re a highroad.

Mr. Halfyard, from New Chelsea, re a highroad.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned on Friday I was endeavouring to answer that portion of the Finance Minister's spech in reference to the heavy taxation upon the consumers of this country. I was pointing out the facts in connection with a number of articles, imports of Canada, that came in under a much less rate of duty than they came into Newfoundland, and while I do not intend to delay the House at any length to-day I will go a little further into the matter in order to show the House that the Canadian consumer is not up against the same heavy taxation as we are in Newfoundland. I was pointing out for instance for readymade clothing in Canada they only pay thirty per cent. on clothing coming in from the Old Country while we have to pay seventy per cent. Axes, they pay 15 per cent. coming in from England while in Newfoundland we pay 25 per cent. Paper bags, which everybody has to use, every shopkeeper, we pay 55 per cent., in Canada 15 per cent.; a difference of about 40 per cent. Wool blankets only 22½, and in Newfoundland 55 per cnt.; boots and shoes 17½ per cent., from the United States 22½ per cent., and coming into Newfoundland 55 per cent. Caps coming into Newfoundland cost 55 per cent., and into Canada 22½ per cent. Clocks and watches coming into Newfoundland 55 per cent., and to Canada only 20 per cent. Cocoa 3c. a lb., ad valorem in Canada. Collars and cuffs in Newfoundland 60 per cent., into Canada 35 per cent. Table linen 55 per cent here, in Canada 20 per cent. Embroideries only 12½ per cent. in Canada, and in Newfoundland 60 per cent.; 48 per cent. difference. Curtain nets 60 per cent. coming into Newfoundland, and only 25 per cent. going into Canada. Writing paper and envelopes 55 per cent. coming into Newfoundland, and 22½ per cent. coming into Canada from the Old Country and 32½ per cent. from the United States. Flannels into Canada 22½ per cent., and into Newfoundland 55 per cent. Spices going into Canada 10 per cent., and coming into Newfoundland 55 per cent. Automobiles going into Canada from England are taxed 22½ per cent., and from the United States 30 per cent, and coming into this country 55 per cent., plus 5 per cent. sales tax.

I could go on enumerating a lot of other items but I think I have shown to this House here that we are up against heavier taxation in this country than they are in Canada. Now we speak about the free list. The Finance Minister referred to kerosene oil, and gasolene coming in duty free. In Canada they have salt and molasses and other things in demand for the fisheries, fish hooks, nets and netting free of duty. Bananas, pineapple, or-

anges and other fruits not mentioned in the tariff, all come into Canada free of duty. There are lots of other items on the free list in the Canadian tariff, so that Newfoundland is not the sole exception where articles come in on a large scale free of duty.

The next thing that I want to get at is this. I want to show that it does not cost the same to the Canadian consumer as it does to the Newfoundland consumer, and why they do not require such a heavy duty. It is because the cost of the Government is not so great to the Canadian citizen as it is to the Newfoundland citizen. By reference to the fiscal statement of the Minister of Finance for Canada, last year the expenditure for the Dominion Government amounted to $320,660,499, of which the interest on the public debt was $130,690,000, or 40 per cent. of the total expenditure, while in Newfoundland the interest charge is 35 per cent. On agricultural and settlement there was expended in Canada $17,000,000, representing about 6 per cent. of the total expenditure. Newfoundland spent about 3 per cent. In connection with pensions they spend 12 per cent. of the total expenditure, and we spend about 8 per cent. On public works they spend about 4½ per cent. and we spend 12 per cent. On the postal department they spend about 10 per cent. and we about 12 per cent.

(Reads)

With a population of nine millions of people, and allowing five persons to a family, this would represent an average cost to the Canadian people per family of $178. Now our estimate of the total expenditure for the fiscal year 1927-28 is $10,074,000, or an average cost per fam ly in Newfoundland of $200. We are spending per family in this country $22 more than in Canada. In other words while it costs the Canadian family $178 to run the Government, it costs the Newfoundland family $200. And then we have to remember that the average earning power of the family in Canada is $850. Whilst the most you can say of the earning power of the Newfoundland fishermen is $600, or $250 less than the Canadian fishermen, yet he is paying $22 more for the running of his country than the Canadian family. I think that ought to command the serious thought of every member of this House, particularly when we look at the estimate of expenditure for 1927-28.:

(Reads)

It was said the other day in the House that the optimist sees the doughnut and the pessimist sees the hole. I believe in optimism as much as anyone. But everyone in this House ought to face the facts. I would like to take the same rosy view as the Finance Minister that the deficit will be only $850,000 the coming year. He estimates a return from the revenue of the customs of $7,800,000. The previous year, 1926-27 he estimated the amount at $7,500,000. Yet in his Budget Speech he says that the one million of a deficit for the past fiscal year was due to the lower prices of cotton goods that were imported into this country. Well they are not going to be any higher for 1927-28.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—They have gone up to some extent.

MR. GRIMES—But woollen goods have not gone up. It may be that a certain class of cotton goods have gone up in price. But there is not the same demand to-day for cotton goods as there was in the early part of the year. And we can only guess as to what is going to happen during the first part of next year. At the most there will be only ten per cent. of an increase all around. There may be $100,000 more duties collect-

ed next year in connection with cotton goods than there was last year. And then I would be taking a rosy view of the situation. But where are you going to make up the other $900,000 in connection with ad valorem duties. Now I can only put it down to the fact that the Finance Minister is estimating his revenue in this way in order to make as good a showing as possible in the money markets in order to be able to raise another $5,000,000. But if he wanted to state the truth, as to what is going to be the revenue on goods imported into this country for 1927-28, he would have down there not $850,000 of a deficit but at least $1,850,000. If we lost one million dollars last year in connection with goods coming in under the ad valorem rate, there is no reason to believe that we are going to gain on that by $100,000, if we gain that at all. We have $900,000 to make up from some other source. But there is no other source unless we establish the income tax and that would only help to a small extent. Even if we estimate the profits the same as last year, and are things going to be as good in this country throughout the coming year as they have been last year, and then they were none too well. But it is a fanciful picture to think that we are going to get the same amount of revenue from winter sales as we did last year, when the people have not got the money to spend and there is no indication at the present time that for the next six or seven months that trade conditions are going to be any better. If the reports from the Labrador fishery are correct, the prospect is anything but rosy as to what those engaged in the fishery are going to get for their summer's work. And it seems to me as if the Labrador fishery is going to be abandoned almost entirely next year, and the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and others engaged in that business know it better than I do. If the Labrador fishermen are only going to get three and a half or at the most four dollars a quintal for his fish he cannot make it pay. What is going to be the result. Are those men going to continue that fishery when they are not able to pay their bills. It is only natural to expect that you are going to see a large number of people that prosecute that fishery this year abandon it next year and what are we going to do then. If the greater portion of the people abandon that fishery there will be less returns from that direction. You may say, "We have Buchan's Mine." We will have railway building and we may have the International people in here, and operating on a larger scale at Corner Brook, but the utmost that we can expect in my estimation from all these operations is just the absorbing of the people who will be obliged to give up their fishing next year and will seek these occupations to tide themselves along. We will be in no better position than at present. It is a good thing to have those to relieve us from extra burden, but it will not avoid a further deficit in revenue greater than that anticipated in the Finance Minister's Budget. That is the reason why all men having a stake in this country and who want to see Newfoundland get out of the rut that the Government is in at the present time, with regard to heavy expenditure in connection with public works and positions in the various departments of the civil service, ought to get together and see if they cannot with co-operation, lessen the heavy expenditure in view of the declining earning power of the people of Newfoundland. I cannot see how any one gentlemen in this House can see anything but trouble for the next two or three years.

We are going to have an increased deficit, or at any rate the same deficit

as last year. And where is the country going to land to, faced with a position of that kind? I consider that it is up to every member that considers the welfare of his country to find some solution to this, and it can be found, providing it is possible, and I cannot see why any sensible men cannot see their way clear to make it possible to co-operate in lessening the public expenditure in running the Government of the country, and to co-operate upon some fishing policy that may enable our fishermen to get better returns than they are getting at the present time, in order that we may be able to find a new market for our fish. And if we do come together on that basis with the will to do it, I have no doubt but that we will be in a better position twelve months from now than we are at the present time. There are some matters in connection with the Budget Speech that I intend to refer to, and that is in connection with the Post Office. It happens that up there there are rules and regulations whereby parcels coming into this country had to be subject to inspection, and the duty collected upon inspection. I think that was a step in the right direction. The trouble is that there are so many abuses in connection with things coming into this country from outside, such as people getting their friends in the United States or in Canada to send down things and call them second-hand or personal effects, thereby getting it in duty free, and if that had been allowed to continue it would have been just as well for every business man in the country to shut up shop. I think that step was rightly taken when that was stopped, if the business man of this country was to be protected from importations in that way.

Now there was two thousand odd dollars spent on highroads, and the Government now intends to raise a loan of fiive million. Now with regard to the distribution of a certain portion of that loan for the different districts I think that outlying districts ought to be given consideration, particularly in the fishing settlements. It is well known that for the last couple of years a large amount of money has been expended in connection with the cutting of timber for the repairs of public wharves, and that we have been unable to get sufficient funds to complete the work. The only way that those can be completed is to allocate sufficient for the various districts in order that we may be able to send on the balance as required, in order to complete the work in connection with certain roads and public wharves, and I trust that the Government will give due consideration to those districts particularly in which fishermen are living, so that they may get what is absolutely required for the successful prosecution of the fisheries.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: Before these resolutions pass the Committee stage I would like to have a few words to say not because the resolutions themselves will materially affect the situation of the country, as regards taxation either one way or the other. The damage in that connection has been done long ago, and the actions of the Government have been well night irretrievable. I feel it my duty to say a word or two on this subject, and I intend to do so as far as I possibly can in an impart al spirit. If I were to follow the trend of the document that the Finance Minister delivered the other day, called the Budget Speech, I could be very partial in my remarks, because I consider the Budget Speech was nothing more or less outside of a few bald figures with regard to the financial conditions of the country, nothing more or less than a political document. In fact I will go so far as to say that now the Minister of Finance becomes the supreme and sole apologist for the Government and for their sins of omission and commission. And we have heard a great

deal of talk within these walls during this session, about the probability or the advisability of this country being called upon to have a general election in the autumn. I will say right here and now that judging from this Budget, it looks to me as if the Minister has issued, what may be called a Manifesto in advance. Now I did not hear the Finance Minister read his Budget Speech the other afternoon, but since he read it and since it has been printed and put into our hands I have taken the trouble to read it very seriously once or twice, and I have devoted much thought to some portions of that speech. I approach the subject of this Budget Speech this afternoon with mingled feelings of disappointment and despair, disappointment in that the Finance Minister was obliged to come down to this chamber and lay before the House such a terrible condition of affairs in this country at the present time as regards our financial position. Despair for another reason that I believe that during the time the present Finance Minister has held office he has exercised every means in his power to haul out of the pockets of the people of this country the last dollar that can be got in the way of taxation and revenue. And he has even gone so far as to boast about it. I do not know whether there is very much to boast about. True the amounts due the Government in various ways were collected. He has taken stringent efforts despite the great expense to the country to deal with the problem of smuggling. And on top of that he brought down in 1925 that iniquitious tariff, on which the Government stands more condemned than on any other policy. It can be said that the Finance Minister has been trying to squeeze out of the people of this country, the last dollar by way of revenue. I say therefore because of that I view it with despair. As regards the efforts being made to collect taxes, I believe the present Finance Minister has manfully exerted himself, and it is very possible that no finance minister will succeed him, that can do more in that particular direction than the present Minister has done. Therefore as we find conditions at the present time I am prone to ask, in all seriousness, how can we expect that conditions of things in this country are going to be so improved, that we will be able to cover up the enormous deficit of one million seven hundred thousand dollars, which the Finance Minister mentioned in his Budget Speech.

I heard the Leader of the Opposition here on opening day refer to the Speech from the Throne as the Government's obituary. I would go now so far as to say that if the Speech from the Throne was the Government's obituary, that this document that the Finance Minister read out here, be not only the obituary of the Government but the obituary of the country as well.

I realize that that is a somewhat serious aspect to take of things and I realize that it is a somewhat serious statement to make, but, as has been pointed out by Mr. Grimes, is it not a fact that we have arrived at a position to-day where every serious minded man in this country should make it his bounden duty to give the most earnest consideration to the financial condition of affairs that confronts us at the present time. After the present Government came into office in 1924 I was struck with the buoyant and confident attitude the Finance Minister adopted when he delivered his first Budget. Indeed I say sir, that the Finance Minister exulted himself not from the country's point of view, but from a political point of view and exult-

ed himself, as regards his own ability to take charge of the financial affairs of the country, to the extent that he came in to find a deficit of $1,600,000. H s present Budget bears ample testimony to the fact that he lost no occasion to hold up his predecessors in office to ridicule and contempt; he was buoyant and confident that he was the one man who was able to pull this country out of the financial mire that he found it in, and I for one was prepared to sit back and note the experiment he was about to perform so as to place this country on a sound and business-like basis. Three years have passed. Three years is a short period; but in three years we have learned too, although I would not like to be personal with the Finance Minister, and I can only ask that, in view of his Budget of 1924 as compared with his Budget of to-day, how have the mighty fallen. For example, I will quote from his Budget of 1924, in no sense of personal animosity towards the Finance Minister, in justice to the men whom I believe he traduced and whom he referred to so often as being responsible for deficits. He too now must rang amongst them, and he has found that the position he has had to deal with in managing the financial affairs of this country was not the easy task that it appeared to him when he was speaking on this side of the House a few short years ago. However, quoting from the Budget of 1924 he said:

(Reads)

Any member who sat in this House in 1924 and heard these words from the present Finance Minister could only suppose that he meant one thing and that is that we, the late Government, had been living too much on borrowed money and had not been making any attempt to make the country self-supporting, and the likely deduction from his remarks is that upon taking office he was going to make the bear to which he was referring and that he would no longer live on loans and that the garment would be cut according to the cloth. But, Sir, how has the Finance Minister and his Government lived up to those high ideals and those high expectations within those three short years. They have failed and woefully and miserably failed. Talking about a saternalia of expenditure, why the saternalia of expenditure that the Finance Minister referred to in his Budget of 1924 pales into insignificance as compared with the saternalia of expenditure that has occurred since he has taken power. And if there was a saternalia of expenditure going on before he took office there is absolutely no justification for such taking place within the past three years because, according to his own words, he was going to do away with it and bring about a condition of affairs that no such extravagance would any longer exist. In 1924, while he said that we had to meet deficits by borrowing, he hoped to exercise economy and change these deficits into surpluses. Since then we have no record of any substantial surpluses having taken place; in effect we have had no surpluses. Now I do not propose this afternoon to set up any position in that connection other than the figures as given us in the Budgeet; neither do I propose to question the figures of the Finance Minister or of the Auditor General. I am going to deal with the figures and take them for granted as correct and I think they will show that there are weak spots in the present Budget. To-day we are called upon to meet a deficit of over two million dollars, a deficit that was brought about by borrowing. Therefore, all this buoyancy and confidence that the Finance Minister boasted of has been shattered; and

am I not justified in asking has he been weighed in the balance and found wanting, and how has the mighty fallen? I say this in no spirit of animosity to the Finance Minister; but I say it in justice to the men who preceded him in office and to the men whom he and his colleagues traduced in 1924. The present Government have made a terrible hash of the financial situation of this country, and there is no disputing the fact that your chief stock in trade during the campaign in connection with the general election of 1924 was the weakness of your predecessors over the way they had managed the affairs of this country. Here are a few excerpts from the Prime Minister's Manifesto on that point:

(Reads)

As regards the Budget which we now have before us, the outstanding criticism which I would urge against it is that the Finance Minister has made no effort or no attempt to balance his Budget. In this Budget Speech he has quoted the financial position of Great Britain and referred to Mr. Churchill and the problems he had to deal with as Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Old Country. He has also referred to the position in Western Australia and South Africa. Now anyone who reads of current politics in the Old Country or of any of its Dominions must be struck with the fact that, whilst it may be correct that each of the countries already mentioned may have been faced with deficits, in no one instance will you find a case where a Finance M nister has not attempted to balance his Budget. That is the outstanding criticism against our Budget and it leads me to the conclusion that the present Finance Minister is impotent as to where he is going to find the ways and means to balance his Budget. We are now in Committee on Ways and Means, which is a misnomer, as there are no Ways and Means being devised to balance this deficit of ours. You are merely re-enacting the Revenue Act of 1925-26. The Finance Minister seems very much put out because there is so much talk circulated about our financial position; but has he not himself sent abroad the most damaging propaganda to the financial future of this country when he sent out to the world a Budget showing a deficit of $1,800,000.00 and without showing where or how he proposed to meet that deficit? Now if that is not a damaging statement and a statement damaging the country's credit, I would like to know what is. Another very interesting aspect of this Budget is the way in which the Finance Minister reduces the deficit on last year's account, namely $1,750,000 to $800,000 for next year. But how does he make allowance for it? The Budget does not show. He anticipates an increase of Customs Revenue of $500,000; he expects to get $15,000 more for the current fiscal year than last year from Postal Revenue; $5,000 more from Telegraph Revenue; $12,000 increase from Crow Lands Revenue; $55,000 extra fees from public institutions. During the period I have been a member of this House I have tried to give some serious attention to most of the propositions that have come before the House, and it is news to us to learn that you are going to derive $55,000 extra revenue from public institutions for the next year. I trust the Minister will take note of that point, as I would like to know on what ground he makes his estimate. But assuming he does get the increases in the channels he allows for, I can only figure up a total of $550,000, whereas the Minister makes it $850,000. Now I should like to know the ways and means he is going to adopt whereby he will get an extra $550,000 from the directions

mentioned? That is another criticism aginst his Budget and I should like the Finance Minister to clear the matter up in the House before these Resolutions go through. This Budget has been discussed from this side of the House very extensively and very well and it was not my intention this afternoon to make any lengthy remarks beyond dealing with a couple of main points, and there are a few pertinent questions I would like to address to the Finance Minister. I have already said that I was one person who was prepared in 1924 to watch the Finance Minister experimenting in uprighting the ship of state, as he had promised the electorate. Now if ever any Government had a mandate from the electors of a country to deal with the various financial propositions of the country, the present Government surely had. They had a mandate in no uncertain terms to reduce taxation and reduce expenditure and to put the sh p of state on an even keel in that respect. The task they found, no doubt, was not so easy as they anticipated when they went to the country seeking to remove their predecessors from office and they have since learned that a promise is one thing and the carrying out of that promise is another thing, and the moral of it is that a promise not made is better than a promise not put into effect. The Finance Minister of today, after three years of office, has made no effort to put the pledge of the Monroe party into effect. The Government in 1924 had a golden opportunity to put in the pruning knife and reduce expenditure, but that opportunity has passed and lost sight of and what is the use of further discussing the question at this late day; still, despite all that, the Finance Minister should have made some attempt to balance his Budget this year. Where is the Income Tax and the Business Profits Tax, which we were told in the beginning of the session were to be placed on the Statute Book. We were told in the Speech from the Throne on the 11th day of May last that there would be a deficit and with a view to avoiding any possible future deficit we would be called upon to reenact in amended form the Income Tax Act of 1924. There is no indication in this Budget or in the Resolutions before the Committee that the Government has any intention whatever of carrying out what was promised in the Speech from the Throne. The Government, apparently have foresworn the Income Tax Act. For what reason I do not know. Something has intervened, and people who know better than I do aver that there are men in the Government ranks who have come out as political gunmen. At all events, I presume somebody got their wind up and the Government have altered their plan as regards the reimposition of the Income Tax Act. The Finance Minister has a deficit of $1,850,000 to meet next year, whereas if the income tax was enforced that deficit would be considerably lessened. Has political expediency or gun play, call it what you like, been the reason for foregoing the reimposition of the income tax? If the Government is going to be tripped up by the whims and caprices of any one individual of the Government, then you are no longer fit to govern this country. You were well advised and your intentions were good when you thought you had to impose the Income Tax Act, but the sad thing about it is that even if you had enforced the Income Tax Act and got an extra revenue of $350,000 say from that source you would still not be able to give the people of the country a corresponding lightening of their burden. Another aspect of

the Budget is that I would like to know what condition of affairs the Finance Minister expects to arise whereby if he had a deficit for last year of $1,750,000 that that deficit is going to be reduced to $850,000 next year. Take an average duty of 60 per cent. and the revenue from that must be the amount by which you expect the earning power of the people to be improved within the next twelve months and which I should say would be $1,500,000. But I would like to hear from the Finance Minister how he can figure out the earning power of the people is going to increase $1,500,000 in that respect within the next six months, because that is about all the time you got to run now? I contend, Sir, it is all political kite flying. Then again your Budget talks about all the labor that is going to take place at the Buchan's Mine and the Humber because of recent agreements that went through this Legislature. No such thing will happen whilst it will take years before the Gander starts.

I notice in the estimates of last year the Finance Minister in estimating the revenue provided for something like eighty-eight thousand dollars for interest on guaranteed loans and in the estimate of this year he left that entirely out of consideration. That is another point I would like to have cleared up, because last year if the Finance Minister could put in eighty-eight thousand interest on guaranteed loans he would be able to do so this year unless these people became defunct. I would like to hear the Finance Minister say a word on that later in the Committee. The Finance Minister told us when he brought down the Budget that he was going to lay the true conditions obtaining in the country before the House. I trust he has done so. Another point is brought to mind. You tell us you had a deficit of $1,750,000, I don't deal now with the railway, and yet I see one item in the loan for $1,900,000, to pay the deficit. I cannot understand if your deficit is only $1,750,000, why you are going to borrow $1,900,000 to pay it even though you have accounts not yet complete I know. These are a few points that have occured to me as I have gone along and have read the Budget and a few technicalities that I would like to see cleared up. In concluding I want to reiterate what I have already said this afternoon and on other occasions that I believe you are making a mistake in that you are neglecting the goose that lays the golden egg. You are forecasting operations on the Humber and Gander and at Buchan's Mine and these and various other industries are going to be the solution of our problems and the panacea of all our ills. I think not. I think that what you have to concentrate on if you are six months in office or whoever succeeds you in office is the question of the fisheries. You are never going to get the returns by various methods in this country out of pulp and paper or mines even with all due respect to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the returns are not in the same proportion as you are going to get out of the fisheries. The majority of the people of the country to-day are fishermen. Two-thirds of our exports to-day are fishery products; and that is a lesson that you as a Government seem to fail to learn. Your increase of tariff in 1925 was a step in the wrong direction. Not only was it wrong because of the hardship placed on the people of the country but it was economically unsound. You know it yourselves and Hansard will prove that time and again you have spoken in this House to the effect that you d d not believe higher tariff was the best way of procuring revenue.

If I mistake not you always contended that a lower taxation would produce more revenue than an increase of taxation could possibly hope to do. There are good and sound economic reasons for taking that point of view but I do not propose to discuss them this afternoon. Try and exert yourselves to increase the earning power of the people. Throw away a million if you can do something worth while to encourage the fisheries. If you can discover something to improve our markets and increase the earning power of the people you will not have to be coming in here borrowing money to pay deficits. You are neglecting the thing that ought be your first attention. You are neglecting what was the main theme of your Manifesto, the encouragement of the fisheries. You started in good. Your intentions were good. They say that hell is paved with good intentions. I wont go so far as to say you have gone there. I wish some saviour of Newfoundland would arise in our midst to-day; and there is a seat here he could have. If he could come and show me where he could put us in a better shape financially there is a seat here he can have and I will take off my coat and go to the district and help him be elected. When you were elected your intentions were good enough but the sad thing about it is your intentions had no practical effect; that the fisheries were not given attention. The Finance Minister is optimistic as regards the price of fish. All I have got to say is I hope he will be right. If he is taken seriously by everybody what is going to happen is that all the fishermen are going to hold back their fish until the good prices come that Sir John Crosbie has promised in his Budget remarks. I am not in the same position in connection with the industry as Sir John Crosbie, but I do not hold the same views as he in that respect. Every year we have had a large catch of fish in September and if the weather holds good and bait is procurable it will be large this year. The Labrador fishery is exceptionally good too. I don't see how the fishermen can get at present one dollar more than they got last year though I hope they will get a good advance on last year's prices. Take last year's prices. I doubt if the average Shore fish is going to be higher. The fishermen barely got seven dollars last year and at seven dollars had an expenditure of ten million dollars. Somebody has got to be taken by the scruff of the neck before the fight is over. Somewhere a Government must eventually arise; a Government determined to bring reforms into effect and take the consequences. Before that is done somebody will have to be taken by the scruff of the neck and there may be some squealing. With regard to the Budget if things are to be straightened out you have got to do something to put up the price of fish. Get Labrador fish up to five dollars and Shore fish above seven and with the catch of fish this year we will pull through. You will not increase the catch of fish with those prices under these circumstances I fail to see how Newfoundland can be pulled out of the financial mess it is in at the present time. I fail to see it.

No, sir, we have got to concentrate on the increasing of the earning power of the people, not merely by sending them to Buchan's or the Humber, or into the Gander to work. They must still engage in the fisheries. is their only hope of salvation. Keep on enacting tariffs and increasing taxation. It is all to no avail. How much beter off are we to-day for the tariff of 1925? Not one bit. In 1924 you came in and started to raise a furore over the deficit of the previ-

ous administration, and here to-day you are faced with a deficit of one million seven hundred thousand dollars yourselves. In spite of the millions that you borrowed, you are still coming in here and asking us to give you permission to borrow more, and bringing us back to 1924 conditions, which you claimed were so bad. These are only a few brief remarks, and I have only given expression to a few of my own opinions that occurred to me as I read the Budget. But as I said before if I wanted to make a political speech on that Budget delivered by the Minister of Finance, I could hold up the House for four or five hours, if I wanted to do so because there is the material here at my disposal. But I only gave expression to a few general opinions and I hope that I will be answered by the Finance Minister before the Committee rises.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I just want to ask a few questions before the debate goes any further. What is this amount of $250 paid to Mr. Keating in connection with the Budget so far, for?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I will find out the explanation.

MR. CASHIN—What services would he be doing?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Probably getting together the figures.

MR. CASHIN—Is that an annual thing?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—I think it has always been done.

MR. CASHIN—Why was it not in the estimates?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—There are a lot of things not in the estimates.

MR. CASHIN—Exactly, that is what I am getting at. We find that in the Upper House the Leader of the Government according to the estimates should be geting $250, and then why does he get $650? Are we in earnest or are we playing with ourselves down here. Every civil servant in the four wall of this House is receiving two, three or four hundred dollars in addition to his voted salary.

(Reads)

How long is this going to last. Every member in this House to-day is just as much entitled to a bonus as these fellows are.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman: Mr. Keating is a man that if you want to go in and do business with him you have to go in with brass knuckles on. And then this man gets $300 of a bonus last year. I think that it is time for this to stop somewhere. I did not know anything about him until this afternoon. These gentlemen should not receive any money only what they earn. Now I do not know whether Mr. Keating earned that or not, but I think that we have a lot of widows and orphans in Ferryland District that should get the money that is going to Mr. Keating.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS — Mr. Chairman: I would like to add a few remarks to the discussion. This House has been in session now for four months. Now I do not know whether this House has any control over the officials of the Legislature, but I must say this that those officials have spent the summer here, and it is too late now to earn anything for the balance of the season. The opportunity has gone, and I think that this House ought to take that into consideration, and that they ought to be provided with a little extra pay. I think we will all agree on that. I think we ought to be disinterested enough and honest enough to see that they get some remuneration, more than they have been receiving as their usual amount. I do not think that it will be waste or extravagance.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: For the explanation of members I may say that there is one point about the payment to Mr. Keating and Mr. Mews. I have no knowledge of that, because it is outside the scope of the Internal Economy Commission. There is nothing unusual or remarkable about the payments to both branches of the Legislature. The actual fact is that for these payments the Government accepts the recommendation of the Internal Economy Commission. Members on both sides of the House will appreciate what happens year after year. There has grown up the practice and I do not say it is a good practice, that if the session is prolonged, there has been this bonus system. As a matter of fact it is only fair to say this now that the officials of the House after a session that has occupied four months have no hesitation in expecting similar consideration. But the Internal Economy Commission has nothing to do in any shape or form with any payment either to Mr. Mews or to Mr. Keating. But I do know that in actual fact what happened last year was that because of the length of the session, representation was made by hon. members on both sides of this House, so far as outport representatives were concerned, that is members living in the outports, allowance was made to them because of the additional expenses that they were under. Reporters of the House, the Clerks and officials generally, all in accordance with this system were graded in that direction. In actual fact as regards the Leader of the Government in the Upper House, for that position he is voted $250 and as a member of the House he is voted another $250. Now as regards the many officials. Mr. Janes has been mentioned as supervisor, and the door-keepers, etc., that the gentlemen have referred to, these are all handled by the Internal Economy Commission. I do not say that it is a good practice. But it is only fair to remember this. Take the position of a reporter here. He is down at $210. A reporter to come in and spend four months in the House at a salary of $210. I think that it will be recognized that that is not adequate remuneration. Neither is $100 adequate remuneration for a doorkeeper. Now the practise has grown up and I do not say that it has originated recently; I knew it many years ago when I was speaker of the House. The circumstances were exactly the same. That is why these small amounts were put down. It was felt that if the session were short that it would be sufficient remuneration. But it was always felt that the best idea would be, that instead of increasing the amounts to let this system prevail. It is questionable as to whether it is good or bad. It has its disadvantages, but it has this advantage that it really puts one in the position as to whether when the session is four months for example, we are not justified in giving a bonus to the officials of the House. I am not discussing the individual aspect of it. I am only dealing with the principle. The Government will have to make up its mind that as long as it goes on as a deliberate assembly, meeting here year after year, and meeting for a very much longer period than the officials are paid for, that you will have people expecting to get remuneration. Nothing has been done that is in any way different from what was done in the past.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: With regard to the remarks made by the Hon. the Minister of Justice and in reply to the Minister of Justice I may say that I have made no comment regarding door-keepers, nor about reporters either. But I would say this

in reply to the Hon. the Minister that when you do give a bonus to these door-keepers that you will treat them all in the same way and not give one individual $125 more than the other fellow, as you did last year. Now with regard to the point that I was trying to get at and I am not trying to get at the under-dog. But I do object to the individual with a great big fat bank roll, who goes into the House of Lords of Newfoundland and with a salary that is supposed to be only nominal, he also gets $200, or $300 of a bonus. I am after the fellows getting huge salaries and who are not civil servants of the country, and they are not entitled to any extra money whatever. The Minister of Justice admits that it is all wrong and then why is it done. Every member on both sides of this House are just as much entitled to a bonus as they are, just as much entitled as the Chairman of debates or anyone else. But you found it convenient to pick the men to whom you were going to give it last year. It was done conveniently. Partizanship was exercised with regard to the extra amounts that were paid by the Internal Economy Commission, whoever that body is composed of . Whoever they are they have got to learn something with regard to economy.

MR. MOORE — Mr. Chairman: I would like to say one word in connection with the remarks of the Minister of Justice. He stands up here and tries to draw a red herring across the trail. He tries to bring politics in here. I want to disassociate myself from having said on insinuated anything with regard to door-keepers, reporters or officials of this House. contend that they are not getting enough. But it is the men that are getting $3,600 here that I am after. Mr. Mews or Mr. Keating. Why should these men be getting a bonus of $300 or $400 a year. As I stated before in the District of Ferryland there are widows and orphans up there, who cannot get enough to keep body and soul together.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the Prime Minister if any highroads have been constructed this year in any district, and if so, from where the money came to pay for it?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — There has been some money spent in Trinity Bay and Bay de Verde districts in connection with highroads work that started last year.

MR. CASHIN—That bears out my point. There was very little money spent in Ferryland district where highroads work started last summer. I have been arguing on this point for the past few weeks trying to get work resumed in my district, and I was frequently told by the Government that there was no money available and that no highroads woudl be done until the Loan Bill is passed. Politics is at the bottom of the whole thing. You are building roads through wildernesses in other parts of the country and I cannot get anything done for the main line of road in my district. There is also highroad work going on now at Outer Cove and no one but the political friends of the Government members for St. John's East can get a job there. Then we are told in this House that the Highroads Commission is a non-political body. Why it it a tool for the Government. The fact of the matter is that the Government is robbing the money from my district to give it to somebody else. The Government do not know the meaning of the word decency, according to the treatment they mete out to Opposition members in this House, and if Ministers of the Crown paid more attention to their ministerial duties the country would

not be in the financial mess it is in to-day. Now I am going to get up here and talk for the rights of my people until I am sick, whether the Government likes it or not. I want to ask the Finance Minister if the Government have taken any steps to remove this fellow Green from Cape Broyle. He is a public nuisance and should not be there, and he is paid $1,200.00 a year, besides drawing a fat pension from the Militia Department, to satisfy certain Executive members of the Government. Green was put in Cape Broyle for services rendered the Minister of Justice on Bell Island four or five years ago. He is now an eyesore to the people up there in my district and I want an assurance that he is going to be removed before this loan Bill goes through. Mr. Chairman, it is public robbery to pay this fellow $1,200.00 for doing nothing, except drive around in a motor car all day; whilst his superior officer in the Customs there who has all the work to do gets only $800.00 a year altogether. But the worst part of all is that Green was trying to get the Sub-Collector's job in Ferryland, a man who has been in the job for 30 years and a man who knows more about Customs work than the Minister himself. I made a statement here the other day and I make it again, that the whole thing is false, and the man who wrote it and the man who read it to this House knows that it is false. I have never seen in my experience before I became a member of this House, and when I used to come here to listen to the debates, I have never seen a Finance Minister so degrade his position as the present Finance Minister has done.

The Finance Minister would no more go on a platform in St. John's West to-day than he would go and jump overboard; but he foisted a fellow named Green on the people of Cape Broyle, and he came in here, although he was short of revenue and unable to pay his bills, and took off the income tax and he put on 15 per cent additional taxation on the common necessaries of life and gave extra protection to manufacturers of butterine, tobacco and lines and twines. If any members of the present Government benefitted directly though that kind of legislation they should be impeached and if they benefitted indirectly they should be thrown out of office. I am now going to appeal to the Prime Minister this evening to have this individual Green taken out of Cape Broyle. I do not want to have to remove him, because that is what eventually will happen, if the Government does not transfer him now to where he came from or somewhere else. After all, who is paying Green's salary any way, the taxpayers of the country or are members of the Government paying it?

MR. ASHBOURNE.—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to hold any night sessions? I understood that we are going on and finish the Budget this evening and take up the Loan Bill and discuss it to-morrow. I think it is only fair that we should have a few night sessions in order to finish up the business of the House, as we have had only one night session thus far. Unless we have a few night sessions I do not think we can hope to have the business of the House finished this week. This argument was put up before to the Government, but at that time they were working overtime on these big industrial measures that went through recently; but I consider now we are not working conscientiously in the interest of the country unless we go on to-night.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS.—I want to make a few remarks just now in connection with the matter of Mr. Green whom Mr. Cashin has been referring to. This Green was not put in by Mr. Higgins. I want to point out why he is there. Mr. Green was taken into the service for certain work and he gave out and was transferred to Cape Broyle. I am told by Mr. LeMessurier he was sent there because he belonged there and being a returned soldier I didn't feel like having him dismissed. If Mr. Cashin has any complaint to make he can give the particulars and I can take the matter up and see justice done. He became sick when at the work he was engaged for and I allowed him to be transferred to Cape Broyle. I think in fairness to Green and fairness to us if Mr. Cashin wants to make any charge he should do so in proper manner and state exactly what complaint he has or if he has done any wrong.

MR. CASHIN.—I don't know any wrong but he is not doing any good. The man who was tidewaiter there was tidewaiter six months out of the year and received sixty dollars a month. Now why bring in another man and put him in for twelve months out of the year at a hundred a month I would just put the question is that retrenchment?

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

On motion the remaining orders of the day were deferred.

MR. RANDALL,—Mr. Speaker, if I may have permission there is a subject I would like to speak on for a moment before the House closes. I refer to the great damage caused by the storm during the past week and I would like to ask the Government how it is we don't get a better report from Toronto, if we are paying for such, than we have been getting the past week. Now as I understand it there was no weather forecast given this country of that storm. I see here in the estimates a vote of $700.00 for meteorological service and then last week when we should have had notification of a severe storm approaching the coast we had no intimation of any such thing whatever. Now I think if we are paying for information of this kind we should get it. And I would like to point out while I am on my feet that this country more especially this time of the year is more dependent on weather conditions perhaps than any other in the world. It is true many of our fishermen may be away from the land and not benefit from a weather forecast at some time when they needed informatin, but that does not apply to all and if correct information were available some at least of such disasters as we have had in the past week might be averted.

MR. DUFF.—I would like to add a word to what Captain Randall has just said. It is a very serious matter not to have that forecast and I feel it is a matter that should be looked into. There was a ship in Harbour Grace that had no notification of that storm in the weather report that it had got and it is hard to understand why we should not have it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—I am glad the matter has been raised in the House. I suppose it is a difficult matter for Toronto or anywhere else to forecast weather conditions but at the same time it is very difficult to understand how a thing of that kind could have hap-

pened or why there wouldn't be some previous knowledge of a storm of that kind.

The telegraph offices have instructions as I understand to send forward all messages that come along, and I did not know until the Minister of Agriculture and Mines mentioned it, that this system has been discontinued. I understand that now all these weather reports are forwarded by the telegraph offices as they come in. However, we will have an enquiry made with regard to that. Now we will take up the matter with the Toronto people and find out why this particular storm that was coming this way was not forecasted so that we could have been better informed. I may say that as far as I understand fifty or sixty lives have been lost as a result of the storm and the Government may have to render some assistance to those who have been bereft of their support. I think that possibly we may have to bring the matter before the House. It is really one of the worst disasters that have occurred in this country for a long time. It is very distressing to feel that quite possibly some of these might not have been lost if the telegraph information had been more defiinite.

MR. LAKE.—Mr. Speaker, — A couple of years ago I had occasion to bring up before the House of Assembly this matter of outport news. The compiler of the public despatch used to embody in that despatch the weather forecast from Toronto that was twenty-four hours old. I was interested in getting that forecast wired on, so that it would arrive at noon time. Now the public despatch is compiled in the morning, therefore the forecast that is sent out is the forecast of the day previous. Now I think that if the Government will see to it that that forecast is sent out specially in the afternoon, they will be doing a great service to the fishermen of this country. When I was in Sydney on my way east a few weeks ago, the storm was forecasted there, and all the steamers in port were notified, and messages were sent down to the various vessels not to leave port.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I unite with what has been said by the different speakers but I am afraid that on this occasion that even if the forecast had come along, there were a great many boats out of Cape St. Mary's and there was no way of getting the forecast. Possibly if the lighthouses on the headlands could put up storm signals, when anything like that is coming along, it would be very useful. Because many of the ships are just off the land and if they could see the storm signals, they would probably be able to make port. Possibly that might be considered.

It was moved and seconded that when the Houses rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Tuesday, August 30th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 30, 1927.

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

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Cahill took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, yesterday it was suggested that the Committee should adjourn until to-day thinking that there might be some members on this side who had not yet spoken, and that they might like to say a few words. Personally I have not much to say. What I have to say

will be in a few words as I think that we should endeavour to get through the session, as it is important at this time of the year that we should get away from this House of Assembly. However, I think that it would be unfair to the dignity of the House if good and just criticism were not made in reference to the Budget. The day on which the Finance Minister delivered his budget I was not in the House, and consequently I did not hear him make his speech. Since then I have read it in pamphlet form. Before I had read it and as soon as I looked at it I knew that it was a poor budget. It is a terrible state of affairs to present to the country, and I would not like to be sitting in the chair of the Minister of Finance to-day after the horrible mess that he and his Government have made of this country, and its affairs. They continually harp on the deficit left over by a previous Government, and they have brought that up at every session right through to the present one. I would like to know what will be the position of affairs in this country, when the present Government gives it over to somebdy else. I predict that it will be far worse than when they took it ocer. During your tenure of office you have borrowed already eleven and a half millions of dollars, and now you are about to bring in a loan for another five or six millions. That would bring your borrowing for the short time that you have been in office up to sixteen or seventeen million dollars. In other words when you have taken authority to borrow another five or six millions now it will be nearly half a million per month which you have borrowed since you have been in office and for which you have had to tax the people of this country to pay the interest. The Finance Minister has estimated a deficit of $850,000 added to which must be the deficit on the railway, of a similar amount which means that we are heading down hill all the time. The Finance Minister has made no attempt whatever to balance his budget. He shows us nowhere where he can get the money to finance the country or the department so that he can balance it. It means that he has got to keep borrowing to pay the interest. Now when the House opened this year the Speech from the Throne was read and this is a part of the speech.

(Reads)

Now that speech was not only given to this legislature, but I am reading it now from the Journal of the Parliaments of the Empire. It has gone broadcast throughout the British Empire. It was understood that you were to re-enact legislation to repeal the income tax of 1924. You stated this in the Speech from the Throne. Now whether it was right or wrong to put it on, I am not prepared to say, but the fact remains that you have made a statement and then you have fallen down on it, because you have been defeated in your own ranks like you have on many other occasions on legislation that you brought before this House. I claim that the Government was defeated long ago on this point, if on nothing else, and you had no right to carry on the affairs of this country, if you could not amongst your own ranks put into effect legislation that was proposed.

Now in reference to the bills that have passed this legislature quite recently in reference to the International Company. We are still under an obligation of $10,000,000. What happened is that if the Government had taken the proper stand we could have had ourselves relieved of the obligation. I have already stated that it would not have been very difficult for the International Paper Co. to borrow £6,000,000, instead of £4,000,000, of which £2,000,000 could be used to pay off the indebtedness to the bond holders, and which was guaranteed by the Government of Newfoundland. That

guarantee can be written down as a debt on this country.

It strikes me that if we do not have to pay the interest in the near future, still we have an obligation of $10,000,000, which we will have to pay when the bonds mature. The Prime Minister has told us several times during this session, that any timber lands that reverted to the Crown would be sold for the benefit of Newfoundland and the revenue. I put a question on the order paper a few days ago and I got the information that the Government have disposed of 132 square miles of timberlands, for which they have received about $6,700. Eighty-five thousand acres of timber lands, which they can sell to-day for $85,000. If the Government and the Prime Minister were sincere and they have the interests of the country at heart I see no reason why they would not put those timber properties up for auction, and dispose of them in a way that this country would get some benefits from them. It is very misleading and particularly for us on this side of the House, and I think that the Government in many respects are not doing their best, when disposing of what I call the assets of this country for very little, and we do not see any real results from it. It is no use my discussing the financial condition of the country, because I really do not know what it is. I doubt whether anyone, particularly on this side of the House, knows what that position is. We have had figures given us, changed and jumbled and it is very difficult for us to understand just where we stand at the present time. But one thing I do know and it is that we are heading down hill as fast as we can, and unless this country can produce some revenue from sources that we have not just now, that very soon we will have to stop. Because we will be insolvent and unable to pay our obligations. Now in 1913 this country required $4,000,000 to carry on, that is to pay the interest on our debt and overhead expenses, to-day we are asking for $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 and we cannot see any new resources on any side, and it is evident that in the near future something will have to be done.

Ever since you came into power you have confirmed thirty-seven new pensions and now you have another Bill here for twenty more new pensions. You have also increased the staffs and salaries in the various departments whilst at the same time you have collected less revenue. Now we cannot expect in the very near future to collect any more duty than last year through the Government because the people of this country have not got the purchasing power and are therefore unable to buy the goods and the importers are unable to buy as they used and the country has to lose the revenue. I think it would be time well spent for the Finance Minister to go into the matter of adjusting tariff, as there are certain things that need to be changed, and certain things that he must be aware of, in the interest of Newfoundland. I do not know whether or not it is the intention of the Government to introduce any more new legislation at this session, as I hope that some effort will be made to have the House close by the end of the present week because some members on this side of the House have no time to attend to legislative duties at this particular season of the year.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, after reading the Budget Speech I was struck with one or two main thoughts. These are that what the country needs mostly is a Government that is prepared to retrench and a Government that will take into concern the increasing of the purchasing power of the people as a whole, of Newfoundland. It has been argued that the matter of the exportation of our fish products is a matter which concerns the fishermen and the exporters; but, accord-

ing to the Budget we have before us, it now assumes a national problem and a problem which it should be the duty of the Government to face and to tackle. To-day we find that there is going to be a very large Labrador fishery and we are led to believe that the price will be $4.00 per quintal and probably less off the coast. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that at that price the Labrador fishery cannot be prosecuted at a profit. What are you doing about this problem as a Government? And what are we doing about it as members of this House? It appears that we are leaving it to mere chance instead of investigating it with a view to seeing whether or not something cannot be done to increasing the purchasing power of the people in this regard. The problem of the Newfoundland fisheries is a big one and I maintain that it is a difficult one to attempt to solve; but as regards the Labrador fishery I believe it would be an easy matter to effect some rules and some standards because it is all of one cure so to speak and I think something could be done to stabilize the Labrador fishery, either by pooling the entire catch of codfish or by going into the matter as regards marketing of our products, otherwise in a year or so we will have no Labrador fishery being carried on because the people who prosecute that industry will be so disappointed that they will not go at it any more. Now where do we as a fishing country fit in at the present time? We find to-day that the markets for Labrador fish are very restricted and we find that Spain is getting trawlers of her own. There has been a large Tuna fishery this year in Spain and this interferes with the price of our fish to some extent, and still the Government is contented to go on and not take any active part in trying to solve the problem, which, I maintain now, has become a national problem in that the purchasing power of our people has become so small that the Government is unable to see any hope of being able to balance the Budget this year. Take the herring fishery, which very soon will be a thing of the past. I consider it is the duty of the Government to try and do something to help that fishery. Then take the matter of the much talked of Fordney Tariff in the United States. I do not know but that it would be a good thing to put a duty on everything coming in here from the United States in order to show the Americans that while they are having the Fordney Tariff protecting themselves against our fishing interests that we are taxing American products that come in here as well.

I think, sir, that the cost of running the Government in this country is too high. The Prime Minister said that the financial problem of the country is one that will need to be grappled with by some Government who will have to make an appeal to the people as to the firm stand they contemplate taking in that connection; but what is the good to go to the country on a plea of retrenchment to save the Colony from a disaster which menaces it, as the Monroe Government proclaimed in 1924, and then come back and not retrench. The Monroe Government was given a mandate from the people to retrench and that is why the people to-day are wondering if we have the men available in Newfoundland that will go into office and cut down expenditure. I contend that if we have not got the men in this country we ought to get them from somewhere else and let us have either a Royal Commission or a Crown Colony to be governed by, if the proper men are not available. The time has come when we want to get the best brains the Colony can command in order that we may be taken out of our present position and be put on the right road, so that if we have not the men available in this country to do it we should get them from somewhere

else. With regard to the Railway, I would like to know why it is that a railway that cost four million dollars to build has created a liability of twenty million dollars on our hands? Has the Government gone into the matter of deficits on the railway and have they attempted to retrench in that direction? Have they made any effort to cut down the expenses of running the railway and why are such huge salaries paid railway employees when this country and this House have voted moneys to meet an annual deficit of nearly a million dollars a year in connection with the operations of the railroad. If the railway was running at a profit we could afford to pay big salaries probably, but when it is running at a loss I think it is the duty of the Government to cut down expenses. Altogether Mr. Chairman, there are a great many people in this country who consider that we are in a very sorry plight. We have before us the cold facts as outlined by the Finance Minister and it is a matter of grave concern to every member of this House and to the people throughout the Colony as a whole. The question is where are we bound from here and are we on the right road? If we are not on the right road, the quicker we get on it the better for all concerned. The difficulties and the problems that confront us are such that a great many people are wondering if we would not do better if we were not under Responsible Government. We cannot as far as I can see go on forever borrowing year after year, and if we go on borrowing and cannot meet our expenses where are we going to land?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE —Mr. Chairman, before concluding the Budget I would like to make a few passing comments. As far as I am personally concerned I do not intend to deal with personalities in connection with the discussion that has taken place on the Budget. I want to thank the members of the Opposition who criticised this Budget fairly and straightforwardly. I believe they were sincere in their utterances and I believe that they are just as sincere as I am over the financial affairs of the Colony. As Minister of Finance I have now brought in my fourth Budget during my experience of three and a half years in that position, and in making up the present Budget now before the Committee I was perfectly prepared to let the people of Newfoundland know the actual and true financial position of the country. Finance Ministers in the past, as well as those of to-day, have been accused more or less of trying to "doctor" financial statements. Perhaps things have been done to help matters along in the hope that the future would show up that the situation is not as bad as it really looked; but, sir, I have no regrets to make to-day for the Budget I have produced or over the criticisms of the Opposition on this Budget. I give the position of Newfoundland's finances to-day, as I find it, to my fellow-countrymen. The statement in the Budget of the debt and the loan is the exact position of the financial affairs of this Colony, and I defy contradiction, and any one who doubts that statement can go to the Bank of Montreal where they will get a certificate showing that my figures are absolutely correct in every particular, and any amount of twisting figures cannot alter the facts that I have submitted to the House.

After my three and a half years' experience as Finance Minister of the Colony I have to say that I must agree with Mr. Halfyard when he said "where are we going and whither tending"? I have no doubt but that some day in the not distant future this country is going to meet its Waterloo unless you are prepared to get a body of men to come in here and cut down expenditure in the public service by two millions of dollars a year. There is the problem to be grappled

with. Some members here will say cut down and cut out salaries and do other things in certain directions, but they do not seem prepared to do it themselves. If you go down to any department in the civil service to-day and use the pruning knife, the cry will go forth immediately that certain people were turned on the street; and what are you going to do about it? Unless you get people big enough to come in here and use drastic measures you are not going to cut down expenditure in the way some people imagine you can at the present time. I do not think that the country's condition financially can improve until the earning power of the people is increased to enable them to pay taxes to the revenue. That is the only hope, as I see it, that the Colony got to depend on to-day, and my hope for the increasing of the earning power of the people is in the development of Buchan's Mine and the operation of the paper mills of the International Paper Company, of world wide reputation, at Corner Brook. The operation of the mines and paper mills will provide means for the fishermen to augment their incomes. For instance, take a fisherman who goes to the Labrador and makes a couple of hundred dollars. Now after the voyage is over he will have an opportunity to increase his earning power by working in the mines or in the mills during the winter season and incidentally help to bring in revenue to the country. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel a bit depressed for not increasing taxation to meet deficits. I believe if I had I would be severely criticised here for doing it. With regard to the tariff, I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that the tariff could be adjusted. Men whom I consulted on the matter say everything is alright, but the moment he is taxed everything is all wrong. As to the fishery, I believe every member in this House is sincere about it and are anxious to see it resuscitated. I am not able to advance one myself and I have yet to hear of a practical way to handle this much vexed problem. It is all very well to suggest, but when you undertake to carry out that suggestion in connection with the fishery it is an entirely different matter. The one great stumbling block in regard to our codfish is the cost of catching it, whilst on the other hand if you increase the price abroad the poor man on the other side of the water is not able to pay the high price for it. Our fish cost the consumer in Brazil to-day 20 cents a pound. The fishery question is a hard one to handle and it is bristling with difficulties. I have seen many attempts privately and publicly to try and solve the problem, but the results are well known. I do not think standardization will fix matters because I have travelled across with a cargo of fish that was packed in St. John's. When it arrived in Naples I would not know it was the same fish owing to the way it deteriorated on the voyage. Take a cargo of well dried fish that leaves here for Brazil. After a thirty days' passage it turns out an excellent cargo. A few days after you ship a similar cargo and the vessel takes sixty days to get to Brazil and it turns out bad as a result of the long passage. I do not think that either pooling or standardization is very beneficial to the fishery. The only way to bring about a practical reform in this direction is by united effort on the part of those engaged in the industry. In conclusion, I trust I have made myself clear to the House and I want to thank the hon. gentlemen for the fair and impartial way they criticised this Budget. I am satisfied that I have done my duty to my country and this Budget will be on record to tell the story in the future.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that the Committee had considered the matter to them referred and had passed certain resolutions

and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance a Bill was introduced entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925, and Amendments thereto", and was read a first time; and by unanimous consent was read a second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and with unanimous consent it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time.

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances" was deferred.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for certain public purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— Mr. Chairman: In introducting these resolutions in connection with the raising of a loan of $5,000,000, I want to say that you will notice that there are two main items, $1,750,000 to cover the deficit of 1926-27, and the other to cover the deficit on the railway operations. These are the two main items. As regards the other matters the Government has taken into consideration and decided that we should rrow for roads, bridges and marine works $500,000. We considered that as there was certain work to be done on Public Works that we were ustified in borrowing this amount. As r the next amount, $160,000. That an amount that we have had much liscussion about already, to complete the present railway line. I understand that there is a break in a cer'ain portion of the Bay de verde line. There are a number of bridges on the present highways to be built and a few matters like that that I am not cognisant with. However this repor here will give all the necessary information I think.

(Tables the eport)

"900,000 for the railroad." I shall have a statement during the afternoon which will show hon. members what that amount of expenditure is for. "Expenses on the Labrador Boundary." The amount put in is $100,000. There is already some portion of that paid. $25,000. I think that the Minister of Justice can explain about the bills. "Government survey of the Labrador boundary." We decided to have this territory surveyed and to really find out what can be done with it, if anything. That is the reason that we are asking for this $200,000. "The Gander Railway." You know already about that. It has been discussed here in this House. "Special Public Works." That was cut out of the estimates for the past two years, but the Government

decided to raise this amount again. "$130,000 for public buildings." There are a number of public buildings wanted and there is a lot of work o be done to them. "Encouragement to the Fisheries, $200,000." I am not quite clear as to what is the actual position that the Government is going to take in regard to encouraging hem. I think that the Prime Minister might explain that if you want any explanation. I do not know any other information that I can give, but if there is I am only too willing to give it to you. The conditions are the same as last year, as regards terms.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Chairman: Sec. 2 reads:

(Reads)

Now it seems to me that that five million is going to be another slush fund for the Government. They can apply it to whatever purposes they wish. Now if every member of the Opposition is of my opinion that will never go through. When we wanted to get those bait depots in Bay Bulls last year, we know what happened. You are going to spent that money just as you wish. Now if every member of the Opposition have got their minds made up, as I have, this Loan Bill will never pass with that clause in it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that in former acts we had a clause to the effect that the money if not used for the purposes voted could be used for any other purposes at the discretion of the Government. We have taken that clause out of this bill deliberately, so that the money cannot be spent in future for any other purpose.

MR. MOORE—Well you have done it since you came into power.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Under former Acts we had the right to do it and you gave us the right. We have not got the right to do it now. We have deliberately cut it out. Unless we spend the money for these particular purposes we cannot spend it at all. That is plain enough I think for any member of the House.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I presume that recommendations or suggestions made in the usual form and sent to the Government will be accepted as in the past. Well those recommendations were made last year, regarding certain public works. They were absolutely ignored. I have no guarantee that any recommendation that I may make is not going to receive the same consideration from the Government this year. Now you have cut out a clause that has been in the previous Acts and you have substituted another one instead.

(Reads)

That means the same thing. If in your opinion it is not necessary you can still apply it to something else.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No we cannot. It goes to a drop balance.

MR. CASHIN—There is nothing in that Bill to say that the $500,000 for public works will be allocated as per capita to each district. Well there should be. To-day we are going to vote $150,000 for public works but there is nothing in that bill to say that Ferryland District or Fogo District is going to get its per capita share of that.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman: I hope that it is not the intention of the Finance Minister to ask us to go on with these resolutions this afternoon, because I am of the opinion that before we are able to debate them with any degree of wisdom, we ought to have a statement outlining the purpose, as to how these various grants are going to be spent. In these resolutions there is an attempt at trickery. There is no

doubt in my mind but that the Government intends to allocate that $150,000 to districts per capita. But there is all kinds of doubt in my mind that the Government intend to take that money and play with it as it chooses. My district has been relieved within the last three years of $50,000. It would probably have been $100,000 if it had its fair share of all that has been spent since the present Government came into power. And now I want to see the district that sent me to this chamber, the district that produces 100,000 quintals of fish annually, come into its own. I have got to take the pos tion of Mr. Cashin, and get on my feet here, and let my voice be heard until, I get from this Legislature before this loan bill passes, an assurance that I will get a fair share of that money for the district of St. Barbe, that you propose to spend under these resolutions. I do not propose to have you go out, when these doors are locked and have you play fast and loose with that $150,000. It is no use of the Prime Minister getting up here and lamenting the fact hat no money has been spent in Bonavista Bay. If no money has been spent there it is his own fault. The harbor of Bonavista itself is a standing disgrace to the present Prime Minister. The storm that came the other day and destroyed twenty-five fishing vessels because the work the past administration tried to do, was thrown to the four winds of Heaven because of political jealousy and spite. Now there is going to be a show down on these resolutions. We are not going to allow Mr. Sullivan to have all the say about that $150,000. St. Barbe wants its share and St. Barbe has got to get its share. Now there is going to be considerable absence of temper before these resolutions pass, unless you gentlemen are going to do the square and honest thing by the north of this country. I do not want this money to be thrown out as a slush fund to attempt to win that district in the case of a general election. Not that care, because I will be here representing that district, even though you spend gold between here and Cowley. And then I want to get the accounts of the Labrador boundary. How much longer are we going to be called upon to vote monies in connection with this. Somebody is going to get up to-morrow or the next day and tell me that it is my place to vote for $200,000 to be spent on what is put down as a survey of Labrador, whether you are going to charter steamers or vessels. It is no good to be coming in here and asking this Legislature to give you permission to borrow another five millions without giving me more information than you have given us here. I have made my position clear. I f that is so, and it is not your intention to give all the districts their proportional share of the vote, their proper share, then I want you to reconsider your position.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman,—With respect to the $500,000 ear marked in the Loan Bill for roads, bridges and marine works, I am sure it will be generally agreed that this is a very necessary vote, as the condition of roads, bridges, wharves, etc., throughout the extern districts of the country are to-day in a deplorable condition. Section 2, however, of the Resolution states that the "said sum, or so much thereof, as shall be necessary, shall be applied to the following purposes," and then goes on to designate the purposes on which the various items, which comprises the $500,000 is to be expended. The objectionable feature that I see to Section 2 in the Resolution is that it leaves a loophole by which the Government may divert monies from the purpose for which we are now voting it. I do not think that power should rest

with the Executive when once this Legislature has decided as to how the Loan should be disposed of. The $500,000 will go but a short way towards covering the many outstanding needs for expenditure throughout the various outports of the country, consequently I see no reason for the provision made in Section 2. The Prime Minister stated here some time ago that the major portion of this $500,000 Grant would be spent in Districts that did not benefit by the work of the High Roads Commission. If this amount is distributed on that principle then I know of no district in Newfoundland that would be entitled to a greater per centage than the district of Fogo. All public highways and other utilities are in such a bad condition that in some places it is difficult for people to carry on their usual intercourse between settlements. Roads have become almost impassable. Bridges are rotting down and public wharves are in some places completely destroyed and, in fact, to practically all public works in the district considerable repairs are at present an absolute necessity.

Under ordinary conditions the per capita method would be the most fair and equitable way in whch to spend this money, but when one considers that the districts of St. John's East and West and other districts in the Peninsula of Avalon have been the scene of very large expenditures during the regeme of the present administration, then, I think it is manifestly unfair to give these distr:cts the same percentage as the district of Fogo or other extern districts that have for the last three or four years being practically placed outside the pale of recognition. The people living in the extern districts have had to contribute their portion of the taxes which made possible the very large expenditures that have being going on during recent years, and have received absolutely no direct benefit from all the monies that have been handed out, and for that reason, sir, the time has arrived when those of us who represent districts outside of the Peninsula of Avalon will have to take steps to see that justice is done the people whom we represent.

The Prime Minister has suggested that a committee of four from each side of the House be appointed to arrange as to how this money is to be expended and to make recommendations to the Executive Government, and while I consider the Prime Minister's suggestion as an earnest of his desire to give fair treatment to extern districts representing, as he does, one of them, I cannot candidly see just how this committee is to function or to be of much benefit to the various representatives. Personally I do not need the assistance of any committee to show the Government just where the per capita share of this money can be best expended in Fogo District. I have been agitating with the Government for a number of years in an effort to secure moines for public works that are an absolute necessity to the people who have to earn their living in the way that most of my constituents in Fogo District have.

Outstanding among the needs of the district are, the completion of the Canal at Fogo. This is a job that should have been completed in 1925. About $5,000 was expended there by the Government, and this waterway was consequently left in a worst condition than it was previous to the work being done. The deepening of that Canal would confer a great boon not only upon the people of Fogo and nearby vicinities who have to use the Canal practically every day during the fishing season, but fishermen from all parts of the Coast who come into Fogo Harbour through the eastern Tickle will be enabled to pass out through the western Tickle, and vice versa, thus, cutting off a distance

of five or six miles, if they are obliged to go around the outer headlands. In fact, it is often impossible for boats even in the busy season of the year to pass out through the eastern Tickle if the water is rough, and much valuable time is lost by not being able to pass through this Canal and find an outlet through the Seal Cove end of the harbour.

A great deal more may be said in favour of this very necessary marine work, but I feed sure that practically every gentleman in this Chamber, particularly those who have had marine experience are fully aware of the necessity of having this work performed at the earliest possible moment.

I take this opportunity of again referring to the hardships that the people of Carmanville have had to suffer through the need of a public wharf at that place. The old wharf which was built in very shallow water served no useful purpose as far as the mail boat and other large craft were concerned, and as a consequence no repairs has been effected and the structure today is in such a state that it is unsafe and practically useless. I have been promised a sum of money for this purpose for the last two or three years, but the Government has always failed to live up to its promise, and the time has arrived now when I must demand that out of the per capita share of this grant a suitable wharf be placed at Carmanville.

Among the various other problems calling for solution in Fogo District is the necessity of a pure water supply. Towards this end I have been struggling for the past six years, and while I see money squandered recklessly upon silly fads and fancies I have been unable to secure from the Government sufficient money to operate the well drive which was secured for that purpose and thus complete a work that would render the various settlements effected a safe place for the people to inhabit. As medical science never fails to emphasize the importance of pure water for domestic use, but the district of Fogo has been singularly unfortunate in that respect, as evidenced by the prevalence of typhoid fever in many settlements, which too often has resulted in loss of life, and in many cases has incapacitated many industrious fishermen from earning a livelihood when afflicted by this disease. The situation throughout certain sections of that district in the past, has been so serious, notably Tilting, Joe Batt's Arm, Barred Islands, and Change Islands that the Board of Health should have taken steps to cope with the evil long ago and not leave it to the representative of the district to be repeatedly begging for money for this purpose from an unthinking and unsympathetic Government. The people of this District of Fogo are not seeking Government support as far as their livelihood is concerned. They are in the main, an honest and industrious people wresting their living from the ocean. No better evidence of their manly independence in this respect can be furnished than the fact that only $90.00 for able-bodied relief was spent in that district last year, while at the same time we have witnessed the spectacle of over $20,000 being doled out to the residents of one settlement in a nearby district during the same period. The absolute ignorance of, or difference to, one's representation of such cases in this House is demonstrated by the manner in which the Evening Telegram newspaper, one of the chief organs of the present Government misrepresented a similar appeal which I made to this House some time ago on behalf of these deserving people. The reporter of that newspaper, who stands behind the screen yonder, is a paid servant of this Government. Judging

by his method of reporting Opposition members, his job consists of telling lies and wilfully misrepresenting the speeches of honourable members on this side of the House, while the Opposition has no means of placing the real facts before the country at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I have referred to two or three outstanding needs in the district that I have the honour of representing, but there is no one settlement throughout that constituency where the need of some public improvement is not a pressing one, and I take this opportunity of serving notice on the Government that unless this expenditure of $500,000 is distributed in a straight and above board manner on the recommendation of the representatives, as far as the Opposition is concerned, that the Loan Bill will not pass this House as soon as the Prime Minister may have anticipated. I repeat again that the districts of St. John's East and West particularly, which have benefited by large expenditures, such as high roads work at $2,000,000 Dry Dock and a $1,000,000 Hotel should not participate in this expenditure to the same extent as the extern districts of the country that have enjoyed nothing but the paltry annual grants, which are sent from time to time. I do not wish the representatives of these districts to imagine that I am knocking St. John's, I am merely demanding that justice be done our people irrespective of what districts they may reside in.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—We got very little of the Highroads Commission money for St. John's West.

MR. HIBBS—You have a number of main lines radiating from the west part of the city. There is the Waterford Bridge Road, the Topsail Road and the Kenmount Road, for instance.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—We built the Kenmount Road out of our district grants.

MR. HIBBS—Yes but years ago you managed to secure a district grant large enough to build that road, which is more than I can say.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What about the Gander railway?

MR. HIBBS—The Gander railway which is one of the many concessions which you are showering on the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company at a cost of $1,000,000 to the taxpayers of this country will not benefit the people of Fogo District as far as its construction is concerned, if it ever is constructed, as much as it will benefit the railroad builders of Conception Bay. I admit however, that there is greater hope of building a railway out of the taxes of the people of Newfoundland than there is of getting a paper mill at Gander Bay at the expense of the International Paper Company. What about the quarter of a million dollars which the Highroads Commission wasted down through St. John's East, building a marine drive, so that tourists that have just recovered from a period of sea sickness might get another glimpse of the Atlantic.

While I am on the subject, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to another aspect of the situation, which may affect this expenditure. At the next election the new Re-distribution Act comes into effect. Many districts have been subdivided and honourable gentlemen are likely to cater to the particular section which they expect to contest in the next General Election. I refer particularly to the district of Fogo. I understand that Captain Winsor will be contesting Bonavista North, which now includes the Straight Shore of Fogo District, as far north as Ladle Cove. I want to be absolutely frank about this, and I now ask Captain Winsor what he purposes doing on the Straight Shore with regards to this expenditure. If it is understood that hon-

curable members are to look after the needs of their present constituencies, then the Straight Shore will be taken care of by me, as I am just as anxious as ever to serve the interests of these people who have stood by me so faithfully since I first entered into active political life. Public wharves, roads and bridges from Lumsden to Ladle Cove are in a deplorable condition, and require immediate attention, which I hope to remedy as far as possible by the proportional part of this expenditure, and in order to prevent misunderstanding or overlapping, I want to get some assurance from Captain Winsor as to what part he intends to play in the matter. If the Government does not play fair with this money and attempts to use it for a political slush fund to gain political supporters, then I want to tell them right now, that they will not get very far with that game. The people of Newfoundland are too intelligent and wide awake to-day, to be beguiled by such political tactics. If the sentiments of the country are with either the Tory or the Liberal Party, then that party will win out, regardless of what inducements that may be thrown out in regard to public monies. In 1919 the Tory Government of that day had at their disposal $500,000 which they deliberately used for the purpose of buying the electorate. My opponent at that time went into the district of Fogo equipped with allocation forms and threw out money right and left in the hope of buying votes. When the ballots were counted, his activities had secured him 252 votes, while the people favored me with their confidence to the extent of 1508 votes. That case is an example of what will happen when the next General Election comes off, unless I very much misunderstand the public sentiment.

The late Government under Sir Richard Squires, made a point of recognizing the representatives of the people, whether they sat on the Government or the Opposition side of the House. The Honourable Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, and many other gentlemen with seats on the Government side to-day, can certify as to the correctness of my statement. The Opposition districts were then, in many cases more generously dealt with by the Squires Government than were the constituencies represented on the Government side. That Government made no discrimination with respect to the expenditure of public monies, but the example set, so far has not been followed by the present Government. However, in the present case the Prime Minister has given his word that there will be no discrimination, and we have nothing to do but to accept his word and take it for granted that the Government has at last decided to play fair by the people who pay the taxes, and on whose shoulders rests the burden imposed by such loans out of which this money is granted.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: There is one point which was raised by the member for Fogo and which I would like to see cleared up before the House next meets. For a number of years past there has been a section in the loan Bill reading as follows:

(Reads)

In the present loan Bill that section is eliminated. The practical effect is that under previous loan Bills the situation was that any balance of any particular account could be swung by the Executive Council in any particular direction. Now, under the present Bill, if any amount, under any of these headings mentioned in the Bill remains unexpended, it simply means that such amounts will have to stay as unexpended balances and cannot be diverted to any par-

ticular purpose without the sanction of the Legislature. With regard to the charge made about districts not getting their fair share, I do not think it fair to say that St. John's was getting more than its share and because there is more people living in St. John's than in any other place in the Island that is no reason why St. John's should not get its share, neither do I consider it fair to say that because certain public works, such as the building of the dry dock and the new hotel, were carried on in the city that St. John's got more than its share. If St. John's happens to be the headquarters for a dry dock, it is only natural to have the work done 'n St. John's, unless a different location is decided upon for the dry dock. As to the matter of labor in St. John's I do not think there was any terrible effort made to prevent outport men from getting labor building the dock in St. John's and I think they got a substantial share of the labor at the dock. Another point I would like the hon. member for Fogo to bear in mind and that is that his district should not be deprived of its per capita share of the loan because the Gander railway is going to be down there.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: Despite the fact that the Government took out that clause that was in former loan Bills, I contend that the Government to-morrow can expend this money, after they raise it, on any public works they like and how they like, and that is the point we are fighting here this evening. Take the $200,000 for the encouragement of the fisheries. The Government can spend this money how they like after this Bill goes through, without any consideration for the districts represented by Opposition members. We know what happened the million dollars last year. Even though we voted for that million dollars to be spent on public works in various districts it was not spent.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I may say I was disappointed to find that one hundred and sixty thousand has been specifically earmarked and there is nothing there to show that one cent will be spent in Trinity District for connecting the road from Carbonear to Heart's Content or Brownsdale to Lead Cove. It seems that the Highroads Commission or the Government after all its fine dreams has to abandon its policy with regard to the building of any more roads. I am sorry to say that no bridges will be built in Trinity District and what we are going to do even if we get our per capita share of that five hundred thousand I really do not know. We will have to be satisfied to build wooden bridges. The Government has had to abandon its policy as far as the building of bridges in Trinity District is concerned. We will have to have wooden bridges as we can't attempt concrete bridges and the road from Carbonear to Heart's Content whether we go over the old road or Heart's Delight Road will take practically my share of that five hundred thousand if we are to build any way in comparison to the roads built by the Highroads Commission. It seems that the Government has to abandon its road building policy and I suppose we could do no more than say it is what I told you would happen but that doesn't make it any better. You started to build highroads but find now practically you can't afford to keep them up. What has been the reason for the argument this afternoon. Some certain sections of the country have benefitted more than others and by accident or otherwise Government districts have benefitted more so than Opposition. Well, "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be." We are all complaining of existing conditions and we shall go on complaining I suppose and making propositions until there

is some change in our system of Government and if anybody can bring that about I trust it will be brought about as early as possible, because I don't want to remain in the House as a member of the Legislature any longer if anybody else can come in and carry out what we think should be carried out.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask if part of this loan will go on the local market. I know you haven't considered it. It might be remembered that last year we were told a certain portion of the loan would go on the local market. We have people in this country with money in the savings bank and that money would be just as safe in Government bonds and they would be able to get the benefit of higher interest and having that income free from income tax. I think a certain portion of the loan should be put on the local market and give people in the country with a little money to invest a chance to invest in it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances" was read a second time.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and by unanimous consent the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice what the salary of Judge Johnson was?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I may say that his salary was $7,000. I would like to say here that that pension was arrived at on this basis. The Civil Service Act does not apply to the judges, number one. There was no method by which we could compute retirement. We took the Canadian scheme that obtained in Canada. There when a judge reaches the age of seventy-five and has done thirty years of service, he is entitled to be retired on full allowance. What was different about the present case was that while he had reached the period of years, as to his age, he was short in the sense of years in the service. So we decided to take as our basis two-thirds of the Canadian salary. As far as Judge Johnson was concerned I think that he was quite satisfied to leave the matter to ourselves.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Prime Minister why Mr. A. A. Parsons, Superintendent of the Penitentiary, has been placed on the retired list? Mr. Parsons claims he is able to fill that job for several years yet and besides it means an extra tax of $1620.96 on the revenue of the Colony per year. Is it correct that he was asked by the Government to send in his resignation I would like to ask? It is only a matter of a short time when Mr. Thompson will be put back in his old position again and some one else will be appointed Supt. I would like to hear an explanation from the Prime Minister as to why Mr. Parsons was asked to resign his position?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I may say that Mr. Parsons was asked by me personally to resign his position as Superintendent of the Penitentiary because he wrote articles in the public press defaming the Gov-

ernment and it was not done out of any personal spleen on my part. I think it is the duty of any Leader of a Government to dismiss any man holding an important position in the Civil Service, if he takes any prominent part in party politics. Accordingly, Mr. Parsons was asked to resign and he resigned without a pension and without any consideration of a pension. The matter came up afterwards as to whether or not he should be pensioned and the Government, giving consideration to his long years of service, thought that, under the circumstances, Mr. Parsons might be given a pension and that is why we recommend it to the House to-day. Besides Mr. Parsons has got a little beyond his labour. He is now an old man and it would be only a matter of a year or so when we would have to make the present arrangement which is not costing the Government any more just now.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises I would like to know when we might expect to have the Whaling Bill and Dog Act introduced?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I may say that the Bills are now being printed and will be introduced at the next sitting.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this report was received and adopted.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and with unanimous consent the Bill was ordered to be read a third time.

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and 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 that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 206 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies' " without amendment.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of Question.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs'."

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Regulate the Whaling Industry.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn to to-morrow, Wednesday, August 31st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, August 31, 1927

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

A petition was presented by Mr. Linegar, from unemployed persons in St. John's, re employment.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs' " was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Whaling Industry" was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow,

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions respecting the raising of a sum of money on the Credit of the Colony for certain public purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—Last evening, Mr. Chairman, when Committee rose, the hon. member for Ferryland, Mr. Cashin, asked what was the balance of the 1924 loan. There is nothing of the 1924 loan. Of the balance up to date of the 1926 loan there is $871,404.76. Mr. Cashin, I think, on February 28, asked what was spent.

(Reads)

Since that, I think, the following amounts were paid:

(Reads)

That is the position of the 1926 loan.

MR. CASHIN—There is other information with regard to the distribution of the loan now before the House. I would like to get necessary information as to particular expenditure of these moneys; for instance $500,000; to begin with, we would like to see how that is going to be spent. The Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, no doubt, could give the information.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We have been giving a good deal of consideration to the expenditure of that $500,000. To begin with, the Government is very much concerned that this should be considered a fund to be given out and spent lavishly all over the country by members and we are very determined the expenditure of it must be safeguarded, and it must be entirely controlled by the Executive Government. I have stated in the House before in connection with this question that we would be perfectly satisfied for each district to get its proportionate part. What exactly that proportionate part should be is a little difficult to determine. In my opinion districts benefiting by highroads should be curtailed to some extent and districts not receiving very much assistance should get a greater proportion. That is my view of it personally, but the Government hasn't considered it and hasn't come to any definite conclusion regarding it, and I don't think sitting around here in the House of Assembly we can very correctly determine just how that money should be spent. Now, I gather from the debate that has taken place so far that there is a great deal of mistrust on the part of the Opposition that Opposition districts will not be given a fair share in the expenditure of that money, and for that purpose I am going to propose this afternoon merely as a suggestion of my own to try and show that the Government wants to treat the matter fairly and squarely. I am going to suggest that a committee be appointed to sit outside of this House consisting of four members of the Government and four members of the Opposition and let the Opposition choose its own particular representatives and let that Commission give consideration to this question. It seems to me that is a fair and reasonable proposition. It seems to me it proves to members of the Opposition that there is no intention or desire on the part of the Government to treat the Opposition districts differently from districts with representatives on the Government side, and I am perfectly satisfied that not a member of the Government has any desire otherwise. I hope we may prove that to the Opposition by this suggestion of nominating a committee of eight—four from the Government and four from the Opposition—to consider the expenditure

of the money outside the session of the Legislature and have them determine what share of money shall be spent. One member for a district may say he wants to have some particular expenditure in his district, whereas the district itself may be much greater in need of some larger propostion. The district itself may put forward some matters stating they require more attention than some smaller matters that are put forward by the member for the district, and I think members of the districts in the meantime will have time to fully consult their districts and find out what the majority of people in the districts would like to have done. Personally, as far as my district is concerned, I wouldn't like to say on what expenditure the money will be made in connection with Bonavista Bay. I would like to go round and see the people and have them decide whether the expenditure decided on by their representative was the best way to use the money. In some cases particularly the people shall judge what is best, because I don't think members in St. John's only visiting their districts at election time can really understand the situation. I hope members on the Opposition side of the House may be able to give consideration to that proposal of mine.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to what the Prime Minister has said with regard to the disposal of the $500,000 loan, but I think the Prime Minister will agree with me we have good cause, at least I have, as representative of one district, for being rather distrustful as to what the Government may do with regard to the expenditure of this money on public works, because we don't want history repeating itself. We voted a certain amount of money for certain specific purposes and the Government didn't work very hard to meet the recommendations of members of the Opposition or give the districts any show at all, but spent the money wherever it pleased themselves.

With regard to a committee with four from each side being appointed, I might add to that suggestion that if such a thing happens, if the Opposition are in favor of that—I don't know whether they will be or not—if the Opposition are in favor of getting together with the Government on these lines, that that meeting take place and that that commission consider the matter before this Bill goes through. Then we know where we are, but as far as we are concerned if we pass this Bill to-day that meeting may never be called. There is nothing to guarantee it will be called, only the Prime Minister's word.

As to that $150,000 for special public works, is the idea of that to be allocated as $150,000 in the Estimates last year? What I mean is this, after we pass this Bill will the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries be instructed that representatives of various districts on the Government and on the Opposition sides of the House will have necessary authority to allocate that money as they think necessary, just as allocated last year when $150,000 was put in the Estimates.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY. — Mr. Chairman, I can't help but think that the Hon. Member who has just sat down is not fair in his criticism. I want to say as a member of the Government that there was never any other idea but to allocate this $500,000 proportionately to all the districts. Every district was to be treated the same, with no favour for Government or Opposition. We bring it in in the form of items on the Loan Bill. We cannot put such an appendix to the statement of the Loan Bill as this shall be proportionately distributed between the different Districts. What would the financiers think of us when they see such a term as that. Those Bills

have to be seen by them; $500,000 to be distributed proportionately, that is unnecessary. The Prime Minister just now made a proposition, and if Honorable Members on the other side can't take the word of the Prime Minister and can't trust the Government, then the only thing we can do is say —don't trust us, but we were prepared to take the recommendations of this Commission. I don't know what other way the money can be given unless you want us to go down and put the money in the Bank to the credit of each district. There is another aspect of this matter, and I think a rather serious one. We are just now entering into an entirely new phase of district representation in this House, and I have no doubt hon. members now present in this House are picking out the particular corner of the district at present represented to go to next election. Now is there any danger of that particular section of the District being looked after to the detriment of another portion of the District. These are matters that have to be carefully considered, and it is a grave responsibfility on the Government. Therefore, I think a committee composed of four from each side that would take into consideration the expenditure of this money and advise the Government on the distribution in the districts would be a very good thing and I think the Prime Minister's suggestion is a fair one; $150,000 was put in the Estimates last year, and naturally was distributed per capita. This year it is in the Loan Bill and it is the same thing, but we don't intend to put the money to the credit of each district the same as the ordinary grants.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, an evidence of good faith coming from the Prime Minister in this connection would be refreshing, but that it is ridiculous, because everyone here this afternoon knows the Government has not in the past acted fairly with public moneys. I have been waiting for this opportunity all the session. Since I left the Government I have not been permitted to have a word to say with regard to the expenditure of money on public works in Port de Grave. Not only is that the case, but I have been treated most discourteously over the matter. It took me three months to find out where I stood. Evidently because I ceased to be a member of the Government I was refused to be allowed to have anything to do with the expenditure of money in Port de Grave. I am sorry the Minister of Public Works is not here. I will say this for him, that he regretted to have to do it.

HON. MR. CRAMM.—Did he have instructions?

MR. BRADLEY.—I don't know whether he had instructions. Either he or the Executive Government will have to take the responsibility, but I have stated facts. I have not allocated one single cent, and was told that I would not be allowed to do it. I speak of the Public Works Department. In honesty and fairness to Capt. Winsor I have to say that he has consistently refused to allow any expenditure out of his Department unless he had my imprimatur. I got a square deal from Capt. Winsor, but from the Department of Public Works I have not allocated one single cent since I left the Government. Now, is there any wonder that I should stand here this afternoon and ask for some guarantee of this kind, in order that I and my district may be treated fairly.

The Minister is here now and he can answer for himself. I understood from him that he could do nothing else. Whether it was the Government or some member of the Government that was guilty is not my business. The Government is responsible to the district and to me.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Your charge is correct. But I had no definite instructions from the Government to do so.

MR. BRADLEY.—You asume the responsibility then.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Yes. It was intimated to me that it would be looked after by another member of the Government.

MR. BRADLEY — Who was that other member.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS.—Sir John Crosbie.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few words in reply to the Colonial Secretary. Here is the evidence why any remarks that I have made or that have been made by Mr. Bradley were correct. Why should Sir John Crosbie be allowed to go into the Department of Public Works and allocate what he likes, when another man represents that district. I do not distrust the Prime Minister's words, but this I do say that the Colonial Secretary avoided very carefully, telling us of the one million that was to be disposed of last year. We know what happened that, it was spent everywhere and how. I feel that possibly if three or four members of the Government met three or four members of the Opposition while the House was open, and came to a decision before the loan bill was passed, then there would be something at any rate in this proposition, yet the position is this that under the circumstances and especially in view of certain expressions here a moment ago it is difficult to take it for granted that we as members of this House and representatives of districts would have any opportunity of even recommending expenditure in connection with districts that we have the honour to represent. With regard to my district I am informed by the Colonial Secretary that there will be no change under the new Redistribution Bill.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—You will have only fifty per cent. representation.

MR. CASHIN—I will have one hundred per cent. representation, because where there was only two members before there will be one now, and I feel that I will be elected again despite the fact that the present Government are doing everything in their power to try and stop it. I am glad to hear the Colonial Secretary say what is the intention of the Government, and I make this statement now and I feel safe in saying that if that matter were left to the Colonial Secretary himself, he would see that there would be a fair distribution of that money. Now I am prepared to listen to the suggestions coming from the Government, as to how they are going to allocate the moneys in this loan bill. I asked the Minister yesterday regarding the $100,000 for Labrador, if he would give us a statement as to how the $25,000 was spent and what is proposed to be done with the other $75,000.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I may say that personally I am interested in the suggestion made by the Prime Minister, that a satisfactory settlement as regards the distribution of $500,000 for roads, bridges and marine works, could be reached by having a committee composed of members from both sides of this House. Now an opportunity is afforded in considering these resolutions to refer to past actions of the Government. I do not know that we can gain very much. We feel sore on what we regard as unfair treatment. But I am principally interested in what the Government is going to do with the balance of the 1926 loan. We take it for granted that the statement made by the Prime Minister and other members on the Government side, that they intend to deal fairly with the various districts, through their representatives, in connection with the $500,000 item and also

the $150,000 item for the special public works, is bona fide. But perhaps it would be impertinent on my part to ask the Executive Government as to what they are going to do with the $871,004.76. Does the Government really think that this Legislature has nothing whatever to do with it. You may apportion out that money at your own sweet will, would it be too much to say for political purposes. The Colonial Secretary said that possibly members of this Legislature who represent certain districts, may have to pay particular attention to certain sections of those districts, in respect of giving a part of the district a square deal. Is it not a temptation to the Executive Goverument viewing the electoral districts from the redistribution point of view to say that as there is certain sections of Bonavista Bay in which they are very strong, that there is no use in troubling with other parts of it. Therefore there is that anxiety on the part of the Opposition which has arisen out of the treatment meted out by the Government in certain connections in the past. This Government as well as other Governments. It would be of interest to this House if we knew what balance is left from the 1926 loan as voted last year.

HON MINISTER OF FINANCE—

(Reads)

MR. HALFYARD—If I understand the Finance Minister correctly, he has given us a statement to show the difference between the statement that he made early in the session and that which exists at the present time. So my statement is correct that two or three weeks ago there was a balance of over one million and a half and now it is only $871,000.

Under the Resolutions before the Chair every item is here earmarked to make up the five million dollars which is hoped to be raised in the very near future. Now we have representations made here this afternoon from the unemployed of St. John's and there is a great deal of unemployment existing all over the country, whilst the conditions that will obtain during the approaching winter months will bear harder on the people. Now how are you going to deal with this contingency if you cannot use a portion of that $871,000 that was left from last year's loan? Is that money intact to met emergencies? If not, we are in a worse position financially than I thought we were when these Resolutions were introduced. If that $871,000 has got to be spent within the next month to meet outstanding liabilities and commitments, there will be nothing left out of this five million dollars and it is just as well now to make the loan six millions instead of five in order that this unemployment question can be dealt with. I would like for the Finance Minister to give us a clear understanding to-morrow as to what this $871,000 is earmarked for and what votes were unexpended from last year's loan. I would also like to know from the Minister of Justice this evening the expenses in connection with the Labrador Boundary case? What bills we got to pay and what bills have been presented for payment thus far?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: I would first like to point out to the House that I was rather impressed by the suggestion offered by the Prime Minister to-day. Personally I will say that the proposition was his own and was not the decision of the Government because the matter was not submitted to the Government. Therefore, for that reason I hope that the suggestion will be accepted by the whole House. The Col. Secretary voices the thoughts of the Government when he intimated that there never was any other idea at all but that all districts would get their proportionate share of moneys voted. I think it will be appreciated by honourable members that you cannot put in the terms of

a loan Bill anything that indicates that you are raising money for a scramble so to speak. In other words, you cannot indicate in the loan Bill itself that you are asking for a loan and going to divide it up on public works in the different districts purely on a per capita basis. Never in the history of the Legislature was there a loan Bill which stated in its resolutions that the money was to be spent on a per capita basis. I do say that it is only right to bear in mind that there is this difference between the terms of the present resolutions and previous ones to this extent that under the present resolutions, the Government might divert all that money under the head of marine works to any particular district to the exclusion of others, but they cannot diyert that money from any one heading to any other purpose. In other words, at present provision is made that any amount of money that is voted for a specific purpose cannot be spent for any other matter. That is a limitation and the wisdom of which I frankly doubt. That is an act of the Government itself. Resolutions come down here without that provision, probably due largely to the feeling that the matter would be accepted more readily in these terms. So far as raising loans is concerned, it is impossible to specify in detail exactly to the dollar how you are going to spend that money. Take the $500,000 item for instance. You cannot base that on anything. You might just as well as to have the whole five millions spent on public works. In actual fact on a mater like this members of the Opposition side have not as much knowledge as the Government with reference to spending money on actual public works that are of value. We all know in this House to-day that $500,000 will not begin to fill the order of the requirement of the country in general; but when you take the second position that you are not making any special provision for unemployment the only hope you got is that in providing for necessary public works your relief and unemployed will be cared for, but if one were to start and put in the loan bill a fund to cover all the public works required and then provide for general employment besides throughout the country any member can forecast about how much you would want to vote for it. The natural object of the Bill is to keep the loan to as low a degree as possible.

In connection with the Labrador Boundary matter, I am not able to state definitely that the amount of $100,000 voted for expenses in that regard will cover our bills. I may say that already $25,000 have been forwarded to Burn and Burridge, the solicitors in the case, I asked them to explain what this was for and some correspondence was exchanged during the months of June and July of this year in that respect. For the information I would like to read the leter I received from Burn and Burridge in response to the one I sent them. They state that they wanted this amount to cover printing expenses.

(Reads letter)

I would like to say I do not think that this amount wlil cover the printing cost of the case. Some time ago the member for St. Barbe asked me to give an approximate idea as to what the expenses of the Labrador Boundary cost the country to date and I promised I would ascertain for him as far as I could what was expended in connection therewith. Since this dispute started I should say there has been spent approximately $300,000 up to date. The great bulk of that amount has of necessity been spent since 1921. I feel that honourable members will accept the statement that so far as we have dealt with people on the other side

of the water we are in this position that the remittances already sent do not indicate the fees for the solicitors for the Colony at all. The practice in England is that counsel like Sir John Simon and others do not have any direct touch with any client. Payments are made through a Solicitor. I should say that the amounts put down to Burn and Burridge up to now covers four-fifths of actual disbursements paid to Counsel and other agencies. As to what is likely the possible net result of cleaning up this case, I am not able to answer definitely, but in my oinion I do not think that $75,000, which is the amount available, will cover all the expenses. With the possible exception of the attendance of Sir John Simon on the final judgment day of the case, and I have to assume that all his bills up to that day were paid him, we have so far not received any bills from Burn and Burridge at all, although we have asked them to send in their bills. The practice in England is that Burn and Burridge, the Solicitors, employed Sir John Simon and they did other work in connection with the case as Solicitors.

The important matter to-day in dispute and largely delayed through our Canadian friends is our proportionate share of the printing cost.

The printing cost in connection with the case was very heavy, and the relative cost to be borne by each side is a matter for the Solicitors on each side to determine. There was a mass of documents prepared and printed for both sides and certain ones had been prepared on joint account. I trust that the $75,000 will cover the cost of the bills but I candidly cannot give any guarantee that they will cover it. The amount of $25,000 we paid in July last was spent under Section 33b of the Audit Act and is to be charged up to the loan now about to be raised. We felt that it would be right and proper to make some provision for this amount to be paid and it is now outstanding in the Justice Department.

I trust that this explanation will be accepted in the spirit in which it is conveyed. I do not want to assume the responsibility for stating that the amounts mentioned indicates the full amount to be paid by the Colony in connection with the Labrador Boundary case, because I think by the time all the bills are in that a big hole will be punched in a half million dollars.

MR. HALFYARD—I accept the statement the Prime Minister has made as made honestly. He says the money will not be spent only for purposes for which it was voted. I believe the Prime Minister believes that honestly, but suppose you get one of the members of your Government going in some section of his district and asking: "How are you off for the winter The price of fish was low; we can do nothing regarding the price of fish, but I am here to help you. How are you off for the winter I am here to see you provided for.' Then orders are given on every store within a radius of five or ten miles more or less and goods are taken up by these orders, and after a month or two these orders are presented to the Executive Government for payment. What are you going to do about it?

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Turn them down unless authorized, I should say.

MR. HALFYAR—I just point that out as what the Prime Minister is up against. He might be quite honest regarding what he said about not spending a cent for purposes other than those here, but there is some danger. Representations will be made to the Executive Government and to the Prime Minister or to other members requesting money, and it will be said "It is no good to say you haven't got any. There is a vote

there not spent," and the idea is refreshing that this Government or any other is going to go out of power and leave $200,000 there for the other Government to spend. After all we must only accept the statement of the Prime Minister, and I trust that the expenditure of money will be done in the best interests of all.

Regarding "Public Buildings," I can't see why we can't have stated what that $130,000 will be spent for. Don't have that put there unless it is earmarked, because if I was in the Government I would be expecting you to build some kind of building in Trinity District, and I am sure some member of your Government will want a building.

MR. MOORE. — Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Hon. Member for Fortune that the committee should rise and these four men from each side of the House meet before we proceed any further with the Loan Bill now before the House and have them settle matters before we go out again the same as we did last year. The Prime Minister in some of his remarks mentioned a cold storage plant at the Lunatic Asylum. I agree it should have been there years ago. The food that went to the nurses there in the past wasn't fit to eat but since the visit of the Prime Minister the other day and the other gentlemen who went with him there is a great improvement. I am pleased to be associated in bringing that about at the lunatic asylum. The honourable member from Fogo I think had something to say too. Now you went there on Friday, Mr. Prime Minister, and on Saturday morning there was nothing for the nurses to eat and they refused to go on duty and they were sent for by Miss Field and she said if they would go on duty and not say anything more about the transaction, in the future it would be alright. Now I am glad to say the food being supplied in the lunatic asylum to the nurses is all that is desired, but there is no question at all about its being supplied badly in the past up to the time you went in there. I think that cold storage plant would be of great assistance and should be supplied. I think it is only right that everything be done to see that these nurses get good meals, working as they do from six in the morning until eight in the night. I agree with Dr. Mosdell's suggestion with regard to the committee rising and having this Commission discuss the spending of this five hundred thousand and one hundred and fifty thousand now. With regard to the one hundred and thirty thousand we don't seem to be able to agree as to how that is going to be spent on public buildings.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. — Mr. Chairman, there is one point in the remarks of the honorable member who just sat down, and who seems to be taking an active interest in the welfare of those working at the lunatic asylum and I am very glad to see that interest, one point he didn't lay stress on and I think it should receive the consideration of the Government, whatever Government be in power, and that is that of having separate quarters for the nurses and staff in that lunatic asylum. I do not approve of these nurses on duty all day having to go back to bedroom with only a partition between the lunatics and themselves, it is very hard to know how they remain sane. In connection with the other matters I don't think it is at all possible for that committee to settle in two or three days just what way that money should be spent. I think that we have got to conserve it as far as we can. The idea is that this Committee can come together and decide the matter as regards the spending of the $500,000, and that the Government should give careful consideration to the various propositions

that may come before them from time to time. I do not think that it can be reasonably expected that the Government or anybody else can be of very much assistance in coming to that conclusion, while this House is in session. Therefore I would suggest that the Government may reasonably be expected, with that clause cut out, where they cannot use the money for any other purposes, that it may be left to them to consider all matters that may have to come up before them for consideration. The hon. member for Ferryland, Mr. Moore, made reference to the fact, and in fact he implied that we had handed out this last loan for political purposes purely. I want to contradict the hon. member in that respect. If we were trying to play politics with that fund surely Bonavista Bay would have been entitled to get some of it. A great many stressing cases came before us where concrete bridges and wharves were needed in Bonavista District. We said that we did not think that it was advisable to do those things and take the money out of that account. You know what the position has been in connection with the demands for relief, and various other things. No money has been frittered away and used for political purposes. We have heard a deal of talk about this money spent in Burgeo District during the election of Mr. Chambers. Nothing was done in that district that was not badly needed, in the way of putting men on the roads, etc.

MR. CASHIN.—It was only an accident.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER. — I dare say, but I am honest enough to admit that quite possibly a great deal of the work would not have been done if it had not been for the election. I am perfectly prepared to admit that. Suppose a man goes up to his district and sees quite a lot of matters that are standing in abeyance for five years, then he cannot presume to contest that district unless those things are done. I do not think that there is anything dishonest or unreasonable about that, and I am perfectly sure that if the hon. members on the other side had the money they would be doing the same thing at the present time. There are many customs at the same time that I do not approve of, but I do think that there has been no money spent in connection with that loan that was not right and reasonable and it was not for political purposes.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, to-day when I gave notice of question as regards the amount of money spent by the highroads in the various districts it was to find out as accurately as possible the amounts that had been spent in various districts, as I remembered hearing the Prime Minister state that the districts which had not been effected by the expenditure on the highroads would be given preference in the expenditure under the Loan Bill. Now I could appreciate the argument of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary this afternoon as regards the difficulty that must be encountered in order to give the exact details of amounts. There is one thing which I consider in my opinion is just. I am very pleased to hear that the Government has decided that these amounts are to be allocated according to per capita to the various electoral districts, having taken into account and given preference to these districts that have not been benefited by the highroads. I consider that fair and proper. As I said here yesterday that I thought that this was the opportunity for the Government to practice what it preached, of a square deal for all. All the members of the Monroe party that went to the country in the last general election preached the doctrine of a square deal to all. If the members on the opposite side had been elected to the districts which the mem-

bers on this side hold to-day they would be standing up for their districts just the same as we are at the present time. I think that the Government is very wise in anticipating certain monies which they feel that they are likely to be in need of before this House meets again. If there is one thing more than another which strikes me forcibly it is the amounts of money that this House of Assembly has been called upon to vote in Supplementary Supply and additional Estimates, and under the Audit Act 33b. for the last seventeen years have amounted to over thirteen million dollars. The amounts have been necessary beyond the amounts that have been voted by this House of Assembly. I think myself that the Government should do its utmost in order to keep within the amounts that are voted by this House. Since these amounts are coming out of the Loan Bill and not out of current revenue, the members on both sides of this House should see to it that the best value is received for the money that is spent.

MR. GRIMES — Mr. Chairman, I think the position taken by the Prime Minister is the correct one, that we should be very careful now we are going to spend that money provided for in connection with these resolutions. It has been intimated to this House that the Labrador catch is a very large one and that it is impossible that it may be marketed successfully at a profitable price. That is going to place a large number of the fishermen on Labrador in a very bad position this fall and during the winter months. As Mr. Halfyard suggested that it is not likely that we will be able to bind ourselves down to the various amounts specified in this Bill. We will find perhaps that we will want more than $200,000 for the encouragement of the fisheries. It may be found that we may need a portion of the amounts voted for roads, bridges and marine works to help out in that connection. Now with regard to the Labrador situation, and the possibility there is of many finding it difficult to sell their fish excepting at prices which will be ruinous to many fishermen, as to whether we should not accept the suggestion put forward before, and endeavour to get up a combination in this country for the increasing of local consumption. We have got the example in Canada and the United States, and at present in Aberdeen and elsewhere similar combinations are being started for the purpose of getting the people in the vicinity of Aberdeen and also throughout the whole of Scotland to eat more fish than they have been doing in the past to help out the fishing industry. The conditions in Scotland are worse than they are in Newfoundland. I read some of the debates that took place on the fishery situation in Scotland in the House of Commons. The representatives of Aberdeen were pressing the Government very strongly for assistance, but the position taken by the Government was that if you go and assist one industry you will soon be called upon by twelve other industries in a similar position. Then they were thrown back on the suggestion made by another member, and I understand that that suggestion is going to be carried out, and that was that any person interested in the fisheries to endeavour to start a combination along the lines that I have already pointed out. And in Canada, in the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries it was stated that because of that the increase of consumption was between 20 and 25 per cent. A similar thing happened in the State of New York in Massachusetts, and in one of the Midland Western States. Now then, if that is the position that has been up there, then I trust that the Government will take cognisance of it, and realising the position of this country itself, and the position that the Labrador fishermen are in, that they will

take some steps along similar lines. I was speaking to a resident of Deer Lake, who was in town about a fortnight ago, and he informed me that he saw very little fish around there. I asked him was that because the people there did not want to eat the fish, and he said it was not, but that lots of people, on the contrary, come into Der Lake from the northern districts and they have on several occasions asked about fish up there, but the trouble is that up there they go in for canned meat and fresh fish a lot, and they are satisfied to go along in the same old rut. They are only interested in making sales of the products that they have on hand and that is the only thing that concerns them. Now, then, to follow along the lines as they have done elsewhere. There is no question but that it is going to help out the Labrador fishermen, there is not any question but that it is going to help stabilise prices. I have not the slightest doubt whatever but that when the situation is placed before the people of this country, and when every consumer realises that he is helping out a declining industry, he will be only too ready to respond to any call that may be made in that direction. For that reason I would suggest to the Government that they take that matter into consideration. I recognise what the Prime Minister has said about the danger confronting the Labrador fishery this fall, and I think that is one of the ways of making it easier than what it is at the present time.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon, as to how best the interests of the various districts throughout the country are going to be served from the standpoint of fair play in the expenditure of the $500,000. The situation seems apparently to have been clarified in respect to the $150,000, which is to be formally alocated to the Department of Public Works, and I presume that the department will deal squarely with the members of each district. As regards the suggestion of the Prime Minister with regard to the $500,000, there are very strange things happen sometimes. I do not know how it happened but during the morning I was giving some consideration to this subject, and my mind ran along the same lines as the Prime Minister's—the idea of a standing committee of this House. Still I can see that it is a difficult matter in the working out, but I am prepared to take the suggestion in the spirit in which it is made. I am prepared to do my share to get four people from this side to sit with four people from that side, as a joint committee. I feel very strongly as I think I gave sufficient evidence yesterday on the expenditure of public moneys. The district of St. Barbe has many things that are crying for aid. We cannot much longer see the extension of the telephone line being delayed. We have lots of important bridges that have gone to pieces down there and that simply must be replaced. I want to see the five miles of road connecting Bonne Bay and Deer Lake finished out to the West Arm of Bonne Bay. I want a Court house at Bonne Bay and one at Flower's Cove. I could recite many more things, and in fact I could put them in writing and calculate to the dollar just what the outstanding needs of the district would cost. You do not want to appoint a commission to go into St. Barbe district, and find out what that district wants. I know its needs. I spent $600 in going through that district. I went into every nook and cranny of it. Now I do not say that everybody that is looking for a hundred for so and so, that their requests should be acceded to. But I know that there are outstanding things that are needed, to which I have referred, this afternoon. The Colonial Sec't' made reference to a situation that might arise in the future. He referred to

the fact that under the redistribution act there was the danger on the part of the representative to be partial to the sections of the district which that member might hope to contest in the next general election. But the Government themselves in the distribution of moneys in the district of St. Barbe last year were partial to certain sections of St. Barbe district to which they hope to send men in the next general election and it was found that the bulk of the special moneys spent in St. Barbe district were spent in the White Bay section, because my opponent was permitted to go into the Department of Public Works or somewhere, and to have a free hand as to what should be done in White Bay. Was it because he represented certain sections of the coast, that he was to be the whole show and the last say as to what should be done in White Bay.

I hold my honour as sacred as any member in this House, and I say that if I am permitted to make recommendations for the expenditure of public moneys in the district of St. Barbe there will be no partiality shown, despite what I may have in the back of my head. All down through the years since I have occupied a seat in this House, whether I was on the Government side or the Opposition side, public moneys have been evenly spent by me as between the Treaty Shore on the one side and the Straits of Belle Isle on the other. In the present instance I do not propose to allow myself to be ignored. I got weapons at my disposal and I am going to hit hard, if things are not done straight. I know that the Minister of Public Works is weakneed in some respects. I fought a terrible battle with him last year and while I was touring the district I spent qnite a deal of money telegraphing his department over the way my district was being treated in connection with expenditures on public works. When I came back to St. John's I found that part of my grant was sent to and spent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who had been hobnobbing with the Minister of Public Works at that time. It is cases like that cause us Opposition members to doubt the sincerity of Ministers of the Crown in charge of expenditures of public moneys to do the square thing. When my recommendations are made I want them to be taken serious cognizance of in preference to outsiders; I do not care who builds the roads and bridges or anything else. I am prepared to deal reasonably with the suggestion of the Prime Minister, but I am expecting that the Executive Governvent will be prepared to do the right thing with recommendations that I make for St. Barbe district. If you want a list of the outstanding and urgent public works that are needed, I can give them to you this evening. Now it is rather puzzling to hear the Prime Minister stating that there is $200,000 voted in the loan for the encouragement of the fisheries and he has not the haziest idea as to how that money is going to be spent. I was hoping to hear from the Prime Minister or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries some definite plan whereby the fisheries were going to be encouraged through this expenditure and it is a great pity that we should be in the dark in that respect, because nobody knows better than the Prime Minister of the confusing state of affairs that is going to confront us in connection with the exportation of codfish. I do not know, but this $200,000 may mean like paying a bonus of 50 cents a quintal on Labrador fish. Goodness knows what you will do with the money, because according to the remarks of the Prime Minister this afternoon people who buy Labrador fish this fall will have to hold it over until next year to export it. If the Government bought fish I fancy the stones of the street would cry out. There are many things in the Resolutions that I would

like to see cleared up and I do not see why this Committe should not rise and discuss this whole matter in joint Committee, as originally suggested by the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising to adjourn until to-morrow, Thursday, September 1st, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY September 1st, 1927.

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

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Supply was deferred until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means was deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on esolutions respecting the raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for certain public purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Last evening in the debate on the Loan Resolutions Mr. Halfyard asked me what balances there were in connection with the amount of eight hundred and odd thousand dollars. Some has been allocated since. $647,811.77 is left and allocated as follows:

(Reads)

I might say in addition:

(Reads)

have not been expended.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman: Some discussion took place yesterday over expenditure of the $500,000 included in the resolutions, and I understand that the Prime Minister made a suggestion that a committee from the Opposition of four and an equal number from the Government be appointed to discuss the distribution of this money. I would like to say that the Opposition have had a meeting and nominated a committee who would be glad to meet a committee of the Government to go into the matter; that is, to go into it immediately before the amount is passed. I shall name the Committee if the Prime Minister wishes to know who they are.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I can't see any object in naming a commitee to go in and do this work before the House closes; it would be just as well to do it in the House and let the whole House be a Committee of the Whole because the idea was to save time. I was hoping to get the House closed to-morrow night; there is no reason why we shouldn't. We have no intention delaying any longer than it should be and members of the Government have work to be done as well as members of the Opposition. We want the committee first to apportion the amount to go to each district. For these districts that have not benefitted from the highroads at any rate, the amount will not be less than per capita, however much more. I didn't want to say "per capita," because I felt that the commission has to consider the

work already done. The idea of the commission sitting now and keeping the House open sems to me unnecessary, and I do say that if you are going to do that—have it sit and keep the whole House open—you will spend another week at it. My idea is the committee might wait; it can't do anything while the House is open. We cannot give any time during the day when the House would be sitting. My idea was to appoint the committee and let them judge the amounts that were to be allocated to each district. I think that we would get through much faster than otherwise.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: My opinion is that it would facilitate the possibility of a solution very much, if the prime Minister agreed to the suggestion. It is his own suggestion that a committee be appointed and it has been appointed. While I do not doubt the sincerity of the Prime Minister in trying to meet the wishes of the members of the different districts, I think that we would like to be assured of exactly the method in which the money is going to be disbursed. The Committee could meet right away I suppose, in the evening or the afternoon and discuss the matter. I certainly think that, particularly in view of the position that has been taken on this, that it would facilitate the possibility of a solution if the suggestion were adopted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I frankly am satisfied that when the committee meets that a solution will be arrived at, but I think that when it does meet that it will at once see the absurdity of in twenty-four hours, arriving at a definite decision. There will be information that will be required, which has been more or less conveyed to some extent, in the reply to the questions asked by Mr. Halfyard. There are statistics that will be required. I think that the hon. member will see my point in that respect. I cannot see what the objection is. If you are going to keep the House open until the Committee has done its work, well then I think that this House will be in session for another fortnight at least. I cannot for the life of me see why the members of the Opposition cannot have sufficient confidence in four of their party, and four members of our party settling a matter like this. If they do not, all that I can say is, that it shows very unwarranted suspicion on the part of the Opposition, that the Government are not intended to play fair with the proportion of the grant. I would like to see that committee get to work when we are clear of this House.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Prime Minister the way in which the authority of that commission acting out of session would be conveyed, in respect to the expenditure of that money. If that could be done I think a great many of the doubts would be removed, in respect to adhering to the recommendations of the committee after the House is closed. That committee may not be in a position to do more than make recommendations, and it may have no power to enforce its recommendations.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I want to put the Hon. Member right on that point. The Committee will not have power to enforce anything. The Government is still in office and anything that the Committee recommends must be submitted to the Governor in Council.

MR. HIBBS.—Mr. Chairman, I take it then that the Committee is merely to act as an advisory committee. But what we are concerned about is the functions of that committe. Now there are certain districts that obviously are not entitled to as much as other districts. The districts that have benefited most by the highroads,

generally speaking, are not entitled to as much as districts that have no connection with the highroads whatever. I think that is only fair. The Committee would have to come to the conclusion as to how much money is to be spent in districts that are not served most by the highroads. It would pay to divide up the balance on a per capita basis. I do not know of a more equitable way than that. If the Committee does that and afterwards it is an understood thing that members representing both the Government and the Opposition will have the right to recommend just how that mony is to be spent in the district, then I think the whole business would be finished. Take the district of Fogo. We have a district down there which would be looking out for a larger share of this vote than anywhere else. Their needs are great. The needs of the district of Fogo are somewhat out of proportion to the needs of many other districts. I would be expecting to be granted a little more per capita for a district of that kind, because you have to reduce the allocation to a district that has benefited greatly by the highroads. So that seems to be the functions of this committee. If the Prime Minister will give us his word, I am prepared to take it, if he stands up and says that whatever amounts are apportioned to the various representatives of the districts, that they shall have the right to recommend how that expenditure is to be made. I cannot for a moment doubt his word on that. We have after all respect for his honor and we have a little confidence in him. Still I would like to see some definite understanding that the Commission have that power. In referring to St. John's I do not want the Minister of Justice to imagine that I am knocking St. John's. We know that St. John's has benefited fairly well by the highroads.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —We got very little out of the highroads in St. John's.

MR. HIBBS—But you have a number of main lines running out of your district. There is the Kenmount Road.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—We built the Kenmount Road out of our own money.

MR. HIBBS—Then there is the Blackmarsh Road, the Petty Harbour Road. These are all good roads.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —What about the Gander Railway?

MR. HIBBS.—I cannot regard the Minister of Justice as being serious, when speaking about the Gander Railway. I wish I was as sure of having a mill down on the Gander as of having a railway. But that does not give us a public wharf in a place like Carmanville. I have been pressing the need of that for the last three years and up to the present I have not succeeded in getting one dollar. Last year you spent one million for public works and I do not think that we benefited to the extent of ten dollars by that. I say that it is an absolute outrage. I want to point out that down in the district of Fogo we have problems that we do not have to contend with in any other district I will refer to one, because it is a job that should have been attended to long ago. I refer to the Canal at Fogo. The Government expended four or five thousand dollars on it, and it was just as well that it was thrown away. They made the canal worse than it was before. This canal is a very important public utility. Not only does it serve that particular but the whole surrounding district would benefit by it. Everybody knows the harbor. Boats coming in there for herring are often wind bound and they have to remain there for days and sometimes weeks. If they were able to pass through the canal they would be able to do their work. Now

I would urge upon the Prime Minister to give some attention to our demands in that connection. I know that I could spend half my per capita grant out there, and while I would be performing a great service to the people of Fogo that does not mean that I would have to deprive the rest of the district of any expenditure whatever. Then, again, we have been trying to make certain sections of the district fit to live in. We are trying to give them more education. And the outlook at the time is good,

Now as regards this Committee there seems to be a nigger in the woodpile, for when it comes down to making that committee effective, there seems to be some hitch. Supposing four members of the Opposition met four from the Government, and with good intentions in that respect, I see no reason why we cannot have that committee meet as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. And then the next question is are you going to give the members of each district the right to decide as to how their portion of that grant is to be spent.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES—Mr. Chairman, seemingly the whole discussion has been brought about because of fear on the part of many Opposition members that they would not get their share of the amount allocated out of the loan for public works in their different districts. There may be some justification for their theory, but I must say that I received fair treatment in that regard from former Governments when I sat in opposition, and I am prepared to extend that same courtesy to members on the Opposition side of the House now.

With regard to the functions of the suggested committee as viewed from both sides of the House, I was not here yesterday when the matter came up for discussion, but if the committee is to decide where moneys in the various districts are to be spent I for one will not give my sanction to any such a proposition, because such committee would not be able to decide where and how money is to be spent in my district. For instance, I am not going to put myself in the position to have to go to Mr. Ashbourne or Mister Anybody else before I can get authority to attend to some matter of pressing importance in my district. Why should we arrogate to ourselves the right to perform the duties of Public Works Department to allocate moneys and hand moneys over to a committee of this House to allocate? I think we should decide here and now as to what we should do, and I think that members representing Opposition districts should get their proportionate share, and it is up to them to see that the moneys are judiciously spent. That is my position and I shall not deviate from that position one iota.

I am responsible to my district just as other honorable members are responsible to theirs for any public moneys I spend in connection with my proportionate share of this grant. I do not subscribe to the idea that I should not get my share of the grant for my district simply because a road was built to Placentia. A large section of Placentia & St. Mary's district did not receive a solitary dollar for highroads. I am satisfied to give my support to anything that I think is anywhere near reasonable. I would not sanction any proposition that would allow any committee to make recommendations for the allocations and expenditures of moneys in the different districts out of this loan, and I am prepared to stand by that attitude.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr Chairman, I cannot state definitely what the exact ideas of the Government are on this matter. I am only one member of the Government and as such can express only my own views; but there seems to be a sort of supposition in the air from the re-

marks of previous speakers that this $500,000 is to be borrowed and flung around where certain people want it to be spent. Now I want it to be clearly understood that whilst this $150,000 will be used as it was last year the $500,000 will be dealt with in a different way. In other words, the Executive Government will be responsible for this larger amount and they want to see that some permanent work be done for this money, and I think we have a right to look for it. The other smaller amount I think is sufficient to do the work that was done in the districts last year just as it was done in years previously when it was divided per capita. Now this other $500,000 is for another purpose. There might be districts that would not require any of this big amount at the present moment, and if they do not require any public works of a permanent nature to be done now they can let it go to their credit and, perhaps, use it later on. But please do not run away with the idea that because we borrowed $500,000 we can make up our minds in 24 hours and take our proportionate share and spend it within that same period of time. I feel the grave responsibility there is in borrowing this money, but I would not have advocated the borrowing of it unless I saw that in many districts we would have to feed people next winter if the money was not borrowed. For instance, there is a great deal of unemployment just now and by giving labour it will help to tide the people over next winter. That is absolutely my idea in connection with the spending of this $500,000, and for that reason I assure members of the Opposition that they will not get less than their per capita share of the vote. They do not have to spend their grant at once, but they can advise the Government of any urgent works needed in their districts, and a committee of four from either side of the House will be called upon to consider the various representations as they come up, so that it will safeguard all the more any waste of this money. I cannot see that we are going to get any further ahead by the committee meeting and deciding upon anything before this House closes. If Opposition members are not satisfied with what I have outlined, the inference I take is that there is a want of confidence in my suggestion, and, if that is so, all I got to say is that I withdraw the proposition that I advanced altogether.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the Prime Minister his views on putting in resolutions to have expenditure divided up per capita. The Prime Minister makes a statement that it is not his own intention to have it spent that way. If the money is going to be put to the credit of certain districts and put there for different districts as required, we all know it is going to disappear in two or three months.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I didn't say "to put to the credit of districts as required," I said the Executive Government were going to see how it was spent.

MR. HICKMAN—As for the suggestion of the Prime Minister that a committee be appointed, we had the idea of appointing a committee not to spend money per capita, but to allot money in places where it was needed. We know there are districts where more money is needed than per capita, for reasons the Prime Minister has stated. For the benefit of the House, I would like to ask if it is decided to allot $500,000 per capita in districts.

MR. CASHIN—Mr Chairman, the more we talk on this matter the further away we are getting from final settlement. Each time we see a solution and offer it to the Prime Minister we are just as far away as when we started, because in listening to the Prime Minister one gathers as much that whilst we may agree in here on both sides of the House that this am-

ount will be spent per capita in all districts, the Executive Government would control the spending of it. I am not entirely in accord with that. If I control the spending of my portion of that $500,000 I intend, to a great extent, to personally supervise the work. Certainly I am in the fortunate position that I can go through my district four or five hours by myself. That is my intention provided I am given an opportunity, but after listening to the Prime Minister a few moments ago when he intimated that the Committee will merely recommend to the Executive Government, here is the position: If the committee makes recommendation they have not any assurance that the Executive Government are going to carry out the recommendations of the committee whatever they might be. Now, I am inclined to be of the opinion even that I consider my district entitled to more because all members consider that. Probably, Mr. Power thinks his district is entitled to more than it will get; possibly some northern districts have representatives who are of the same opinion, but we will never get anywhere the way we are going at the present time. So, in order to try and bring a solution about because I am just as anxious to close the House as the Prime Minister, I am going to make a suggestion and I trust it will be considered.

I suggest that this amount of money be allocated per capita; that the amount in question be placed in the Public Works Department and the Marine and Fisheries Department and that possibly a committee consisting of both sides of the House would sit immediately that the money is put there, and without going to the Executive Government, that it recommend that certain amounts be spent out of the $500,000 allocation. I think that considerably simplifies matters because if we are lead to believe that the Executive Government will accept the recommendations of the committee, well, then the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be empowered to accept recommendations and will get them accepted much quicker than by going through the Executive Government because recommendations might be in for a long time between Executive meetings, perhaps two weeks; but if they were to go to the Public Works Department they could get attention immediately. That is one difficulty I see to the Executive having the spending of the money because none of us knows what there will be anxious to grant money. I want to get value for the money; I am going to see value given whether I am in the Government or the Opposition and even if the Government took the allocating ot money out of my hands and gave it to someone else I would still be rather inclined to want to see that good value is given for the money.

I have another suggestion to make and I regret to have to make it in a sense because I discovered a very few days ago after considerable probing that the Highroads Commission have already disposed of the amount of $160,000. Now, I have strayed from the point I was leading to. It seems to me that if the Loan is put through, my district should be attended to by the Highroads Commission. Now, I am still inclined to go further with the Government in this that I suggest to them that out of the sum of $750,000 for the building of the railway down on the Gander, which is entirely too much, because anyone knowing anything about railways knows that 30 miles of railway should not cost more than $400,000 in view of the fact you have already got the steel rails—those between Clarenville and Bishop's Falls taken up are going to be used. The only expense for rails therefore will be transportation along the line to the point of construction. Thirty miles of steel at $40 a ton is saved and

that seems considerable money. Now, I would suggest to the Government that they take at least $150,000 of that $750,000 and reduce the amount to $600,000 and devote the 150,000 to the completion of the highroads that were started, because I would much prefer you never touched the district than do what you have done. You made a farce of it; 18 miles of good road and the rest undone. It is worse now than it ever was; when you drive over a good road and then go straight on to a bad road you feel worse about it, so I look upon the work of the Highroads Commission last year in connection with the construction of that road as a farce in view of the fact that you knew when you started you wouldn't have money enough to complete it. Now, I make the suggestion and I think it should be taken in all seriousness. If the Prime Minister says they don't require $750,000 for expenditure on the Gander then what are they going to do with it; come in next year and ask for authority to dispose of it some other way and I at least am prepared to give authority now to spend $150,000 to finish the roads started.

There was a point brought up yesterday by Mr. Scammell, which I want thrashed out to-day. We are voting monies this afternoon for public works, and yesterday the Minister himself in this House announced that people who represent nobody in this Chamber have authority to go into a department and allocate monies on their own. Mr. Scammell threw a wrench in the whole work when he told this House that his political opponent in the last election had the allocation of monies in the Public Works Department. That is preposterous. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works now on whose authority that individual was allowed to allocate public monies at all, in the District of St. Barbe.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I really do not remember much about it. There was some correspondence, when I took office last year, between the Government and Mr. Moore. But I think it was all transferred to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

MR. CASHIN—In other words here is what has happened. The money was voted by this House, and a considerable portion of it put into the Department of Public Works, and then it was transferred from that department to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Now I will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on whose authority did he accept the recommendations from Mr. Moore the defeated candidate in the district of St. Barbe, as to the allocation of money in that district.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: In reply to the hon. member I may say that I think that every dollar that Mr. Scammell ever asked to be allocated for his district, I have done so, and any monies that have been allocated through Mr. Moore, in the district of St. Barbe have been allocated with my consent.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the reply of the Hon. Minister but I do not consider that any Tom, Dick or Harry that represents nobody should be allowed to allocate monies in districts. That is not right. I represent a district in this country and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries represents another, and I as representative of my district, it does not matter whether I may be politically opposed to him or not, I have the right.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—You have not.

MR. CASHIN—I have that right and I am going to hold that right as long as my name is Cashin. I have allocated all the monies that have been sent to my own district. But I disagree with the principle of the

thing, that even the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, if he had his own way would not allocate any money to any district without a recommendation from the member for that district. Because after all I know more about my district than he knows about it, and he knows more about his own district than I know about it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman:—I am going to make another suggestion now after hearing the member who has just sat down, and after hearing certain other remarks from the members of the Opposition which led me to be considerably anxious as to what is going to happen to this country. I am going to make the proposition that we withdraw the money altogether. That we do not borrow it at all, and not to perform any public works beyond the $150,000. It is absolutely alarming the way that members have been talking about the money as if it was going to be freely given out. One hon. member said that he was going to take charge of the district grants, he was going to run it, and was not going to be dictated to by anybody. He castigates the Minister of Public Works because he may have listened to Mr. Joseph Moore. I do not see anything extraordinary in the Minister of Public Works listening to him as to what may be the requirements of that district. I certainly would feel that the Minister was quite justified in listening to the advice of a man who had travelled around that district, who has done business there, and is interested in the Government sending money out there. I am absolutely disgusted with the turn that the debate has taken this afternoon. I am perfectly willing to withdraw the $200,000 for the encouragement of the fisheries. I am perfectly prepared to cut down the loan Bill by $750,000, because it appears to me that the members of the Opposition have got the idea that it will not be usefully spent.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Chairman: I thought that I was perfectly reasonable in my remarks but suddenly I seem to have aroused the Prime Minister's ire. As far as the suggestion of the Prime Minister's is concerned I say cut it all out if you are going to cut out the public works and just pay the deficit that the Government incurred during the past twelve months. Suggestions that I made in good faith and then to receive the response that I have. It only goes to prove that it is because of the fact that I made a decent suggestion that it is turned down by the Prime Minister. Within your own ranks to-day the feeling is being expressed that they want the money for public works, and then why criticize the members of the Opposition for expressing their opinions, which are in harmony with the opinions of men in your own party. We were only looking for fairness. We were not criticizing in any way. We were only trying to arrive at a conclusion whereby the money could be properly and economically spent. Now I take it that there is a motion before the Chair that this loan be reduced to two and a half millions. Well I am going to second that motion.

Surely an educated man like the Prime Minister ought to be able to be as courteous to me as I have been trying to be to him, and if I have not been as courteous as I intended to be the Prime Minister should have taken into consideration that Cashin is only an ignorant bayman. But I am sorry that I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth. I was attacked because I expressed my own opinion and which I consider is just as good as the Prime Minister's opinion is. Now I move Mr. Chairman that we all move out of this House because the whole thing is a farce, and even while debating or

trying to debate intelligently with such a dignified individual as the Prime Minister I will take back water from no one in this Chamber.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I regret very much that the Prime Minister has taken the view he has with regard to defeated candidates being considered on equal grounds with members of this House in connection with the making of recommendations for the expenditure of public moneys. The inference one would gather from these remarks of the Prime Minister is that it would be correct for the head of a department to accept recommendations from defeated candidates. That process was tried out in Trinity District in June 1924. So far as I was personally concerned I did not take the matter seriously because it is no sinecure to have the the allotment of a district to distribute. You do not get votes by spending money, because where you get the support of the one who spends the money you earn the enmity of a hundred others. Therefore, I said I was satisfied when the Government let the defeated candidate who led their team recommend changes and allocate public moneys; but I say now as I have often said before that I do not believe in the principle of defeated candidates handling district moneys and it is a principle that I have supported ever since I have been a member of this House. I remember when I was in charge of the Marine and Fisheries Department in 1923 a certain representative came to me and asked me for allocations for a certain district. I told him to go ahead and get it as he was responsible representative. He was a sincere and honest person, but he found that the game was not worth the candle and he was disappointed so far as being elected for the district he was running for was concerned . Matters were misrepresented to him and he found that he was imposed upon and that certain parties got money under false pretences. As far as I was concerned, he could allocate all the money he liked so long as my district got the benefit of it. The Prime Minister may think it is alright for defeated candidates to allocate moneys, but the principle is all wrong and does not work out to be beneficial in the way some people are inclined to think it does. Here is another instance, a man wanted me to recommend him to the Minister of Public Works for a certain amount of money for marine works. He said he got votes for me and I replied that I was sorry I could not give him the recommendation in consideration of other parties in the district who were not geting a cent for public works. That man went and used his influence with members of the Executive Government and got a cheque from the Department of Public Works and then went and misappropriated the money. Therefore, I say let the representatives on any side take the responsibility for recommending expenditures. It is up to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether they will accept the recommendations of myself and colleagues or not. I think it has been stated by the Prime Minister that this $500,000 will be allocated on a per capita basis to the different districts. If that is so, we can rest assured that the various proportions will be put at our disposal in the department of Marine and Fisheries and Public Works. As far as Trinity District is concerned I may say that the money is badly needed at the present time.

As the Minister of Public Works is aware, there is $1,100.00 already spent out of our proportion on Shoal Harbor Bridge and the outport road inspector has recommended $3,000.00 to be spent on Clarenville bridge.

Besides that there are many other bridges in my district tumbling down; whilst the roads in many sections are in an impassable condition. I trust that the Government will see the impracticability of having a committee to allocate this money, because a committee can only meet and make recommendations, but they could never supervise the allocation of the moneys. The Executive Government is the responsible party and there seems to be a misunderstanding that the Executive Council cannot do as it pleases. The Executive Council is responsible to the House and we got to trust the members thereof. The reason for suspicion and doubt is because of things that happened in the past and because of the fact that the time is drawing near for a dissolution of Parliament and the temptation is there for a Government Party going to the country to try and influence votes by spending moneys. Personally I would like to see a dissolution and an appeal made to the electorate this autmun with the hope that some Party would come back to this House strong enough to do something that should be done. The present Government is not strong enough and their friends and foes are talking of their impotence and some of their friends have gone so far as to state in the public press that we are not qualified to govern ourselves. Before we get a Royal Commission to come in and govern us I think we should try and get somebody else and if not then get a coalition Party; but get some crowd here, whether the people elect them or not, that will do something worth while. I would like for the Prime Minister to just tell us just now what the Government intends to do with this $500,000 so that we will all be satisfied.

MR. HIBBS—Within the last hour I have been absent from this Chamber and according to Mr. Halfyard's remarks, the idea of a committee has been abandoned. Now I want to say frankly that I never attached a great deal of importance to the idea of a committee because I could not see how that committee could function. But I did attach importance to the idea that it was the intention of the Government to deal squarely with the Opposition. I realise that when the suggestion was made it was made with the best of intentions. I think now that the matter can be handled very easily. The Opposition do not want anything unreasonable. We merely say that there are districts badly in need, and you have decided to take from the loan $500,000. We want the assurance that that is going to be spent per capita, at least. We were assured some time ago that we might get a little more for extern distircts. You have been very well treated the last few years in a district like St. John's. We feel that in view of that, that that district may be satisfied with something less. That was a reasonable suggestion of the Prime Minister. But I appreciate and sympathise with his position. He also represents an extern district. He must not discriminate in favour of his own district. But immediately the Prime Minister made the suggestion, Mr. Woodford and Mr. Walsh, the members for Harbour Main and Placentia respectively, did perhaps what I would be doing if I were in their place, and they say "It looks now as if they are going to cut off a portion of the money that is due our districts, and allocate it somewhere else," and like good representatives they stand up and make a fight for it. The Prime Minister immediately finds himself in a difficulty. He finds that he cannot carry out his suggestion. But I do not think that anyone will disagree with the suggestion, that all the districts get their per capita share of that $500,000, and that the Opposition members be given the right to recommend the allocation of that

money. That is only fair. We know the districts very well and we know the demands that are being made. We know how to discriminate between those that are deserving and those that are not. When you say that the Executive Government have the right we admit that, but if we close this house we will be absolutely in the hands of the Executive. That is not good enough. We want the assurance now from the Prime Minister that we are not going to be discriminated against. Why do we do that. In the first place let us look at it from the cool, hard stanpdoint of politics. This expendiure of mony will not help you. It is a fact that if public sentiment is with you you need not spend a dollar, but if that sentiment is against you you will not buy votes with money. I remember in 1919, money in Fogo was allocated to be spent on public works. My opponent had absolutely a free hand. I was not even in the Opposition. He could go down there and not only spend the per capita share but more besides. Because Fogo is looked upon by the Government as a pretty hard district to fight. After going down there and going into every settlement and spending money he came back from the polls with but one-sixth of the votes. Not that he was not as good as Hibbs, but sentiment was strong against him. I would say to the Prime Minister: "Live up to the reputation that you have at the present time and that the people of this country expect you to live up to." It is going to redound to your credit later on. If you decide today to allow certain influences to work against you, although I know that you have no intention of doing that now, but some influence might be brought to bear. As I look on the opposite side of the House I see gentlemen over there whom we did not go back upon, when we were the ruling power. There is the Minister of Justice for one. He was a member of this House during the regime of the late administration. He was treated pretty decently. May be there were some complaints, but you will find that the rank and file got a pretty square deal. The Member for St. John's West whom I see sitting opposite, had the right to allocate monies. Mr. Woodford has a different story, but I do not know how that happened. It cannot be said that there was discrimination in favor of a Government member and against an Opposition member during the regime of the late administration. It is just as well to call this thing short now. We don't want the Committee to dictate as to how the money is going to be spent. Let the Executive define their position right now. We are going to take your word. The Prime Minister after all is leader of the Government, and looked upon, and will be held responsible, not only by the districts represented on the Government side, but by the districts represented on the Opposition side also, as being the man at the helm. I feel sure that he is firm enough and that when he makes up his mind to do anything that he is going to do it. What is the good of wrangling. All we want is the definite asurance that you will do what is right.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, when the Leader of the Opposition spoke this afternoon he told us that he supported the idea of having a Committee formed from opposite sides of this House to consider this matter, and that he wanted the Committee to do the work before the House closed. I took that to be an absolute refutation of the purposes that I had in mind, that the Committee should meet after the House was closed. I took it to be an indication that the Opposition would not take my word for the spending of money on a per capita basis. I could

not draw any other conclusion. If this House wants to be satisfied as to how this money is to be spent before the House closes, I do not think that it is possible, without keeping the House open for a considerable time. I think I have already expressed myself to the effect that. I was perfectly satisfied with a pro rata distribution of this fund for the different districts, but I reserve my remarks as to a definite pronouncement on that point, because I was hoping that a district like my own has not received any assistance from the Highroads Commission and like other districts, as suggested by the hon. member for Fogo, ought to be given a little more consideration. Everybody knows that Bonavista is the biggest town, next to St. John's, in the country and the people there are looking for a harbour and a place to harbor their boats, and it seems to me that it would mean an expenditure of $10,000 a year for five or six years before the people could get this harbour. I was hoping that such districts as I have already intimated, would get a little more consideration than others that benefitted by the highroads, yet I am perfectly satisfied that all districts will not get less than their pro rata share of the moneys to be expended, and I give the House my assurance on that point.

As regards the distribution of this 150,000, I am prepared to take the advice of the members of the districts; but I want it to be distinctly understood that this vote of $500 000 will not be treated simultaneously with the $150,000. In other words, this $500,000 has got to be looked upon as a capital expenditure and the Executive Government have got to be responsible for the expenditure of it and we have got to look for some good returns for the expenditure of it. So the Executive Government wants a pronouncement from the House in that respect. If that proposition is satisfactory to the Opposition side, I am sure it is satisfactory to the Government side, and let us put the vote through as it is.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman: I do not intend to delay the passage of these Resolutions, but I would like to make a few observations in connection with the loan. With reference to this vote of $500,000, I frankly admit that until I had the pleasure of listening to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines I had very little interest in the matter by reason of what happened at the Public Works Department last year, and whether Sir John Crosbie or somebody else in the Government interfered there would be no recommendations accepted from me on behalf of the district I have the honour to represent in this House. The remarks of the Ministers of Posts and Agriculture and Mines gave me encouragement that I might have some voice in connection with the expenditure of my share for my district of that $500,000, whether it affects me politically or not. Honestly I was not impressed with the suggestions for the appointment of that joint committee, irrespective of who were to comprise that Committee, and I do not know who were to be appointed as its members. But I do not see what they could do. It must be fairly apparent that the members who would be appointed on that Committee, could have no knowledge of conditions in districts, other than their own. I claim I know more about the needs of Port de Grave district than any other member of any other district and the same principle applies to every other member of every other district in the country. The only reasonable object for the formation of such a Committee would be to decide what shares of this $500,000 the various districts are to receive, and there again they could not recommend as the final decision would rest with the Executive Government. The Prime Minister stated that it is his in-

tention to be fair with regard the distr.bution of this money. Having that statement before us, there is no other argument which can clarify the situation, whether the Committee is in existence or not, either the Prime Minister :s honest in his assertion or he is not, and we have got to take his word for it. Personally, I do not think the Committee would do any good at all and we have to depend upon the Prime Minister and the Executive Government as to how we will be treated in connect on with the $500,-000. I quite agree with the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in their remarks as to the proportionate sharing up of th s sum. It may be that some districts got more than others out of the loan that built the highroads, but, like these two Ministers, I do not see what that has to do with the needs of the various districts either from the standpo nt of public works or from the standpoint of the needs of the people at the present time. Whether the highroads went through the main roads of Port de Grave district or not does not effect the wharves and bridges of Ship Cove or any other public work that is necessary to be done :n any other out of the way place in that district, nor does the highroads affect or help the people of these places to tide themselves and their families over the coming winter. The Prime Min ster also suggested here that he would be prepared to withdraw the votes for public works and public improvements altogether. The suggestion came to me rather suddenly, but I am half inclined to agree with h m; and that brings me to a matter with which I wish to deal this afternoon, and that is the borrowing that has been going on for years past in this Colony. Slowly but surely, and in some cases rapidly, our nat onal debt has been mounting. Today our total liabilities will exceed seventy-three million dollars with a possible additional liability of ten million dollars in connection with the Corner Brook enterprise. We are dealing today with a further liability of five million dollars. On principle I am only prepared to assent to the raising of a sufficient sum of money to-day to pay our immed:ate debts. This is essential in order that our Government may carry on. If that five million could possibly be done without, then I would vote against it; but if it :s necessary, and I am afraid it is, then I cannot vote against it in honesty. It is necessary for the reason that more than half of that five m.llion dollars is required to pay the deficit which has so laregly increased for the year 1926-27 on current account and in connection with the Railway. In connection with the Budget which was presented here a few days ago there was shown a shortage that one can only regard as be ng the climax of a record of sheer incapacity. For over three years the present Government has been in power.For at least two years the Government has seen the financial condition of the Colony gradually getting worse, and, in spite of the fact that they recognized in 1924 when they appealed to the electorate, that someth ng should be done to reduce expenditure, there has not been the slightest attempt made to reduce that expenditure during one single year. On the contrary, the expenditure has been increased and the Finance Minister has announced a deficit of two and half million dollars, and he prophesies in addition that by the end of June 1928 there will be a further deficit of $850,-000—and we can take it for granted that he did not exaggerate in producing these figures—but he did not offer us one suggestion as to how that deficit was going to be reduced. It is truly a case of "The blind leading the blind." No effort is made to reduce expend ture, but the Finance Minister simply says "Here's the expenditure and here's the deficit. Now bor-

row the money to pay it and you will have to do the same next year." How long is this sort of thing going to continue? It must stop somewhere. At some point or other some Government has got to begin to try and square our accounts. If it is not done ere long you will witness the spectacle of a British self-governing Colony defaulting. I have heard the Prime Minister on the floors of this Assembly state that his Government was not strong enough to bring in the drastic legislation that the times demand. If that is so, why does he stand in the path of this Colony as a stumbling block? Why do he and his Government remain in office when they admit their absolute impotence to deal with the situation that confronts us? Why does he stand in the way and prevent this Colony from trying to right herself. Then he tells us that he does not believe that anybody else could do better than his Government has done. Of course, that is his opinion of himself and his Government, and is evidence of nothing but conceit and unwarranted self-assurance. I have not lost faith in Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. I do not admit that there is no person to lead a Government in this country and nobody to constitute a Government in this country that could not do better than the Prime Minister and his associates have done during the past three years. If the Prime Minister's vastly flattering opinion of himself and his associates is correct, then let us all get out of this House at once, because we are clearly incompetent and incapable of carrying on the affairs of the country and the country clearly incapable and incompetent of existing under the system of self-Government.

Mr. Chairman, as it is now 6.30, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to Order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs'" was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

On motion the remaining Order of the Day was deferred.

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice that he will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for defraying certain expenses of Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June One thousand nine hundred and twenty-seven and the 30th day of June One thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he will on to-morrow move that the Rules of this House be suspended in regard to all matters now before this House and to come before the House during this present Session.

Mr. Russell gave notice of Question.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to to-morrow, Friday, September 2nd, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, September 2nd, 1927.

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

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Speaker, on the motion to suspend the rules, I would like to ask one question before the motion is put. I do not do this for the purpose of delaying the House, but I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any further

leg.slation to come before us of which notice has not already been given.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, the question is a very reasonable one, and I rather expected that it would be asked. I mentioned the other day that I proposed to bring in a short bill, which I do not think will be very contentious, in respect to the Bay of Islands light and power company. It is a local company that desires to light Bay of Islands district, and they are looking for a franchise. It does not interfere with Corner Brook, and they are only looking for free duties on transmission lines.

MR. BRADLEY—That is the only concession?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes. They are not looking for any water powers. That is the only bill as far as I know, that I propose to bring before this House except the two of which notice has been given.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, before the motion goes through I would like to have a more definite assurance that no private members on the other side contemplate bringing in any bills of a private nature. For example any bills in connection with shell contracts. If so I do not propose to support the motion for the suspens on of the rules.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the honourable member I may say, that I would suggest that if there is any member on this side of the House that has a bill of a private nature that I do not know of, that he make a statement to this House explain ng that bill. As regards the bill that came into my hands yesterday, it is a subject as I say that the people of Bay of Islands want legislation upon.

Pursuant to Notice and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the Rules of the House with respect to all matters now before the House, or to come before it dur.ng the present Session, were suspended.

Second Reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend the War Pensions Act of 1922."

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill I may say that it is a verbat.m re-production of the 1922 Act. It is simply a re-enactment and it extends what has been done yearly since 1922, namely, the applications of payments of pensions or bonuses to soldiers, as provided for under the 1922 Act.

MR. CASHIN.—Mr. Speaker, I take it that this Bill refers to war pensions. Some time during the present session of the Legislature I brought to the notice of the Government that last year people went around certain sections of the country on behalf of the Government or the Finance Commission, with the result that an old lady in Ferryland who lost two sons in the war and had been receiving two pensions suddenly had a portion of that stipend cut off on the ground that she had a son in the United States who was morally supposed to contribute to her support. Now that son abroad has never contributed a cent towards that old lady's support, and the pensions she had been getting for years was reduced on the recommendation of an agitator and an imposter named Green to whom I have already referred in this House. Now I want to ask the serious consideration of the Government in the case of this old lady, as I think we are morally responsible to look out for such cases in this House as the one I have referred to.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse what my colleague has said. I know of the case very well and I believe that the Colonial Secretary on looking into the whole matter will see how unfair it is for this old lady to lose this money which was taken from her through this busybody Green who is paid $1200 a

year besides a war pension and who is kept by the Government in a position where he is not wanted.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Speaker, I think it will be remembered that earlier in the session when the House was considering the Estimates I made a statement regarding certain cases that did not come within the purview of the Pensions' Act, and that the Board of Pensions had to carry out the Act, although they were in sympathy with such cases. I think also that I intimated that we were endeavouring to organize some proposition as between the Trustees of the Patriotic Fund Committee and the Charities Committee of the G. W. V. A., and I am strongly of the opinion that this scheme can be adopted within the next month or two so that cases, as has been referred to here this afternoon can be taken up and dealt with. I know the merits of such cases, as has been suggested, but, unfortunately, the Pensions Board are powerless to do anything. Consequently, we have to have an organization to look after this sort of thing. If the honourable member for Ferryland (Mr. Cashin) will send me that lady's name, I will see that her case gets consideration.

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask if the expenses of medical men who conduct examinations for soldiers from time to time are paid by the Pensions' Board.

THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY —Yes.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice a Bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The War Pensions Act, 1922'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and 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 Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1927, and the 30th day of June, 1928, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service" was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to

be engrossed and 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. Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Resolutions respecting the raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for certain public purposes.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. BRADLEY—Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon I was trying, with my limited knowledge of the financial conditions of the Colony, to demonstrate that under existing conditions the present Administration was admittedly incapable and admittedly impotent to in any way even attempt to extricate this Colony from the financial muddle enveloping it. Early in this session the Prime Minister admitted his powerlessness by reason of the paucity of his majority in this House, and if any evidence of the incapacity of his Administration is necessary in order to augment my argument it is found in the fact that the Minister of Finance and Customs came in a few days ago and read to this House—with some difficulty—a Budget Speech showing a deficit of two and a half millions, and to-day we are faced with a Loan Bill to be passed by this Assembly for the purpose of borrowing money on capital account to pay current expenses, having already anticipated in his Budget that there would in all probability be a deficit on next year's account of some eight hundred thousand dollars. I think we are justified in assuming that the Minister of Finance and Customs did not in any way over estimate the probable deficit for next year. It is not the habit of Ministers of Finance and Customs having presented a Budget with a deficit of two and a half millions to foreshadow then any greater deficit than he is likely to have the following year. We are then, Sir, perfectly justified in assuming that our deficit for next year will be in excess of the eight hundred and odd thousands which he mentions, particularly when he expected a small surplus for last year, and his figures were two and a half millions out. Now, that Budget did not contain one single item which showed the slightest attempt whatsoever on the part of the Government to in any way meet that deficit or reduce it within reasonable bounds. If the financial situation of the Colony is such that during the past year we met a deficit of two and a half millions, surely we are justified in expecting from any administration that hopes to retain power, or thinks it ought to retain power, should offer some suggestion as to how they propose to make the debit and the credit side balance. But, Sir, there has not been a single indication in this House from the day of opening to the present moment which gave us the least hope that conditions will be in any way improved during the next twelve months. The Government has not made the slightest effort in the world to grapple with the situation, but they come in here like so many schoolboys and say: "Here is your deficit, we want a loan to pay it, you will have another deficit next year, and we will have to get a loan to pay that." Is that finance? Is that the act of an administration that should rule the affairs of a British self-governing Colony? Well may we echo the cry of a famous patriot of years ago—"How long Oh, Lord, how long." This kind of thing cannot go on indefinitely. We must sooner or later reach the point where our credit will have exhausted itself, and in the meantime the administration which came in here three or four years ago on the crest of a wave created by itself for retrenchment and the reduction of expenditure does not make the slightest effort to carry out

that policy of retrenchment and reduction of expenditures so loudly heralded by it. There is more evidence, if any further evidence of the impotence and incapacity of this administration is needed, in the Speech from the Throne which was delivered here four months ago, when the Government foreshadowed the introduction of a Bill to re-impose the Income Tax. They know perfectly well that Bill ought to have been introduced this Session. The Minister of Finance himself and other members of the Government knew perfectly well that Bill ought to have been introduced last Session, as I advocated that it should be, but having agreed amongst themselves to bring it in this year we are about to close the House without the introduction even of that Bill, why? Why it is you have not brought in that piece of legislation in connection with the Income Tax which in the Speech from the Throne you said should be introduced and passed? Simply this, that your Government would split in pieces if it was introduced. There are influences in the present administration which would cause its downfall in twenty-four hours if the introduction of that Bill was attempted. And because of these influences, because of the paucity of your majority in the House, because of your legislation which is essential to the Colony you are useless—worse than useless—to this Colony to-day. I might go on and enumerate instances which prove the utter uselessness of the present administration to Newfoundland. Early in the Session for instance I drew the attention of this Committee to the fact that the staple industry of this Colony was dying—and it is dying—that there were certain burdens imposed on those who prosecuted that industry in the nature of taxes which had no other effect than to benefit certain individuals in this Colony, the reduction of which taxes would not in any way affect the revenue of the Colony; but, in the light of the fact that the revenue would not be increased by the remission of those taxes, and in the light of the fact that such a remission would benefit the fishermen of the Colony, any such action in that regard was refused by the present administration, because in all probability the same thing exactly would have happened as would happen to-day if the Bill to re-impose the Income Tax were introduced. I say, Sir, that if the present administration can do no better in the future than it has done in the past then its usefulntss to the Colony has long since ceased, if indeed it ever existed. The Prime Minister tells us that nobody can do any better than they are doing. He may be right, but I am not prepared to accept his word for that. I am not prepared to admit that all the brains of Newfoundland are bound up in the present administration. I am not prepared to admit that there are not men outside of this House to-day as capable as men who are inside it, and some who are more capable. The statement of the Prime Minister reminds me of a statement once made by Wm. Pitt when he said he could handle the desperate conditions of England, and he was the only man who could; but, the difference between William Pitt, the great Earl of Chatham, and the present Prime Minister is that he (Pitt) made an effort and succeeded, while our present Prime Minister and his associates made absolutely no effort whatsoever. No Government is justified in retaining office unless it can do something to ameliorate conditions such as exist in Newfoundland to-day. Any Government which finds itself in the position that it is not able to grapple with conditions and bring in such a Budget as we heard here a few days ago wherein no attempt was made to grapple with the problem, can only be regarded as rocks standing in the path of progress; a rubbish heap in the

middle of the road which must be removed before vehicles can pass. Surely the Government can see these things. If they cannot then it is only further evidence of incapacity and a further proof that they should retire. I was born in this Colony and a great many of my forefathers. I have to live here the rest of my life. I do not know whether my family will continue to live here or not afterwards. If conditions continue to retrograde with their present velocity then assuredly they will never be able to live here. I appeal to members of this House this afternoon apart from any consideration of party politics. I am not playing party politics. I have no party, Sir. I am speaking for my country. I do not know whether it would be expedient or not for me to appeal to the Prime Minister on grounds of patriotism. He is not a native of this Colony and possibly he has a regard for the land of his birth which to some extent overshadows his consideration for the land of his adoption. Whether he is justified in that attitude or not I am not prepared to say. I offer no criticism on that score. I have never lived in a land of adoption and therefore it is not for me to in any way criticise him on that particular point. I repeat I don't know whether it would be expedient for me to appeal to the Prime Minister on grounds of patriotism, but I do think I am justified in appealing on grounds of common decency to so use the power now resting in his hands that this Colony have a chance. He at least must admit that since he came to this Colony, the country of his adoption has treated him well, and it is poor returns for the consideration and courtesy he has received at the hands of our people that he should continue to stand as an impotent obstacle in the way of the progress of this Colony; an obstacle, a further obstacle over which this unfortunate Colony has to climb in its endeavour to get out of the financial mess into which it is plunged at the present day. To the other members of this House I have a right to appeal on that ground of patriotism. I think they are all native Newfoundlanders born and if ever an appeal on the ground of patriotism was needed in Newfoundland it is needed to-day: "Is it nothing to you—Is it nothing to you that this Colony is going downhill day after day and no effort whatsoever is being made to stop that downward movement?" Have you no desire whatever to even make any attempt to avert the financial crash inevitable in this your native land if our present reign of incapacity is to continue. That is the situation we have to face. These are the conditions that must be dealt with. What are we going to do about them? Is it nothing to you that this Colony is headed for ruin? Is it nothing to you that we face a debt of seventy three millions with added a possible liability of another ten millions in connection with Corner Brook and with a further liability of five millions under the contemplated loan and a further increase next year by another demand for five millions more to meet future deficits already predicted by the Finance Minister. Is it nothing to you? What is needed to-day is clearly a party strong enough numerically, and with brains enough, to grapple with the desperate situation which confronts us; to try at least to make that effort which the present administration refuses to make. Under ordinary conditions I presume that the present administration has roughly another twelve months to live. During that twelve months much may be done; much may be done to surmount the tremendous difficulties we are bound to face. The Government has given no indication whatsoever of any intention to grapple with them. The Government stands stolidly by, and presents us with increased estimates of expenditure with admittedly decreased estimates of re-

venue. All they have to say about it is to ask us to give them the money to pay the bills with a promise of a repetition of the offense next year. They ask us, sir, to increase our liabilities—our annual liabilities—by voting money on capital account to pay the deficit on current revenue. Now if they are not in a position to deal with the situation—and they have had over three years to do it because they asserted that it was necessary four years ago—claimed that it was necessary four years ago—promised to do it four years ago—if they are not able to do it, it is no use to tell the publ c of the Colony that nobody else can do it. They are not going to escape with that kind of vapouring. Their clear duty, if they can't act is to get out and give this Colony an opportunity of obtaining a Government that can act. At least the electorate can't make th:ngs worse. We can't get a Government that can do less than nothing. Give us a chance to see if we can get one to do a little better. During every session of this legislature for years past it has been one continual cry for loan after loan, loan after loan. Never a session of the legislature passes but we have to pass a loan bill of five or six million. I repeat that kind of thing cannot continue. It must come to a stop when the credit of the Colony has been exhausted and that is likely to be at no far distant date according to present indications. The present adminstrat on in the light of its admission that retrenchment is necessary, in the light of the fact that it admits it cannot bring about that retrenchment; in the light of the fact that it offers no remedy for the evils that oppress the country to-day still continues in office at the expense of Newfoundland—and Newfoundlanders. Sir, I have little more to add. The situation is so clear so unmistakable; the duty of the Government is so evident that none but an imbecile can fail to see it; and I am not sure but some of them would see it. The action of any Government in keeping itself in power under such circumstances when they cannot do any good is nothing short of a crime, a crime against a people who placed their trust in them some three years ago; and I do say in all sincerity that unless you are prepared to apply the remedy or stand out of the road—and I am sure you can avoid the latter—now, you may rest assured that generations of children yet unborn will live to curse the name of Monroe and the men who supported him in this Assembly under such cond tions. I make this appeal as strong as I possibly can because I sincerely believe unless some immediate change is made in the method of conducting public affairs this Colony is doomed. I repeat that statement and I am prepared to stand by it. Unless some immediate change is made in the conduct of the Colony's affairs the Colony is doomed. Now is the time if ever there was a time when strong administration is necessary. Now is the time if ever there was a time when capable administration is necessary and the present administration possesses neither of these qual fications on its own admission. Are they then determined to stand in the path of this Colony? Are they then determined to deprive the people of this Colony who trusted them of their right to make an effort through the polls to obtain a Government that will be capable of do'ng something. This is not a time, as I have said before, for playing party politics. This is a matter to-day of one's country of the very existence of one's country and on this plea of patriotism, which I claim I have a right to use here th's afternoon, I appeal to the members of this Assembly to end the present condition of affairs. I particularly appeal to the Executive Government in whose hands is the power and on whose shoulders alone will rest the responsibility for any ac-

tion or lack of action after this House closes in a day or two. At this time clearly party interests should be subordinattd to interests of country to do what I consider 95 per cent. of the country believe ought to be done. The reorganisation of this House of Assembly through the polls in order that the present administration be returned with a strong majority or some other administration be returned with power sufficient to undertake the Herculean task which the present times necessitate and which is beyond the strength of the Monroe administration, and bring order out of chaos in this unfortunate Colony.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman, am I to understand that the propositions made by the Hon. the Prime Minister when we were last discussing these resolutions have been abandoned. I mean in respect to a joint committee. I personally am anxious to see it proceeded with. And when yesterday I put the question to the honourable gentleman as to what were the functions of that committee, I think he quite misunderstood the trend of my remarks. He seemed to think that we expected that such a joint committee would have the right to allocate certain public monies without reference to the Executive Government or anybody else. Now the idea that I had in mind was based upon the experience of the highroads commission, who handled very large sums of money and I thought that a joint committee should be placed in the same position of advantage as the highroads commission. I do not see where I am asking too much for the joint committee and I do not think that the Prime Minister or the Executive Government could expect the representatives of the people to accept a position of less advantage than is held by these gentlemen who handled large sums of money in connection with the highroads. Now I am anxious to know if the idea of the joint committee is to be abandoned. Personally even if the committee has not arbitrary powers, I do not see where the appointment of such a committee could be any harm, and as a matter of fact I can see where it could do a great deal of good. Because a joint committee drawn from the Government and the opposition could compare notes as to the outstanding needs of the various districts, and could take council together, and then those districts that had outstanding needs to place them in a needy position above the others. I have in mind now the position of districts on the southern coast such as Burin, Fortune and Placentia, which were badly hit by storms. In Placentia district the loss of life was particularly great. Fortunately it was not so great in the district that I have the honour to represent. But take Placentia or any district that has suffered through those storms, it is the duty of this House to do all it can to help to repair the damages through loss of life. I was continually getting appeals by telegraph and otherwise from the district of Fortune asking if anything is to be done to enable the fishermen who have lost their means of livelihood to carry on the industry and to endeavour to make sufficient to tide themselves and their families over the long winter ahead. I feel that if there were four men from the other side of the House sitting in collaboration with four men from this side to deal with those cases of need or in connection with any expenditure of money that they would be only too glad to co-operate and relieve the distress which has arisen in certain sections, and enable the fishermen to go back and carry on the industry from where they left off. With some of the remarks made by the Hon. the Minister of Posts and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, I am in full accord. The fact for instance that the Hon. Minister of Posts through whose district of necessity the highroads had to

go does not mean that it is fair and proper for his district to be cut out of any allocation or share of $500,000 provided in bill, for roads, bridges marine works and things of a like nature. The fact that the district represented here by the Hon. Mr. Sullivan and by Mr. Walsh has suffered so very greatly in the recent storms, would be a sufficient reason why that district is not to be deprived of its percapita share of the $500,000. As far as the south-west coast districts are concerned they have been badly and consistently neglected, in connection with the improvement and provision of public works. There are certain districts that have stuck closely by the fisheries, and these districts have in the past been consistently neglected. They have not been given their fair and proper and reasonable share of the public expenditure that has been embarked upon. Now it seems advisable above everything else that in future we will have to be prepared to undertake to do more in the interests of the fisheries, than we have done in the past. And how better could he begin than by starting now with the expenditure of the $500,000 provided for in the measure before us and provide better facilities for these fisheries. Were even some of the handicaps under which the fishermen are labouring to-day, removed and it was made easier and more profitable for these men to work and earn their living, we would be doing something worth while. When I have regard to the fact that in one of the St. John's districts to-day there has been spent by the Highroads Commission the sum of $85,000 for the building of bridges or roads, and when I have further regard to the fact that that exceeds by one-half the total road grants for my whole district, I believe that that is not decent treatment for a district that can only be properly represented as a fishing district pure and simple. Perhaps in the beginning when the Government started their roads policy they really believed in that policy as a revenue producer, and they believed that tourists would be encouraged to come here, and that coming here they should be provided with good roads to encourage them to come again and bring their friends with them, when the expenditure is made entirely apart from the districts where the bulk of the fishermen earn their living. But sir, I believe that the time for expenditure on roads, bridges and works of that nature is long past, and I strongly object to a continuation of that policy, because I have regard to this fact that residents of my district in conjunction with other districts have not sufficient money to prosecute the fisheries in a profitable manner, and at the same time large sums of money are, and have been spent on districts which are being served by the highroads at the expense of other districts, who can get all the privileges that they want. The leader of the Government gave us all to understand, early in the session that the policy of the Government would be to provide greater monies for extern districts and that then any amounts that were not spent out of the loan were to be provided for the districts that already had one million dollars spent through the highroads policy of the Government. The Prime Minister afterwards qualified his remarks by saying that they simply represented his own personal ideas. I take it that as far as that goes that the idea of the Prime Minister should really represent the ideas of the members of the Government, or at least the majority of them. If we cannot take the Prime Minister as being in a position to state ideas of that sort, and give them force in such a connection as that is it not only logical to conclude that the Prime Minister has not more power or authority to enforce his suggestions in connection with the expenditure of this $500,000 per capita

and particularly in connection with the extern districts. Now I do sincerely trust that the idea of a committee of co-operation in respect to the allocation of that $500,000 provided for in this loan bill will not be abandoned, because I am sure that co-operation in such a matter as that will do a great deal of good. Now there is another feature o f this loan bill that I would like to refer to before I take my seat, and that is the provision in connection with the encouragement of the fisheries. The loan bill has included within its provisions an item of $200,000 for that specific purpose and I have asked the Minister of Fisheries and I have asked the Prime Minister for some explanation along the lines which that fairly large sum of money is going to be spent. Nobody seems to have any definite idea. Permit me to urge upon the Government generally and upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries particularly that immediate steps be taken to formulate a plan for the encouragement and the improvement of the herring fishery of this country. Years ago that fishery on the south-west coast and particularly in Fortune Bay was mainly important and profitable to the fishermen of that section. Through some mistake the fisheries fell off, and it practically disappeared until three years ago, and it is now beginning to revive again. I may say that as far as the present Minister of Marine is concerned I have found him only too ready and willing to co-operate with any of the suggestions brought forward on behalf of the district there for the encouragement of the fisheries. And I believe that if that honourable gentleman were to set himself down to the formulation of a specific and practical plan for the encouragement of the fisheries, and for the increasing the extent and the value of that fishery, he could readily discover ways and means of carrying out that policy and of spending a fairly large portion of that $200,000 for the benefit of the fisheries. And I may also say that the capacity of the fisheries generally will be increased by this expenditure on the herring industry. There is not the slightest doubt about it.

So I would urge that in respect to the herring industry that immediate steps be taken for the encouragement of that industry, and then there is the question of the opening of the lobster fishery. I am continually getting enquiries by telegraph from the people of the District of Fortune Bay as to what the purpose of the Government is in respect to this fishery. Men who were engaged in that industry before the close season came into force, write and say that if anything is going to be done with that industry, and the conduct of it, next year, it must be done now and quickly or permission to operate that industry will be of no avail. Perhaps the Minister of Marine is not in a position to give me the information but the people in that section of the country are very anxious about it, and they would like the hon. gentleman to put me in a position to allay their fears or to give me some definite information so that I can proceed to make plans either to engage in that industry or to abandon the idea altogether, because another year of close season is going to be calamitous. And now in conclusion I would like to recapitulate my different requests, first that the idea of a joint committee of both sides of this House will not be abandoned in its entirety, but that honourable gentlemen from both sides of this House will get together after this House closes for at least advisory purposes in connection with the allocation of $500,000 provided for under this loan Bill. Let me also emphasize the hope I have that the Government will see its way clear to do something of a

specific and outstanding nature for the relief of the fishermen who have been very much distressed by the total destruction of property, boats, gear, etc., on the South West Coast, and that the Government will see its way clear to co-operate with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the expenditure of a considerable portion of the $200,000 for the encouragement of the fisheries, and to help to restore the herring fishery to something like that it possessed before in connection with the fishing industry of the country generally.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: In reference to the member for Fortune, I may say that I am not in a position to tell him to-day that the people of Fortune Bay can go ahead and catch lobsters. We have been working on it for about three weeks, and we have got so far. I think that in five or six days we may be in a position to say what can be done in reference to the lobster fishery. But I may say this for the information of the House that it is impossible almost, to sell lobsters this year even though the lobster fishery was open. So I do not think it would be advisable to open the lobster fishery this year. As far as the herring fishery is concerned, no man has done more than I have for the people of Fortune Bay and Placentia in reference to that. And I am sorry for the position that that fishery finds itself in to-day. If there is anything that I can do I am prepared to do it. Last year I was the man that turned into Fortune Bay $6,000 or $10,000 through the herring industry. I must admit that something has got to be done as far as the fisheries of this country generally are concerned. Those men who went to the fisheries this year, no doubt they made a successful year. But as far as I can hear it looks as if the prices are going to be very poor. If the prices are going to be any poorer than last year, those that have kept up their end of the plank for the last five years will have to fall down. Therefore I do not pay attention to all that is going on around town. I hope that the fishermen will get remunerative prices the coming year.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: Last year some inspectors were sent out from the Fisheries Department in connection with the herring fishery in Fortune Bay. One of these gentlemen got in rather a mix up through accepting fees on the side. Now is it the custom of the department to send out instructions to collect fees for instructing in the putting up of herring, or can that be done, because people who were connected with the gentleman against whom some complaint was voiced in this House always thought that they had to instruct the fishermen and the packers in the putting up of the herring and that they should be paid for it. But I can quite see where they got up against the rules and regulations governing the industry. The point I was emphasizing was the necessity of instructions being available during the herring season, and whenever people require them. Can any gentleman supply that information.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: A great deal of fuss was made here some time ago that herring inspectors were receiving money for the inspection of herring. As I stated here then, I consider that any true Newfoundlander that knew the laws of the land were being broken by these people, or that men sent out to do their duty were collecting money from these people, that it was their bounden duty to report it to the fishery department. But in this case the Hon. Member for Fortune did not report what information he had got in reference to the collection of mon-

ey for inspection until he got on the floors of this House, and then he made the complaint. Well I am glad to see that his complaint has been justified. I met that gentleman the other day on Water Street, and I asked him was the charge correct. He said that in a way it was and in another way it was not. He said that he had shown a man how to pack herring, and that that man had paid him one hundred dollars for his services. I said "Do you know that is against the law." Thereupon I discharged that man, and as long as I am in the department he is not going back there any more, because that man knew as well as I knew that he was not allowed to accept any money for instructing people how to pack herring. Only the other day I received a message from the Union Trading Company at Notre Dame Bay saying that some of the people were starting to put up lobsters and they did not know how. They asked me if I could send an inspector down to show them. And supposing they charge ten cents that is not paid into the Customs Department. It is no use for the Member for Fortune Bay to make a charge against some man who has done what is wrong and then try to get him back.

DR. MOSDELL—Mr. Chairman: I was simply asking what were the duties of that inspector because the people wrote me and told me not that his business was merely to inspect, but because they thought he was doing them a special favor he was paid $100 for showing them how to put up Scotch cured herring. That is why I asked the Minister to send up instructors to Fortune Bay. At the same time I thank the Minister very much for the information he has given me and I think he dealt fairly and squarely with the official who offended, not only because he broke the rules and regulations of the department but because he took money illegally, and I shall take immediate steps to broadcast the information the Minister has given me in respect to the duties of an inspector in Fortune Bay with regard to the packing and supervising of herring.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman: Fearing that there may be any misunderstanding as to what the duties of herring inspectors are, I shall issue a circular letter to-morrow setting forth what their duties are, because it appears that there are a couple of men who are not acquainted with their duties; but in the case under review the man who was dismissed was an experienced inspector and knew all the ropes.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I am inclined to agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Port de Grave in connection with this loan Bill. I cannot see how any legislators can complacently vote away five million dollars now and in the light of the deplorable prospect of an increased deficit for the year ending June 30th, 1928 voting away another five million dollar loan next year. How long is such a condition of things going to continue, may I ask? Should not we all get out of this House and not come back any more until the electorate of this country is appealed to and given an opportunity of saying who shall conduct the affairs of this country for the future. I think that must be patent to everyone. The present Government cannot or will not do anything to remedy the existing condition of affairs and still we are prepared to sit down here day after day, vote ourselves salaries and vote away $500,000 for public works and other large sums for other things amounting to five million dollars. There is also a vote in the loan for $200,000 for the encouragement of the fish-

eries; but at the same time it does not follow that, because this amount is earmarked in the loan, anything will be done for the fisheries. There is no action on the part of the Government for the past three years to convince that one cent of that amount will be devoted towards the encouragement of the fisheries. I think this vote of $200,000 is a wise one, as every member knows it is high time that the Government did something to resuscitate the codfishery. The policy of the Government, if we judge by their past actions, is such that we cannot look with confidence to having ways and means devised towards the bringing about of a different condition of things than that which obtains at the present time, and no man on the opposition side of the House can use language strong enough against the inaction of the Government, and we would not be discharging our duties and our responsibilities if we did not again voice our protests as vigorously as we can against the impotence displayed by the present Government. Still the Prime Minister is satisfied. He was elected for a special job, yet he is quite satisfied to close this House and do nothing until it meets again. The statements and promises that the Prime Minister broadcasted in 1924 when he appealed to the country, and since, are not worth the breath he used in expressing them and are not worth the paper they were written on and I endorse what has been said this evening by the hon. member for Port de Grave in that respect. The people of the country have no faith in the present Government because the Government broke faith with them. The Prime Minister promised the people of this country that he would do something to carry out their wishes with regard to reduction of expenditure and reduction of taxation, but then to find that the Government did nothing since they took office but to sit tight and vote themselves their salaries, can you wonder at the people having no faith or confidence in the Government? Can you wonder, Sir, at the people of this country saying that the members of the Monroe Government are in office merely for the money they get out of it? Put your loan Bill through. Close the doors of this House and then if you have any self-respect or any honour, either political or personal, admit your utter incapacity to do anything and get out of office. The Government, as at present constituted, is so numerically weak that the political gun is put to the Prime Minister's head very frequently and he has got to accede to the demands that are made, simply because of his desire to hold on to office. I wonder what influence was brought to bear upon the Prime Minister that caused him to disavow the pronouncement in the Speech from the Throne, namely the re-enactment of the Income Tax Act in a modified form to help lessen the deficit in some way. Influence was brought to bear by a member of his own Executive and I consider it was an insult to the man who occupies the position of Prime Minister in connection with such a matter. What would the late Sir Robert Bond do, if such a thing happened in his Government Either one or the other would have to get out, and that is the kind of man we want in the Prime Minister's chair to-day; not one to be made a "goat" of and held up to public ridicule. The present Prime Minister of this country had the greatest opportunity that any Prime Minister ever had since we had Responsible Government to do something in connection with the management of public affairs of this country. There is nobody realises more so than the Prime Minister himself that something of a drastic nature

should be done to reduce expenditure, but, as he is surrounded by a number of men who are evidently influenced in their actions and in their advice to the Prime Minister, he is there as a "goat" to carry out their wishes and their desires and he is therefore held up to ridicule by the whole country. The greatest supporters of Mr. Monroe in the last elction stated publicly two years ago that commercially he was a good business man; but that he was the greatest failure as a Prime Minister that occupied such a position in this country, particularly in this crucial period as at present when we are heading as fast as we can to bankruptcy and ruin. "Who will steer the ship of State in some straight course, as she is now almost high and dry on the rocks of bankruptcy and ruin?" These are the words that are uppermost in the minds of the people throughout the length and breadth of this country to-day as well as in my own mind, and I would be shirking my duty as a responsible representative of the people if I did not repeat them. We are all here as public servants and we address each other as public officials. We may be the best of friends personally, but that will not deter or influence me as a representative of the people from doing what I think is right in the best interests of the country as a whole. If I am to tell what I believe to be true and honest, I would say what is the good for me to be in this chamber, if we are to be governed by the sentiment of indifference that prevails at the present time here. It may be left for us next year to continue Responsible Government, which we all glory in, but what can that do with the tens of thousands of people who have left the country within recent years to try and get a bit to eat. There are scores of people leaving the country to-day because they are unable to get employment in this country and they are forced to seek it elsewhere; whilst here we are after voting away sixteen and a half million dollars since the present Government took office. What a record for any Government to have. Possibly I advocated when this House opened a dissolution and a general appeal to the country. I know that if there was an appeal to the country this autumn and a new Government took charge that they would have the most undesirable and unenviable job any Government ever had in the history of this country to clear up the mess left by their immediate predecessors. Therefore, I do not covet Government positions of emolument. I would not like to have to play any part in controlling Government affairs for another year or two. However, I think it is the absolute duty of the Government, in view of present conditions, to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country and put up with the result. I cannot imagine that we will ever have a Budget introduced in this House like the one we have at the present time, so that if there is not a general election this fall there is sure to be one by the time the House meets again; but I think it would be in the interest of the country to have an election in the fall rather than in the spring. It may be the object of the Government after this House closes to decide to remain in office until the fall of 1928 by dickering with certain members of the Opposition and get them to support the Government. I hope that is not so. I never agreed with that sort of scheme and I was never an active participant in it because there was never any good came out of it. Let the people decide and if we cannot do anything else to improve matters let us abandon the idea of Responsible Government and be governed by a Royal Commission, but let us do something for the country and not remain in this present inactive

state.

I have finished. I could have remained quiet; a peaceful attitude; but I trust that what I have said may be regarded as what I actually believe should be done and I hope that self interest is not an influence in my remarks this afternoon. I hope that it is not; but I am only viewing conditions that obtain at the present time as this House is constituted. The Prime Minister said here on opening day drastic legislation should be introduced. His own party would not allow him to introduce it. "You are not to interfere in my district with regard to this or that vote." It is too late now. That will go on next year. We are getting nearer the time when an appeal will be made to the country. Nothing will be disturbed. Who is going to pay the salaries when we become bankrupt because we can't go on borrowing millions of dollars much longer and there will be Commission Government or a Crown Colony one or the other and then the natives of Newfoundland or those who are doing business here because I don't believe in making distinctions of that kind will have some one foreign to them come in here and manage affairs because we have not confidence in ourselves. We have proved incapable and must ask some one to come in and govern us and submit to alien rule which is humiliating. We should carry on. There are men in this House now who could carry on but what is the good when you haven't a majority and cannot put your desires into effect. Well then somebody must come who will have a majority with the idea that an effort be made. We have had talk of the need of a Mussolini or a strong man to do things but the result of Government by such a strong man I am not prepared to say and I am sure it wouldn't be the panacea for all our ills. If the fishery can be put in a better position. If any thing can be done. If any plan can be worked out so that the prosecution of the fisheries will be more remunerative to those engaged in it let some attempt be made but the present Government cannot do it and the present Opposition cannot do it. Let some strengthening influence be brought into this House. Let the people decide while we have Responsible Government as constituted at the present time.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Prime Minister in connection with the $750,000 for a railway I suppose it is not the intention of the Government to construct the railway until such time as the Gander have made a contract with some reliable concern to carry on operations down there?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—We are not going to build until they exercise the option to take up Reids' property. Then we propose to start the railway.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had passed the same and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that a Bill be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for certain public purposes" was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time presently.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker: On the second reading of this Bill I would like to take the opportunity to address a question to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if I could have permission. It is in reference to the lobster fishery. I intended to do it during the committee stage but

unfortunately I was called downstairs and missed the opportunity. I want to ask the Minister if he has got many representations as regards the opening of the season this fall and if so where they are from and if the Department or Board has arrived at any decision with regard to regulations and what they are going to advise the people to do when the season opens.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: In reply to the Honourable Member I wish to say merely in reference to applications for the opening of the lobster season we have got just about fifty per cent. asking to open the season and fifty per cent. asking for a close season for another year. I have already told the Honourable Member for Fortune about them. With regard to the regulations we won't be able to give you that until about a week's time. As soon as we have them I will be only too pleased to let you know.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I very much regret I missed the opportunity this afternoon to say a few more words in connection with the loan resolutions and I am in the same position to-day as when they were introduced into the House and I say now every member of the House from the Opposition view point is in the same position as I find myself in. We are still absolutely in the dark as to how the Government propose to deal with Opposition members with regard to that five hundred thousand dollars. We have had a good deal of talk and flow of words and have got no undertaking yet and I defy contradiction that a member going out of the House has a definite idea as to how his district is going to be treated with regard to the allocation of that five hundred thousand and the Government doesn't know itself and everything we have said as regards any intention that there might be on the part of the Government to act in a manner that could be characterised as trickery still holds. We had the spectacle here of the Prime Minister proposing a joint committee of both sides of the House. Then we witnessed the further spectacle of its being decried by members of his own party and finally the whole thing falling through. In place of that undertaking we have not got another undertaking given as to what the Government propose to do. Now I want one more word from somebody on the other side of the House; one final word at least so I shall have the consolation if I can't do anything else of passing the buck to somebody that the Government proposes to play squarely and fairly with the external districts of the island with regard to that five hundred thousand. I still maintain that I am the person best qualified to know as to how the share of this money that goes to the district of St. Barbe should be allocated. You have five thousand dollars here now which is roughly $2.00 a head for each man, woman and child and our share should be $25,000 roughly. I want that money for St. Barbe district and no nonsense about it. We have needs down there. I do not want the idea to get abroad in St. John's that this is going to be a scramble and that we are going to put this $25,000 to what ever purpose we like. I have definite things that want to be done for the expenditure of that $25,000. It is alright for the member for Placentia to grin. I do not want him to be grinning at me. He is in a secure position. He knows that he is well enough placed to get what he wants. The representative for the district of St. Barbe is not in the same position.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I am prepared to fight for it.

MR. SCAMMELL—And I am going to see that my district gets a square deal. We are just now going to ring down the curtain on this Assembly and perhaps this will be the last time for a great many of us that our voices

will be heard in this Chamber. And very shortly you as a Government will be weighed in the balance and I predict that you will be found wanting, as as the electorate of the country is concerned, for they say that you have broken faith with the people of the north particularly, whom you have outraged, discriminated against and whose rights you have discarded in the manner that you have as regards the policy of public expenditures within the past three years. Now I am not going to stand up here with the idea of stampeding the Government into doing it. That is not my policy, but I make the appeal to the Government that they allocate the money percapita. Or that at least they will have the courtesy to consult me or to ask me for my recommendations before spending this money.

MR. HIBBS—I do not think that there is any doubt in the minds of the members whatever but that the Government intends to spend this money on a percapita basis. I think we are all agreed on that. But what I am still in doubt about is whether the commission composed of members on the opposition side as well as the Government side will have the privilege of recommending the allocation of this money. That is the point that I want cleared up. If you accept the recommendation of any other person but the elected representative of the district then you are playing politics. Nothing more or less. I can quite understand the Prime Minister saying that he did not want this money to be spent on anything but what is necessary. Well I want to say this to the Prime Minister and the Government that as far as my district is concerned that my share will be expended upon very important public works. But we are going to have an election shortly and there is a man that you are going to send down to oppose me, and are you going to give him a chance to spend that money for the purpose of getting votes, or are you going to recognise the recommendations of the elected representative. I would like Mr. Chambers to tell us what in his opinion will be the right thing. If for instance a certain amount of money is placed in his Department to the credit of Fogo, on whose recommendation are you going to spend that money, mine or some other person's.

Whereupon the Bill was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Chairman, I may say to the honourable gentleman that it would be very enjoyable to see the member for Fogo come into my office particularly if I have full control of the expenditure of that money. I would certainly satisfy him.

MR. HIBBS—Do you not think that you will have full control?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—That is what I believe, but the money is not there yet.

MR. HIBBS—If the money is not there I do not want you to spend it, but if it is there I want you to do your duty and you will be a bigger man and better respected if in regard to the money that comes in here for Fogo, if you treat with the member of the district and not any other member.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, I have already pointed out to this House that that $500,000 is not going to be put into the Board of Works or any other department, but the Executive Government are going to consider the propositions of the members on that point. This is not going to be looked upon as $500,000 for general purposes. We have got to make sure what it is going to be spent

on and the applications have to come to the Executive Government.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree that as this is a large expenditure of money that the Government will want to know what it is going to be spent on, but if a representative of any district, take Fogo district for example, if I go and write a letter to the Executive Government and point out that in the district of Fogo we have public works that require the spending of $3,000 or $4,000, are you going to take steps to find out that that is a reasonable requirement and then are you going to acceed to my request?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the honourable member for Fogo has suggested that, if their recommendations were not acceded to, we were going to make a slush fund of this $500,000. Might it not be as reasonably argued that, if there was an election pending and we handed over the money to them, there might be a slush fund. We want to make perfectly sure that this money is for the most judicious and best expenditure that can be made in the interests of the districts for which it is recommended. We accede to the idea that the members for the various districts can give us the best advice and we will be inclined to follow their advice to the greatest possible extent. Seemingly, members of the Opposition have not got very much confidence in the Government, and, perhaps, we in return have not got such enormous confidence in them.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has given up altogether the idea of having a committee from both sides of the House with regard to the distribution of this $500,000? The suggestion of a committee was brought on by himself and members of the Opposition thought it was a very good one; but now it seems the idea has got to a point that we don't know where we are. I would like to hear a pronouncement from the Prime Minister as to whether or not it is the intention to abandon the idea of a committee?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman: I gather from the expressions of Opposition members that the committee would not do more than recommend the apportionment of the fund. The expenditure of this money is to be governed by the Executive Council and any requests for expenditure that come from members of either side that are considered reasonable will be acceded to, but the Executive will make perfectly sure that any expenditure asked for is in the best interests of the district for which it is asked. After listening to the debate on the subject, possibly this committee would not be of much service. At the same time I have no objection to calling the committee together.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman: I think it is only right for some member of the Executive Government to corroborate the undertaking of the Prime Minister regarding the distribution of this money. It must be borne in mind that the original intention of voting this $500,000 was to meet contingencies that exist all over the country respecting public works. Now whilst there may be instances where some districts are very much worse off than others from the standpoint of public works, still, after the debate that has taken place the last few days, it is evident that the only fair way to allocate this money is on a per capita basis. At first blush I thought that a representative committee of the House getting together to discuss the method and the means whereby this money would be allocated would be a good one; but after mature consideration I fail to see

that any advantage would be gained by having that committee in existence. The point that is regrettable over the whole matter is that there seems to be a lack of confidence between one side of the House and the other. Now I make bold to say that the one thing that is doing more harm in this country than anything else is the lack of appreciation public men in public life have for each other because of the different attitudes and different angles from which they discuss public questions. We are confronted in this country to-day with a very serious situation, a situation that could well be tackled by a united House and a united country. Whilst we are all anxious and desirous of displaying an especial interest for the districts we represent, still it must be realized that often, and, perhaps, more often in the future if the country is to prosper, we must find a common level and look at common questions from a common standpoint for the common good. I think it is unusual—I do not know of any precedent for it—for a Government to undertake what this Government has undertaken to do with regard to the distribution of this money. I think it shows good intentions on the part of the Government and that they want to treat Opposition members representing constituencies throughout the country fairly and squarely. They do not want to take any undue advantage by having the expenditure of this money for Government districts to the detriment and sacrifice of Opposition districts, and I feel sure the Government will carry out the promise they have made through the Prime Minister with regard to the expending of this special money, but it seems it is absolutely essential in my opinion that some control should be held over this money. Now I do not anticipate that any Honourable Member within the hearing of my voice is going to improperly spend one dollar of that money but as I pointed out the other day there is a situation that will arise in this country that would probably prejudice the minds of Honourable Members in their decisions with regard to the expenditure of money and I am glad to know that I have already been informed in some districts; Opposition districts they do not intend to fritter away this money but intend to spend it in a way to be of lasting value. Surely no Honourable Member in this House means to take that money and have it so spent that it will disappear and he will not have something there to his credit for a few years to come. There are so many outstanding claims from every part of the country to-day. I know in the district of Harbor Grace there are outstanding claims and I only wish I had sufficient funds to meet all those claims and have those public works attended to and the expenditure of every dollar of that would be justified, but we cannot expect the Government to meet all requests and we can only cut our garment according to the cloth we have at our disposal, therefore I feel the House ought to have sufficient confidence in the word of the Prime Minister because I know he as well as all members of the Executive Government has no other idea in view but that expressed. We have to get down to brass tacks. We have too much politics and too little patriotism. What we want to-day in Newfoundland is a common effort on the part not alone of politicians but of the people of the country to resusciate this country once more. It is deplorable and I know Honourable Members must feel with regard to the situation here that it is alarming and possibly we are going through a crucial period as alluded to by Mr. Halfyard but he wouldn't wish to be in charge of the general administration of the affairs of the colony for

the next year or two. We are certainly sincere in this object that this money will be spent in the best possible way but not to the advantage of politicians of this side of the House or the other side and I think in that spirit we ought to face it and that the Opposition ought have every confidence that the Government will act fairly in every instance.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS — Mr. Chairman: At the closing of my job as Finance Minister I would like to endorse the opinions expressed by the Honourable the Prime Minister and the Honourable Colonial Secretary. I take the same attitude exactly as he takes, and in concluding I would like to thank members of the Opposition during the session for their criticisms. Sometimes I thought they might be intended for me but after all it was only the Minister of Finance so I don't feel hurt in any way. The curtain is now ringing down, as Mr. Scammell says, on the session and I want to say I have no ill feeling whatever because of any remarks directed at me. I was going to say that the man who in future is going to take the Finance Minister's job when the people have decided after they have an opportunity to change it will have great burdens there and quite a task. I have gone there and done the best I could and I reiterate unless the people of the country take it seriously it is no use, and after three years' experience I am fully convinced that with party politics as they are there is no hope for Newfoundland unless we change that. After all unless the people are going to rise to the occasion and do their part they are never going to be able to send members to the Assembly to do theirs. I take this opportunity of saying that nothing that has been said I take as personal. I take them as said to the Finance Minister and I am always able to bear that while I am in that position and aways said, as was said before, "There is a great deal of bad in the best of us and a gread deal of good in the worst of us," and I hope that when we go out and that five hundred thousand is to be spent and we conclude and meet again in the House you will all be satisfied.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

And it being now half past six, Mr. Speaker left the Chair until eight o'clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at eight o'clock.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that broadly the effect of this amendment is that it gives an opportunity for people in an area to petition for a change in the law practically at once, at the end of the year. For example a proclamation at the moment does not expire for seven or eight years it is impossible in the meantime for anything to be done. Petitions have been coming in from all over the

country about this thing. The object of the present bill is to enable people of an area to get this after taking a vote on it. That is the reason why with the consent of the House, the principle of having the majority of the people decide has been introduced, is because the whole theory about th's keeping of dogs is for the protection of sheep. This bill does not attempt to meet any idea of giving permission to keep dogs for sporting purposes. I want that to be clearly understood, because requests have been coming from Harbor Grace and certa'n parts of Conception Bay, where this authority is not effective at the moment. I think that it is a sound principle to go on that this amendment can be only effective upon the dec sion of the majority of the people of any particular area.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Whaling Industry" was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in introducing this Whaling Bill I may say, it is three years ago since first I was approached to bring in a whaling bill into this House. The first time that the bill was presented to me there were all kinds of concessions asked for. Concessions were asked for on nets to be allowed to be imported in duty free into the whaling factories. Also that barrels should come in duty free. But in this bill here the only thing coming in duty free is machinery. I do not think that there is very much in this bill that should delay the House. The only paragraph in this bill that has been spoken to me about by the many people, is section four. Instead it will be three vessels at each factory. Section four says to-day two vessels. On that I submit that I personally have my own opin on, that there is only a short period for whaling steamers to prosecute the industry on the Labrador coast. We had an instance about twenty years ago as everyone knows, when there were quite a few whaling factories started around the country. They went up in smoke in a very short time. We have had the example of one whal ng factory that started about twenty years ago and continued right through. That was the one down on the Labrador. I do not think that whaling factory has been closed down since it started with the exception of one year. At that time there was nothing to prevent a person from putting up a whal ng factory almost anywhere. Consequently quite a number of our people that put their money in the proposition lost out. This bill is brought in to protect the country as I think it does and to protect those people who have put their money into the whaling business at the present time. I personally do think that a great number of steamers are allowed to prosecute the whaling industry in this country, It w ll only be for a very short time, as soon practically all the whales will be either killed out or driven from the

shores. In the old bill at the present time the operators of whaling factories are not called upon to pay any fees but in this bill there is a fee of a thousand dollars charged yearly for license. One clause states here that there shall not be more than two whaling factories on Labrador, two on the east, two on the south and two on the west. That has been brought in as I stated before to try and protect the whaling industry. There has been a great deal of talk this year about a Norweigan whaling factory that has been built on Labrador. I have heard of said that whaling factories are of practically no benefit to this country. Now I was under the impression myself that very little profit accrued to this country through having whaling factories here, but after making enquiries I found that the whaling factory that has been in existence during the last two or three years have employed quite a number of men. I took the trouble to get the number of men employed in the different whaling factories during 1926. I found that there were employed there 203 Newfoundlanders and twelve Norweigans. There has been a great deal of work going on in connection with the Norwegians that came out, and went down on Labrador to erect a whaling factory down there. Well personally I had not much to do with that until they were out here with their whaling apparatus and ready to go down. But I did go on board and I saw the manager, and I finally succeeded in getting about thirty or forty Newfoundlanders to go down and work. When our fishery overseer went down on Labrador this year, I gave him a copy of the 1907 whaling act. I told him that he was to carry out that law to the letter, as far as the employment of Newfoundlanders was concerned. Well I may say for the benefit of all, that when a certain fishing inspector got down there he found that they only sent up five more Newfoundlanders. I took it for granted that the remainder of the men taken down there were taken down for the purpose that our people are not acquainted with whaling. Under this new act it provides that all Newfoundlanders shall be engaged in all ordinary work, in connection with whaling. Taking into consideration that the whaling factories at Hawk's Harbor and Rose au Rue employ between them something like two hundred Newfoundlanders and twelve Norweigans, this Act will be beneficial o the country, and I am in hopes that as soon as the factory on the Labrador is properly constructed and ready to start operations that it will also employ about a hundred and fifty men. This Bill is something similar to the 1907 Act, excepting that you could use as many steamers as you liked and there was no license fee charged under the old Bill. I, therefore, move the second reading of this Bill.

MR. RANDELL—Mr. Chairman, I do not think I could agree with the first cause of this Bill. I have not had the opportunity of considering the Bill, but to prohibit any person from pursuing, shooting at, capturing, etc., whales in Newfoundland waters is I think going a little too far. I must confess that I would not know a whale if I saw one, but I know that some of our fishermen in parts of the Island catch potheads and squid hounds and they call them whales, and the question to my mind is that this Bill will discriminate in favor of the big companies as against the fishermen. Now with regard to the manufacture of whale oil or other whale products without having a license, it is quite probable that a fishermen may catch a whale, which would otherwise be lost altogether, and tow it into a harbor and I know that has happened, but, according to this Bill, if the fisherman has not paid a thousand dollars license he is not allowed to take that whale to land and thus

loses a considerable lot of money. I think this bill is again discriminating in favor of the big companies, who are only interested in whaling in so far as the oil is concerned. I think a great deal of consideration should be given to this Bill before it passes this House. I know there are a number of fishermen around this country who would be very much opposed to this Bill if they saw it, and, as a representative of a fishing constituency, I do not think I would be doing my duty towards them by voting in favor of this Bill as it stands at present. Then again in clause (9) it says:

(Reads)

Wherever there is a whaling factory erected on this coast and whale products are manufactured you will find in every bay, creek or harbor noxious or deleterious matter. That is what happens whether you make the manufacturers pay the penalty or not. I would like to see that enforced, but I question whether that clause will be found workable. However, I do not think that the fishermen of this country want a Bill as this one reads now to pass this House of Assembly.

THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY —Mr. Chairman, I am quite in accord with the remarks of Captain Randell regarding clause (9) which provides for proper protection of the waters in the vicinity of whaling factories because I have in mind a factory to be erected on the Labrador. I am informed that it is to be situated in a very important cod fishing centre and that there are some misgivings on the part of those interested and it is thought that the carrying on of the whale fishery there will seriously hamper the cod fishery. I notice also under this Bill that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has very wide powers and control as regards inspection and control over the factories. To-day, as can be borne out by the member for Ferryland (Mr. Cashin), the entire carcass of the whale is manufactured. Heretofore, as some of us know, considerable repulsive conditions existed in certain localities owing to the great waste that took place in connection with the carcass of the whale. The carcass of the whale was not manufactured in those days. Now if it is a fact that the entire carcass can be utilized as a commercial commodity at present then I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have it absolutely assured that no noxious or deleterious matter gets into the waters surrounding these factories. Our first duty is to the fishermen of the country. They have vested interests all their lives. They have to carry on the codfishery where the factories are situated and nothing should be allowed to interfere with their rights and privileges and their heritage that would in any way hamper their operations. I do not propose to make any opposition or to suggest that this is not a desirable Bill; on the contrary, any thing that will tend to promote industry or give employment will have my unqualified support. But there are bigger issues involved. One is the far-reaching powers given to the Minister and the other is the depositing of deleterious matter in the waters where the codfishery is carried on by our fishermen and in this respect I trust that the Minister will see to it that an inspector is duly authorized to carry out the law.

MR. ASHBOURNE—The only point raised over this amendment to my mind is I presume under the terms outlining the proposition would be manufacturing whale into oil. There is whale and whale carcass.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is clearly meant to mean the entire whale.

MR. ASHBOURNE—My point is the same as Captain Winsor's. Suppose a whale is found by fishermen that they may be able to sell the meat then the other part may be manufactured into oil at some factory without having to

get a license for one whale. With regard to potheads that is an importart thing because potheads often run ashore in Newfoundland particularly around Bonavista Bay and they are sold by fishermen to firms who have factories for manufacturing them and I th.nk that is a very important point and I am very glad it is included. Porpoises are much smaller than potheads and I think it is a good point.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Bill to them referred and had passed the same w.th some amendment.

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

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion and with leave granted the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Resolutions relat.ng to the Bay of Islands Light and Power Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of those not in the House when it opened this afternoon I might repeat that some time ago I received a petit.on signed by about one thousand people of the district of Bay of Islands asking that this bill might be enacted. It is solely for the purpose of giving the rights to a local company there in Bay of Islands to light their own town in that particular district. There is a clause in this act which cuts out Corner Brook and any interference with that town except in as much as it may be necessary for the poles to go through that town. This is not formed with the idea of any profit making on the part of the company, but it is simply for the convenience of the people there to get the light to these particular places by electricity from the power generated from Corner Brook. It does not any way interfere with the Newfoundland P. & P. Co. or its successors. The company sells the power to them. They first asked for the right to certain water powers, which could not be given to them because they are liable by using that particular water to interfere with the rights of the Newfoundland P. & P. Co. So now they simply buy their power from the Newfoundland P. &. P. Co. and operate this plant. The clauses in it as I see them can in no way be contentious, except as regards the duty clause and in that case as you know the Newfoundland P. &. P. Co. or its successors were there distributing their own power and they have the right under this bill to get practically everything in duty free. However we can discuss each clause as we come to it. I would suggest now that the bill be read and we can take up each clause separately.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, the committee have made arrangements with the Newfoundland Light and Power to supply power for a certain rate, for a certain number of years. The company is bound in that respect so that we should try and conserve our own interests. We should be very careful.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think that clause covers them.

MR. POWER—The International people did not recognize the contract.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They take good care that they protect themselves.

MR. POWER—That is why we had Mr. Rollings draw up this clause.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—It is a very nice clause.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the Resolutions to them referred and had passed the same with some amendment, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the provisions thereof.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Bay of Islands Light and Power Company, Limited" was introduced and read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time and passed and was ordered to be engrossed and 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 that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting Patents" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time.

The amendments being read a second time it was moved and seconded that they do pass and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting them that the House had concurred therein.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter (4) of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the vacation of seats in the House of Assembly."

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —Mr. Speaker, I insisted this afternoon that there would be no more new legislation to come before the House at this session; but since I have decided to depart from my promise at the request of the Leader of the Opposition in connection with the Bill that has just been given notice of by the Attorney General and a Bill that I think we were all agreed upon last year. This amendment to the Election Act provides that is cases where a man is elected to the House of Assembly at a general election and takes a portfolio position in the Government he will not have to go back for re-election. I suggest that this be done a considerable while ago, but it was argued that it was simply to protect some member on this side of the House. Later, under existing terms, we thought it would be advisable to have this legislation enacted before our term of office expired. The Leader of the Opposition suggested to me this evening that he would like to see this legislation enacted at this session of the House. Personally, I do not think that any member of the House can have any objection to it. I do think that with the advent of the Re-Distribution Bill the whole Election Act requires amendment and re-organization and I hope that at the next session of the House some recasting will take place and that legislation will be brought in to amend the other sections which will require great consideration in view of the Re-Distribution Bill. If the Opposition are desirous of having that particular clause put in

now I do not see any objection to having it put through. The section that was drafted and handed to us by the Opposition seems to give very much greater powers than ever intended, and I also think that under the section drafted to-day that a man could be Deputy Minister of a Government Department or Inspector General of Police and still hold a seat in this House.

I, therefore, beg to move the adjournment of the House until Monday next at three of the clock. There will be some amendments to come down from the Upper House then to be dealt with in connection with the International Paper Company and Buchans Mine contracts.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adjourn to Monday, September 5th, at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, September 5th, 1927.

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

A petition was presented by

Mr. Halfyard, from New Melbourne and neighbouring places, re roads.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, there is an error in the printing of the Revenue Act and I am hoping to have the amendments sent up to the Upper House. I would ask the Clerk to read what the changes are.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I understand that it was set up from the Customs Book in which the type runs on longer lines than in these Acts, so where the fourth line would be referred to it would be the fifth or fifth and a half in the printed Act. In actual fact the reference should have been to the engrossed copy itself.

MR. MOORE—Mr. Speaker while we are on the Revenue Bill would you permit me to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs if there is any possibility of the Colony getting back the duties we were supposed to be cheated out of at Corner Brook?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—I might say we are hoping to have that thing adjusted tomorrow.

MR. MOORE—Any possibility before the new company takes charge of getting it back?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS——I think so.

On motion of Hon. Minister of Finance and by unanimous consent it was resolved that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to make certain amendments in the message set forth in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1925, and subsequent amendments thereof."

Second Reading of Legislative Disabilities Bill.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, In moving the second reading, following the remarks made by the Prime Minister, the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition has been given a great deal of consideration since last sitting, and we submit the Bill in this form and we think it will get over some objections urged last year in the Upper House. We think the point we all have in mind is avoiding following a general election all Ministers having to go back for re-election, therefore we simply specifically provide as here and we merely added to the Bill:

(Reads.)

Members will see the object behind that of course is to avoid the objection urged in the Upper House and to which we took some objection down here when a rider came down practically to the effect that a man has to come out and pledge himself to what party he was attached. Of course it is not a party a man is elected to, it is the House of Assembly. We agreed it was unnecessary that Ministers be asked to go for re-election for two

reasons. First the history immediately following general elections is that in the formation of a cabinet it is unknown that there is ever any alteration. Secondly, as generally trouble has got to be gone to and there are often no contests it means a totally unnecessary waste of time and money. It is felt to keep the principle in mind we still keep open that if during the life of a Government say after the end of a year a man accepts office we should think he should go back for re-election. It is not a party measure I need hardly say, a measure in which both sides of the House have a common interest. I merely ask the House to accept from me the assurance that a good deal of thought has been given the phrasing of the Bill and do think it meets the object in mind.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Speaker, I accept the principle of the Bill. That is the object in mind as outlined by the Minister of Justice.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —In 1919 two departments were made and these two Ministers of Posts and Education at that time were specifically added to the exemption clause. The House the other day decided to abolish the Ministry of Education. I feel if a new department is made there ought to be an opportunity given for an expression of opinion which might be done by having re-election necessary.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I presume we all support the principle of the Bill. I am sorry that we cannot include the amendment sent down from the Upper House last year. I supported it at the time. Perhaps I did so without giving it any serious thought, but as I have thought of it since I was more and more convinced that the introduction of that in the Upper House was correct. That Bill covers the objection the amendment was to cover to a certain extent, that is, it is to avoid, supposing as a result of a general election, parties coming back fairly even with a majority of two, three or four, as the case may be, there is an opportunity there for one side to get support from the other side by giving of jobs to men although they were elected under another leader, and that is what the amendment tried to avoid, and I agree with it, but it says here this only applies to members of the House taking departmental jobs in the first administration formed:—

(Reads.)

MR. CASHIN—Now with regard to that section for instance, if a party went to the country to-morrow, and all the various Ministers were returned, and six months after one of them died, his successor would have to go to the country then.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, it is quite correct, as the hon. member says, that if he for instance was a Minister and he subsequently dies, then the new Minister under such circumstances would have to go back for re-election. With regard to that point I may say that the difficulty here is, what period is going to be fixed. I will read the whole of section three in order that members may have an intelligent grip of the amendment.

(Reads.)

We decided in merely adding these words additional, having in mind the same principle as in the act there but getting over the feature, that if through the necessity of a Minister being temporarily appointed, if that man were not in the first administration, he did not have to go back for re-election. The point raised by the hon. member who has just spoken with regard to the death of a Minister is correct. The difficulty that I see about it is this. Where are you going to draw the line? For what period? We are merely endeavouring to carry out the principle that those who accepted office under the first administration did not have to go back for re-election.

I am not suggesting for a moment that that objection is not there. But what I am endeavouring to do is to try and put it in a form that is going to be accepted in the Upper House.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to Ament Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly' and Acts in Amendment thereof," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill was read a second time and was ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon the Bill was read a third time, and passed, and was ordered to be engrossed and 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 messages from the Legislative Council acquainting this House that the Legislative Council had passed without amendment the bills sent up entitled as follows:

"An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

"An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

"An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1927, and the 30th day of June, 1928, and for other Purposes relating to the Public Service."

"An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes, 1916, entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals.'"

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Limited," with some amendments, in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, before this amendment is read a second time I would like to explain just what the idea behind the amendment is. I think Mr. Alderdice moved an amendment in the Upper House, and we substituted this amendment after we had some conference with the International about it. The clause that was proposed in the original bill was giving protection in a smaller amount for the B. debenture holders. Of course this apparently covers the A. debentures also, but the amount is larger because we know perfectly well that when it goes to England whatever protection is given to the B. debentures will be demanded by the A. debenture holders. The agreement is not exactly the same as the first amendment proposed by Mr. Alderdice, which consisted in practically putting back a clause which was in the original 1923 Act. But it stipulates according to this amendment that the International who are the holders of a large portion of the com-

mon stock cannot get any dividends on that common stock until two and a half per cent. of the profits have been put back into the assets of the Newfoundland International Paper Company. In other words two and a half per cent. will be invested for the benefit of the working capital before the parent company can get any dividends on its holdings in this company. I had no great difficulty in getting the company to consent to that because they told me that they intended to do it anyway. But the Upper House thought it advisable, and possibly it is advisable to have that more clearly stated in the Act. The other clause as regards nails, etc., on which they are to pay duty if they are the kind and sort that they want, is a proposition which came up in the Upper House in connection with Buchan's Mine, and at that time I telegraphed to Grand Falls and I eventually got their consent to that, and then I told the International that the question would certainly be raised, or I expected that it would be raised, in connection with their Bill. They consented to this wording. These are the only amendments to the Bill, largely arranged by ourselves without much difficulty. But they are improvements to some extent.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that I take exception to and that is the fact of the Upper House being able to bring in an amendment which we in the Lower House have been fighting for days and weeks, and were not able to accomplish. I refer to that amendment now about nails, etc., manufactured in this country. While the Buchan's Mine Bill was before the House we were continually asking for the duty to be put on this kind of goods, and we particularly mentioned nails, etc. The Government did not seem to agree to anything I suggested and they turned it down. Then it goes to the Upper House and an amendment is brought down here and accepted by the Lower House unanimously — by the Government. That takes away a good deal of our usefulness from this Assembly if the Government cannot heed the suggestions thrown out by members on this side of the House, and then afterwards agree to the same thing when it comes from the Upper House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, we do not want to see a Bill thrown out when it goes to the Upper House, and on the other hand the Upper House do not want themselves to be looked upon as a rubber stamp. Regarding the amendments that may come down from the Upper House, we should give them our best consideration, for the simple reason that when a Bill that has passed the agreement stage and has been signed by the Government and amended in the Upper House, that Chamber can very well threaten that unless the amendment is agreed to that there is quite a possibility of the Bill being lost altogether. For that reason greater pressure can be brought to bear by the Upper House on the Government than by the Opposition in the Lower House, without casting any reflection on the Government at all in that respect.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I want to endorse the criticism raised by the Leader of the Opposition against the way in which this amendment is made. During the discussion on this Bill the point was raised by members of this House that a certain change should be made in this Bill, and the statement was made by the Minister in charge of the Bill that the Company absolutely refused to accept amendments from this Chamber, yet when it comes from the Upper House it is accepted. This is a slight to the House of Assembly, and I think it should not be acquiesced in so readily. The Government should be just as ready to accept suggestions from this side as from the Upper Chamber.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I think that it is only right that hon. members should understand that these amendments only arose because of discussion in the Upper House on another measure altogether. I am sure that the hon. members will understand that we did not for one moment think this side of the House paid any attention to the matter merely because the amendment came from the Upper House and not from the Lower House.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, regarding these amendments, if I am not mistaken they originally came from the Opposition in reference to protection for local industries. When they were submitted here by this side of the House the Government stated that the Buchan's Mine Company would not accept them and would not carry on with their contract. Then the Bill went through this Chamber and went to the Upper House where certain amendments were made to the Bill and the Company has got to accept them or else the Bill has to be withdrawn. It simply goes to show that proper pressure was brought to bear on the company with the result that the company must accept the amendments of the Upper House or the Bill is destroyed, so that it would have been just as logical for the Government to have accepted the amendments of the Opposition in the first place. The position is that the Government did not press them hard enough before. Now they find that they got to press the company and it all goes to show that the suggestions of the Opposition were not seriously considered by the Government.

MR. GODDEN—Mr. Speaker, I want to record my sympathy with the amendments, inasmuch as the common stock holders have to wait for dividends until a certain sum is transferred from the earnings to be spent on the extension of works. I think it is a great pity that we could not have more amendments that would further safeguard us as guarantors to B. debenture holders, and also safeguard the people of Newfoundland generally as regards the whole agreement with the International Paper Co.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, as far as the Minister of Agriculture and Mines is concerned in relation to this Bill, I may say that he asked me to assist him, and in justice to him I will say that, as regards the Buchans Mine proposition, every possible effort that he could use was done and when he came back to the House he made the statement definitely and positively, namely, that the Company's attitude towards the amendments of the Opposition to the Bill. Now we know it is not nice to discover nor is it gratifying to the Government to find that similar amendments made by the Upper House are to be accepted.

Without prejudice to the rights and privileges of this House, the said Amendments were read a first time.

The Amendment being, without prejudice to the rights and privileges of this House, read a second time, it was moved and seconded that they do pass and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that this House had passed the said Amendments, they being in accord with the wishes of this House and without derogation from the undoubted rights and privileges of this House.

Mr. Speaker read a message from the Legislative Council acquainting this House that the Legislative Council had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Act 15 Geo. V. Chapter 2 enitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited'" with an amendment, in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

On motion, and without prejudice to the rights and privileges of this House, the said Amendment was read a first time.

The Amendment being, without prejudice to the rights and privileges of this House, read a second time, it was moved and seconded that this House concur therein, it being in accordance with the wishes of this House, and without derogation from the undoubted rights and privileges of this House.

At five o'clock Mr. Speaker left the Chair until half past eight.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at half past eight.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting this House that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting the Bay of Islands Light and Power Company, Limited" with an amendment in which they requested the concurrance of this House.

On motion, and without prejudice to the rights and privileges of this House, this amendment was read a first time.

The amendment being, without prejudice to the rights and privileges of this House, read a second time, it was moved and seconded and resolved that the House concur therein, it being in accordance with the wishes of this House, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that this House had concurred in the same, but without derogation from the undoubted rights and privileges of this House.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting this House that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited" with two amendments in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, with regard to these amendments I take it that there is no objection to the first one, which is very similar to the amendment as regards the protection of local industries as contained in the International and the Gander Bills, agreed to this afternoon. As regards the second amendment I have to say that we cannot agree to that amendment. Personally it would appear to me that if the amendment were put into effect that it would be valueless under any circumstances, because I doubt whether anybody is able to tell us to-day just what constitutes an open town. I doubt whether the judges of the Supereme Court would be able to tell just what an open town is. One may say that possibly Grand Falls was a closed town, and Bell Island an open town. But first we have to ask ourselves the question "Which is the most benefit to the people that live in it." In Bell Island there are lots of shacks going up and poor kind of stores, and in Grand Falls there is a classification of the stores that are allowed to go up there. Now they say "The same kind of town as Corner Brook, St. John's or Port aux Basques." I do not know why they include the last because I did not know that it was a town at all.

MR. MOORE—It is an open town.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It is certainly very open. I do not know whether you can call St. John's an open town in as much as whoever owns land can stipulate what kind of a store they want on it. Grand Falls always stipulated to have the right to refuse anybody permission to go and build in the town. Outside Corner Brook you have an example of an open town, where there was an outbreak of fever because there was no one to take charge, and no municipal control. For that reason I think that the control of the town is very necessary. Of course there is the claim brought forward that quite possibly

the A.N.D. Co. or any company might create a monoply. Well take the Royal Stores for instance, if they put up a large t uilding there and if they agree to have sufficient supplies to carry the people through the winter so that there will be no shortage, and if they agree not to charge more for the r goods than in St. John's plus the freights, and if they agree to stipulate that no employee of the company shall have a writ issued against him for debt, then it may be agreed to give a monopoly in that particular to such a concern that w ll come and put big business like that in their midst I don't see what objection there can be to it. Whether it is beneficial or not to the general interests I do not know. But the thing that concerns this country is how it affects the people, not the shopkeepers. Personally I have yet to hear any complaint from the people of Grand Falls concerning the trade there. The people of Grand Falls are perfectly satisfied. Some members of the House may know more about it than I do. But what does an open town mean. Does it mean that the people that own the land have got to sell it for any price that the man that wants to build, is willing to give for it. Does it mean that you can still ask the price that you think is right and reasonable and that you can dictate as to what kind of stores are to be built. That seems to me a very justifiable right of any landowner, in any town site. Now the Upper House have put an amendment from my point of v ew, which is entirely unworkable. There will be a railway going down to this Buchans Mine owned by the company. Even if it was an open town I could very well see how they need not take freight for certain people along that railway, if they do not want to do so. At Grand Falls anybody if he does not want to buy goods in the co-operat ve stores or in the Royal Stores, can go to the stores outside of the town altogether or send to St John's, or to Montreal or Toronto, and get his goods. He is free to do as he likes. But here we have an amendment which in my opinion Mr. Speaker, is entirely unworkable. I would be inclined to advise the company if I were their lawyer to let the amendment go through, because it is absolutely meaningless. But the company does not choose to do that. They say they will not, whatever the result seem any use my consenting to the amendment that would not be acceptable to the other party to the agreement. So I think there is nothing whatever for us to do but to reject the amendment whatever may be the result to the Bill. That is as regards the second amendment. Of course the first amendment I take it is entirely agreeable to the House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I should say that at first blush it is rather unfair and very difficult for the Prime Minister to expect the House now to be able to give that serious consideration to the amendments which their importance merit. It seems to us that both these amendments should have been in our hands long ago. The first one is simple, because it is the very point that the Opposition had tried to stress upon the Government throughout the debate on the Buchans Mine Resolutions. Now in the dying hours of the session we find that the Government admits the force of the first amendments submitted by the Legislative Council; but with regard to the second amendment you ask us to say we are not prepared to receive it. Personally, to say the least, when the Prime M nister moved the suspension of the rules of the House I had no idea we were going to be confronted with that important amendment. I consider it was the Government's job to know it and not to be making plans for the closing of the Legislature. I had no other idea but that these Resolutions had been disposed of as they were passed by this

Chamber. I knew that things were outstanding in connection with legislation that we send up to the Legislative Council regarding the International Paper Company and other legislation; but I had no idea that such amendments would be sent down by the Legislative Council, amendments which agree in toto to the suggestions made by the Opposition in this House in substance and in effect. I am opposed to the idea of a closed town at Buchans Mine, and if I had a vote on this subect I would vote in favor of the amendment. My personal opinion is, despite what the Prime Minister may tell us, that it is an outrage upon British fair play. That has been my thought from the outset when this Bill was introduced and nothing has happened in the meanwhile to alter my attitude towards it.

MR. LAKE—During the early part of this session I had a fight with my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Mines over this same Bill, and the point at issue then is the same that the Upper House objects to and sends down an amendment which the Prime Minister asks this House to vote for. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what he thinks this Opposition is here for? Are we to be ignored entirely? It may be that when members of the Opposition offer suggestions that the Government do not seem wise to accept our amendments; but it seems that the Upper House hears of these amendments and they bring in the same line of thought and then the Prime Minister asks us to vote for them particularly so far as the protection of our local industries are concerned. With regard to a closed town, I gather from the amendments that the closed town under discussion would be somewhat on the principle of what prevailed at Corner Brook. Now I spent a year there. Now anyone who goes there and applies for a piece of land and is satisfied to pay the price which the company asks for it and puts up a building suitable and in accordance with the ideas of the company, that the company will grant him certain privileges. Now if the A. N. D. Company set a certain reasonable price on their property I think it would be alright; but if they want to set a certain prohibitive price on the land and thereby create a monopoly and make it impossible for anybody to do business, such as the Royal Stores got at Grand Falls, well then

I am not in favor of the amendment. If this company is prepared to have an open town like they have at Corner Brook, I think everything will be alright. I do not think that they should compare a town at Buchan's Mine to a town like St. John's or Twillingate, for instance. If the land at Buchan's Mine is owned by the company we cannot dispute it, but if they only own the timber land that is there, why not let us legislate accordingly? It seems to me to be particularly peculiar to bring in such an amendment at the dying hours of the session, and I suppose we are to be called upon to swallow such amendments. In the early part of this session we were criticised on the ground that we were obstructing and holding up business here. Now the Prime Minister and his associates know that it was a godsend for us to talk as much as we did on the Address in Reply because for the simple reason that the Government had no legislation ready. With regard to the statements made that we were out to break the Government, I may say that nothing was farther from the minds of the Opposition members because the Government is broken in themselves. There are members in the Government who have lost confidence in themselves and the country at large has lost confidence in the Government. It is time for this House to shut up shop, so to speak, when we have to submit to amendments such as has been sent down by the Legislative Council, driven down

our throats. I for one am disgusted with the trend of affairs that exists in public life to-day. It is an absolute disgrace and I am surprised that the Prime Minister does not admit that fact. The Prime Minister is defeated within his own ranks, and he knows it. I was not here when the House was discussing the Buchan's Mine, International and Gander Bills, but I want to go on record now as being absolutely opposed to each of them. We have come to a pretty pass when we have to sit here day and night and wait on amendments from the Legislative Council. I consider it an outrage of the worst kind, and if the Prime Minister had the courage of his convictions he would resign his seat to-night. What is going on in the Legislature to-day is nothing better than a farce comedy and one cannot say what the end is likely to be. Why does not the Government lay their cards on the table. The Prime Minister told us in the early part of the session that the Government were not strong enough to bring in drastic legislation, and that statement has been proven.

If you had called me to order I would have listened to your decision and abided thereby. I consider that the welfare of Newfoundland is before this chair to-night, and if we have not the welfare of Newfoundland under consideration then I will get out. If I was not in order I should have been told so.

HON. THE SPEAKER—I want you to stick to that amendment and discuss it.

MR. LAKE—That I am trying to do, but I may not be up in parliamentary style and on that account I may wander a bit, but it is not from any intention so to do. I was trying to impress this House with the fact that I did not see why we should be here and what right we had to be here discussing Buchan's Mine Bill which was before this Chamber some six weeks ago, and the very things which I personally was fighting for against my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and which almost precipitated a fistic warfare, in fact the very things which I sponsored and which the hon. gentleman and the Government could not get from the A. N. D. Company ,were the very things which are now brought in here and supported in the form of an amendment. I cannot lay too much stress on that as a member of this House and as a representative of the district of Burin, and with every dollar that I earn or that I expect to earn staked in this country. And still you expect me to come in here and vote for amendment upon amendment in the dying hours of this session and when we are anxious to get back to our business. I say now that it is outrageous and disgraceful to the Monroe administration, and the Prime Minister knows it. I shall not go any further to-night on this subject because if I do I may get out of order again. But the Prime Minister knows that I have the welfare of this country at heart, and it is questionable whether some on his side have.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, I have listened with some interest to what has been said in reference to a closed town at Buchan's Mine. There are two sides to every question and naturally one hesitates to support anything that means the killing of competition in any place because competition helps to protect the consumer; but there is this about it, you can have undesirable elements in the business life of a country. You can go up Middle Street and down Water Street and you will find there running business men who don't belong to this country at all; running places formerly occupied by natives of the country; because people belonging to the country would not conduct business on the same lines as these people. It is not a question altogether of insufficient enterprise as

Mr. Hibbs just now suggested but they would not use the methods. I would like to find out too if the company means by a closed town one l mited to one or two concerns or if as pointed out here by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines they are willing to have co-operative stores such as in Grand Falls controlled by the people as shareholders in the concern and other concerns like Parker & Monroe's doing business in Grand Falls and other concerns that I think furnish all the competition that protects the people of Grand Falls and the question then resolves itself to this are we going to allow any town growing up in this country competition running along the same l.nes as it is running in St. John's to-day gradually driving out Newfoundlanders out of business and substituting for them people from outside. Let me say I have nothing against any person because he may be a Jew or a Marianite or anyth ng of that kind. I have heard some of these people condemning strongly some business methods of people of their own country. Some had good reason to do it and even wondered why there wasn't some sort of licensing system in this country whereby persons would have to get a license before they could establish business and that should be considered by this House to-n'ght does a closed town limit to a couple of concerns; if the Government can assure the House that not this is meant but that the company are prepared to allow reputable concerns to come into Buchans Mine and do business I think that puts a different aspect on this altogether.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of trying to make the position understood as to what attitude the Prime Minister is putting to the House. The Government made a contract, a contract of course subject to ratification by the Legislature, but in so far as the Government that made the contract is concerned it of necessity is bound to keep faith with the principle underlying the whole contract. It must do that. Now the point the Prime Minister drew attention to is this. This Legislature went out from this House and over night the contract was modified a good deal in this House but modified by agreement with the company. Some points raised the company agreed to and the Act modified the agreement accordingly step by step. When the Bill was going through a point raised by honourable members on the opposition side of the House was submitted to the company, namely, the admission of boxes, nails and other things, and they refused to agree to this as they had to others, and when this was raised in the Upper House after it had passed here the company agreed to that. Now as far as this Government is concerned, as remarked here this afternoon, we put the request to them and they declined to agree to it. They did subsequently to it in the Upper House. The second position that is brought on is entirely out of the contract and it is not a question of how we feel about it, it is not a question of our individual opinions of the merits of the amendment at all, because I want to make a statement here now, and I make the statement deliberately, that the amendment as it is here is not worth the paper it is written on, and if I had the power and the Government had the power to get the company to see it the way I see it, what the Government would like to do is accept the amendment and thereby tend to save the contract. But the Government finds itself in the position that the company flatly declines to have that made a condition precedent. For that reason the Government are not going to ask members to vote on that. The Government are not able to present it. I regret the matter exceedingly because of possible results. I regret ex-

ceedingly that the company will not see the amendment as I see it. It would not give an open town at all. It doesn't alter the position a bit. If ever there was a thing that meant nothing, and I say it after considering the amendment carefully, with all respect to the honourable gentlemen who sent it down, it would have no practical effect. If I might be pardoned I would like to read it to the House. We have to assume that the honourable gentlemen in the other chamber were to make what is known in law, if ever there could be such a thing known in law as an open town; make a place some sort of a free to all in the sense that it would not be such a place as one with people having privileged rights; not a monopoly or exclusive; and if that is the idea listen to how it is expressed.

(Reads.)

Now, honourable gentlemen don't need me to draw attention to the faults. You only have to read it through as I have to see the absolute valuelessness of it. In the first place there is no such thing at all. There is nothing created by this amendment at all to create somebody that will decide what is or what is not a closed town. Who is to decide it. What evidence? What machinery? Let us follow the working out of the case. John Jones would go up to Buchans Mine town if we call it such and apply for a piece of land to build a store. He wants to open a hardware store and John Jones is told "We are very sorry we can't give that land we have other use for it." "Can you give me some land anywhere," he asks. "No. We haven't any land to spare," he is told. John Jones' only remedy can be through the courts. John Jones therefore has got to go to court and has got to ask whether he will be given an injunction compelling this company to give him a site. Now honourable members of course I think will agree that asking a court to pronounce whether or not this act compels it on all occasions to give an injunction on forcing them to sell or let land and settling the terms on which it is to be given is tackling a pretty big point. But the second point that of the Act being forfeit because the Company is desirous of making conditions to suit itself; that happens to be making a closed town; that certainly is a novel idea to me. Honourable members have only got to turn over the matter in their minds to see the utter absurdity of it. Again:

(Reads)

As Corner Brook. Corner Brook is defined in the amendment as an open town. If the idea that is intended to be conveyed is that anyone can go in and set up business anywhere in Corner Brook they only need try it to see that that is not the case. Corner Brook is a townsite controlled by the Newfoundland Power and Paper Company. You have got to go and see them as in any other place where men own property you have to go to the owners and if they are willing to let you go on in very good but if it doesn't suit them you don't get a place to go. But the joker in the whole thing, I would like to remind honourable members is contained in the fact that we are talking about an open town and the only means of access to this place is over a private railway owned by the Anglo - Newfoundland Development company.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks of the honourable member for Fogo I may say that I heard the same report as he did, namely, that there was going to be a monopoly created at Buchan's Mine. When the Bill was under discussion before this House it was intimated that one firm on Water Street was going to have a monopoly at Buchan's Mine. I thought I knew something about the business of the A. N. D. Company, having been associated with them for a number of years,

and I took it upon myself to write Mr. Harris, the Manager, and ask him if the story that was abroad was correct. I wrote him on June 11th last asking him if it was true that any firm was to be given a monopoly, because I knew if such a thing was to happen it would create endless controversy. On June 13th I received a reply from Mr. Harris clearly proving that there would be no monopoly and that the Company are prepared to do business on the same lines as business is conducted at Grand Falls, but the establishment of stores at Buchans Mine is not possible until the railway is completed. Here is Mr. Harris's reply:

(Reads Message)

That is reasonable after all in order to facilitate the work of getting supplies into the stores at Buchans Mine. All freight has to be brought over Millertown branch and teamed over a rough road and a rough country. The Company were trying to do a certain work there and they did not want to be bothered with portaging supplies until the railway is completed. I am afraid this whole Bill will amount to nothing unless the members of the Upper House change their minds. The Company will not accept that amendment in relation to an open town and they know that if the Upper House insists on that amendment passing that the Bill is lost and why there is any necessity for us to continue this debate I am at a loss to understand. Evidently they have made up their minds in the Upper House that there is to be an open town. Personally, I am in favor of allowing the Company to carry on just the same as at Grand Falls because what we want in this country at the present time is labor for our people. That being so, let the gentlemen who are responsible for jeopardizing the passage of this Bill bear the responsibility on their shoulders. We, in this Chamber, are blameless in the matter. We have sent them up a Bill and they in their wisdom have rejected it. There may be grave issues as a result of the attitude of the Upper House. It is surprising how much legislation involving the expenditure of millions of public moneys can be disposed of sometimes in less than a half an hour in the Upper House and it is astonishing how some corporations can get all kinds of concessions and freedom from taxation at the hands of the Upper House without a word of protest against it. Here is the A.N.D. Company, a Company that we have been doing business with for the past quarter of a century, who are not asking exemption from Income Tax, but are simply asking to retain the vested rights that were given to them in 1905. Now, without laboring the question any further, I may say that the only hope in connection with this Bill as a labor giving project which is badly needed in this country at present is for the Upper House members to re-consider their decision, because the Company will not accept the amendment as regards an open town.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, and I will go further and say that I believe that every other gentleman of this Chamber is of the same opinion, that, even if we throw out the whole Bill, the Buchans Mine will go ahead and all the Government has got to do is to call the Company's bluff. The suggestion that the A.N.D. Company and the American Smelters will not accept the amendment concerning an open town is absurd and ridiculous. I do not accept the statement that this corporation will decide to discontinue operations simply because they are asked to do what every other corporation in the world are asked to do.

MR. RUSSELL—Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Bill at the present time, there is nothing in it whatever regarding the matter of a closed or an open town. I can see difficulties in the way of having anything inserted

in that bill because of the Reids, and because of the claim that company has there. The company is not like a private individual in St. John's or Carbonear owning a piece of land in either of these places. The A.N.D. Co. has entered into an agreement with the Government, and to that extent there is a difference between a private individual owning a piece of land in any of those towns that I have mentioned and the A.N.D. Co. in making th s agreement with the Government. If that company owns the area in question they have rights and privileges there in connection with the operation of the railway. I am wondering if a compromise could not be effected between the Upper House and th s Chamber and the company. If they are not agreeable to an open town, as it is generally understood, let us put it in black and white conforming in a more elaborate way to the messages sent by Mr. Harris several weeks ago to the Prime Minister and other messages sent to Mr. Sullivan. I do not think that it is an insurmountable difficulty. It is not so important but what some compromise could be effected, as between the Upper House, this Chamber and the company. In any event, no matter what you do the company owns the land and the townsite, and they would have the power to regulate the style of building that would be put up there. Some reference has been made to the townsite outside of Grand Falls. Well, if I know anyth:ng about that townsite it is not much credit to the people who live there, and I will go further and say that it is not much credit to the Government of this country. Not the Monroe Government particularly, but any Government that has been controlling the affairs of this country for the past number of years and has allowed the things to go on the way that they have been going for the past few years. The same remarks apply to the townsite outside of the official townsite of Corner Brook, where no attention has been paid to the laying out of the town nor to the construction of the buildings or anything else. People who went to live there and do business were simply astounded with the conditions of things out there, although the attention of the Government has been called to the matter time and again. So if this amendment, as the Minister of Just:ce has said, is not worth the paper it is written on, surely this Chamber can send this message back to the Upper Chamber and tell them so.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —In my opinion it would not affect these gentlemen.

MR. RUSSELL—Perhaps the opinion of this Chamber would not affect these gentlemen, but we could call their attention to the matter and poss.bly some compromise could be arranged. In any event, I contend that if this matter is as important as it appears to be, and it must be important to the people of this country, especially to the business people who want to protect themselves against a monopoly or a near monopoly, then I claim that if we do not accept the amendment of the Legislative Council, and if, particularly, it is not worth the paper that it is written on, some clause should be inserted that would be agreeable to the company, to this Chamber, to the Upper House and to the business people of this country. I do not see any reason why that could not be done, and it would not take very long to do it. It would be a very simple matter for the M.nister of Justice to draw up a clause, have it discussed, laid before the Committee, and I believe that some way out of the situation could be found.

MR. CASHIN—Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the House by any further discussion, but I would like to point out the fact that the same thing has occured this afternoon and been

reiterated by every member of the Opposition, that we had occasion during the debate on these resolutions or this bill as it is now before us, to emphas ze the protection of our local industries. And while we advanced our arguments in the best manner that we could, the Government took no notice of them whatever.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —That is not so

MR. CASHIN—There was no proof that the Government took the matter up with the company.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE —The Minister of Agriculture himself has told you that he took the matter up with the Company.

MR. CASHIN—The po.nt I am making is this that if we acquiesce now to the Upper House there is no reason why the Company should not acquiesce to us if properly pressed by the Government. In my opinion the Bill which :s now before the House, or which has been before the House and which has been practically turned down by the Upper House is a vote of want of confidence in the Government, because here is the position. If the Government makes any agreement with any company, and is unable to put it through the legislature, there is no confidence :n that Government. Consequently the proper course for this Government to follow now is to resign. No Government ever made an agreement with a company and was unable to put it through with the exception of this Government.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —That is what is going to happen. The only concern the Government has in the matter is that there m ght be a possibility of the mine closing down. We cannot estimate the loss of labor it may mean to the country. Outside of that the rejection of the Bill as far as I can see is not any cause for serious concern. Besides I understand I do not think there is any big demand for zinc and lead. I know that in other places similar mines have been closed down to some extent and there is a possibil.ty of the American Smelters closing down at Buchans, and in that respect I am thinking of the country's interest. Personally, I have not received any word of complaint from the people living in places where closed towns exist and I wish I could say the same with regard to open towns. However, I see nothing more we can do, under present circumstances, but to send back the second amendment to the Upper House.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, before the Amendments are put I would like to know if we are clear on the position set up by the Prime Minister. If I understand the Prime Min ster aright any attitude we may adopt here now upon this second amendment is immaterial to the Bill so far as the Upper House is concerned. Supposing this House opposes the amendment, is that going to affect the Upper House?

On motion, and without prejudice to the rights and privileges of this House, the amendments were read a first time.

The amendments being, without prejudice to the rights and priv leges of this House, read a second time, it was moved, seconded and resolved that the first amendment do pass and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that without derogation in any way from the undoubted rights and privileges of this House, this House has concurred with the Legislative Council in the first amendment, which :s in accordance with the wishes of this House.

It was moved, seconded and resolved that the second amendment be rejected, and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that this House regrets that it is unable to concur there n.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting

this House that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Regulate the Whaling Industry" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of this House.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an opportunity of making some remarks on this bill. It is generally known that this whaling business from the time that it was started in Norway in 1864, and during the seventies was very successful, and most of the whales were killed on the Norwegian Coast, and many of these Norwegian whaling steamers went all over the world. We know what happened in Newfoundland. In ten years Newfoundland killed over four thousand whales and the industry was ruined. In the first few years I think some of them got as many as 230 or 240 whales, and then it dropped down to an average of thirty and many of them got a good deal less, and the industry was ruined, and the people that put their money in it lost their money. That ought to be a sufficient lesson to us not to repeat the same thing again. The Newfoundland whaling company as the Minister of Marine has said the other day has employed 203 Newfoundlanders. The whole business was conducted by Newfoundlanders practically. They operate factories down in Hawke's Harbor, a place where there are no fishermen at all, and as a result they do not interfere in any shape or form with the codfishery industry. But the Norwegian Company has planted themselves on the people of the fishing settlements on the Labrador Coast. I may say here that clause 9 reads:

(Reads)

I am going to state here now that in spite of the obvious intentions of those who drew up that clause, that every day that that whaling factory operates, there will be deleterious matter going into the harbor. It is not possible for a whaling factory to operate without doing this. A whale weighs between twenty and forty tons. And there are tons of blood and other matter that is bound to be offensive to the fishermen. Now if three steamers from Norway are going to operate in conjunction with three steamers owned by the Newfoundland Company, for a very short time, you are going to kill the whaling industry, and as the Minister of Finance has told us in his Budget this year, there were $290,000 worth of products shipped out of this country. But if this is allowed to go on in a very short time you will have killed the goose that lays the golden eggs. So what we did before we are inclined to do again and that is overdo the whaling industry and I am very sorry the Upper House didn't see fit to agree to the Act this fall.

The amendments were read a first time.

The amendments being read a second time, it was moved, seconded and resolved that they do pass and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council that this House had concurred therein.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting this House that the Legislative Council had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly' and Acts in amendment thereof" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Legislative Council had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925 and subsequent amendments thereto" with the amendments requested by this House.

It was moved and seconded that the House at its rising do adourn to tomorrow, Tuesday, September 6th, at two of the clock ni the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, September 6th, 1927.

The House met at two of the clock in the afternoon pursuant to adournment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting this House that the Legislative Council had withdrawn the amendment made in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited" in which amendment this House was yesterday unable to concur.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to Question 420 of Order Paper August 9th. The question reads as follows:

(Reads Question)

I had a reply from the Prime Minister to the effect that there was no correspondence. I notice by the "Evening Telegram" of yesterday that a question similar to mine was asked in the Upper House by Hon. Dr. Campbell, who got this reply:

(Reads Reply)

Now I was told that there was no correspondence and Hon. Dr. Campbell was told in another Chamber that there was some correspondence. I presume that the Prime Minister has some explanation to make on that point and I would like to hear it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition it is perfectly right. I replied to him there was no correspondence with Mr. Dunfield acting Deputy Minister of Justice. The Justice Department made what might be called a report confidentially and there was no correspondence with Mr. Dunfield. That was the reply made in the Upper House.

At three of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Door of the House and informed Mr. Speaker and the House that His Excellency the Governor commanded the attendance of Mr. Speaker and the House in the Legislative Council Chamber.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber, and being come there Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:

May it Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly has voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service.

In the name of the House of Assembly I present the following Bills for Your Excellency's assent:

. "An Act to Govern the Granting of Lands and Rights in Labrador."

2. "An Act respecting Crown Royalties."

3. "An Act respecting Education."

4. "An Act respecting an Agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, Limited."

5. "An Act respecting Patents."

6. "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and International Paper Company of Newfoundland, Limited."

7. "An Act to Amend the Act 15, Geo. V. (1924) Chapter Two, entitled 'An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited.'"

8. "An Act to Amend Chapter 206 of the Consolidated Statutes 1916 entitled 'Of Railways and Railway Companies.'"

9. "An Act to Amend Chapter 129 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of Crown Lands, Mines and Minerals.'"

10. "An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.'"

11. "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1925 and subsequent amendments thereto."

12. "An Act respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

13. "An Act to Regulate the Whaling Industry."

14. "An Act respecting the Bay of Islands Light and Power Company, Limited."

15. "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

16. "An Act to Amend the War Pensions Act 1922."

17. "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1927, and the 30th day of June, 1928, and for other Purposes relating to the Public Service."

His Excellency the Governor was then pleased to make the following Speech to both Branches of the Legislature:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

At the close of a busy and unusually lengthy Session I am glad to be able to relieve you from further attendance. The importance of enacting legislation in connection with the pulp and paper industry has kept the House in Session at a season of the year inconvenient to all concerned.

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

I thank you for the liberal supplies you have granted for the Public Service. It will be the constant care of my Ministers to ensure that they are economically expended. The provision that you have made for expenditures upon various public works not covered by the ordinary grants, will ensure much needed repairs to existing public works and the creating of new conveniences which have become necessary in the general interests.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

The legislation which you have enacted with respect to mining operations in the Red Indian Lake District foreshadows an industry of great magnitude and prime importance to the Colony, which will, I trust, prove to be the forerunner of similar important developments in other areas.

The Bill to which I have given my consent, confirming an agreement with the International Paper Company regarding the future operation of the mills at Corner Brook provides for the continuation and extension of an industry the threatened termination of which had been causing the gravest public concern.

The proposed development of the Gander area promises to open up a great labour giving industry in that section of the country, and will ensure remunerative employment to a large number of our people at a season of the year when they are in a position to avail of it.

The wise and prudent measure adopted in connection with Labrador is both timely and commendable, and will tend to safe-guard this valuable heritage for future generations.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Lagislative Council:

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

In taking leave of you, I sincerely trust that an abundant measure of success awaits you in your respective avocations.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council by Command of His Excellency the Governor said:

GENTLEMEN: It is His Excellency the Governor's will and pleasure that this General Assembly be now prorogued until Thursday, the 20th day of October next, then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

INDEX

A

ADDRESS IN REPLY.
Motion for Committee, 6.
Committee on, 22
Report Presented, 23
Amendment to, 285.
Presentation of, 500.

ASHBOURNE, Mr.
On Bond Bequest, 75.
Address in Reply, 128, 308.
Labrador Bill, 328, 516, 582.
Buchans Mine, 359, 437, 1036, 1070.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 390, 394.
Supply, 677, 761, 770, 817, 861, 914, 1163.
Crown Royalties Bill, 035.
Privilege, 1034.
International and Gander Resolutions, 1110, 1113, 1118.
International Bill, 1171.
Gander Valley Bill, 1174.
Ways and Means, 1219, 1223.
Loan Resolutions, 1245.
Whaling Bill, 1284

AGRICULTURE AND MINES, MINISTER OF
On Bond Bequest, 78, 332, 339.
Buchans Mine, 349, 356, 440, 456, 463, 476, 485, 655, 665, 927, 930, 985, 1020, 1021, 1031, 1040.
Labrador Bill, 420.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 451, 453.
Fisheries Petition, 575.
Motion to Adjourn, 486.
Supply, 771, 815, 888, 889, 891, 894, 999, 1161.
Loan Resolutions, 1252.

AMENDMENT TO ADDRESS IN REPLY, 285.

B

BILLS, FIRST READING.

Labrador Bill, 36.
St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service, 324.
Education, 382.
Tourist Bill, 415.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 456.
Crown Royalties, 793.
Patents, 793.
Railway, 1051.
Buchans Mine Bill, 1051.
International P. & P. Co., 1125.
Gander Valley P. & P. Co., 1128.
Crown Lands Act, 1153.
Retiring Allowances, 1191.
Revenue Bill, 1227.
Keeping of Dogs Bill, 1236.
Whaling Bill, 1236.
War Pensions Act, 1264.
Public Service Bill, 1264.
Loan Bill, 1276.
Bay of Islands Light and Power, 1286.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 1289.

BILLS, SECOND READING.

Labrador Bill, 330.
St. George's Coastal Service, 348.
Tourist Bill, 425.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 474.
Crown Royalties, 930.
Patents Bill, 945.
Education Bill, 965.
Buchans Mine Bill, 1052.
International Bill, 1172.
Gander Valley Bill, 1174.
Crown Lands Bill, 1176.
Railway Bill, 1190.
Revenue Bill, 1227.
Retiring Allowances, 1235.
Keeping of Dogs, 1262.

War Pensions Act, 1264.
Public Service Bill, 1264.
Loan Bill, 1278.
Whaling Bill, 1282.
Bay of Islands Light and Power, 1286.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 1289.

BILLS, THIRD READING.

St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service, 413.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 475.
Labrador Bill, 597.
Tourist and Publicity Bureau Bill, 487.
Crown Royalties Bill, 935.
Education Bill, 1035.
Buchans Mine, 1070.
Patents Bill, 1165.
International Bill, 1188.
Gander Valley Bill, 1191.
Railway Bill, 1196.
Crown Lands Bill, 1197.
Revenue Bill, 1227.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 1236.
War Pensions Act, 1264.
Public Service Bill, 1264.
Loan Bill, 1281.
Keeping of Dogs, 1282.
Whaling Bill, 1285.
Bay of Islands Light and Power, 1286.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 1289.

BILLS ASSENTED TO, 864, 1302.

BRADLEY, Mr.

On Address in Reply, 40, 80, 314, 316.
Bond Bequest, 72, 495.
Motion to Adjourn, 118, 232.
Labrador Bill, 326, 379, 521, 536.
Tourist Bureau, 373.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 389, 448.
Buchans Mine, 438, 460, 461.
Supply, 610.
International P. & P. Co. Bill, 1151, 1168.

Suspension of Rules, 303.
Gander Valley Bill, 1174.
Loan Resolutions, 1239, 1260, 1265.

BROPHY, Mr.
On Address in Reply, 283.
Buchans Mine, 363.
Labrador Bill, 597.

BROWNE, Mr. W. J.
On Bond Bequest, 66.
Motion to Adjourn, 118, 232, 415.
Supply, 632, 416.
Buchans Mine, 1024.
International and Gander, 1103, 1107, 1121, 1122.

BROWN, Mr. K. M.
On Bond Bequest, 74.
Address in Reply, 120, 306.
Labrador Bill, 379, 580.
Buchans Mine, 429, 1042.
Supply, 607, 633, 670, 847, 917, 1159.
Motion to Adjourn, 630, 699.
Privilege, 1033.
International and Gander, 1068.
International Bill, 1171.
Crown Lands Bill, 1175.

C.

CAHILL, Mr.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 6.
Report for Address in Reply, 23.

CASHIN, Mr.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 20.
Motion to Adjourn, 119, 188, 231, 417.
Address in Reply, 152, 166, 296, 299.
Privilege, 191, 211.
Buchans Mine, 361, 1046, 1047.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 387.
Labrador Bill, 398, 407, 412, 421.
Tourist Bill, 446.
Supply, 614, 631, 632, 671, 735, 736, 748, 783, 790, 792, 830, 833, 850, 854, 862, 865, 866,

869, 920, 976, 077, 988, 989, 1157, 1161.
International and Gander, 1079.
Ways and Means, 1149, 1198, 1206, 1217, 1218.
Loan Resolutions, 1234, 1235, 1238, 1240, 1253.
War Pensions Act, 1263.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE.
On Bond Request, 56, 332, 494.
St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service, 324, 413.
Tourist and Publicity Bureau, 366, 414, 443, 466.
Labrador Bill, 376, 397, 418, 442, 487, 500, 516, 540, 576, 592.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 382, 446, 474.
Buchans Mine, 425, 456, 476, 655, 925, 965, 1020, 1035, 1051, 1069.
Supply, 575, 597, 610, 653, 668, 677, 701, 727, 753, 773, 793, 811, 865, 888, 905, 920, 975, 986, 1153.
Crown Royalties Bill, 931.
Education Bill, 977, 1016, 1035.
International Resolutions, 1002, 1052, 1070, 1098, 1118.
Gander Valley, 1002, 1052, 1070, 1098, 1125.
Patents Bill, 1165.
Ways and Means, 1129, 1198, 1221.
International Bill, 1176, 1188.
Gander Valley Bill, 1186.
Railway Bill, 1192.
Crown Lands, 1196.
Revenue Bill, 1227.
Loan Resolutions, 1227, 1237, 1249, 1265.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 1235.
War Pensions Act, 1264.
Public Service Bill, 1264.
Loan Bill, 1278.
Keeping of Dogs, 1281.
Whaling Bill, 1282.
Bay of Islands Light and Power, 2186.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 1289.

CRAMM, Hon. Mr.
On Labrador Bill, 512.
Supply, 767, 768, 830, 833, 874, 877, 879.
Gander Valley Bill, 1187, 1190.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON.
On Bond Bequest, 342.
Buchans Mine, 360, 972, 1022.
Tourist Bureau, 366, 370, 372, 414, 423, 443, 445, 466, 468.
Labrador Bill, 421, 423, 491, 515, 586.
Supply, 740, 741, 742, 745, 755, 758, 762, 764, 768, 794, 795, 833, 865, 869, 872, 893, 921, 922, 1154, 1156, 1163.
Motion to Adjourn, 888.
International and Gander Resolutions, 1074.
Railway Bill, 1193, 1194.
Loan Resolutions, 1238.
War Pensions Act, 1264.
Loan Bill, 1279
Whaling Bill, 1284.

D

DUFF, HON. MR.
On Address in Reply, 294.
Supply, 922.
Motion to Adjourn, 1220.

DIVISIONS
On Address in Reply, 323.
Education Bill, 965.
International Bill, 1172.
Suspension of Rule, 303, 1173.
Gander Valley Bill, 1174.

F

FINANCE, HON. MINISTER OF.
On Motion to Adjourn, 188, 499, 919.
Privilege, 189.
Re Questions, 365.
Buchans Mine, 476.
Supply, 575, 674, 777, 791, 852, 854, 986.

Ways and Means, 1129, 1220, 1225.
Loan Resolutions, 1227.
Loan Bill, 1281.

G

GODDEN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 204, 305.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 450.
Labrador Bill, 510.
Supply, 701, 883.
Buchans Mine Bill, 925.
International and Gander Valley, 1070, 1073, 1109.
International Bill, 1172, 1185.

GRIMES, MR.

On Address in Reply, 208, 212, 310.
Bond Bequest, 341, 495.
Tourist Bureau, 372.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 453.
Labrador Bill, 500, 583.
Supply, 723, 727, 760, 775, 798, 799, 800, 860, 889, 892, 898, 992, 996.
Buchans Mine, 1025, 1044.
International and Gander, 1065.
Crown Lands Bill, 1176.
Railway Bill, 1195.
Ways and Means, 1206.
Loan Resolutions, 1246.

H

HICKMAN, MR.

On Resolution of Condolence, 6.
Motion for Address in Reply, 14.
Bond Bequest, 62, 339.
Motion to Adjourn, 117, 187, 231, 887.
Privilege, 191.
Address in Reply, 271, 276.
Labrador Bill, 325, 418, 419, 420, 423, 488, 489, 494, 568, 569, 571, 588.
Buchans Mine Resolutions and Bill, 350, 352, 441, 457, 476.

Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 383, 447, 449, 450, 455, 474.
Supply, 676, 776, 707, 852, 884, 915, 994.
International and Gander Valley Resolutions, 1015, 1052, 1064, 1098, 1101, 1108.
International Bill, 1183, 1185.
Ways and Means, 1221.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 1235.
Loan Resolutions, 1249, 1250.

HALFYARD, MR.
On Address in Reply, 23, 37, 307.
Motion to Adjourn, 118, 417, 465, 919.
Bond Bequest, 344.
Buchans Mine, 353.
Tourist Bureau, 369, 470.
Labrador Bill, 381, 395, 422, 423, 511, 564, 567, 586, 596.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 393.
Fisheries Petition, 572.
Supply, 597, 754, 819, 821, 834, 855, 858, 867, 870, 875, 896, 899, 901, 903, 905, 910, 993, 994.
Education Bill, 935, 946, 983, 1018.
International and Gander, 1094, 1125.
Ways and Means, 1198.
Loan Resolutions, 1234, 1240, 1257, 1273.

HIBBS, MR.
On Bond Bequest, 63, 346.
Address in Reply, 136, 143, 311.
Labrador Bill, 329, 377.
Buchans Mine, 360, 1038.
Tourist Bureau, 370.
Supply, 673, 674, 682, 769, 771, 893, 895, 913, 1160.
Privilege, 1033.
International and Gander, 1067, 1068, 1099, 1104.
International Bill, 1178.
Loan Resolutions, 1229, 1251, 1258.
Loan Bill, 1278.

I

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 233.

J

JUSTICE, HON. MINISTER OF.
On Bond Bequest, 77, 498.
Address in Reply, 320.
Labrador Bill, 325, 376, 378.
Buchans Mine, 350, 354, 362, 426, 427, 433, 460, 666, 928, 965, 967, 973, 1021, 1023.
Tourist Bureau, 374, 445.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 382, 389, 393, 446, 448, 453, 456, 474.
Motion to Adjourn, 307.
Labrador Bill, 403, 419, 490, 507, 509, 510, 520, 564, 569, 570, 581, 585.
Supply, 734, 736, 742, 782, 860, 861, 862, 976.
Crown Royalties Bill, 924, 931, 932, 933, 934.
Patents Bill, 945, 1165.
International and Gander, 1067, 1105, 1122.
Crown Lands Bill, 1175, 1196, 1197.
Railway Bill, 1188, 1192.
Ways and Means, 1217.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 1135.
Loan Resolutions, 1241.
War Pensions Act, 1263.
Keeping of Dogs, 1281.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 1287.

L

LAKE, MR.
On Address in Reply, 93, 101.
Tourist Bureau, 371.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 392, 447.
Labrador Bill, 409.
Buchans Mine, 457, 479, 484.
Supply, 767, 778, 812.
Motion to Adjourn, 1221.

LINEGAR, MR.
On Motion to Adjourn, 486.

Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 383, 447, 449, 450, 455, 474.
Supply, 676, 776, 707, 852, 884, 915, 994.
International and Gander Valley Resolutions, 1015, 1052, 1064, 1098, 1101, 1108.
International Bill, 1183, 1185.
Ways and Means, 1221.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 1235.
Loan Resolutions, 1249, 1250.

HALFYARD, MR.
On Address in Reply, 23, 37, 307.
Motion to Adjourn, 118, 417, 465, 919.
Bond Bequest, 344.
Buchans Mine, 353.
Tourist Bureau, 369, 470.
Labrador Bill, 381, 395, 422, 423, 511, 564, 567, 586, 596.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 393.
Fisheries Petition, 572.
Supply, 597, 754, 819, 821, 834, 855, 858, 867, 870, 875, 896, 899, 901, 903, 905, 910, 993, 994.
Education Bill, 935, 946, 983, 1018.
International and Gander, 1094, 1125.
Ways and Means, 1198.
Loan Resolutions, 1234, 1240, 1257, 1273.

HIBBS, MR.
On Bond Bequest, 63, 346.
Address in Reply, 136, 143, 311.
Labrador Bill, 329, 377.
Buchans Mine, 360, 1038.
Tourist Bureau, 370.
Supply, 673, 674, 682, 769, 771, 893, 895, 913, 1160.
Privilege, 1033.
International and Gander, 1067, 1068, 1099, 1104.
International Bill, 1178.
Loan Resolutions, 1229, 1251, 1258.
Loan Bill, 1278.

I

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 233.

J

JUSTICE, HON. MINISTER OF.
On Bond Bequest, 77, 498.
Address in Reply, 320.
Labrador Bill, 325, 376, 378.
Buchans Mine, 350, 354, 362, 426, 427, 433, 460, 666, 928, 965, 967, 973, 1021, 1023.
Tourist Bureau, 374, 445.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 382, 389, 393, 446, 448, 453, 456, 474.
Motion to Adjourn, 307.
Labrador Bill, 403, 419, 490, 507, 509, 510, 520, 564, 569, 570, 581, 585.
Supply, 734, 736, 742, 782, 860, 861, 862, 976.
Crown Royalties Bill, 924, 931, 932, 933, 934.
Patents Bill, 945, 1165.
International and Gander, 1067, 1105, 1122.
Crown Lands Bill, 1175, 1196, 1197.
Railway Bill, 1188, 1192.
Ways and Means, 1217.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 1135.
Loan Resolutions, 1241.
War Pensions Act, 1263.
Keeping of Dogs, 1281.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 1287.

L

LAKE, MR.
On Address in Reply, 93, 101.
Tourist Bureau, 371.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 392, 447.
Labrador Bill, 409.
Buchans Mine, 457, 479, 484.
Supply, 767, 778, 812.
Motion to Adjourn, 1221.

LINEGAR, MR.
On Motion to Adjourn, 486.

M

MARINE AND FISHERIES, MINISTER OF.
On Supply, 774, 775, 778, 792, 703, 796, 797, 801, 816, 827, 828, 841, 844, 849, 849, 850, 851, 857, 914, 1155, 1167.
Loan Resolutions, 1272.
Loan Bill, 1277.
Whaling Bill, 1282.

MOORE, MR.
On Motion to Adjourn, 22, 442.
Address in Reply, 218, 320.
Buchans Mine, 359.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 386.
Labrador Bill, 411.
Tourist Bill, 468.
Supply, 746, 815, 830, 877, 920, 924, 995, 1160.
Ways and Means, 1216.
Loan Resolutions, 1244.
War Pensions Act, 1263.

MOSDELL, DR.
On Address in Reply, 247, 256.
Bond Bequest, 338.
Buchans Mine, 356, 425, 427, 430, 432, 433, 926, 927, 965, 967, 973, 974, 1020, 1024.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 386, 388.
Tourist Bureau, 444, 445, 468, 470.
Labrador Bill, 509, 536, 540, 569, 570, 581, 583.
Motion to Adjourn, 607, 609.
Supply, 703, 732, 740, 756, 762, 763, 765, 793, 795, 796, 800, 826, 827, 828, 849, 851, 857, 858, 863, 872, 873, 876, 888, 889, 894, 895, 896, 899, 900, 911, 912, 917, 921, 1153.
Motion to Adjourn, 864.
Crown Royalties Bill, 932.
Education Bill, 956, 978, 979, 981, 984, 985, 1017, 1020.
Railway Bill, 1192, 1196.
Crown Lands, 1196, 1197.
Loan Resolutions, 1250, 1269, 1272.

P

POWER, MR.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 10.
Bond Bequest, 75, 499.
Motion to Adjourn, 499.

P

PETITIONS PRESENTED.
By Mr. Halfyard, 23, 382, 572, 1069, 1206, 1287.
Mr. Hibbs, 23.
Mr. Scammell, 37, 166, 211, 610, 810, 829.
Mr. Brown, 55, 211, 575, 609, 888, 1165.
Mr. Ashbourne, 55, 211, 255, 1152.
Mr. Cashin, 80, 487.
Dr. Mosdell, 80, 101, 211, 397, 609.
Mr. Grimes, 234, 366, 487, 727.
Minister Agriculture and Mines, 298.
Minister of Justice, 331.
Mr. Godden, 397.
Hon. Colonial Secretary, 500, 975.
Mr. Brophy, 540.
Mr. Bradley, 772.
Mr. Linegar, 931, 1236.
Mr. Hickman, 1188.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, MINISTER OF.
On Buchans Mine Bill, 484.
Supply, 646, 755, 757, 901, 904, 909, 912, 913, 914, 916, 917.

PRIME MINISTER.
On Resolution of Condolence, 5.
Motion for Address in Reply, 17.
Bond Bequest, 37, 56, 78, 337, 494, 497.
Motion to Adjourn, 117, 188, 231, 330, 415, 499, 516, 608, 864, 887, 918, 1221.
Address in Reply, 285.
St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service, 324.
Labrador Bill, 324, 376, 379, 394, 401, 411, 418, 488, 500, 505, 510, 519, 535, 562, 571, 576.
Buchans Mine, 358, 438, 1049.

Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 386, 449, 455.
Education Bill, 413, 951, 977, 979, 981, 985, 1016, 1018, 1019, 1035.
Fisheries Petition, 574.
Supply, 735, 752, 770, 789, 821, 850, 861, 863, 882, 885, 896, 897, 910, 911, 994, 1160, 1162, 1163.
International and Gander Valley Resolutions, 1002, 1015, 1063, 1068, 1072, 1074, 1097, 1099, 1106, 1112, 1118, 1122.
International Bill, 1152, 1168, 1184.
Gander Valley Bill, 1186.
Loan Resolutions, 1237, 1244, 1249, 1250, 1252, 1256, 1259.
Retiring Allowances Bill, 1235.
Loan Bill, 1278, 1279.
Bay of Islands Light and Power, 1286.

PUDDESTER, MR.
On Motion to Adjourn, 608.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER OF.
On Supply, 844, 897.

R

RANDELL, MR.
On Address in Reply, 184.
Motion to Adjourn, 1220.
Whaling Bill, 1283.

RUSSELL, MR.
On Address in Reply, 193.
Bond Bequest, 336.
Tourist Bureau, 371, 372, 424.
Labrador Bill, 509, 591, 593, 597.
Supply, 879, 896, 898, 1154, 1156.

RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.
On St. George's-Bay of Islands Coastal Mail Service, 324.
Buchans Mine, 349.
Internation P. Co., 1002.
Gander Valley, 1002.
Loan Resolutions, 1227.
Bay of Islands Light and Power, 1286.

RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE, 6.

RULES OF HOUSE DISPENSED WITH, 1002, 1173, 1174.

S

SCAMMELL, MR.
On Privilege, 55.
Bond Bequest, 78.
Address in Reply, 221, 234, 300.
Motion to Adjourn, 331, 499, 500.
Buchans Mine, 364, 433, 656, 930.
Tourist Bill, 424.
Privilege, 442.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 455.
Fisheries Petition, 573.
Labrador Bill, 576.
Supply, 640, 647, 653, 668, 737, 744, 750, 754, 773, 774, 782, 830, 833, 834, 843, 850, 853, 879, 900, 915, 1153, 1163, 1166, 1167.
Crown Royalties Bill, 932, 933, 935.
Education Bill, 954.
Ways and Means, 1209.
Loan Resolutions, 1228, 1247.
Loan Bill, 1276.
Supply Granted to His Majesty, 80.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORTS.
Buchans Mine, 331.
Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 366.
Patents Bill, 1152.

SPEAKER, MR.
On Ruling, Mr. Hickman, 15.
Ruling, Mr. Bradley, 53
Ruling, Notice, of Motion, 79, 1001.
Ruling, Mr. Lake, 113.
Ruling, Mr. Brown, 124.
Ruling, Re-questions, 255, 365.

SULLIVAN, HON. MR.
On Holyrood Pond Fisheries, 385.
Motion to Adjourn, 397, 465.
Buchans Mine, 431, 432, 441, 1025, 1047.
Supply 831, 869, 884, 901.
Crown Royalties Bill, 934.
International and Gander, 1083.
Motion to Adjourn, 1221.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, 3.

SPEECH, CLOSING, 1303.

SELECT COMMITTEES.
On Buchans Mine Petition, 298.
Holyrood Pond Petition, 331.
Patents Bill, 945.

SUSPENSION OF RULES, 1263.