

JOURNAL
of
PROCEEDINGS

of the

**First Session of the Twenty-
Sixth General Assembly
of Newfoundland**

1924



PROCEEDINGS

of the

House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION, 1924

WEDNESDAY, July 9th, 1924.

Begun and holden at St. John's in the said Island on Wednesday, the ninth day of July, Anno Domini, Nineteen Hundred and Twenty-four, being in the Fifteenth 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.

His Excellency William Lamond Allardyce, Esquire, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies, by His Proclamation bearing date the 25th day of April last, having dissolved the late General Assembly, and by His Proclamation bearing date the 3rd day of July having appointed Wednesday the 9th day of July for the Meeting of the said General Assembly for the despatch of business, the following are the names of the Members returned by the Returning Officers of the several Electoral Districts to represent the said Districts in the General Assembly:—

HON. SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE,
K.B.E.,

WILLIAM JOSEPH BROWNE,
ESQ.,
WILLIAM F. LINEGAR, ESQ.,
(St. John's Western Division).

HON. WILLIAM J. HIGGINS,
CYRIL J. FOX, ESQ.,
NICHOLAS J. VINICOMBE, ESQ.,
(St. John's Eastern Division).

MAJOR PETER J. CASHIN,
PHILIP F. MOORE, ESQ.,
Ferryland.

HON. MICHAEL S. SULLIVAN,
WILLIAM J. WALSH, ESQ.,
EDWARD F. SINNOTT, ESQ.,
Placentia & St. Mary's.

HAROLD BERTRAM CLYDE
LAKE, ESQ.,
HON. JOSEPH J. LONG,
Burin.

WILLIAM R. WARREN, ESQ.,
Fortune Bay.

WALTER McK. CHAMBERS, ESQ.,
Burgeo and LaPoile.

THOMAS J. POWER, ESQ.,
St. George's.

JOHN H. SCAMMELL, ESQ.,
St. Barbe.

THOMAS G. W. ASHBOURNE,
ESQ.,

KENNETH M. BROWN, ESQ.,

GEORGE F. GRIMES, ESQ.,

Twillingate.

RICHARD HIBBS, ESQ., Fogo.

HON, WALTER S. MONROE,

LEWIS LITTLE, ESQ.,

WILLIAM C. WINSOR, ESQ.,

Bonavista.

WILLIAM W. HALFYARD, ESQ.,

ISAAC R. RANDELL, ESQ.,

EDWIN J. GODDEN, ESQ.,

Trinity.

HON. RICHARD CRAMM,

JOHN C. PUDESTER, ESQ.,

Bay de Verde.

ROBERT DUFF, ESQ., Carbonear.

ALBERT E. HICKMAN, ESQ.,

HON. JOHN R. BENNETT,

CHARLES E. RUSSELL, ESQ.,

Harbour Grace.

HON. F. GORDON BRADLEY,

Port de Grave.

HON. WILLIAM J. WOODFORD,

CYRIL J. CAHILL, ESQ.

Harbour Main.

By virtue of a Commission under the Great Seal to the Honourable J. D. Ryan, President of the Legislative Council, the Honourable A. B. Morine and the Honourable S. Milley, Members of the said Council, which is as follows:

COMMISSION.

GEORGE T H E
FIFTH by the
Grace of God,
of the United
K i n g d o m of
G r e a t Britain
and Ireland, and
of the British
Dominions be-
yond the Seas,
King, Defender
of the Faith,
Emperor of In-
dia.

(Sgd.)
W. L. Allardyce.
Governor.

To all to whom these Presents shall
come—

Greeting:

Know ye that We have appointed the Honourable James D. Ryan, the Honourable Samuel Milley, and the Honourable Alfred B. Morine, Members of our Legislative Council, to be Commissioners, they, or either of them, to administer the Oath of Allegiance to the undermentioned persons, elected to serve in the House of Asembly for the several Districts and Divisions of Districts set opposite their names, respectively, and appointed by Proclamation of Our Governor of Our Colony of Newfoundland to be holden in St. John's on the ninth day of this instant month:—

(Sgd.) W. J. HIGGINS,
Attorney General.

HON. SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE,
K.B.E.,
WILLIAM JOSEPH BROWNE, ESQ.,
WILLIAM F. LINEGAR, ESQ.,
(St. John's Western Division).

HON. WILLIAM J. HIGGINS,
CYRIL J. FOX, ESQ.,
NICHOLAS J. VINICOMBE, ESQ.,
(St. John's Eastern Division).

MAJOR PETER J. CASHIN,
PHILIP F. MOORE, ESQ.,
Ferryland.

HON. MICHAEL S. SULLIVAN,
WILLIAM J. WALSH, ESQ.,
EDWARD F. SINNOTT, ESQ.,
Placentia & St. Mary's.

HAROLD BERTRAM CLYDE
LAKE, ESQ.,
HON. JOSEPH JAMES LONG,
Burin.

WILLIAM R. WARREN, ESQ.,
Fortune Bay.

WALTER McK. CHAMBERS, ESQ.,
Burgeo & LaPoile.

THOMAS J. POWER, ESQ.,
St. George's.

JOHN H. SCAMMELL, ESQ.,
St. Barbe.

KENNETH M. BROWN, ESQ.,
GEORGE F. GRIMES, ESQ.,
THOMAS G. W. ASHBOURNE, ESQ.,
Twillingate.

RICHARD HIBBS, ESQ., Fogo.

HON. WALTER S. MONROE,
LEWIS LITTLE, ESQ.,
WILLIAM C. WINSOR, ESQ.,
Bonavista.

WILLIAM W. HALFYARD, ESQ.,
ISAAC R. RANDELL, ESQ.,
EDWIN J. GODDEN, ESQ.,
Trinity.

HON. RICHARD CRAMM,
JOHN C. PUDDISTER, ESQ.,
Bay de Verde.

ROBERT DUFF, ESQ.,
Carbonear.

ALBERT E. HICKMAN, ESQ.,
HON. JOHN R. BENNETT,
CHARLES E. RUSSELL, ESQ.,
Harbour Grace.

HON. F. GORDON BRADLEY,
Port de Grave.

HON. WILLIAM J. WOODFORD,
CYRIL J. CAHILL, ESQ.,
Harbour Main.

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

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

Witness Our Trusty and Well-beloved Sir William Lamond Allardyce, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over Our said Colony of Newfoundland, at St. John's, in Our said Colony, this 8th day of July, A.D. 1924, and in the Fifteenth year of Our Reign.

By His Excellency's Command,

(Sgd.) J. R. BENNETT,
Colonial Secretary.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND.

The said Commissioners came into the Council Chamber between the hours of two and three of the clock on the said Ninth day of July, Henry Y. Mott, Esquire, Clerk of the House of Assembly, as in duty bound attending, and the names of the Members returned for the several Districts and Divisions of Districts having been called over by the Clerk, they appeared with the exception of

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
OF NEWFOUNDLAND

WILLIAM J. BROWNE,
and took and subscribed the Oath of
Allegiance in the presence of the said
Commissioners, as follows:

HON. SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE,
K.B.E.,
WILLIAM F. LINEGAR, ESQ.,
St. John's Western Division.

HON. WILLIAM J. HIGGINS,
CYRIL J. FOX, ESQ.,
NICHOLAS J. VINICOMBE, ESQ.,
St. John's Eastern Division.

MAJOR PETER J. CASHIN,
PHILIP F. MOORE, ESQ.,
Ferryland.

HON. MICHAEL S. SULLIVAN,
WILLIAM J. WALSH, ESQ.,
EDWARD F. SINNOTT, ESQ.,
Placentia & St. Mary's.

HAROLD BERTRAM CLYDE LAKE,
ESQ.,
HON. JOSEPH JAMES LONG,
Burin.

WILLIAM R. WARREN, ESQ.,
Fortune Bay.

WALTER McK. CHAMBERS, ESQ.,
Burgeo & LaPoile.

THOMAS J. POWER, ESQ.,
St. George's.

JOHN H. SCAMMELL, ESQ.,
St. Barbe.

KENNETH M. BROWN, ESQ.,
GEORGE F. GRIMES, ESQ.,
THOMAS G. W. ASHBOURNE, ESQ.,
Twillingate.

RICHARD HIBBS, ESQ.,
Fogo.

HON. WALTER S. MONROE,
LEWIS LITTLE, ESQ.,
WILLIAM C. WINSOR, ESQ.,
Bonavista.

WILLIAM W. HALFARD, ESQ.,
ISAAC R. RANDELL, ESQ.,
EDWIN J. GODDEN, ESQ.,
Trinity.

HON. RICHARD CRAMM,
JOHN C. PUDDESTER, ESQ.,
Bay de Verde.

ROBERT DUFF, ESQ.,
Carbonear.

ALBERT E. HICKMAN, ESQ.,
HON. JOHN R. BENNETT,
CHARLES E. RUSSELL, ESQ.,
Harbour Grace.

HON. F. GORDON BRADLEY,
Port de Grave.

HON. WILLIAM J. WOODFORD,
CYRIL J. CAHILL, ESQ.,
Harbour Main.

At three of the clock, the Gentleman
Usher of the Black Rod appeared at
the Bar and said:

Gentlemen of the House of As-
sembly—

“His Excellency the Governor re-
quests your immediate attendance in
the Council Chamber.”

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

COMMISSION.

By His Excellency
Sir William La-
mond Allardyce,
Knight C o m -
mander of the
Most Distinguish-
ed Order of Saint
Michael a n d
Saint George,
Governor a n d
Commander - in -
Chief in and ov-
er the Colony of
Newfoundland.

W. L. Allardyce,
Governor.

To—

Honourable James D. Ryan,
Honourable Samuel Milley, and
Honourable Alfred B. Morine, K.C.,
Members of Our Legislative
Council,

Greeting:

Whereas I have deemed it expedient that the First Session of the Twenty-sixth General Assembly should be open for the despatch of business on Wednesday, the Ninth day of this instant month, whereof I have given notice in my Proclamation dated the Third day of July instant; and

Whereas it is not convenient that the purposes for which I have called the said General Assembly together should be declared on the said day, nor until the Members of the House of Assembly have proceeded to the choice of a Speaker, you, the said Honourable James D. Ryan, Honourable Samuel Milley, and Honourable Alfred B. Morine, are hereby authorized and directed to signify to the Members of the said House of Assembly on the Ninth day of this instant month, that it is my pleasure that they should proceed to the choice of some proper person to be their Speaker, and present such person on the following day for my approbation.

Given under my Hand and Seal at the Government House, St. John's, this 8th day of July, A.D. 1924.

By His Excellency's Command,
(Sgd.) J. R. BENNETT,
Colonial Secretary.

W. J. Higgins,
Attorney General.

The Honourable James D. Ryan, President of the Legislative Council, then said:—

“It is not convenient for His Excellency the Governor to declare the reasons for His calling this General Assembly on this day, and it being

necessary that a Speaker of the House of Assembly should be first chosen, you, Gentlemen of the House of Assembly, will repair to the place where you are to sit, and there proceed to the appointment of some proper person to be your Speaker, and present such person whom you shall choose here to-morrow, at three of the clock, for His Excellency's approbation.”

And the Members having returned to the Assembly Room, the Honourable the Prime Minister, addressing himself to the Clerk, who standing up pointed to him and then sat down, moved “that Cyril James Fox, Esquire, Member elected for the District of St. John's (Eastern Division), do take the chair of this House as Speaker,” which motion was seconded by Albert E. Hickman, Esquire, Member elected for the District of Harbour Grace.

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

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

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

FRIDAY, July 10th, 1924.

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

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

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the

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

Mr. Speaker further announced that whilst in the Council Chamber, His Excellency had been pleased to make a Speech to both branches of the Legislature, of which Speech, for greater accuracy, he had obtained a copy, which he then read to the House as follows:

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

I welcome you to this the first session of the twenty-sixth General Assembly. The circumstances under which you meet suggest that your deliberations need not be protracted, for my advisers have not been in office long enough to permit of that close investigation into public affairs which should precede legislation.

Since the last General Assembly was prorogued, three administrations have been appointed and two have resigned, and a General Election has resulted in a large majority for my present advisers. Of my Ministers who sought re-election, all except two

were returned by acclamation, and the two who were opposed, obtained largely increased majorities. Many electors being absent at this season, at the Fishery and elsewhere, from Bonavista District, the two members who sit for that Constituency will seek re-election at a later date this year.

The Seal Fishery this Spring was a successful one, and the Cod Fishery has commenced hopefully, with prospects of satisfactory markets. Unemployment has decreased, and upon the whole, a new spirit of encouragement is manifested by the people of the Colony.

Field Marshal Earl Haig has recently honoured the Colony by his presence under the auspices of the Great War Veterans' Association, to unveil a beautiful National Memorial to the Colony's loyal sons who fell in the Great War, and the manner in which the occasion was marked, and the success which attended the efforts of those responsible will never be forgotten. The Field Marshal was accompanied by Lady Haig, and warships of Great Britain, France and the United States of America were present in the Port of St. John's, and officers and crews took part in the ceremony.

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

Estimates were provided by the preceding Government for the consideration of the last General Assembly. My present advisers have not had sufficient time for a complete consideration of those estimates. They have amended them in some particulars, only in the direction of greater economy and propose to submit them as amended, with a promise that such further economies shall be made as investigation may prove feasible.

The Enquiry by Auditors into the affairs of several Public Departments

instituted by a recent Government, has been steadily pursued, but has not yet reached a stage which would justify an Enquiry on Oath. When such a stage has been reached, a Commissioner to hold the Enquiry will be obtained from England. In the meantime, investigations on even a wider scale than was proposed, will be commenced.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

It is publicly recognized that the Prohibition Act has not been enforced, and that unlawful practices with reference to the importation, manufacture and sale of liquor, have become general. A measure designed towards more adequate control, and to decrease the many evils which result from law breaking, will be submitted to you.

The excessive cost of public printing and stationery have induced my Ministers to prepare for your consideration, a Bill designed to place the matter under the control of the Colonial Secretary, with a special official in charge as King's Printer. The work of printing, and the supply of stationery it is proposed to submit to tender and contract.

Contracts concerning an enterprise on the Gander River, and a Flour Mill at St. John's, are being reconsidered by my present advisers, and if and when satisfactory to them, will be submitted for your consideration.

My Ministers are giving earnest attention to plans for the development of natural resources to give greater employment, and stimulate the trade of the Colony, and when these have been completed, your approval will be asked.

I commend your deliberation to the guidance of the Almighty for the pro-

motion of the best interests of the people.

MR. H. B. LAKE, Member for Burin moved that a Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor was pleased to open this session of the Legislature. He congratulated the Speaker on being appointed the first Commoner of the land and felt sure that His Honour the Speaker will do his duty fairly and impartially. He also congratulated Hon. Walter S. Monroe on becoming the Prime Minister of this Island. The Leader of the House had brought back with him a substantial majority of members and he had no doubt that, under the leadership of Mr. Monroe, the people of this country will not have cause to regret their action. As His Excellency appropriately suggested in the beginning of his speech, in view of all the circumstances, our deliberations need not be protracted. It is unusual to have a session of Parliament at this particular season of the year when so many of our people are engaged in the fisheries and trade of the country, but, under the circumstances, the best possible was done in the best interests of all concerned. A brief session is desirable from the fact that this Government has been too short a time in office to acquire that information about public affairs which is necessary for wise and sound legislation.

The past six months has been extraordinary in the political history of Newfoundland, as, during that period, not less than three administrations were appointed, two of which resigned; but he felt that the present party is here to stay and that the Leader has the confidence of the whole country.

Mr. Lake was pleased to note that the Bye-Elections in Hr. Grace resulted so favorably for his colleagues.

In the case of Bonavista it was deemed advisable to have the Bye-Election postponed until the Fall when the fishermen are home, thus showing how fair Mr. Monroe is, and that no voter will be disfranchised.

He endorsed the remarks of His Excellency that this year's sealfishery was a successful one and that the codfishery—the mainstay of the country—had opened up so favorably and he trusted that the prices paid for this product in the local and foreign markets will be such as to be remunerative to the fishermen of the country. He went to the Bank fishery as a boy with his father, one of the pioneers of that branch of the fishery, and had seen the fishing business in all its stages and he was sure that this Government was composed of men who will see that no legislation will be introduced that will again handicap this great industry which, in his opinion, means practically everything to Newfoundland; and he trusted that our Fisheries Department, under so capable and experienced a Minister as Captain Winsor, Member for Bonavista, would be brought to such a stage of usefulness that everyone would be proud of it. He said he was aware of the fact that we had the Humber, Grand Falls and Bell Island industries and he trusted to have the Gander and other industries opened up within a short time, but still we could not get away from the fact that the codfishery was our main industry.

He endorsed the opinion expressed by His Excellency that unemployment had decreased and that a new era of things had been entered upon, and hoped that able-bodied relief would be a thing of the past, and that the people generally abhor the idea of dole.

He thought that a great advertisement had been given Newfoundland

this Summer by the visit of so distinguished a soldier as Field Marshal Earl Haig and that the Great War Veterans, particularly Padre Nangle, deserved congratulations upon the successful manner in which the whole programme in connection with that event had been carried out.

The Estimates for the carrying on of the public service, which are now in the hands of the Finance Minister, have due regard for economy and retrenchment which he thought was necessary to allow the working classes of the country to live in the country.

With reference to the enquiry into the public affairs of the Colony, he said the Government proposed to invite a Commission from England to deal with the matter when the time is ripe.

Regarding the Prohibition Act he thought that the present law was not being enforced and he denounced the script business. He said that the Government proposes to remedy the whole system at an early date.

Speaking of the excessive cost of printing, he said that the Government proposed to introduce a system of economy and retrenchment by having printing done by tender and contract and that the work will be controlled by the Colonial Secretary with a special official in charge as King's Printer.

He thought it would be good news for the workingman to know that legislation will be passed at this session for the manufacture of pulp and paper on the Gander River and the Flour Mill on the South Side of St. John's. These industries, combined with those already mentioned, will give employment to thousands of men when the fisheries are over.

He said that 5,500 men are now engaged on the Humber and that 90 per cent are Newfoundlanders and he had no doubt that as time went on

and our people became proficient that all the men employed there would be Newfoundlanders. He was also glad to know that the steel works at North Sydney will not be closed down, as at first thought, because the Besco people have received orders from the Canadian Government for steel rails. This will mean our men now employed will be kept going in full swing.

In conclusion Mr. Lake said he was proud of the honour conferred on him in moving that this Committee be appointed and in particular as representing the electorate of Burin District.

MR. LINEGAR had very much pleasure in seconding the motion made by the honourable member for Burin. He congratulated the Speaker on the high honour conferred upon him and felt confidently certain that he would do honour to himself and to the people of this Dominion. Especially did it give him pleasure to express his feelings as a labour representative—the first time a representative of labour had a seat in the legislature in the history of Newfoundland—and that is one particular reason why he felt gratified in expressing his thanks to the Executive Government for asking him to second the motion to-day. He expressed himself as to whether he would be able to fulfil all that was required of him at the present time, because it was such a large contract to fulfil and perform. He said he was proud to be the representative of labour in the House, and that he had the pleasure of being the first representative of labour to stand on the floors of the Honourable House of Assembly. He represented labour in all its forms, organized and unorganized; he represented 300 coopers strong, besides other numerous forms of labour, and he trusted that he would be successful in keeping up to what was expected of him. He assured all those

whom he represented in the House that he would do his best for their welfare and benefit. Labour needed a representative in the House. He did not want to see crowds of men coming to the Bar of the House this year, as they did in the past asking for their rights. He advocated for years that the conditions of the labourers be improved, and he trusted and hoped that his efforts were to be rewarded now; and he also hoped that he would measure up in a good way to that which was expected of him, and that when he went back to his District four years hence he would be worthy of some reward for accomplishments and acts which he performed on behalf of the labourers, and the labour movement. He congratulated the Prime Minister upon the confidence reposed in him by the people of this country, and expressed his candid conviction that the electorate of this country had made a wise choice in selecting the Hon. W. S. Monroe as Prime Minister of our ancient colony.

He also congratulated Mr. Lake the Hon. Member for Burin, on the splendid speech made by him, and particularly because of it being his maiden speech on the floors of the Hon. House of Assembly, and that it rivetted his confidence and faith in Mr. Monroe when he had such men as the Hon. Member for Burin allied with him. With regard to the speech from the throne, Mr. Linegar did not propose to deal at length with it.

With regard to the Sealfishery, Mr. Linegar expressed himself as being pleased to note and say that it had been a successful one. Later on in the session he hoped to say something regarding the conditions of the Seal Fishery and to show why the Seal Fishery is not as profitable to the labourer as it should be. He also said that the fish markets at present

are good and he did not think that there is any doubt whatever, but what we will have good results throughout the year. He was glad to express his pleasure upon the visit of our distinguished guest Field Marshall Earl Haig. He felt certain that all were pleased to have him here, and infinitely more pleased to know that the distinguished visitor enjoyed himself to such an extent during his stay amongst us, and that he was given such a rousing and whole hearted reception.

Regarding estimates Mr. Linegar said that as they had already been covered by Mr. Lake the Hon. Member for Burin he could only reiterate what had already been said by that Hon. Gentleman.

With regard to the motto of cleaning up and keeping clean Mr. Linegar said that it was one of his election planks all through the campaign and that he meant to stand by it; and it was only right and proper and just that those who have done wrong should be punished to the utmost extent of the law.

With regard to prohibition, Mr. Linegar assured the people that something would be done in the very near future to remedy the abuse of the law as it stands at the present time.

With regard to industries in general, Mr. Linegar said that it was high time that we had some confidence in ourselves. This country possesses sufficient industries to be in a flourishing financial position if we only had the confidence in our resources. This country has been demoralized, the spirit of the working people is broken. The working people have been taken, in a good many cases, from their ordinary work and put in some place where they do not belong and consequently have not been able to do justice to their country in general, or themselves in particular; conditions as they at present

exist must cease, and a general improvement made for the betterment of the working class.

In conclusion, Mr. Linegar remarked that he would like to refer to the conditions of our work men, which to-day are appalling. He could say in dealing with this matter that he knew as much about the conditions of the working man in this country as any person in Nfld. and any person who wants to know under what conditions the labourer works and lives in this country has only to go among them and be convinced as to the unfairness and the disadvantages under which they exist. He said that the conditions were such that it was a miracle how the people could live at all. It has been said that you cannot get good results or returns from the labourer, but Mr. Linegar affirmed that the working man of St. John's was the finest kind of man, and the finest kind of workmen that you could get, but he was sorry to say that the working man's spirit was broken, and that when things did start it would take two or three years to get him going, and to instill a feeling of independence and willingness in him.

He wished to thank the Government, its Hon. Leader, and the Electorate of his District for sending him to the House to-day and in giving him the privilege of being able to champion the rights of those whom he represented, and he assured them all that he would do his best to justify his seat in the house as a representative of the District of St. John's West.

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Hickman said he wished to make a few opening remarks and in doing so he would like to tender his congratulations to Mr. Fox on his election as Speaker. He felt sure that Mr. Fox would do his duty fairly and unbiassed, and that he would treat the Members of the Opposition in the same way as he

would the Members of the Government.

Mr. Hickman also wished to congratulate the mover of the Speech of Reply. He said it was good to see men of the type of the Hon. Member for Burin representing their own Districts in the Hon. House of Assembly, and that he felt certain that the District of Burin would find an able and confident supporter in the person of Mr. Lake.

He also wished to congratulate Mr. Linegar the Member for St. John's West upon the speech made by him. He said that Mr. Linegar claimed to represent Labour and that the Opposition were pleased to see him and have him in the House and that they assured him of their sympathy in the movement in which he was so interested.

We of the Opposition are veritable working men and before the session concludes we will give evidence of it and see that legislation is put in force to provide for the laborer. As to the Speech from the Throne it has been customary heretofore to distribute copies previous to the opening of the House so that members of the Opposition might have an opportunity to discuss it but on this occasion this has not been done. As glanced over by him, Mr. Hickman said, there was nothing of importance in the Speech, though it might be interesting to the public to know that Earl and Countess Haig had visited here and that those who had opposed the Government in the election had been defeated. He promised to assist the Prime Minister in carrying out his promises to the people and to assist in every way possible in forwarding whatever legislation that might be brought before the House. He hoped that the policy of "clean-up" the maintenance of law and order and the amendment of such acts at present in force and incapable of being

carried out, would be brought into being and employment found for the people, particularly the fishermen, so as to enable them to live in comfort. As to the cutting down of expenses he trusted that men would not be dismissed because of their party affiliations and their positions filled by supporters of the Government on the only grounds that they had supported the right side. In conclusion he expressed the belief that though Newfoundland is at present facing a serious situation in her history, she can weather the storm as she has done before and by proper legislation be brought back again to a condition of prosperity.

The Member for Fortune District, Mr. Warren, speaking for the Independent Opposition, congratulated Hon. the Speaker on the dignity conferred on him by his election to the position of First Commoner of the land and paid a glowing tribute to his ability as citizen and lawyer. He also congratulated Messrs. Lake and Linegar on their efforts in proposing and seconding the motion for the address in reply.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER took the opportunity to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply and the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Warren for the manner in which they had referred to the Speech from the Throne. He congratulated the Speaker on his election to that important position, expressing the belief that none was more qualified to fill it. He regretted that copies of the Speech from the Throne had not been available for the Opposition, but that was due to his inexperience. As to the promises made; or said to have been made, by the present Government, they had never made anything like the promises of their predecessors but would guarantee to carry out their programme as well as any party who

ever held power before. The Government is sincere in its efforts to clean up and to give a square deal to all and that policy will be rigidly adhered to. He did not wish to make a political speech, but as to the suggestion of the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition that Government employees might be dismissed because of party affiliations he wished to state that none would be interfered with as long as they were faithfully performing their duties but men who had taken an active part in politics might have to be dealt with. He was sorry to say that previous governments had dismissed people from various offices simply because they or their relatives had supported those opposed to the Government. As to the fishery the Government would do all possible to foster it and every other labor giving industry and a speedy solution of the Bell Island problem is looked for. The position of the Government is to try and make labor and capital agree and while some think that a standard wage should be given to labour throughout the Island, the whole situation hinges on supply and demand. We have to go cautiously before saying that every employer shall pay a certain rate. Continuing, he hoped to reduce taxation but pointed out that at present it is impossible to make an estimate of the country's finances owing to the way in which the accounts have been jumbled for some years past, salaries, bonuses, etc., being so confused that it is next to impossible to tell the wages of some officials. This will be straightened out and everything made clear to the public. At the next session it is hoped to be able to state where the country stands financially, but at present this is impossible owing to the way in which figures have been turned and twisted. The Prime Minister concluded by stating he would have more to say on this subject later.

On the motion of Mr. Lake, seconded by Mr. Linegar, it was ordered that an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor in reply to the Gracious Speech with which he had been pleased to open the present Session of the Legislature, and that a Select Committee be appointed to draft such Address in Reply and that the following gentlemen be such Committee:—Mr. Lake, Mr. Linegar, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Chambers.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would ask leave to introduce a Bill "to Amend the War Pensions Act, 1922."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would ask leave to introduce a Bill to "Amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace."

Mr. Halfyard gave notice that he would ask leave to introduce a Bill to "Amend the Election Act 1913."

Hon. the Colonial Secretary gave notice that he would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery."

Mr. Brown gave notice that he would ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled "Of the Employment of men engaged in Logging."

Hon. the Minister of Finance gave notice that he would move that Supply be granted to His Majesty.

Hon. the Colonial Secretary tabled the Annual Report of Newfoundland Savings Bank, also Estimated Revenue of St. John's Municipal Council for year 1924.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammel gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday next, 14th inst.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 14th, 1924.

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

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a largely signed petition from the people of Rocky Harbour, on the subject of having that place made a regular Port of Call, coming and going, for the Boat that plies on the Humbermouth-Battle Hr. route. Originally, Rocky Hr. was placed on the Schedule as a Port of Call for this Boat, but for some reason or other, year in and year out, the Boat has been passing up and down and utterly ignoring this Port. It is one of the largest and most important fishing centres in the District, and people are greatly inconvenienced by the Boat not calling there, and they are inconvenienced chiefly as regards freight and passenger service, and have to undergo extreme hardships at all times in the conduct of their work in this connection. I can quite understand that it is not always possible for the Boat to call there, particularly in stormy weather during the Autumn months, but through the Spring and Summer months the Harbour is perfectly safe and there is no reason whatever why the boat should not call as requested.

I strongly support the prayer of the petition, and would ask the Colonial Secretary, as ex-officio Head of the Railway to ask the Management that the Captain be instructed to have this place made a Port of Call continually during the Summer, coming and going.

MR. K. BROWN presented a petition from the people of Pilley's Island asking for an allocation of \$500.00 for

the repair to the public wharf and for the dredging of a channel through which small boats were accustomed to pass.

MR. ASHBOURNE supported the petition.

MR. LINEGAR presented a petition from the block-makers of St. John's. (The clerk read the petition). During the war the material for blockmaking was imported duty free. The petition asked that the act be made again the same as it was before 1916.

MR. CASHIN presented a petition from the fishermen of Renews with regard to the setting of traps. He read the petition. It was presented to him in January or February, but because the House was open for only about an hour he did not get an opportunity to present it. He supported the petition. For a number of years schooners have been coming there from the North and West and have been a trouble to the fishermen of the settlement because of the dumping of ballast into the harbour. They also throw the offal from their traps into the harbour thereby polluting the water. He hoped that the Minister of Fisheries would see that the petition should go through and that a proclamation might be issued and sent forward to Renews. He also hoped that the Government would see fit to send a fishery warden up to this district at an early date.

MR. MOORE gave this petition his support. He felt that if the Minister of Fisheries would consult with himself and Mr. Cashin some satisfactory arrangement would be arrived at.

MR. WARREN gave notice of question.

MR. HICKMAN gave notice of question.

MR. GODDEN gave notice of question.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill to amend the War Pensions Act 1922 was introduced, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, "Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace" was introduced, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Halfyard the Bill to amend the Election Act, 1913" was introduced, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery" was introduced, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Mr. Brown the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of the employment of men engaged in Logging' was introduced, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance it was ordered that Supply be deferred until to-morrow.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

MR. WARREN asked the Hon the Prime Minister what Departments of the Public Service have been subject to investigation during the past two months; if any of such investigations have been completed; if any report thereon has been submitted to the Government.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER in reply stated that only the departments suggested by the Member

for Fortune had up to the present been investigated but none had been completed. He had received a communication from Mr Watson in which he stated that because of the work entailed in the Custom House it had been necessary to suspend work in the other public departments, with the exception of the Department of Controller, which had nearly been completed, and they were only awaiting some prices from the other side.

MR. WARREN asked if any report had been submitted.

THE HON THE PRIME MINISTER replied that there had not been any report submitted.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Honourable the Prime Minister, if it is the intention of the Government to continue the payment of bounties for shipbuilding, as provided for during the past few years.

HONOURABLE THE PRIME MINISTER in reply said that it was the intention of the Government to continue the payment of bounties for shipbuilding in the same way as before.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to allow the Members of the Opposition to control the Grants for the Districts they represent.

THE HON THE PRIME MINISTER—The control of grants for the various districts is in the hands of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who are advised by the various representatives, whether Government or Opposition. It is the desire of the Government to follow former procedure.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE laid on the table the following statement: The Customs Revenue collected in the Colony during the year ending June 30th, 1923; Imports and

Exports of the Colony for the year ending June 30th, 1923; a comparative statement of goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the Colony during the year ending June 30th, 1922 and June 30th, 1923, showing increase and decrease for the year 1922-23; a comparative statement of revenue received at each of the outports for the years 1921-22 and 1922-23; a comparative statement of Light Dues showing collection at each outport for the years 1921-22 and 1922-23; a return of the Bank fishery for the year 1923; a statement showing the revenue collected on goods, wares and merchandise imported through the Post Office; a statement showing the movements of shipping during the year ending June 30th, 1923, and an abstract of shipping for the year ending December 31st, 1923.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 15th, 1924.

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

MR. BROWN presented a petition from the residents of Long Island, Pilley's Island and Triton Island in the District of Twillingate, asking that the sum of \$800 be allocated for the purpose of repairing and building the North Twin Lakes and Badger Roads.

MR. MOORE supported the prayer of the petition.

MAJOR CASHIN presented a largely signed petition from the residents of Ferryland asking for a public wharf at that place. For a number of years coastal boats and others used the wharf of a private concern. Last winter this wharf was carried

away by ice and at present there is no place for the fishermen of Ferryland and adjacent settlements to tie on their boats.

MR. MOORE gave the petition his hearty support.

MR. LAKE, on behalf of the Select Committee, appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's Speech, presented the report of the Select Committee, as follows:

To His Excellency Sir William Lamond Allardyce, K.C.M.G., Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

May it please Your Excellency:

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

Assembly Room, July 15th, 1924.

(Sgd.) H. B. CLYDE LAKE,
" W. F. LINEGAR,
" W. McK. CHAMBERS,
" W. W. HALFYARD,
" R. HIBBS.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, before commenting on the matter before the Chair I wish to congratulate you, Sr. on the high honour conferred upon you by this House. He felt that the Assembly was very fortunate in their selection, as the Speaker possessed many outstanding qualifications which eminently fitted him for the high position for which he had been selected. Because of our association with him during the past four years we all feel that he will discharge the high duties of his office not only with great credit to this Legislature, but with absolute impartiality toward the Honourable gentlemen on both sides of the House.

He also wished to congratulate

Mr. Lake, who was an old friend and it was no surprise to him when Mr. Lake entertained the House with such a splendid Address on opening day, as it had been his pleasure to hear Mr. Lake on more than one occasion in the past, he also congratulated Mr. Linegar the Seconder of the Address in Reply, for the splendid manner in which he acquitted himself, and felt that Mr. Linegar would be heard from in the future in defence of labour and in upholding the interests of his constituents in St. John's West. He felt that he had made a good beginning.

Mr. Hibbs said that it was not customary for Members of the Opposition to congratulate the Leader of the new Government but, as we were not following the custom, he desired to extend congratulations to Hon. Mr. Monroe upon his good fortune in being returned with such a large majority just at a time when it was reasonable to hope that prosperity was about to dawn upon this country.

We are all glad to feel that we have rounded the corner, and that the period of depression under which this country has been struggling, in common with all the world, since 1919 is past, and that an era of better times is about to dawn for Newfoundland. With the Humber industry which was created by the late Government employing six thousand men, with the fishery outlook considerably improved, and other industrial resources about to be developed there is every reason to believe that the country has seen its worst days.

There is a story told that after the 1919 election when certain members of the present Government were deploring the fact that their Party had been defeated, Sir. John Crosbie said to his associates at the time "Don't worry boys, go home "and say your prayers, and thank

"God that your Party has been defeated, for this Government has the "biggest job to tackle that ever any "Administration had in the history "of the country." Continuing, Mr. Hibbs said that Sir John was right, and he wondered if those who comprise the present Government were now thanking God for the favourable auspices under which they were elected and the happy outlook that was ahead of them. He said it was very easy to criticise now that we are emerging from the woods. Many of us seem to forget that there was ever a War with all its disastrous consequences and aftermath. Now that the sun is beginning to shine we forget the dark days through which we passed from 1919 to 1923, which were by far the most trying times in the annals of this Colony. With practically every source of employment closed down, with a succession of bad fisheries and low prices, the latter a direct result of the great conflict which had just closed, we had perhaps 75 p.c. of the labouring people of Newfoundland thrown out of employment and demanding from the Government the wherewithal to keep their families from starving. It is all very well for those who through some fluke of political fortune happen to be in power to-day to talk of squandermania. Some of those who were loudest in their demands upon the Government during those terrible years are to-day unfair enough to misrepresent the late Government to the extent of saying that the sole purpose of that administration while in office was to squander and throw out money extravagantly. If monies were spent the poor of Newfoundland received it, and he felt safe in saying that no more than 25 p.c. of the monies demanded both by the Opposition and the people throughout the country was expended by the late Government no more than 25 p.c.

of the demands that were incessantly being made from day to day were met but, is it not a fact in human history that people will make demands upon their representatives in the Government when they feel the need, and if 40 p.c. only of those demands are complied with and the same is shown up in cold type two years later, the same people will condemn the Administration for complying with their own request. This is history. This is human nature.

He wished to say to the Leader of the House that both he and his Government will be favourably judged by the people of this country, not by their misrepresentation of their political opponents who have borne the heat and burden of the day, but by what real good they themselves do while in office during the next four years.

Mr. Monroe is new to the high position to which he has been elected, and we are prepared to give him a chance. We have some confidence in him, and we will watch very closely to see that he carries out the promises which he made to the people of this country through his Manifesto in the recent election. It is true his Manifesto was not a very voluminous document, but, it contained some promises that are of vital importance to this country, and we will see how far he will go to redeem those pledges made to the electorate who placed his Government in power.

Misrepresentation and exaggerated statements made regarding those who brought this country through the most trying period in its history will not avail much. We on this side of the House are anxious to see all the true facts disclosed. We have absolutely nothing to hide. There is no desire on the part of any Member of the Opposition from the Leader down to cloak or conceal anything that transpired during the regime of the late Adminis-

tration. All we ask for is the plain, unvarnished truth to be told. We are all human beings, and are therefore liable to make mistakes, and Mr. Hibbs predicted that Mr. Monroe and his associates in the present Government will make their mistakes and will be wiser four years hence than they are to-day. If they could only visualize what the future holds in store for their Party they would do things a great deal different from the way they will be done. Their whole attitude perhaps towards public affairs would take a widely different course. We are all wise prophets after the act.

Mr. Linegar in his speech referred to depositions coming to the Bar of this House during years past, and deplored the means that were adopted to secure assistance. Mr. Hibbs sincerely hoped that the present Government would not have to cope with similar conditions, and he asked the Leader of the House, Mr. Monroe, what he would do if a deputation of four or five hundred men were repeatedly coming to the Bar of the House making demands upon his Government, some of those demands extremely unreasonable backed and supported by the Opposition? He would find the position that he now occupies no sinecure, or the leadership of the Government to be no bed of roses. The speaker then went on to say that the intention of the Opposition was not to obstruct, for if an opposition could not offer constructive criticism, then it were better for them to remain passive and silent.

It is a building up policy we want and not one of tearing down.

Mr. Hibbs said, as there is every good reason to hope that the revenue of this country will enable a further policy of development to be carried out during the coming years, he would take this early opportunity of calling the Leader of the Governments' at-

tention to the possibility of creating a Tourist traffic that will, in future years add largely to the revenue of this country. Mr. Hibbs fully realized that our finances at the present time did not permit of any very large expenditure, but what we could not do this year he hoped would be done next, and that at the earliest opportunity the Government would consider a tourist trade policy along common sense lines.

The question might be asked why did you not do this when you were in office. The answer to that is very plain to the mind of any honest man, and that is that owing to the depression and extremely difficult times through which the late Government passed; the frightful conditions that had to be coped with from day to day; the extreme emergency cases that had to be dealt with in order to keep people from dying of starvation did not permit of any policy to be developed along those lines.

For the development of this trade we have the resources at our disposal—we have practically everything that is required for the development of a tourist trade from the standpoint of sport, beauty of scenery and splendid climatic conditions. He felt sure that it was only a matter of the Government getting busy inaugurating some sound, sensible, feasible policy and it would meet with the approbation and support of the entire country.

He called the attention of the House to the great tourist trade that has been recently developed in Bermuda from which that country reaps the greater portion of its revenue. It is true, perhaps, that Newfoundland may not possess such favourable resources as Bermuda enjoys, but, at the same time if the necessary scheme is inaugurated and carried out, Newfoundland can be placed on the map in this respect as it can in no other way.

He referred to the different provinces in Canada, where great Tourist trade has been developed during recent years. The Tourist trade to Nova Scotia to-day is valued at from six to eight million dollars. In New Brunswick from eight to ten million dollars, in the Province of Quebec the Tourist trade was worth last year twenty-five million dollars, and Ontario realises about thirty million dollars from the same source, while the Province of British Columbia last year estimated the revenue derived from Tourists who entered from the United States at twenty million dollars. We, in Newfoundland, are not able to develop any great tourist trade over night, it will take some time; it will mean hard work, results may be somewhat slow, but it will be sure, and he would appeal to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and Customs, and the Minister of Public Works particularly to get busy and lose no time in making a beginning, and any effort put forward by the Government in this direction would have his whole-hearted support.

One of the greatest essentials in building up a tourist trade is the opening up of the country by a system of decent roads, if private enterprise is not prepared to look after the hotel problem, then let the Government do it. In any case build roads and hotels, and equip ourselves to avail of this splendid source of revenue which nature has made possible for us.

Speaking from an Opposition standpoint, it may not be to our interest nor the interest of Newfoundland to see the Monroe Administration returned when they again appeal to the polls, but he assured the Prime Minister that if he developed such a plan as was briefly outlined by him, and put forward an honest, earnest effort for the creation of a tourist

trade policy, that it would go a long way towards the success of his party at the next general election.

The late Government had created the greatest industrial programme ever thought of in this country in the form of the great Humber enterprise which is now employing six thousand men, and has already proven such a boom to the workingmen of this country, and, if the late Government had been returned a bill would have been introduced by this time giving effect to the Gander Deal which would greatly assist in revolutionizing the conditions of the workingmen throughout the Island. It is now up to the Monroe Administration to put this Deal through. While it would be a splendid thing for the country in general, the District of Fogo, which he had the honor to represent was especially interested in this project. He asked the Government to lose no time in bringing the bill forward, and, if the same favourable terms can be obtained by the present Government as was arranged by the late administration, then he felt that the same would be a great industrial boon to the country.

One of the bones of contention between all Oppositionists and the Government that happens to be in power, is in relation to the handling of district affairs. It has not been definitely stated whether the Government was inclined to permit members of the Opposition to properly carry out their constitutional privileges of attending to all matters in connection with their several districts. He knew that up to the present time this was not being done in the District of Fogo. It would appear that recommendations on all public matters in connection with Fogo District instead of being made by the duly elected members of the District, has been handled by a gentleman who was elected to repre-

sent the District of Burin, namely, Mr. Joseph Long. Mr. Hibbs said, that while not being among the older members of the House, he had occupied a seat long enough here to learn that that kind of thing does not reflect to the credit of the person who tries to practice it. He could understand a young man like Mr. Long coming in here with absolutely no experience, being flushed with victory because of his success, and think that he could run the whole universe, but he will live to learn, and he will find that before he occupies a seat in this House very long, that it will be to his interest to look after his own district. He cannot possibly do me any harm in the district of Fogo by butting into my affairs there. I will do my duty by that District as I always have since I have been honoured as its representative, and I would now ask the Leader of the House to stop this interference at once, and let the member for Burin look after his own affairs as I am well able to look after the District of Fogo. I would ask the older members of the Government to see to it that discrimination of this character ceases. When they were in Opposition and we occupied seats on the Government side, we did not discriminate against them. I have known cases where members of the Government, including myself, made request of the Government through departmental heads, and while those requests were not granted, men who represented Opposition districts were given every consideration. If decent treatment is accorded the Opposition, the Government might count upon the fullest support being given to every reasonable measure that has for its object the advancement of this country. If, on the other hand, these tactics are pursued by those who for the time being happen to have a seat on the Government side of the House,

we wish to warn the Prime Minister that it would not redound to his credit, nor enhance his popularity either in this House or throughout the country. The Opposition only want a square deal and they will demand that, and although our numbers are not great, we warn the Prime Minister that the Opposition are quite capable of giving him and his Administration a very troublesome time if this thing is forced upon them. That is, however, not the spirit of the Opposition at the present time. We have passed through the mill ourselves and realise that the country needs the assistance of us all, irrespective of political affiliations. There are many difficulties still ahead of us, and if the new Administration enters upon its task with an honest intention of dealing with the country's problems, it will give the Opposition much pleasure and they need not expect obstruction or the display of any tactics that will reflect to the detriment of the Government or of any construction policy which they might bring before the Legislature.

MR GODDEN said that he would like to say a few words with regard to the Speech from the Throne. He said that it contained very little indeed, but it was not always what a man said that counted, but what he did. He pointed out that it was mentioned from the Speech from the Throne that a further and more thorough investigation was to be held into the doings of several departments of the Government, and he trusted that those investigations would be conducted in a proper way and that the misdoings of the guilty parties brought to light and that the parties responsible be dealt with according to justice. He also made mention of the proposal to have the matter of public printing controlled by the Colonial Secretary's Office, and in this connection he called attention to and suggested that public or

Government advertising might also be handled and controlled in the same way, and not to waste money by having Government advertisements scattered over pages of pamphlets, magazines and various other small publications. He also pointed out that as it was the wish of the Government to have a brief session it was not the intention of the Opposition to prolong the session unnecessarily.

He also wished to congratulate Mr. Monroe upon his success at the recent Election, and he trusted that Mr. Monroe will be square and fair with all concerned. He did not intend to criticise just yet as there is nothing to criticise at the present time, but after a short while he may have more to say on this point.

ADDRESS IN REPLY, JULY 15th, 1924.

MR SCAMMELL: — Mr. Speaker, I desire first of all to congratulate you, Sir, upon the high honor which has been conferred upon you by this House, in calling you to the high office which you now hold. It is not necessary for me to add anything to the eulogies already expressed to yourself by members of this House, and I feel sure you will uphold the good name and the best traditions of the House. I also desire to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, respectively. I listened, with particular interest to Mr. Lake's speech, as he has been a personal friend of mine for a number of years, and we have frequently had many discussions together on public matters. I am proud to see a young man so prominently identified with the commercial life of the District of Burin, representing his native District in the House of Assembly. I also desire to congratulate Mr. Linegar, and although it is the first time I have had the pleas-

ure of listening to him, I feel sure that if he consistently pursues the attitude he has assumed here to-day, that the Laborers of St. John's West will have a good champion in him in the future and we shall all watch him in this respect.

Now Sir, in passing I would like to reiterate the remarks of the Hon. member for Trinity, when he said that the most notable feature about the Speech from the Throne was its brevity. We have not much opportunity to talk at present. There is not much in the Speech itself to merit lengthy debate, and besides the Government has been in Office such a short time that there is scant room for criticism at present.

Referring to the Bonavista Bay bye-election, which is due in the Autumn, I note that the Prime Minister stated that his reason for postponing this bye-election was chiefly that such a large number of men would be disfranchised if the bye-election had been held in the Spring but to my mind the same reason could have been applied with equal force to the recent bye-election just held in Hr. Grace, hundreds of men had left that District for the Fishery since the General Election on June 3rd, and were consequently disfranchised, but apparently the Prime Minister and his Colleagues did not think it worth while to apply this argument in the case of Hr. Grace. I am inclined to believe that the Prime Minister consequently must have in the back of his head more cogent reasons for delaying the Bonavista Bay bye-election than the one given by him and no doubt time will show what these reasons are.

We now have to look to the future, and in this connection I would like to refer to the Prime Minister's recent Manifest, which I have before me. It is a very brief document but it is also very weighty, and I fear

contains a great deal more in the way of serious responsibility and large promises than even the Prime Minister himself is fully aware of as yet. I wish to say that I am very much afraid that before Mr. Monroe sees the fruition of all the promises contained in this Manifesto, he will experience many wakeful and sleepless nights. The Prime Minister through, this Manifesto holds a large responsibility and assumes a large undertaking and as an Opposition, we are bound to see to it that the responsibility so assumed is lived up to. In the main however, speaking for myself personally, and I feel the same applies to all the Opposition Members, such criticism as we have to offer from this side of the House will be constructive and not subversive, or of an obstructive nature.

With reference to the Humber Industry, I note that Mr. Lake in speaking, said that the number of Newfoundlanders employed up there was as 96% to 4% in relation to foreigners. I am glad to hear this statement, but I have some doubt as to the accuracy of it, and I would certainly like to know the authenticity and authority for the statement Mr. Lake has made in this connection. However, even if his figures are correct, I am of the opinion that there is a great deal of room for improvement in this respect. All kinds of reports are coming from the Humber area regarding matters of employment and labour conditions prevailing up there. Only recently, I heard that a whole carload of foreigners had arrived. There are scores of positions being filled to-day by foreigners that, in my opinion, and the opinion of many others, could and ought to be filled by Newfoundlanders. This is an absolute outrage in view of the fact that we have hundreds of splendid young fellows around the country who are looking for jobs. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that everything else being

equal, the Newfoundlander should be given the first chance always.

Beyond this special reference to the one or two points I have mentioned, I do not propose just now, to delay the debate, because as I stated before the Speech has nothing of sufficient importance in it to merit lengthy debate, and we shall all have an opportunity of discussing various matters more fully from time to time as they come before the House.

MR. BROWN, member for Twillingate, said he would like to support the Gander proposition. He congratulated Mr. Fox on his elevation to the Speakership and felt that in him both sides of the House had every confidence. He also complimented the Mover and Secunder of the Address in Reply, but took exception to the claim of Mr. Linegar in his opening remarks as to being the first labor representative elected to the House. He thought that honor devolved on himself as he had been acting on behalf of the workmen for 14 years and had attended various conventions abroad in their behalf. He congratulated Mr. Linegar, however, on bringing back a Labor seat and hoped to see many more like him in the House to give Labor its proper representation, and he would give him every support in fighting for the rights of those whom he stood for. While Mr. Linegar represented Labor in St. John's, he stood for it throughout the country, and hoped to see the day when it would be properly organized. He welcomed the Gander proposition as a labor giving enterprise and thought that provision should be made to have those engaged there receive better pay than at similar concerns at present in operation in the country. The sub-contract system, which he claimed as disgraceful, should be abolished and he later hoped to introduce a bill to that extent. Children of sub-contractors are starving to-day, a con-

dition not due to the present Government, and he hoped to see this situation speedily remedied and a square deal given to all.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to add my voice to those who have already congratulated you on the high honour that this House has been pleased to confer on you, and feel assured that you will carry out your duties fairly and impartially. I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. To my mind, it is a sign of the times to see so many new and young faces in the House of Assembly, and I consider it a good omen as their presence means the introduction of new blood in conducting the affairs of the country.

There are one or two salient points in the Speech from the Throne and, as brevity seems to be the order of the day, I would like to refer to them in a very few words.

Regarding Prohibition, the Speech states that the law has not been enforced. This is I consider a serious admission to be made, and I would like to be informed as to why this law has not been carried out. It is one of the laws on the Statute Book, and I ask if the fault lies with the medical practitioners, the Government or with the Department of Justice. This Prohibition law was put on the Statutes by the free voice of the people, and I hope this Government will see that it is enforced. I notice by the Speech that it is contemplated to change the Act. I should be in favour of seeing a plebiscite taken and the women of this Colony be given an opportunity to voice their sentiments on this important question. As to the Government printing being put out to tender, I would advocate that all Government purchases be made by tender and if necessary that a purchasing

agent be appointed to whom tenders for all Government needs should be submitted. This I consider would redound to the benefit of the country and would do away with giving patronage to political heelers.

I hope the members of the Opposition will be given an opportunity to express their opinions fully, and that the Hon. the Prime Minister will see to it that their advice is taken as we, here on the Opposition side of the House, represent certain districts of the country, and I believe that this consideration would tend to the greater stability of domestic affairs in general.

We have been told that only 4% of foreigners are being employed on the Humber. I would like to hear the proportion of wages given to that 4% in comparison with the 96% of Newfoundlanders. I think we should see that steps are immediately taken to prevent a foreigner occupying any position that a Newfoundlander can fill. The country, it seems, has entered upon an era of prosperity, and I feel sure that the Opposition are anxious to co-operate with the Government in every step that would conduce and promote better times. I consider that the fisheries are the backbone of Newfoundland, and I hope that everything possible will be done to foster them and to encourage the fishermen. According to the reports to hand the fishery North is not so good as at first expected, but I trust that there will be an advance in price to offset this shortage, and I hope the fisherfolk will be better off than in previous years. I am glad that the last Government took off the duties from certain necessaries of life. I expect the present Government to go further in this direction and help the fishermen to reap the rewards due them from their strenuous labour and toil. I think that our attractions should be advertised abroad in order

to encourage tourists to come to Newfoundland and enjoy our scenery, fishing and hunting.

To-day we want men of vision who will develop our latent and dormant resources. We have great possibilities ahead of us, but we need men of keen foresight. In mining and timber we are second to none and the treasures of the deep are at our back doors. With regard to our forests, it is not good enough to allow all our wood to be cut out without making provision for those coming after us, and seeing that the rights of future generations are protected. We should attend to and have a law providing that those cutting timber must do certain re-forestation, so that we shall not have a barren waste or wilderness.

With regard to the dismissal of Government employees, I am not in accord with the idea that one should be discharged merely to take on a party supporter as this would be without advantage to the country, and we can never hope to build up a good, efficient civil service by this means. We must get the best men for the jobs and leave them there. Though we have the trappings of an empire we are really only a small community. I am glad that the Government will not dismiss any except those who took an active part in politics. If you dismiss those who opposed you, are you going to deal similarly with those who supported you?

With regard to the finances of the country I hope the Government will live on its income and endeavour to make two ends meet. I also hope that the system of Government by Minute of Council will cease, and that we shall have an opportunity to debate the various problems confronting the country on the floors of this House. I hope the criticism of the Opposition will be constructive and helpful, and that it will receive due consideration by the Government side.

My desire as a member of this House is to do the best that lies in my power for the district of Twillingate which I have the high honour to represent, and also for the country at large.

CAPTAIN RANDELL after congratulating the Speaker and the Mover and Secunder of the address thought the introduction of new blood into the Assembly would help the debates, and to clear up many difficult points which we have to face in the future. Dealing with matters that came to his notice in the political campaign he referred to the encouragement of the fisheries, and promised to support anything to that end even to the granting of a bonus. Another thing, he said, in which we are all interested is the matter of loans and he felt that our duty to-day is to get down our expenditures to a level commensurate with our ability to pay.

He as father of a family should not incur responsibility that his son must meet. He was not in favour of any borrowing. No Government as the father of a family had any right to borrow and hand down a legacy for future generations to meet. Another point he mentioned was in connection with the charges on shipping. He said that the port of St. John's might easily be the repair shop of the North Atlantic. But as a matter of fact conditions were such as to almost prohibit ships from coming here except driven in by stress of weather. Our Customs regulations are so worded that a ship coming in on the last day of December pays her full port charges if she leaves on the first day of January. He also wished to call attention to the rates of passage of men going away to Canada and the United States on the Government railway. A man who goes away and earns \$500 for his family is just as much a producer as the man who goes to the Labrador fishery. Yet a man who

goes to Labrador gets a fisherman's ticket while the other has to pay the full fare. In conclusion he said that any bill brought before the House that would be for the good of the country he would be proud to support.

MR. HALFYARD in speaking about the unemployment of the last two or three years said that in Trinity the fishermen had been badly off because no fish had come to the shores. Formerly when the fish came in the months of July or August the fisherman had supplies to last until November or December. But the last two or three years the merchant only gave supplies for one month. There were no fish caught and the merchant would not supply any more. The fishermen had to appeal to the representative of his district for a pass to go to the Humber or some other place. Nobody but the Government would help these people.

Thousands of dollars were given out in relief where the party would often run the risk of starving to death if relief was delayed until it was ascertained whether relief was really needed. In speaking further he referred to Minute of Council Government, and said that according to the Speech from the Throne if there is no more legislation introduced there would be very little done unless by Minute of Council. He referred to Mr. Monroe's Manifesto where he says that a bounty would be given to the fishermen. He said that also would have to be done by Minute of Council if the fishermen are to get the benefit of it next fall. He also felt sure that a Minute of Council would be necessary to cope with the situation on Bell Island when the agreement with the Company would terminate in December of this year.

He said that it would be of no use to appoint an Executive at all, if it were not to do those things which are

for the interest of the country and necessary when the House of Assembly is not in session. Of course the Executive Government would make mistakes. The very best Executive Governments have made them and will be still making them. They have made mistakes when they acted with the very best of intentions. He remembered that during the past three or four years everything was against the Executive of which he was a member. They would do certain things to relieve the unemployment situation. Things happened two or three months afterwards altogether contrary to what had been expected, and it was impossible to take any measures to combat them. The Government has to deal with the British Empire Steel Corporation in connection with the continuation of the operation of the mines at Bell Island. If there has not been some change lately then the Government is going to have trouble in this connection. Capt. Randell, said Mr. Halfyard, was speaking on the railway. There has been nothing settled, although the House of Assembly had decided that there should be three men elected to form a Railway Commission. He had no acquaintance with the Prime Minister, but from what he had heard and what had come before his notice he was of opinion that his intentions might be good, but having no experience in Government matters, his actions no doubt would depend largely upon the advice of others. However, the Prime Minister speaking the other day said that in the election campaign promises had been made as other political parties had made promises in the past. He thought that the party that made promises could not last. It might get through a few years but in a short time it would come to grief. The Prime Minister made the statement boldly, and still the Government

is going to clean things up. The Prime Minister is not only responsible for his own actions but also for the doings and the sayings of the members of the Executive, and he gave the Prime Minister the benefit of the doubt. With regard to dismissals, the Government is solely responsible, and anything he said would not alter their decisions. But he knew of a case in which a man was dismissed and the Prime Minister and the Executive Government had known nothing about it. There were cases in which men displayed no party feelings, even though they had sympathies, had been dismissed. Mr. Halfyard then said that he did not intend at this juncture to make a long speech, and with that he closed his remarks.

MR. HICKMAN moved that the debate be adjourned until the next sitting.

MR. WARREN gave notice of question.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

MR. RANDELL gave notice of question.

MR. BROWN gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

THE PRIME MINISTER gave notice that on to-morrow he would move the House into the Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to confirm an agreement entered into between the Government and the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

In reply to questions No. 1 of the Order Paper the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs made the following statement:—

Arrangements are being made for

the distribution of the mails in the District of Fortune by motor boats. The "Wren" has been taken off the route because the cost of the service was out of all proportion to the service rendered.

The Glencoe was taken off because it was found that the Portia can perform all the services alone.

The Sebastopol has been taken off Bay of Islands and pending further arrangements a small steamer is employed for a few trips.

The "Wren" will be replaced by motor boats at a probable saving of about \$25,000.00.

The Sebastopol was costing \$4,500.00 per month while a small steamer can be had for a thousand or less saving in eight months about \$28,000.00.

Taking off the Glencoe means a saving of say \$35,000.00.

No steamer will be sent to Northern Labrador this season saving \$25,000.00. Total saving \$113,000.00.

In reply to No. 2 of the Order Paper relative to House of Assembly appointments the Prime Minister made the following statement:—

Chas. E. Hunt replaces E. L. Carter as Law Clerk; Reuben Parsons replaces A. Targett as Sergeant-at-Arms; J. G. Muir replaces John Barron as Supervisor of Debates; W. J. O'Neill replaces John Brown as Compiler of Synopsis; Chas. Whitten replaces Robert Walsh as Speaker's attendant. As messengers John Gray, Ed. Butt, Thos. Walsh, Wm. Coonan replace R. Butler, Chas. Tucker, Jno. Snelgrove and Stan Breen.

As door keepers Edward Earles, John Burt, Thos. Martin replace Hy. Morey, Thos. Eustace and Moses Strong. These changes are made at the discretion of the Government and the Commission of Internal Economy in pursuance of the usual custom.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 12 and 13 Geo. V. Cap. 20, entitled 'An Act Respecting War Pensions.'"

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE explained in this connection that there were originally three members of the War Pensions Board. One member, Mr. Clift had died and the remaining members had been given the power of action of the original three. There is at present one member on the Board. The Great War Veterans have recommended the appointment of Commander R. A. Howley and Mr. J. C. Pratt, and these men have offered to serve without recompense. Their offer has been accepted and it is now proposed to make three members of the Board and the expense will be much less than it has been.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 12 and 13 Geo. V. Cap. 20 entitled 'An Act respecting War Pensions,' was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justice of the Peace.'"

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE explained that formerly on many occasions when it had been necessary to send magistrates out of their own districts into others it was very inconvenient because the old act provided that these men were, and had the powers of, magistrates only in their own districts. It was now proposed to make any man appointed Stipendiary Magistrate, a Justice of Peace for the whole Island.

At present, he said, we have two or three very excellent Magistrates, and

at times it is found necessary to transfer them for temporary work in other quarters. He thought the House would be wise in adopting this amendment.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole on to-morrow.

Second reading of bill to amend the Election Act, 1913. At the request of the Hon. Minister of Justice Mr. Halfyard moved that the second reading of this bill be deferred until to-morrow.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled the Annual Report of the Registrar General for the year ending December 31st, 1923.

THE PRIME MINISTER tabled the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year 1922-23.

MR. SCAMMELL gave notice of question.

MR. WARREN in speaking to the motion for an adjournment, asked the leader of the Government if there were any new arrangements made with regard to reporting of the debates of the House. He understood that some change was made in the system, and he wanted to know if it was put in operation.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER said the Government came to the conclusion that verbatim reporting was not a necessity, and they proposed having a synopsis taken of the debates and published in the papers in the usual way. There will be no Hansard this year, as it was looked upon as unnecessary expense.

MR. WARREN—By whom is the synopsis prepared?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE, speaking as a member of the Internal Economy Commission, said it was being prepared by the regular reporting staff. This system, he said, was being tried as an experiment to see how it works out, and as this was not likely to be a long session it was though an opportune time to try out the system. Years ago, without the Hansard, speeches were got from the back files of old papers months after they were delivered. That system was abandoned and the idea of having a Hansard was adopted. The Hansard was found both expensive and unsatisfactory, and it is now proposed to try the system of a digest of the speeches, and he thought this method will be found economical.

MR. GRIMES asked if this system was definitely decided upon.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE replied that there was nothing definitely done beyond what is done now.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 17th, 1924.

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

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Ashbourne gave notice of question.

Mr. Puddister gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice, and no motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, Supply was granted to His Majesty.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER

asked that the motion to move the House into Committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions to confirm an agreement entered into between the Government and the Nfld. Milling Co., Ltd., be deferred. It was ordered accordingly.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

MR. WARREN asked the Hon. Prime Minister (a) if the Railway was being operated under the supervision of commissioners as heretofore; (b) if so, who are the commissioners; ((c) if it is the intention of the Government to continue this system; (d) have any steps been taken to provide for any other mode of operation.

HON. PRIME MINISTER replied that the Railway was being operated by Mr. Russell, and that no commissioners had been appointed; also that it was the intention of the Government to continue this system for the immediate present, and that no steps had been taken as yet for altering it.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Prime Minister (a) when the new Normal School would be open; (b) how many teachers would be employed (c) if any teachers would be engaged outside of Newfoundland; (d) if so how many and from where.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER replied that it was proposed to open the Normal School on September 1st; he could not say how many teachers would be engaged, probably about the same number as formerly. He informed Mr. Grimes it was not proposed to employ or engage teachers outside of Newfoundland. He also said that if the Carnegie Fund of \$1500.00 was available a junior college could be run in connection with the Normal School for a further sum of \$4000.00 whereas now the cost was about \$6000.00.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. Prime Minister if it was the intention of the Government to act on the findings and to put into force any or all of the re-

commendations of the Royal Commission appointed in 1921 to enquire into the working of the Prohibition Act.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER replied that the question was receiving the consideration of the Government.

It was only yesterday that he had seen the commissioners report, and he was surprised that nothing had been done although the report was presented in 1921, and contained some excellent suggestions that were well worthy consideration.

MR. RANDELL asked the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House the answers to the following:—
What amount of coal has been bought or contracted for by the management of the Nfld. Government Railway since the first day of March of this year to date? If tenders have been asked for such coal? What price is being paid or agreed on by the management of the Railway? The names of the Companies or persons through whom the purchases or contracts had been made? What are the prices, terms and dates of such contracts, if any, and if the coal has been bought c.i.f. St. John's? If other than Sydney coal has been contracted for?

THE HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled reply.

MR. BROWN asked the Hon. The Prime Minister if it was the intention of the Government to operate the Steamer Watchful on the Bonavista Mail Service this season.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER replied that at present it was not the intention to operate the Watchful, but that as soon as certain repairs which are now being effected on the Government wharf at Port Blandford the Malakoff would take up the old Clyde route.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House copy of the latest agreement

made between Dominion Steel Corporation Ltd. and Nfld. Government for the operation of the iron mines at Wabana; also if it is the intention of the Government to introduce legislation during the present session for the continuation of the operating of the said mines after the 31st December, 1924, so as to avoid minute of Council Government which was so strenuously objected to by certain Members of the Legislature during past session.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied that since the advent of the present Government in power there had been no agreement. He also said that when his hon. friend was Colonial Secretary an agreement was entered into; the present Government had made no decision regarding the policy which it intended to pursue.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if the S.S. Earl of Devon had been engaged to undertake certain cable work, and if so, to state (a) for what work in particular she has been engaged (b) at what rate per day had she been engaged.

THE HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS replied that the S.S. Earl of Devon was employed on cable work in Notre Dame Bay and Green Bay, and that the Steamer was being paid at the rate of \$132.00 per day.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House the report of G. N. Read, Son & Watson, chartered accountants, into the affairs of Controller's Department for the financial years 1921-22 and 1922-23.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE replied that he was not prepared to give the answer to this question as it involved certain other matters which were under consideration and investigation.

MR. SCAMMELL I beg to accept the Hon. Minister's Explanation.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

MR. GRIMES, in speaking to the motion of Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, congratulated the Speaker upon the high office to which he had been elected by the unanimous vote of the House. When he (Mr. Grimes) first entered the Assembly as a member Mr. J. R. Goodison was the Speaker. He conducted himself with such grace, dignity and tact that caused the admiration of members on both sides. The present Minister of Justice followed and his parliamentary experience enabled him to continue in like manner. Mr. Fox he had no doubt would follow in the same path. His training and education, his legal ability and parliamentary experience, left no doubt in his mind that the House had made a wise choice in selecting him. In moving the motion for the Address in Reply, the member for Burin, Mr. Lake, made Harmony and Good Will the theme of his remarks. This was a very good beginning on the part of the Hon. member, and if he was speaking on behalf of the Government, he (Mr. Grimes) would be ready to co-operate in having such a spirit dominate the deliberation of the Assembly. For this to succeed the Government must be as ready to accept suggestions from the Opposition Party as they are from their own. If they did, much good may be accomplished. There were many pressing problems demanding solution. There were serious conditions that had to be faced in the interests of the Country. Unity would do more to overcome these conditions than bickerings and strife. Economy had not only to be preached but practiced and a square deal to all carried out.

Continuing Mr. Grimes said that the seconder of the motion of the Address in Reply Mr. Linegar had announced himself as a Representative of Labor. He was glad to welcome him as such to the Assembly and agreed with Mr.

Brown that there should be more Labor Representatives so that Labor's interests could be better cared for in the work of Legislation. The Laboring and Artisan Classes have rights which are not exercised to the full, and to exercise them fully they must fit themselves for the responsibilities they will bring with them. He (Mr. Grimes) was in accord with Mr. Halfyard that membership in a Union was not a necessary qualification for one to have the interest of the Laboring and Artisan Classes at heart and he would be sorry to think that anyone sitting in the House was not as much concerned about the welfare of the Laboring Artisan and Fishermen Classes as any other classes. To be a true representative one had to recognize the claims of all and deal with them as circumstances warranted. Men not only from the ranks of Labor but from the ranks of the well-to-do and the nobility have been foremost in the fight for the betterment of social conditions. It was Robert Owen, a manufacturer of Lanark who in the eighteenth century started the movement for a shorter working day, and eventually succeeded. It was Lord Shaftsbury who fought against children under age being employed in the Mines and Factories of Great Britain, and eventually succeeded. The History of Legislation is nearly all civilized conditions will show that that feeling of Justice and fair play is not in the possession of one class only.

He hoped the glowing pictures of prosperity dangled before us, did not blind our eyes to the actual conditions existing. None deprecated more than he the painting of blue ruin pictures of Nfld., and the constant featuring of them in our daily newspapers. They did considerable harm abroad and at home. But there is a danger in talking of prosperity, and lulling ourselves with a fanciful picture. To say pros-

perity was coming our way by leaps and bounds was not the truth. While times are better in Newfoundland than they were last year, there is still much unemployment. Several hundred family men in St. John's were finding employment so scarce that they were on a bare existence with the long winter ahead when employment for the casual laborer practically ceases. There was much construction work going on in the interior by the A.N.D. Co. and the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Co., the end of November will see much of that work completed and would witness the laying off of three or four thousand men. Conditions in connection with the British Empire Steel Corporation was not promising for continued work at Bell Island. He would ask what steps the Government proposed to take for the coming winter in case of a repetition of conditions as prevailed the previous years. It is true that we have a Labor Bureau but that is not functioning to-day in such a manner as to be of benefit to the unemployed. He did not blame Capt. Byrne or his associates for this, it was more the fault of the Government for not giving it greater powers. A Labor Bureau to serve its purpose should be a place where every unemployed person could have his name registered as such showing what kind of work he was accustomed to, and what he was willing to do and in case work could not be found in what he had been trained to do, what other kind he was willing to undertake. Every employer or other person wanting a man should also register his name in the same Bureau. If this were done he (Mr. Grimes) believed more work for unemployed men could be found. The Bureau would also prove of service in acquainting the Government with actual conditions prevailing in the Labor Market and give an opportunity of knowing the number of men out of work through no fault of their own,

and save the charitably disposed persons of the Community against much imposition when beggars come round. Certain it is that the Government has the advantage of the experience of previous Governments in dealing with unemployment and if it fails to learn the lesson, there will be no excuse for the Government. To deal haphazardly with such conditions would be a crime.

In dealing with the Gander development and the establishment of a Flour Mill, Mr. Grimes said that he hoped the Government would not delay their establishment. Every inducement consistent with the true interests of Newfoundland should be held out so that such Labor giving industries should be started at the earliest date.

Dealing with the Salaries of Civil Servants, Mr. Grimes said that he thought it advisable that a Civil Service Commission should be appointed consisting of experienced men, who knew the value of work to the Government and could better apportion salaries than they are to-day. No Civil Servant with dependents should receive a salary less than what is required to keep him in decency and comfort, and they should be graded from that up according to their ability and their responsibilities. Civil Service examinations should be established and only those qualified to take positions should have them. Unless this is done the Prime Minister will have failed to reform the Civil Service.

Mr. Grimes hoped economy would be practised in the right direction. Reference was made to the abolition of the Mounted Police in order to effect economy. Would the saving effected be commensurate with the loss of the value of such services to the Community. This should be given due consideration before such a change was effected. As to the saving to be effected by the establishment of a King's Printer, he would like to have the

figures before he could form an opinion. There should be proper reasons given for the creation of new jobs, and facts given to show that any such job will pay the country to have it. The abolition of the Hansard would be a grave mistake, it is a record of the work of the Legislature, the Government and the Opposition. It enables the member of the House to refer to it at any time for information he may want and from it he can keep his memory fresh and be in a better position to inform his constituents of what is being or has been done.

As to the Prohibition Act Mr. Grimes said if the amendment to be made were in opposition to the spirit of the Act, it was not the business of the Legislature to alter it in such a way. The Prohibition Law had seldom been referred to during the whole political Campaign and consequently there was no mandate from the people to destroy the spirit of the Act. If it was proposed to do so it should be decided by the people in the same way they brought it about; through a plebiscite. Mr. Grimes referred the Government to the findings and the recommendations of the Royal commission appointed in 1921 to enquire into the working out of the Prohibition Law. There were a number of valuable suggestions contained therein. He understood from the Prime Minister's remarks that only those Civil Servant would be dismissed who were actually engaged in politics during the last campaign. He (Mr. Grimes) would remind him that not only those but others who had taken no part were being removed also. Mr. Geo. Roberts of Brigus, a lightkeeper on the Labrador had been removed. There are those who can testify that Mr. Roberts was neutral during the last election. Yet he is dismissed. A man in the eventide of life, past seventy years of age, thrown on the scrap heap without a justifiable reason for it. Mr. Chaulk r is given

the job. He (Mr. Grimes) had nothing against Mr. Chaulker and he thought if he was competent to fill a job there would be ample opportunity within a year or two, when a vacancy may occur which he could fill.

In reference to the Customs Mr. Grimes said it was time efforts were put forth to protect legitimate business in this country, against those who were importing goods and giving false invoices. It was a notorious fact that all sorts of tricks were being worked to defraud the Customs and get goods in under value. If this is allowed to continue no business man wanting to act straight with the customs will be able to exist, and all such will be driven out of business in three or four years. If the Minister of Finance prevents the further recurrence of these disgraceful practices, he will have the commendation of all honest men.

Mr. Grimes referred to his tour of Twillingate District with his colleague and what he saw in connection with the Herring Fishery. Thousands of Herring were being thrown away that did not measure up to the size required for the Market where they were being sent. Herring Factories established there that would manufacture Herring Oil, Herring Meal and Fertilizer could have saved all this waste, and he hoped the Government would take this matter up. The employment they would give to those near home would be of immense value.

MR. DUFF congratulated the Speaker on his appointment as the First Commoner, and also the Mover and Secunder of the Address in Reply, and more particularly did he refer to the mover, Mr. Lake who was a young outport representative from his own district. It was more of the type of men like Mr. Lake we desired to see in this House, men acquainted with the needs of their district and with a

practical knowledge of its fisheries and undertakings.

Although we had nearly a score of districts in this country, there were a great many people who were of the impression there were only two—St. John's East and St. John's West, and this had been more particularly impressed on my mind during the past few days since I had an opportunity to travel the roads to this vicinity, to find perfect roads reaching in all directions whilst in the outports we have the very opposite. Some time ago it became my duty to report to the Minister of Public Works that there were bridges in the settlement of Victoria with as many as three planks broken out of one and they were not safe for car or carriage, and in fact were a manace to life and limb. Similar conditions were apparent on the road between Carbonear and Harbor Grace where broken planks were in evidence.

In a recent issue of the morning paper reference was made to the opposition and it would desire to give its readers the impression that the Opposition were desirous of getting out of sight. It said we had taken to the back benches and the inference was that we had crawled into a hole and pulled the hole in after us. As one member of the Opposition I would desire to state to the House that I had no such feelings. I quite realized my responsibilities and was quite satisfied to be found on this side of the House and found the seat very comfortable. I represented the district of Carbonear, a district that had produced a great percentage of the Master Mariners and seamen of this country, and the men who carried our products across the ocean during the great war. I notice we have two real Labor Candidates in this House, Mr. Linegar on the Government side, who says he represents 300 men and Mr. Brown on this side, who also represents a cer-

tain number; but I do not purpose taking second place to any Labor Candidate, as I represent labour indiscriminately, from the man who catches the cod on Northern Labrador, the seamen who carries it to market, the miner and laborer. And in my district we produce the best miners as well as the best railroaders.

I am pleased to note that the Opposition has intimated their intention of not hampering the Government and in that I concur. I am as desirous of a clean up and keep clean and a square deal to all as the Premier, and also for Economy and retrenchment; but I doubt the Premier's sincerity in this and I have reason to. I find that quite recently an estimable old fisherman of my district that was firewarden has been dismissed and another citizen, also a very worthy one has been appointed in his stead. Again in Victoria there has been a new appointment as firewarden. I have nothing to say against these appointees as they are most desirable men, but why appoint men to such positions where there is nothing to burn, and the same thing applies to Conception Bay, therefore I doubt the sincerity of the Premier. If the firewardens had been dismissed and no other appointed I would not comment on it. When the Minister of Posts, in this House yesterday gave his reasons to Mr. Warren for taking off the boats on the South and West Coasts and declared what a saving he was making in the Public Service, the visitors to this House heartily applauded him, which was proof positive that the people of St. John's were behind the Government in a policy of economy and retrenchment, and I hope they will continue to applaud when the retrenchment policy comes nearer home, as I know no place where the need for lopping off needless government officials is greater than this city of St. John's. One meets smart sprightly men day

after day on the streets that have been pensioned to make room for camp followers, as well as officials in galore.

It is pleasing to hear that the Minister of Finance has taken hold in his department in his usual vigorous and effective style. And we shall hope to hear news of similar purport from the other departments of the Government. Evidently there is a brighter day dawning for this old land, prospects for fish marketing is good, we have the Gander Proposition and the Flour Mill industry in prospect and we have the Humber industry booming, and what we would have done without this latter to take care of our surplus labour population I cannot comprehend. Mr. Lake, in his speech informed us that there were only 4 per cent. of outside workmen engaged in that industry, I do not know where he got his figures, but I very much question them. I would be interested to know the percentage in wages that go to the outside or alien workers. I have been told that our workmen receive 25 cents an hour and men from abroad doing the same work side by side obtain three and five times as much, doing the same work.

We hear of scores of young men, sons of patricians, coming to the Humber to gain experience, and we do not begrudge them the experience, but we do begrudge them the pay and positions when our own men have to go to Canada and the United States to get their livelihood that is denied them in their own land. There is no need to reiterate that they are as capable as any, because that is well known and proved. Then again we have Major Butler looking after labour matters in that section, and I have no doubt he is a gentleman that is giving every satisfaction to the parties that employ him, who ever that may be; but what I desire to know is why a capable workman cannot obtain work on his

merits instead of having to go to a member of the House to obtain work on the Humber. I would suggest that a commission be appointed to look into the labour situation in that direction, because there is a great deal of dissatisfaction there at present and it may save some serious trouble in the near future.

I am pleased to hear that this Government is considering the matter of encouraging Tourist Traffic. We are in an enviable geographical position here in the gateway of the Gulf between the old world and the new, with a very fine climate, scenery and sport. On Friday last I motored over to Portugal Cove and sailed round Bell Island with a gentleman from the United States, and he remarked there were hundreds of people in his country that would pay any money to enjoy what he was getting practically for nothing.

Mr. Friend, Mr. Ashbourne, advocates Women's Suffrage, in which I heartily agree. When one considers that the male imbecile and feeble minded have the privilege of voting and intelligent women are deprived one realizes the unfairness. In my district, on the night previous to voting, we lock up the imbecile in a store or stable and take him off in a motor car to record his vote for his captor, the only drive he enjoys until the next election.

I would call the attention of the House to the new Railway Schedule now in operation. The Carbonear train is due at Carbonear at 10.30 p. m. and is supposed to leave that station for Bay de Verde at 10.45. On Saturday night last the train drew out of Carbonear at 10 minutes to 12 and the train staff was distributing freight, mails and baggage until 7 o'clock Sunday morning. I do not know whether or not the members for the District of Bay de Verde are members of the Lord's Day Alliance or not, but I know

the people of Bay de Verde do not want this state of affairs in their district, and I call upon them to back me up in this matter and have the train changed. Again, think of passengers, perhaps women and children, or even men, being thrown off at one of their stations along that line at one, two or three o'clock at night. They have either to sit on their luggage until daylight or crawl down a dark and rocky lane to a settlement where everything is in darkness, and I warn you that later on in the Fall, when the weather becomes bad, it will be dangerous to life. The Harbor Grace, Carbonear end of this line is the best paying, probably 75 per cent. of the passengers and freight traffic emanating from that section and now our through train from Carbonear to St. John's is taken away from us for the benefit of the Placentia section, and we have to change cars at Brigus Junction. Still more serious is the taking off of our Monday morning train that allowed people to go out of town for the weekend and return at noon on Monday. At present we get into St. John's at half past four and lose the day. These are serious matters that require some serious consideration and I ask the Members for Harbor Grace to back me up in this serious matter.

I went into politics for the good of the outfit and for nothing personal, and certainly expected the square deal though on the Opposition. I have just received a wire from Carbonear that another head has been decapitated, because presumably he voted for me, or rather was supposed to; this man was janitor of the Post Office, and I might add—at the present time we have two janitors pensioned and one active—three men paid by the Government to shovel 10 ton of coal in the furnace of our public building. "To the victors belong the spoil" is a Tammany method and one I did not expect the personnel of the powers that be to adopt,

and it gives a representative a rather mean feeling to realize that a family man has to lose his position because he has exercised his franchise and voted for the candidate of his choice. This should not be and I resent it. I am the representative chosen by my constituents and I demand to be recognized as such. There is always two sides to a story, and to listen to the one side (probably from an irreconcilable constituent of mine) and not to the other is an injustice which I would ask the Government not to repeat. They can always please themselves afterwards.

MR. HICKMAN said that he felt very proud of his Opposition. He had men on his side of the House of ability and good sound judgment. He regretted very much that Sir Michael Cashin was not now a member of the House as he had been for so many years past. He felt that his great ability as a business man would be missed. He understood that it was the intention of the Government to use the Estimates prepared by the past Government. If the previous Government had such a record he thought the Estimates should be brought in now, and if they were not ready the session should be delayed to prepare the Estimates. He would like to see economy practiced but that could not be if the Government spends more than its income. If the Government continues to spend borrowed money each year to meet expenses, the day will come when it will get no further accommodation. The result will be either Confederation with Canada or we shall become a Crown Colony.

He next took up the subject of Prohibition. He said that the Prohibition Act is just as binding as any other law and no man has any right to break it. If it is to remain as at present, it is the duty of the Prime Minister and the Government to see

that it is carried out. If it cannot be carried out, it is also his duty to change it. This has been in the past a subject that the Government was afraid to tackle because certain religious sections were opposed to it while other sections were in favor of it. He said he was not afraid to express his views on the matter. When he was in the Opposition he introduced the Bill because he wanted the open bar done away with. It was a curse. Laborers spent their money there and their children went hungry. There were rabid prohibitionists on the Government side, however, and the Bill that he introduced was not accepted. He did not believe in total prohibition, but in an ameliorated measure, so that the liquor will be distributed evenly and properly. Some people are afraid to express their views on prohibition. Mr. Hickman said that he was not afraid to do so, nor on any subject for that matter. Members of the Government were taught to think that they could bring in any legislation that they liked whether the Opposition liked it or not. There are members on the Opposition side of the House who are able to give help and suggestions and they should get an opportunity to do so. Mr. Hickman also criticised the system of recording the speeches of the House. The members of the House have a right to have their speeches on record. Now there is no reason why members should keep themselves in order. A member can come in here and make the most outrageous charges against any other member and there is nothing to stop him because there is no verbatim copy of his speech extant. There is no Hansard. If, said Mr. Hickman, he wanted to refer to anything which has happened before he had but to go to the Government library and look up the Hansard; from this on, however, this will not be able to be done.

The Government is establishing a precedent. Mr. Hickman thought that there should be a Hansard, and for the further expenditure of another three or four hundred dollars there should be one. The Government is doing away with the Hansard and establishing a Government Printer with a probable salary from \$2,500.00 to four thousand dollars, and an assistant stenographer and an office, all of which will amount to a lot of money. The whole Opposition protests against not keeping an official record of the debates. There are a few people who can take a synopsis and leave out what they like and put in only what is of advantage to a certain party. It is up to the Government to take the matter into consideration.

He understood from the Prime Minister that the railroad was to be run as before under the management of Mr. Russell and a Commission. Mr. Russell is a good man but he should be left alone. Members should not be getting passes for their constituents, because if the practice becomes general, three-quarters of the people travelling will be going back and forth without paying their way. If Mr. Russell is in charge of the railway no clerks should be appointed except at his own discretion and not on the reference of the members of districts. If the railway is to have a favorable balance sheet it will have to be left to the management of Mr. Russell, and if the balance is not favorable we are not going to get any corporation to take it over and run it as a good investment. If a man really needs a pass there should be some officer in some department, such as the Public Charities, who should look into his case.

Mr. Hickman said that he would not like the occasion to pass without expressing his views on the Newfoundland War Memorial. This was

erected through the energy of Colonel Nangle and is a credit to St. John's and Newfoundland and will serve to keep in memory those who fought in the War. Mr. Randell had spoken of the Dock, and Mr. Hickman thought it should receive the consideration of the Government. Newfoundland should be the repair shop of the Atlantic, but this is not the case, because of the excessive port charges and the careless manner in which work is done. The system was to employ a certain number of men, to pay them a salary and have them employed a certain length of time. The authorities at the dock never took occasion to see that the men worked conscientiously, but when the job was done handed a bill to the ship owners, stating the charges with a certain percentage for the dock. The result is that only temporary repairs are attended to here and the real work is done elsewhere, and we lose both money and labor. There are ships sailing the Atlantic which have instructions to steer clear of Newfoundland if possible. The Government, said Mr. Hickman, came into office at a time when a change was coming over the country. The fishery was looking a good investment because it was thought that prices were going to be good, and the Humber industry and Bell Island were offering lots of employment. The Government has not to undergo the same trouble as did their predecessors about the unemployment problem. Much squandering had been indulged in by a previous Government but much of it had been necessary. In consideration of this, then, the credit of this recovery will not be due to the Government, as it would have happened no matter who was in power. Mr. Hickman hoped, however, that the wave of prosperity on which the Government had embarked would continue. It would take an old politician to say what was likely to

happen, but no business man could come into the House of Assembly and run the country's affairs as he would his own business. Mr. Hickman remarked that there were three Ramsay MacDonalds in the House of Assembly of Newfoundland—Mr. Brown and Mr. Duff of the Opposition and Mr. Linegar of the Government. He was glad to say that these men would have the support of the Opposition in anything they might do to help the working man. He hoped that the Government would bring down legislation concerning a minimum wage. If the Government did not do so the Opposition would. Men are receiving only twenty-five cents an hour for labor, which is not sufficient to support their family, while at the same time foreigners are receiving seventy-five cents for the same work. A man needs thirty or thirty-five cents an hour. He cannot live on less. A comparison in wages is the fact that our men can leave here, and before they go they have been used only to the roughest work and in the United States they receive one dollar and twenty five cents per hour.

In his manifesto the Prime Minister promised a bounty on fish. If a man is fishing and does not earn sufficient to support his family then there is nothing else to be done but to give him a bonus to help him out. It is the duty of the Government to carry out its promises in that respect. Mr. Hickman said that he understood that there was a statement made in the Upper House to legislate so that the money Bills might be passed in the Upper House. This is a prerogative of the Lower House and he hoped it would not be taken away. Mr. Hibbs had discussed the tourist traffic. He trusted that something would be done in this connection because it would mean anywhere from one million to two millions of dollars to the country. That would mean that

that amount of money would be spent on goods imported into the country and on which duty was paid. Take the Chateau Frontenac Hotel in Quebec. When that immense structure was under construction people thought it would be a "white elephant," but after it was finished and open for business one could scarcely get accommodation there, with the result that millions of dollars went into Quebec. According to statistics he said the same could be said of British Columbia, due to the encouragement they gave to tourist traffic. When the people of those provinces made the money in that way everybody got the benefit of it; and he saw no reason why the people of St. John's and the surrounding outports could not benefit financially, if only a proper system was adopted here for the handling of the tourist traffic. He thought that more attention should be given to the making of good roads. He did not suppose that the Government were in a position at the present time to make any outlay in that direction, but if in the future they proposed to make any expenditure on roads, he trusted that first consideration would be given to the roads in Conception, Trinity and Bonavista Bays. He was glad to know that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs had saved over \$100,000 by the elimination of some of the coastal services and hoped that the Minister would continue his efforts of economy next session. Speaking of labor again and the local industries that employ our people, he said that there were in this town industries that were over-protected and industries that were under-protected, and that it was the duty of the Government to find out the true standing and position of each individual one of them. He thought that every manufacturing concern in this country could easily pay a dividend to its shareholders without paying as low as five or six dollars a

week to its employees. He said that no destructive criticism would be offered in the House by the Opposition and expressed the hope that in the "clean up and keep clean" policy of the Government that consideration will be given to the requests of representatives of all the different districts.

MR. WARREN said he was elected to the House as an Independent member and he took it that it was his duty to vote for or against any measure introduced from either side of the House. One or two paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne struck him forcibly, one was with reference to the Estimates. He wished to point out that these Estimates, while they were never submitted to this House before, were made up by the Government of which he was Prime Minister and were made up with due regard to all the economy possible. There was no member in the House who had a greater desire to see economy practised than himself and in every shape and form he supported the present Prime Minister's Policy of "clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all"; but he felt that he ought to draw the attention of the father of the House, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, to the direction in which he saw fit to practise economy. He said he had been informed officially by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that the "Wren" had been taken off Fortune Bay because the cost of the service was out of all proportion to the service rendered. He was aware that the "Wren" earned very little for the amount spent on her; but that there were very many other services, he said, which did not give returns to the Government commensurate with the money that was spent on them. He thought that if the Government was going to practice economy they should give a square deal to all and not start on the West Coast which

had already been deprived of certain services while no attempt was made to practise economy on the North Coast. He thought that neither the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs nor his Government should take the credit of saving \$113,000 by curtailing certain services, because provision had been already made in the Estimates by the Warren Government to discontinue the Labrador service, meaning the saving of \$25,000 out of the \$113,000, as well as for the taking off the West Coast route the "Glencoe" when necessary; but not permanently, as has been done by this Government. He wanted to tell the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that the "Glencoe" will have to be put on this service again because the "Portia" is not able to handle the traffic alone. There are no railroads on the West Coast while there is a big population of people there. He had documentary evidence to show that when his Government took off the "Portia" in the early spring the "Glencoe" was unable to cope with the service. Although that ship was only capable of carrying 40 passengers comfortably, yet she carried at a time as many as 250 and people lay around the decks like cattle. The result was that the then Government had to put on the other steamer. He felt sure that the members for Burin would bear him out that it was impossible to run a West Coast service between April and October with one ship. He did not think that \$35,000 could be saved, as the Minister of Posts thought. It was alright to take off one ship when the traffic fell down; but he considered it false economy to take off one ship permanently. When he was Minister of Justice two years ago, for the sake of economy, it was proposed to run the West Coast service by motor boats, but this was found unworkable.

He had nothing to find with the at-

titude of the Minister of Posts, if he was actuated by economic motives and if he thinks that the people of Fortune Bay must pay for what they get; but he did find fault with the Ministers answer, namely, that the "Wren" had been taken off the Fortune Bay route because the cost of the service was out of proportion to the service rendered while there were other services in the country that gave less returns for the money spent on them and were yet untouched for the purpose of economy. He noticed on perusing last year's Hansard dealing with the Railway Resolutions that according to the report on the railroad the Branch Railroads lost heavily. The Trepassey Branch alone lost \$113,000, which equals the amount that the Minister of Posts proposes to save by his method of economy and partly at the expense of the people of the West Coast. He would like to know if the loss on the Trepassey Branch was out of proportion to the service rendered. He thought that in practising economy that the members for Ferryland should be punished as well as he was, and that if the Minister was going to be fair he should be fair to all.

Another method of economy on the part of the Government which he disagreed with was the new system of reporting in the House. It had always been the practice, he said, to have speeches taken down verbatim and from time to time members were given their speeches to revise, afterwards they were published in the daily papers that supported the Government. In 1909 when he was Speaker the speeches were made up into Hansard, which was found to be useful when making a reference any time. It appeared to him that it was not the idea to have speeches taken verbatim this session. He had only spoken once thus far and no speech was brought to him. As he understood it, the synopsis when prepared go straight to the

papers and he did not think that this system should commend itself to members of the House or by people outside who are to depend on authentic accounts of what happen in the Assembly. He thought that if this digest system was to be continued that members should be furnished with the digest first and not have reporters put down what they think members said.

Referring to the Prohibition Act he said that the Department was so mixed up with the enforcement of the Prohibition Law that the only way the Department would be able to carry out the law was for the Minister to transform himself into a policeman, and do nothing else but keep tabs on shebeens, see that no smuggling was carried on and take trips around the Island to put a stop to the illicit manufacture of liquor. He had reports in the Department which he had produced to the House showing how impossible it was to enforce the Act no matter how conscientiously the police or the Customs did their duties because the Act was against public opinion and was carried on a minority vote. He felt sure that if the vote was put to the country today that the same spirit would prevail in Newfoundland, as prevailed in some of the Provinces of Canada where Prohibition was defeated by overwhelming majorities, although the people of those places were rabid prohibitionists a few years ago. If it cannot be enforced in big places he did not see how it could be enforced here. The best thing that could be done he thought was to accept the Bill that was going to be introduced by the present Government for the purpose of amending the present state of affairs. In conclusion he congratulated the members of the House who had made such able maiden speeches, particularly Mr. Ashbourne.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER congratulated the various members of the Opposition on the addresses they had made and for the apparent feelings of good will they expressed to himself and to the Government in general. He did not remember stating that only civil servants who actively opposed them would be dismissed from office, and if he did say it, he did not mean to say it, because some people have already lost their positions, not through politics, but because of reports furnished the Government by the Auditor General. He wished to say, however, that he knew of men who held Government positions in Northern districts who a few years ago were thrown out for no just reason whatever and members of the F. P. Union put in their places. He thought it right and proper now to have these men re-instated. Last year he said he had occasion to bring under the notice of Mr. Hawco, the then Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, that a girl, who was Assistant in the Post Office at Greenspond, had been dismissed without excuse. He asked the Minister to enquire into the circumstances and if there was any good reason why she was thrown out of office he would be satisfied; but that if it was found that she had done her duty, he wanted to have her re-instated. Later, he said, he was informed by Mr. Hawco that the girl had been dismissed at the request of the F. P. Union and Mr. Halfyard, the then Colonial Secretary.

MR. HALFYARD said that as this was a personal matter, he wished to say that the Prime Minister had been incorrectly informed and that he had nothing to do with the matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER said he was satisfied his statement was correct and he could produce Mr. Hawco's letter to clear up that point.

MR. HALFYARD said he wanted to be just to himself as well as to Mr. Hawco and to the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER continuing said that the Government had under consideration a policy for the encouragement of the tourist traffic. He believed that there would be a great future, for Newfoundland through the encouragement of this traffic, but he could not say anything at the present time except that it was receiving serious consideration of the Government.

The Prime Minister definitely stated that no passes would be issued by the present Government. He said that that was a thing they very strongly objected to, he said he could give instances where people were requiring passes or special trains, because the regular train happened to be a few hours late, and that his Government discouraged this in all its phases.

Mr. Monroe said he did not propose to say very much this afternoon on the Prohibition Bill they proposed to bring in but the suggestion is to put a Commission in charge. In the meantime a committee is to be chosen from both sides of both houses to sit and take the view of various temperance organization or other bodies.

With regard to a minimum wage mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister agreed that if possible it would be a very fine thing, and very beneficial to the people in particular and the country in general. He said that it was something that needed to be dealt carefully with, and to go easy with, because as he pointed out if we demanded a minimum wage of say 40c. per hour it may have a detrimental effect upon proposed operations and may deter a proposed project from ever maturing, or being developed. He pointed out that it was entirely a question of supply and demand; if there were strong labour unions in the country, they undoubtedly could demand higher wages but on the other hand if labour was scarce and

men wanted work they would often times work for a small wage. He pointed out that his friend, Mr. Halfyard, would agree with him in this in so far as labourers at Port Union are working for 16c. an hour. Continuing the Prime Minister said that we are to-day faced with a problem of wages on Bell Island; the Company is only in a position to offer a certain wage, and the labourers are demanding more than the Company can see its way clear to pay. Capital has its interest and so has labour.

The Prime Minister said that he did not want to delay the House this afternoon, but as it has been said, people expect him to try to do right, and he would. All persons are liable to make mistakes, and he was no exception. We were put here by the people and were given their confidence and will do our very best for them. The Prime Minister continuing, said that Mr. Ashbourne said the other day that he hoped there would not be any legislation by Minute of Council, this he considered a very wise and important suggestion and it could not be said that legislation by Minute of Council was in the best interest, or to the benefit of the country.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Sir John wished to say a few words regarding the things before the House. He said that it appeared as if some of the Members on the other side of the House had become angels in a space of an hour. In referring to the dismissals by the present Government he called the attention of Mr. Halfyard to the dismissal of the Captain of the S.S. Prospero, and the appointment of Capt. John Field, three or four years ago. He also called the attention of Mr. Grimes to the time when he opposed him in Port de Grave, when Mr. Grimes dismissed a girl from a Post Office in that District. Sir John pointed out to some

of the Members on the other side that when they were in power they thought absolutely nothing of dismissals, they dismissed all and sundry, where and whenever it suited their purpose, and in cases where they could not very well dismiss, they granted pensions and made new appointments. Sir John expressed himself as being delighted to hear and note that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had now come out as a champion of the rights of the Labour, he was also pleased to note that Mr. Duff of Carbonear had taken the same stand.

MR. CASHIN rose to thank his friend the leader of the Opposition for the good opinion which he expressed of, and the commendable remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition concerning his father, who was a Member of this House for thirty-three years. He felt certain that Mr. Hickman was sincere and in earnest.

Mr. Cashin also referred to what he termed as sarcastic criticism on the part of the Leader of the Opposition, when he referred to the visit of Field Marshall Sir Douglas Haig, when Mr. Hickman said that the people of Newfoundland would be glad that Sir Douglas Haig had been here. Mr. Cashin said that there was more behind those words, than the words themselves actually conveyed. He said that it was a distinguished honour to Newfoundland to have such a gallant soldier to come on a visit here to unveil the splendid monument erected to the memory of brave and loyal heroes who laid down their lives in the great war.

In speaking of the subject of dismissals, Mr. Cashin pointed out that when the Squires Government came into power in 1919 dismissals were the order of the day, they dismissed civil servants left and right, and in a great many cases without any pro- vocation or reason whatever. He

pointed out that the first thing they did when they came into power was to dismiss the sub-collector at Ferryland, but Mr. Cashin wished to say plainly and emphatically that the person they dismissed was going to be put back, and that he himself was going to be instrumental in putting him back.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Walsh said that it was not his intention to say much this afternoon, but he merely rose to express his regret, and reiterate the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, that Sir Michael Cashin was not with them in the House to-day. He said that Sir Michael was a man who possessed some of the finest qualities of any politician who ever stood on the floor of this Assembly. He also said that it was regrettable that during the late campaign practically a state of war was waged against Sir Michael, and that Sir Michael at the time was suffering from severe and very serious illness. He expressed the hope that it would not be long before they would have the pleasure of seeing him back in the House again. He said that Sir Michael Cashin was a splendid type of man, in fact a remarkable man in that he achieved success in most things that he attempted, and made success where lots of others failed; he sprang from the ranks of labour, and climbed gradually upwards until he reached an exalted position and one worthy of respect.

MR. PUDDISTER:—Mr. Speaker, before the Address in Reply finally passes, I would like to say just a word on a matter or two that has been brought to the attention of the House through honourable members of the Opposition. I take this opportunity, sir, of extending to you my hearty and sincere congratulations on the high honour conferred on you by the unanimous vote of this House—that of first commoner of the

land. I am very much pleased to hear the Hon. Members of the Opposition congratulate the speaker so heartily. Time was, and not very long since, when those members were not so loud in their praises. I want also to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for an Address in Reply on the very capable manner in which they have acquitted themselves.

I was pleased to hear the Leader of the Opposition utter praise of Sir Michael Cashin. It was well deserved. Hearing this praise, I could not help recalling that during the election fight in Bay de Verde District a paper was circulated there called the Journal, every second line in which was abuse of Sir Michael Cashin. I understand the money to run that paper was put up by the Leader of the Opposition and his employees registered it in their names. I like to see men consistent in or out of the House and if Mr. Hickman spent his money for this purpose and also sent his employees to run the paper, he should stand to what it said or force its discontinuance. I hold no brief for Sir Michael Cashin but Mr. Hickman himself in 1923 when he was defeated in Harbor Grace was a sufferer from the writings against that much abused gentleman. He was also struck by the references to the dismissal of public servants and the instancing of the House as the scene of many of them. Though not previously a member I have taken stock of affairs in the House and note that one of the present officials had been put out of his position when the late Government came into power. Another was kept in the House who was drawing two pensions and a salary but the present administration cannot stand for any more of that kind of thing. The man to whom Mr. Duff referred as having been dismissed at

Carbonear is one who though a public official went to Bay de Verde on the Sunday preceding polling day and distributed campaign literature of the most offensive nature, and also canvassed every man he met to vote for his opponents. If dirty linen has to be washed and the Opposition start it, the Government can also take a hand in. I am not a party to dismissals without reason but it has always been the custom to restore those who have been deposed by previous administrations without cause. There was an instance of unfair treatment in the case of a man from Bay de Verde and I brought it to the notice of Mr. Warren when he was in power. This man had been dismissed by Mr. Cave though he had taken no part in politics. His salary had been \$293 and 10 per cent. on his collections, but the salary of the man who replaced him was not known and the original official had been pensioned at \$500 by arrangement of Mr. Cave. At least that is the rate he has been paid up to the present. Two men cannot draw wages for one job and when the axe falls it is likely to be the new man who will get it. In conclusion I wish Mr. Speaker success in his exalted office and also Mr. Monroe in carrying out his policy of clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all.

MR. HICKMAN said he would like to make a few things clear. It was perhaps regrettable that he had made reference to Sir Michael Cashin but he had done so in all sincerity, though it seemed his remarks had brought friction and ended the harmony that had been spoken of so often. If he were responsible for what had appeared in the papers he would back it up but he did not write for the papers and had tried to stop some things that had appeared. He had nothing to say against Sir Michael Cashin as his dealings with him had always been

of a cordial nature and he would not be like some people connected with papers, blatant hypocrites. He had never penned a word against Cashin, he would not do so, and wanted the House to understand that he had had nothing to do with what was published. He was sorry the affair had occurred but he would always take a determined stand against anything thrown at him, as had been done.

MR. DUFF:—In reply to Mr. Puddister, I may say Quinn is also a cabman, and he would have been just as willing to do this work for any party as it is his means of livelihood. I only ask the privilege of being consulted in reference to these matters relating to my district which I demand as my right.

MR. MOORE as the member sitting longest continuously in the House, thanked Mr. Hickman for speaking in praise of Sir Michael Cashin who had brought him into public life 16 years ago and in favor of whom he was ready to resign his seat at any moment. He knew that Mr. Hickman had not written anything in the papers but he knew who had and it was one who had been hand in glove with Sir Michael Cashin just previous to the election.

On motion, the Report of the Select Committee's draft Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech, was adopted.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddister took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

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

MR. HALFYARD took occasion to complain of the reporting as it was entirely unsatisfactory and he hoped the Internal Economy Commission would give the matter consideration. Formerly members were given copies of their speeches for perusal before publication and he would like to see this system introduced again.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE HIGGINS in reply pointed out that the present system of reporting was in the nature of an experiment as he had previously pointed out. No verbatim reports are being taken now and only a digest is being given and he thought the reporting staff was as good as ever it was. The idea at present is to do away with the expense of the publication of Hansard.

MR. HALFYARD again suggested that the reporters be instructed to take verbatim reports and that copies be supplied the members.

A discussion followed in relation to the abolition of the Hansard and the Prime Minister in answer to a question said that it seemed the opinion of the older members that these Hansards were never read.

MR. GRIMES considered that the Hansard was most important. All members owed it to their constituents to tell them of what they and the Legislature was doing. How

was that information to be obtained if there was no Hansard. To refer to newspapers on file was not fair to members of the House particularly when they (the members) are not always reported correctly. Besides what chance has the Outport Member to refer to files in St. John's. To practice economy by cutting out the Hansard, which would not cost more than three hundred dollars to print, was going to the other extreme.

The Prime Minister said that there would be a party meeting this evening and the matter would be considered.

The House then adjourned until 3 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 18th, 1924.

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

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Little Harbor West, P.B., asking that that harbor be made a regular port of call for the S.S. Argyle. At present the ship passes close by and her calling there would not entail any further cost to the Colony. I therefore hope that the petition will be acceded to. I also beg to present a petition for the allocation of a sum for the completion of the breakwater at Branch which is absolutely necessary to the prosecution of their work by the fishermen. It is a wild harbor and the improvement is badly needed and I trust the Government would see its way clear to grant the petition.

MR. WALSH: I beg leave to support the petition.

MR. SINNOTT:—I also beg to heartily endorse the petition.

MR. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Cape Broyle in reference to the allocation of a sum to repair the public wharf at that place. Last year the wharf was wrecked by ice and money is needed to put it in shape again. A large number of Canadian vessels visit there and the wharf is an asset to the place. At Bay Bulls also the wharf is unfit for use and I ask that steps be taken at once to repair it and that these petitions be referred to the department to which they belong.

MR. MOORE:—I beg leave to heartily support the petitions.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions from various parts of the District of Placentia and St. Mary's and while doing so I would like to refer to the disposal of petitions in this House. I have seen a letter in the Daily News in reference to this matter but I do not think that letter touched on the most important point and that is the trouble that the people go to in taking around the petition and as I see it, nothing being done with it once it has been referred to the department to which it belongs. Frequently I have presented petitions on most important matters and heard nothing of them afterwards and likely they were thrown into the waste paper basket or the furnace. At last session I suggested that a committee of both sides of the House be appointed to deal with this matter of petitions but if nothing further is to be done it would be just as well for the representatives of the districts to tell their constituents that it is no good to send the petitions in. The first petition I wish to present is one signed by all the residents of Oderin and of the settlements from that point of Marasheen asking for a fog alarm on the west side of Placentia Bay. Var-

ious petitions on this matter have previously been presented by me and when money was being spent freely the Hon. Mr. Coaker promised to grant the request but nothing resulted. It is unnecessary for me to repeat why this alarm is needed but I hope and trust that the present incumbent of the office of Marine and Fisheries, Capt. W. Winsor, will see that the matter is attended to. The second petition asks for a way office at Harricot, which would be a great convenience to all the voters of that vicinity. The next is from St. Anne's, on the west side of the Bay, asking for telegraph or telephone connections and perhaps in view of the promised reduction of these services in the district, the request will be acceded to. Another is from the residents of Boat Harbor for a telegraph line which would mean only a very short extension from Baine Harbor. The next is from Woody Island asking an allocation for a public wharf or arrangements to have the old one repaired so that steamers can call there. I trust this matter also will be attended to. Another is from Fox Harbor, one of the most important fish-settlements in the Bay, or on the South-West coast, for facilities in place of the ferry service which has been given up. There is also a petition from Little Harbor West for \$100 for a breakwater. This is absolutely necessary and the petition is signed by all the residents of the place. The next petition is that Rushoon be made a port of call. It is a largely populated settlement and has had little facilities from the Government though the steamer passes close by and it would be only a half hour's delay for her to call there. The other petition is from the people of Gas-kiers, Peter's River, Point La Have and other sections asking for a ferry on Trepassey Harbor. Those who have visited this locality are well

aware of the difficulty experienced in moving about and as the sum required is only \$200 I think it should be granted.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support these petitions particularly that for the fog alarm on the west side of the Bay as for years, although they were promised it, no aids to navigation have been provided on this coast, and in the past many accidents causing loss of life occurred owing to no fog alarm being erected. A fog Terminal at Red Island and on the west coast of Placentia Bay. I hope the Government will see its way clear to erect those. I think the port of call can be arranged without any additional cost. Also with curtailment in the telegraph service, the telegraph and telephone connection with St. Joseph's and Salmonier can be arranged without any extra outlay. I wish to give these petitions my hearty support.

MR. SINNOTT:—I also beg to support these petitions.

MR. WARREN gave notice of question.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

MR. CAHILL gave notice of question.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled answer to question of Mr. Grimes.

Honourable The Colonial Secretary:

MR. GRIMES:—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary what amount of money has been expended on able bodied relief for the six months of the present year, giving a statement month by month for each District: if able bodied relief has been discontinued throughout the country.

In reply to question of Mr. Grimes No. 5 on Order Paper of July 15th I herewith table statement of amount expended in different districts in respect of Able-bodied Relief for the past six months:

BAY DE VERDE.

Peter L. LeGrow, Broad Cove	\$ 934.74
Wm. Snelgrove, Grate's Cove	458.34
W. J. Doyle, Gull Island	1,936.87
Eli Crummey, Western Bay	24.99
Jos. March, Old Perlican	223.96
E. J. Bursey, Old Perlican	577.49
Wm. Joyce, Freshwater	25.00
Charles Cooper, Lower Island Cove	633.39
Malcolm Garland, Lower Island Cove	802.26
W. T. Sutton, Bay de Verde	502.41
	\$ 7,120.05

BONAVISTA.

Geo. Abbott, Gambo	\$ 79.61
J. W. Janes, Greenspond	396.45
H. J. Oldford, Salvage	17.55
L. Bursey, Catalina	101.55
Jas. Brown, Bonavista	1,623.25
H. J. Haines, Portland	94.20
W. Brown, King's Cove	1,779.38
A. Janes, Glovertown	14.00
Jas. Whelan, Wesleyville	141.01
W. Wicks, Wesleyville	2,048.61
	\$ 6,295.61

BURGEO & LAPOILE.

E. L. Parsons, Burgeo\$	577.48	
R. Furneaux, Rose Blanche		43.48	
Geo. F. Read, LaPoile		134.18	
John Cunningham, Burgeo		103.75	
R. T. Squarey, S.M., Channel		75.92	
C. Buffett, Rencontre West		421.31	
		_____	\$ 1,356.12

BURIN.

Thos. Collins, Lamaline\$	192.58	
John T. Walsh, Marystown		657.03	
M. Hollett, Burin		67.20	
E. Harris, Grand Bank		102.84	
Frederick Collins, Flat Islands		52.50	
L. Pike, St. Lawrence		376.35	
		_____	\$ 1,448.50

CARBONEAR.

William Noel, Carbonear\$	293.94	
		_____	\$ 293.94

FOGO.

W. Whiteway, Musgrave Harbor\$	62.06	
A. J. Fitzgerald, Fogo		260.79	
		_____	\$ 322.85

FERRYLAND.

H. L. Morry, Ferryland\$	13.92	
W. O'Driscoll, Tor's Cove		118.05	
		_____	\$ 131.97

FORTUNE.

S. P. Camp, Pushthrough\$	371.01	
R. Snook, Fortune		953.44	
W. E. Parsons, Harbor Breton		61.48	
A. J. St. Croix, St. Jacques		446.14	
Benj. Francis, Hermitage		615.71	
		_____	\$ 2,447.76

HARBOR GRACE.

A. Squires, Hr. Grace\$	2,770.28	
Esau Gosse, Spaniard's Bay		2,651.43	
W. H. Young, Upper Island Cove		25,117.63	
John C. Norman, Bay Roberts		892.38	
		_____	\$ 34,431.72

HR. MAIN.

Jas. Conran, Hr. Main\$	278.20	
J. J. Wade, Conception Hr.		189.00	
		_____	\$ 467.20

PLACENTIA & ST. MARY'S.

A. Wareham, Hr. Buffett\$	915.34	
John Nolan, St. Mary's		24.33	
Thos. G. Sutton, Trepassey		1,997.59	

P. Griffin, St. Bride's	97.98	
A. T. Keats, Argentia	1,581.23	
Thos. D. Leonard, St. Leonard's	5,692.62	
H. Verran, Placentia	631.15	
		<hr/> \$ 10,940.24

PORT DE GRAVE.

A. Newell, Clarke's Beach	\$ 353.08	
S. Roberts, Brigus	6.30	
		<hr/> \$ 359.38

ST. BARBE.

J. L. Fitzgerald, Conche	\$ 285.03	
D. P. Duggan, LaScie	4,167.07	
H. L. Pearce, Westporte	168.65	
S. P. S. Chambers, Flower's Cove	11.20	
John E. Roberts, Bonne Bay	1,532.24	
		<hr/> \$ 6,164.19

ST. GEORGE'S.

M. E. Boland, Curling	\$ 194.24	
John V. Devine, Stephenville	11.20	
		<hr/> \$ 248.24

ST. JOHN'S.

East End		\$ 64.17
-------------------	--	----------

TRINITY.

A. E. Butler, Port Rexton	\$ 50.74	
W. Cottery, New Perlican	214.88	
A. Case, Heart's Delight	97.52	
F. Somerton, Trinity	12.45	
B. Baker, Elliston	12.46	
Gough, Sanger, Tucker, Elliston	468.21	
T. G. Sealey, Hant's Hr.	2,454.01	
John Leawood, Britannia	449.39	
John Newhook, New Hr.	757.27	
E. Benson, Hillview	741.27	
R. C. Kirby, Winterton	981.70	
		<hr/> \$ 6,240.30

TWILLINGATE.

W. Winsor, Exploits	\$ 63.79	
H. F. Fitzgerald, G & B. Falls	497.00	
S. R. Jeans, Lewisporte	6,826.29	
C. White, Twillingate	1,384.41	
Thos. E. Wells, Little Bay	1,137.66	
		<hr/> \$ 9,909.15
Telegrams		226.72

LABRADOR.

E. Neill, Labrador	\$8,005.78	
John Butt, Blanc Sablon	3,653.19	
		<hr/> \$ 11,658.97

Total		\$100,127.10
E. & O. E.		

Regarding the third question contained in this query, Mr. Brownrigg, the Commissioner of Public Charities, informs me that during the month of May all the Relieving Officers were notified to discontinue all Able-bodied Pauper Relief.

MR. WARREN—Before proceeding further I would like to bring to your notice a case, which in the report of yesterday's proceedings in this House published in the Daily News, the Prime Minister in answer to a question, was badly misquoted. Here is the question:—

MR. WARREN asked the Hon. Prime Minister (a) if the railway was being operated under the supervision of commissioners as heretofore; (b) if so, who are the commissioners; (c) if it is the intention of the Government to continue this system; (d) have any steps been taken to provide for any other mode of operation.

HON. PRIME MINISTER replied that the Railway was being operated by Mr. Russell and that no commissioners have been appointed; also that it was the intention of the Government to continue this system for the immediate present and that no steps had been taken as yet for a different system of operating.

MR. WARREN—That is not what the Prime Minister stated. I do not wish to speak in a manner of criticism but I would call the attention of the House and the Internal Economy Committee to this system. It is impossible for this system to be of any service. Why not try some system like the old one. I was also reported as having said that at one period I introduced letters into this House showing that the Prohibition Law was a failure. Whereas, what I did say was that there were letters in the Department of Justice which, if pro-

duced, will show that the law could not be carried out.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say, since yesterday we have taken the matter into consideration and have decided to revert to the old system. I may say that orders have been given that any reporter who is not able to keep up his end of the job is to make room for somebody else. It has been found that the digest is not satisfactory. There will be no official digest except for outside papers. Verbatim reports will be handed to the members as usual. It is requested that a prompt return be made so that any corrections may be noted.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE tabled Reports of the Auditor General as follows:

“Revenue and Expenditure Accounts for Fiscal Year ending June 30th, 1923.”

“Section 33 (b) of Audit Act ending February, 1924.”

“Supplementary Report under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act.”

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—To move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to confirm an agreement entered into between the Government and the Newfoundland Milling Company, Ltd.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I ask the indulgence of this House to postpone this matter once more. Mr. Palmer has not yet signed this agreement owing to his absence from town.

It was ordered that this motion be deferred until to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. 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.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am presenting to the House the Estimates as prepared by the past Government with some changes as made by the present Government. The idea of the Government is to keep down as much as we can the expenditure of this country. With regard to the Public Interest Account on page one there is a decrease, the estimated interest being \$3,158,857.75. Next we come along to the expenditure of the Civil Government. The total salaries for the heads of the different departments such as the Colonial Secretary, the Auditor General, etc., is \$55,750.00, showing a drop of \$1000. The total for the Department of Finance shows an increase. It was found necessary owing to the great amount of work to employ an extra clerk and stenographer and that is why this department shows an increase in the salaries. Also a Custom House officer was taken sick and is now retired. Mr. Benning was also taken ill and is retired. The administration of Justice on page twelve shows no difference. The Legislative Council is also unchanged.

MR. WARREN—I have something to say about a pension for a lighthouse keeper of 82 years of age. I thought you had finished up. I do not wish to delay the House so I will take it up later on.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—House of Assembly, page fifteen, shows a decrease of \$10,000. There is very little in the Vital Statistics. There is practically no change in the Justice Department, with the exception of the Labrador Boundary on page 26, which shows a decrease of \$2000. The Education Department is almost the same as last year. Salaries are the same and the Sparsely Pop-

ulated Localities grant is also the same. The total is \$797,963.03. The inside salaries of the Public Charities Department show an increase owing to the addition of an assistant book-keeper and stenographer. This was found necessary because of the considerable amount of work that was to be done. Relieving Officers are unchanged. The grant for Charitable Societies remains the same except for the Newfoundland Training Society. Board of Health shows a slight increase in salaries. The additional is for the employment of a Veterinary Surgeon in connection with Tubercular cattle. Child Welfare is the same. Small Pox \$1000. Labrador just the same. Contingencies show a decrease over last year. There is a slight increase in the Civil Government Department. Marine and Fisheries shows a decrease of \$500. The total for the lighthouses, on page 59, is the same as the previous year. The Stott's Building, the Kennedy Building, Museum Building, etc., are the same. Controller's Department shows a slight increase and further down in Constabulary Department it has been decided to discontinue the Horse Police.

MR. GRIMES:—I would like to ask if the Government proposes to make a substitute for the horse police.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—No. It is proposed to deal with this matter of speeding in a totally different way.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The Fire Department has a slight decrease. St. John's penitentiary, slight decrease. Outport Court Houses and Jail, decrease. Hospital for the insane, \$28,896.22. Slight increase. Hospital upkeep for the insane \$134,938.22. General Hospital, slight increase for salaries, between four and five hundred. There is a decrease in the vote for maintenance which now stands at \$163,351.49.

There is a decrease in the amount to be voted for fuel, light and taxes of three thousand dollars.

MR. WARREN:—The late Government proposed to call for tenders in this matter.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—That is the policy of the Government also. The Poor Asylum, slight increase in salaries. Vote for maintenance is five thousand dollars less. Slight decrease in the vote for Tuberculosis Campaign. Vote Twillingate Hospital is the same. In the Fever Hospital there is a total increase of about four thousand dollars. In the Sudbury Hospital vote, there is an increase in salaries of about one thousand. I might say for the information of the Hon. Members that the Government proposes having a commission formed to inquire into Sudbury Hospital. Roads, public bridges and ferries practically all the same. Main roads practically the same, \$66,748.00. Railway connecting bridges and roads have practically the same vote. Halfway House keepers the same. Lighting the St. John's streets the same. Total increase for ferries will be about two thousand dollars. There is a decrease in the total vote for the Public Works Department of about fifty-five thousand dollars. The General Post Office shows increase in departmental salaries of about two thousand dollars. General Post Office salaries increase of about four hundred. The money order branch has two additional clerks at an increase in the vote of fourteen hundred dollars. There is an increase in the distribution branch of about a thousand dollars. Mail Clerks practically the same. Outport postmasters no change. There is a total increase of about two thousand dollars shown on page 119. This is due entirely to postal arrangements at the Humber and Corner Brook. Labrador offices the same. The total voted for the Labrador Offices is the

same as last year \$5,473.27. The total vote for couriers, \$114,687.00 is the same as last year. The miscellaneous account shows an increase of \$14,000.00. This is explained by the fact that the fuel and light which was originally paid by the Board of Works Department is now transferred to the Postal Telegraphs Department. The Steam Subsidies show a considerable reduction. This is due to the transfer of the Wren and the Sebastopol and to the change in the Glencoe's service to the Labrador. I may say for Mr. Warren's information that the Glencoe has been sent to Labrador because the Home has had an accident and is undergoing repairs at the dock. The Glencoe takes her place.

MR. WARREN:—Do you propose to lay up the Glencoe?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—We will have to for a matter of six weeks. The total for the Postal is \$797,317.33. I may say that the Sebastopol was removed from Bay of Islands because the people did not want such an expensive ship for so little work.

MR. WARREN:—Could you not put on a smaller boat to do the work?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—That will be provided for in additional estimates. The Telegraph Branch and General Staff, St. John's, increase of eight or nine hundred dollars. This is due to four or five temporary offices on the Humber. On page 136 you will note \$9800.00 for four temporary offices at the Humber. There is a total of \$142,170.00 for this vote of "Operators-Outside." The monthly allowance for fuel, light, etc., brings it up to \$148,920.10. There is practically the same vote for the repairers. General maintenance is the same. There is a reduction in Maintenance Main Line Repairs of \$15,000.00 making a total difference of thirty thousand dollars. Tele-

phones and wireless are the same. The total vote for the Telegraph branch was \$383,411.50 for last year as compared to \$349,080.50 for this year. The total to be expended under this heading is \$1,146,397.84. The Department of Customs, no change. Outport sub-collectors, no change, except for a slight increase of two thousand dollars. Total for Outport Sub-collectors \$79,511.75. Office rent the same. Contingencies the same. In the preventive service you will notice a decrease of about twenty thousand dollars; this is made up chiefly out of decrease in the hire of the steamer for this service of fifteen thousand dollars. The Labrador travelling and miscellaneous of twenty six hundred dollars is being practically dropped. The Fishermen's Insurance, confined to Fortune and other places on that coast is practically dropped. Customs is reduced from eighty thousand dollars to fifty thousand. Making a saving of thirty thousand dollars. The total amount to be expended is \$439,552.25. On page 154 the salaries and contingencies are the same as last year. The Department of Auditor General practically the same. The High Commissioners office practically the same. The Government Engineer's Department is the same. On page 156 that vote is practically the same.

MR. GRIMES:—What is that vote advertising in the foreign press?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—That is the same vote that has been there for years. I think it means advertising in the Financial Post. However, it has been cut one thousand dollars. On page 158 the salaries are the same. There has been a decrease in the Military Pensions of fifty thousand dollars.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, In rising to support the motion I take advantage of the fact that the House is in committee on the estimates to ask the Minister of Public Works

why the main line grants for some of the districts have not been sent out. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works Mr. Russell, would be able to answer. Under normal conditions the money would have been sent two or three months ago and I have received several requests asking if people were going to receive the local and main line grants this year. The winter's frost has had a deteriorating effect on several of the small bridges and roads and the money is wanted to fix them up. I understand that the local and the branch line money was sent to Harbour Grace previous to the election. I presume that they have been sent to other districts. No money, however, has been sent to Trinity up to the present time. I can appreciate the fact that it may take some time for the clerks to get all the grants sent out. But it is no good to keep the money until the fall of the year and I would like to know whether the money is going to be sent out or not.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Some of the grants have been sent to some of the districts and others are in course of being sent out. With regard to Trinity I am not sure. I will make enquiry.

MR. HALFYARD:—I say I can appreciate the fact that it may be very difficult for the office staff to get things promptly. I hope that every effort will be made to get it out as soon as possible so that advantage may be taken of the time to repair the roads.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL Asked, The Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement showing how much relief has been given out by each Relieving Officer in the District of St. Barbe since January 1st, 1924, to date; also to lay on the table of the House the original bills for relief during the above named period, given out by the Relieving Officer at Bonne Bay.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—In answer to this question I may say that the Commission of Public Charities informs me that it would be very inconvenient to table the original documents and that it would take considerable time to prepare copies of the vouchers. However if Mr. Scammell would come into the office the entire file would be placed at his disposal and he can obtain any information he may wish.

(2) MR. WARREN Asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs what is the total revenue of the Colony for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1924.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The total revenue for the Colony for the fiscal year ending June, 30th, 1924 has not yet been received.

(3) MR. DUFF Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if his Executive have given any grants of land in Newfoundland or Labrador to any one since he came into office.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to the Honorable member I may say that the Executive Government has made no grants of land in Newfoundland or Labrador since it came into office.

(4) MR. ASHBOURNE Asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to remove the Export Tax on cod oil.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to the Honorable Member I desire to say that the Government has not yet made up their minds whether they will remove the Export Tax on cod oil or not.

(5) MR. PUDESTER Asked Hon. the Minister of Education if it is the intention of the Government to reduce the amount voted annually for the Augmentation of Teachers Salaries and apply such reduction to a Grant for the operation of the Normal School or Junior College.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to that question I may say that the Government has definitely decided not to reduce the amount for the Augmentation of the Teachers Salaries.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, "Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace," was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provision.

Second Reading of Bill to Amend the Election Act of 1913.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Speaker. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

HON. the COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Mr. Speaker. Before proceeding with the Second Reading of this Bill, I would like to say that, whilst I quite agree with the principle underlying it, namely, to give men in localities, other than in the district to which they belong an opportunity to

exercise their franchise, the carrying out of this project will not be found of such a comprehensive character as the Bill would at first appear to indicate. Those of us who are actively connected with politics know of the conditions that exist at the time of a general election, and we know the necessity of the establishment of booths here in St. John's whereby every district in the Island has to have facilities afforded its people for voting. Under this Bill polling stations are required to be placed at Corner Brook, Deer Lake, Grand Falls and Bell Island. Now I cannot see how you can possibly do without a booth for every district in the Island, because there may be men either in large or small numbers from every district either at Bell Island, Grand Falls, Deer Lake and Corner Brook, and I merely mention this matter for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the very large expenditure that will be required under this heading; and as this Bill opens up the question of the Election Act, I think that the time is opportune to have the whole question of all the districts of the country discussed and considered. We have for many years realised that the distribution of seats in this country has developed into an absolutely impossible position as to the relative representation of different districts. It was laid down in the House of Assembly some forty years ago or more whereby the different districts throughout the Colony got representation in proportion to the denominational population that they had at that time. Now it is an admitted fact that the situation has materially changed in many districts in this country and that some districts are under-represented and other districts are over-represented. It is also an open question as to whether our present system of re-

presentation is any longer desirable in so far as it appertains to districts which are represented by more than one man. A matter that I have for a long time considered is that it is not always in the best interest of a district for three men to represent the entire district. Here is a case in point. Take the District of Harbour Grace, which I have the honor to represent in this House. A system has been in vogue there, without any standing, but has been an understanding between the representatives that one man would be the member for one section of the district, another member for another section and another member for another section. In other words, one member was supposed to represent Hr. Grace and environment; another Bay Roberts and environment and the other Spaniard's Bay and environment. When I went to Hr. Grace district first I found that one of my colleagues, who lived in Hr. Grace proper, almost needed an introduction when he went to Bay Roberts. Although he was a member for some years, he was actually unknown there in spite of the fact that he had spent a lifetime in the other end of the district. But, of course, that sort of system brings about a very vicious principle because it tends to be detrimental to a very strong and capable man in the district. Take the case of our good old friend Mr. Piccott. He was supposed to be the representative particularly for Spaniard's Bay section, and of course the people of Hr. Grace proper were a bit jealous of Spaniard's Bay. It is an anomaly that should no longer exist and the question which suggests itself to one is what is the best way to deal with it. It might be found desirable, upon giving the matter consideration, to have that district divided into three parts so that each member would each repre-

sent a section, because it often transpires in any three-man district where you have one particularly active representative who does an unlimited amount of work on behalf of his constituents, and he may have two colleagues who may be indifferent and who may have the effect of bringing about the defeat of the one who does more than his share of the work. Then again the development that is going on at Corner Brook, Deer Lake, Bell Island and Grand Falls has changed the aspect of things with regard to proportional representation of those districts concerned. Take the case of Corner Brook where it is said there are five or six thousand residents. That will seriously change the aspect of things so far as the district of St. George's is concerned. We have had one member representing the district of St. George's before Corner Brook development commenced. Now it will be entitled to two men from a proportional standpoint. Whilst I have every sympathy with the mover of this Bill in the desire to place the facilities at the disposal of hundreds of people who are working temporarily in those sections already referred to, and whilst there is every possible desire to have every man in the country exercise his franchise, still I do not think that the time is opportune, and I cannot but fear that a great deal of difficulty will ensue and it is questionable whether it can work out satisfactorily, without incurring the expenditure of a large amount of money.

Take the case of Grand Falls. That place has developed into a district in itself, still a man representing Green Bay may not know a man in Grand Falls and still be elected, because the great bulk of fishermen in Green Bay is sufficiently strong to elect three members who can be in a position to pay par-

ticular attention to that section, whereas the wants and needs of Grand Falls may be neglected. Therefore, Grand Falls and vicinity should have special representation. Big industrial development is carried on there, and revenue is collected there; but, I would suggest to the mover of this Bill that, if the booth is to be established at all in that region, it should be established at Millertown or Millertown Junction, because the transient population of Grand Falls is comparatively small to that of Millertown or Millertown Junction, which are situated in the woods, and hundreds of men go to and from work there, whilst the people of Grand Falls are to a considerable extent permanent residents there, so that to get the men down from Millertown and Millertown Junction to vote at Grand Falls would almost cost as much as it would to bring them to St. John's.

Another thing about the Election Act is that there has been open violations of the Act for years. When that Act was passed in this House conditions were very different to what they are to-day. Then a man who got \$50.00 for acting Returning Officer at an election considered himself well paid. A Deputy Returning Officer was more than satisfied with \$10.00; \$5.00 was paid for the hire of a booth room and a special policeman got \$1.00. To-day you got to pay a Returning Officer \$150 for his services, and the amounts paid to Deputies, Poll Clerks and special policemen have increased proportionately. These are matters that are unavoidable and are like everything else. The price of labour and the price of a man's services have increased, and it is always absolutely necessary to acquire the services of competent people to conduct an election.

Consequently, the whole question,

Mr. Speaker, is one that may well receive the very serious attention and consideration of this House, and if we go into Committee on this Bill, which will require the expenditure of a large amount of money to meet all the reforms necessary in this Election Act, I intend to suggest that the matter be referred to a Special Committee of this House to sit out of Session, if necessary, for the purpose of reviewing and revising the whole Election Act .

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker: I quite agree with a great many of the statements made by the Honorable Colonial Secretary, Member for Hr. Grace and I believe that the time has arrived for re-distribution of seats because possibly one man districts would be the better system. Of course that is a matter that would have to be given great consideration by this House before any definite decision would be reached. At the present time we have 36 members in the House of Assembly representing the various sections of the country. There is an Executive Government made up of nine or ten men and you have nine departmental offices to be divided up amongst those 36 men. Perhaps it would not be so easy to get men to contest one man districts. However, that is a matter of opinion and it appears to me at first thought that now, in three men districts, it is generally understood that unless, in exceptional, cases, only one man of the three will be given a department or a seat in the Executive, and there is no misunderstanding whatever what the status of his colleagues will be so far as getting an Executive or Departmental seat is concerned. Anyhow, it will be much better, I think, for all concerned to have one man districts. I have always considered it very unfair to have some members of three men districts to be regarded as ordinary members in a Government.

Still, it cuts both ways, and it depends upon the make up and the characteristics of the men who are colleagues of the one who gets the Executive or Departmental seat and as to whether a feeling of co-operation and good-will will exist between them in the management of the affairs of their particular district. I may say that I have been very fortunate with the colleagues that I have had as a representative of Tritity District. From 1919 to 1923 I had two colleagues who had no ambition for an Executive seat or to become heads of Departments. As a member of the Executive Government and Head of a Department I resided in the city and the people of any outport have more to do with their representatives who reside in the city than with those who live outside. When my constituents came to the city they called on me. I stuck to the job and was nearly always at my office. Therefore I must say that I got the good will of the people of Trinity district, and, although I say it myself, results have been shown that I became very popular with my constituents, whether I deserved it or not; but in justice to my colleagues I might say that a great many people of Trinity district who did not understand the situation gave me the credit for doing things they did, and they even went so far as to speak disparagingly of my colleagues, which was altogether unjust, but it was no use for me to argue with my constituents on that point. Therefore, it can be seen that very often the business of a three man district works out unjustly especially to men who are good natured and not jealous of their colleague who happens to be on the Executive. Of course, like men in other walks of life, some politicians are peculiarly made up and may act unjustly toward an Executive man by telling their constituents that if they were

in the Executive they would have all their requests granted. I repeat that I agree with the honorable Colonial Secretary that it would be much better to have one man districts so that each representative would be responsible for his own actions. But that has nothing whatever to do with the spirit of the Amendment to the Election Act, as stated in this Bill. We all know that in the election which took place on June 3rd that thousands of men were disfranchised, although any references that we may make now will not alter the result of the election. The matter has now to be looked upon as a thing of the past and we have to submit to the result and hope that it will be in the best interests of the country; but, if the thousands of men who were at Deer Lake, Corner Brook and other industrial centres had the privilege of recording their votes, I feel almost certain that a different complexion would have been put on the make up of the membership of this House. I know that the Prime Minister is very anxious that the men of Bonavista district shall be given an opportunity of voting for himself and his colleague during the coming Autumn. A great many of the fishermen of that district are now away prosecuting the fishery and I presume that is why the Prime Minister did not pull off a Bye-Election there this Summer, fearing that those men would be disfranchised, and I feel quite sure, although there is a difference of opinion on the matter, that the Amendment to the Election Act, as contained in the Bill now before the House if found imperfect it would be a very easy matter to amend the Election Act in January or February next or whenever the House meets again, instead of deferring the Bill this session. Now I have heard it stated on several occasions, before the House would meet again during the follow-

ing Winter season, because the Summer season was not an opportune time for business and that the Summer was no time to be here. We waited for the Winter months, but these months came and went and the House did not meet until the Summer again, so that we cannot tell whether or not the House will meet again before May or June of next year. Consequently, I took this very first opportunity of introducing this Amendment to the Election Act, as I thought at the time that it would receive the unanimous support of the House. I agree with the honorable Colonial Secretary that there are other things in connection with our Election Act that should be changed, but this, apparently is not the opportune time for such changes; I do not think that we should defer the passing of this Amendment, particularly when it is so fresh in our minds that delay in the passing of this measure means disfranchising so many people. Corner Brook is an industrial centre and there will be transient labourers engaged there at construction work for a long time to come. Deer Lake and environment will be a logging centre. Grand Falls will continue to turn out thousands of tons of paper, and I know hundreds of men there that did not have an opportunity to record their votes on June 3rd last—men from districts other than Twillingate. Then again Bell Island. Nobody will question the desirability of having Booths established at Bell Isld. It has been said that this scheme is going to be expensive. Well, any project undertaken by us is going to prove expensive for that matter. Now when we speak of the right to vote, we do not and should not consider the expense in connection with giving voters the opportunity to exercise their franchise. It is said the the opportunity to vote is not a privilege, but a God-

given right and one of the greatest gifts that can be bestowed on any man. Therefore, if that right is so precious and so desirable I think we should take advantage of the first opportunity to amend the Election Act so that labourers and others who happen to be away from their districts at any election time may be able to record their votes.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE
—Mr. Speaker, Just a word in reply to the honourable introducer of this Bill. The idea that the honourable member for Trinity had in mind in introducing this Bill commends itself, but, with all due deference, he must have been unmindful of the magnitude of the task when he expects that it be taken up and disposed of at a moment's notice. I quite agree with the principle that, wherever possible, arrangements should be made to get a man to vote. That principle does not need to be defended; but it is remarkable that the honourable member himself has suddenly come to the conclusion that this Bill can be, in the course of five minutes, drafted, printed, considered, discussed and enacted into law for the purpose of serving certain sections, already enumerated, and that no other part of the country should be recognized at all. What is the history of this thing? The honourable member for Trinity knows full well himself that there is nothing new about this. He knows and all Opposition members know better than myself that this matter was talked about hundreds of times before and they know that the major portion of the men who are now engaged at development work in Grand Falls, Corner Brook, Deer Lake and Bell Island will not be there in a couple of years' time. Now it is very obvious for us to see the wisdom of the honourable Colonial Secretary's suggestion, namely, that a Select Committee be appointed to give care-

ful consideration to the whole matter, and I strongly support the suggestion. Further, it is apt and fitting to the Bill, apart entirely from what the honourable Colonial Secretary has said. Then again there is the form of representation of seats and how districts are parcelled out to be considered. These aspects would create an awkward situation in dealing with them and would require not alone to be discussed out of session, but would take some considerable thought and consideration in or out of session. However, that point is not of itself a reason for referring the Bill to a Select Committee; but the first point raised by the honourable Colonial Secretary is to my mind one that deserves the most serious consideration of this House, and that is the practice of allowing men to vote in St. John's for the other districts. This, as is well known to all of us, has not been without its abuses. The system is open to many objections which can be trashed out by the Select Committee.

Now the opening of Booths at the several places mentioned in this Bill for the eighteen electoral districts would entail an enormous expenditure. From the Deputy Returning Officer down to the smallest paid official of each Booth the sum of about \$100 has to be paid, apart from other expenses incidental thereto. Before we pass a Bill like this it should be given very careful consideration. I am frank enough to say and admit, that this Bill or the workings under it may be very much abused if it were in the hands of a corrupt Government. The Bill provides for certain places only, and the placing of Booths at the places mentioned in the Bill for the eighteen electoral districts would entail an enormous expenditure. Again take for instance places like Corner Brook and Deer Lake, as soon as construction work is over in those places there will not be a floating popula-

tion like Bell Island for instance. So therefore it would be unwise to make such definite provision in the Election Act, because in two years from now there may not be any people at Deer Lake, and if they are there they may be permanent residents, and if so they will have the privilege to vote in the district in which they reside. It is not the same kind of place as Bell Island, as at Bell Island there is always a floating population. We cannot tell what kind of conditions will be existing at Deer Lake two years hence. The Government in power during the Election may be empowered to provide for the holding of Booths at those places providing there is a floating population. Take Corner Brook for instance, two or three years hence the place we now know as Corner Brook where such construction work is going on will be a town, and you will not have much of a floating population. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that I am opposed to the Bill, or that I intend or would vote against it, but I agree with Mr. Bennett in his suggestion that it be referred to a select committee. To-day the Governor in Council can run booths wherever they like, for instance we had one quite recently at the Sanitorium, also the late Prime Minister, now the Leader of the Opposition had one opened at the Poor House during the recent General Election. I do not for one moment say that it was wrong to open booths in those places, nor do I say or even suggest that the people who authorized the opening of booths in those places were trying to capture votes. I do not agree to the suggestion that we have booths in places which disappear over night as it were, as is the case in places where large numbers of labourers congregate for the purpose of carrying out construction work. This is too large a matter to be taken up haphazardly as at pres-

ent; I therefore strongly suggest and support the idea of careful consideration by a select committee.

MR. GRIMES.—Mr. Speaker, in accepting the suggestion of the Minister of Justice that this matter is a sufficiently weighty one as to be referred to a select committee, I may say that there is to be a Bye-Election down in Bonavista Bay this Fall, and there will be quite a number of voters absent from the District, the majority of whom will be engaged at various labours at the principal places mentioned in this Bill, viz., Grand Falls, Deer Lake and Corner Brook, and I would suggest that some provision be made to provide a means for those voters to vote, and therefore avoid disenfranchising them as happened during the recent General Election.

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Speaker, this Bill to amend the Election Act brought in by Mr. Halfyard is no doubt a sincere move on the part of the proposer. Perhaps he had in mind the coming Bye-Election in Bonavista Bay. There are at present at least one thousand voters absent from the District, they were absent during the recent General Election and were, therefore, disfranchised, and it would also be unfair to them if the same thing happened during the Bye-Election which is to take place in the Fall. One thousand voters make a considerable difference in an Election. I do not know that this was in the mind of Mr. Halfyard when he brought in this Bill, but I do know that this matter is of sufficient importance to be given consideration.

I can see the point which the Minister of Justice makes, and I do not say that it is not a sound one, and as far as I am concerned I do not object to the Bill being referred to a select committee, providing the committee reports back to the House before the present session is over. If the select committee finds it impossible to do

that, then some provision should be made by the Government so as to avoid disfranchising a great number of people from Bonavista Bay, who are to be found working at Grand Falls, Corner Brook and vicinity.

In so far as Bell Island is concerned it is a place where men work near their homes, they usually work there during the week days and go home on Saturdays to spend Sunday. They always manage to get to and from their work to spend Sunday at home, but when an Election is on they cannot pay their expenses and some free conveyance has to be provided for them; it is therefore a temptation to the candidates of the District to which those men belong to provide some means of transportation or pay the expenses of a trip home for those voters. I would therefore suggest that booths be placed on Bell Island, and that those who leave the Island to vote should pay their expenses and pay their own means of transportation.

I represent a District and I agree with some of the things said by the Minister of Justice, and I also agree to the Bill being sent to a select committee, providing the suggestions which I have made are acted upon.

We on this side of the House are at the mercy of the Government; you have a big majority in the House and you can turn down anything we suggest, but I say right here and in all seriousness that anything in and to the interest of the country we will back up, and fight for to the utmost of our ability.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Speaker, speaking of this Bill again I may say that I had no particular motive, ulterior or otherwise, when I introduced this Bill into the House. I may say that the suggestion for this Bill came from several men who are working along the Humber area and Corner Brook. Numbers of people tele-

graphed me previous to the recent General Elections as to whether they would have the opportunity of voting, and they were asking for booths to be opened at those places. That was my only object in asking for and introducing this Bill; but if some arrangements can be made regarding those men so as they can cast their votes during Elections I am satisfied, and I would agree with the suggestion made by the Colonial Secretary and others that this Bill be referred to a select committee to report at this session.

On motion of Mr. Halfyard that the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Election Act, 1913," be read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the said Bill be referred to a select committee to report during the present session.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following to be the select committee: Hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Hickman, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Halfyard.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 21st, 1924.

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

HON. MR. SULLIVAN asked leave to present a petition from the residents of his district in regard to a breakwater.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Fortune Harbour asking that the roads be repaired and that the port of Fortune Harbour be made a permanent port of call for the Green Bay boat. I have been informed by the railway officials that the captain of the steamer plying on that route now has been instructed to call at Fortune Hr. both

going and coming whenever convenient. As Fortune Hr. does not mean any detour from the route taken by the steamer, I feel sure that it will be made a permanent port of call. I would also like to endorse the remarks made by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines a few days ago with regard to petitions. To my mind the idea that petitions are presented to the House of Assembly is, ipso facto, an important reason why they should receive the consideration which is due them. I would be very much in favour of seeing this house form a committee to consider the petitions presented from time to time. I also beg leave to present a petition from Twillingate District asking that the Canal at Herring Neck be deepened. This is badly needed as it is used by people not only at Herring Neck but also by people at Cobbs Arm, Twillingate and Change Islands. This means a considerable saving of time and possibly of life as the fishermen can avoid much rough water by not having to go around Herring Neck.

I also present a petition from the residents of Summerford asking for the amount of \$570 to clear and widen up the Shoal Tickle there. The canal was first made 12 years ago and has not been cleared up since. I would like to ask permission to present these petitions to the House with my hearty support and ask that they be referred to the departments to which they relate.

MR. CAHILL:—I beg to present a petition from 18 residents of Avondale for a special grant for a road to that settlement. There was a grant made in 1919 and no money has been spent on this road since. I would refer this petition to the department to which it belongs.

MR. HALFYARD:—As an act of courtesy on the part of the Minister of Fisheries I would ask permission

to have the privilege to present a petition from the residents of Clarenville and Shoal Harbour and adjacent places asking for the allocation of \$5,000 for the construction of a road between Clarenville and Shoal Hr. When the railway went through the main line road was used. The road runs between the hills and is too narrow for the track and a road. It will take a lot of money to widen the old road, or to make a new road in another location. It is impossible to get from Shoal Hr. to Clarenville with a horse and waggon or motor at present. I beg to support the prayer of the petition and ask it be forwarded to the Department of Public Works for consideration.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I beg to present a petition from Bonavista where the residents of Ladle Cove and Spiller's Cove wish to be changed from Trinity and made a part of Bonavista. I also wish to present a petition from Bonavista in reference to a channel there which has been clogged up lately. They ask for the sum of \$500 to clear it out.

MR. HALFYARD:—In reference to the petition presented by the member for Bonavista relative to the desire of the electors of Ladle Cove and Spiller's Cove to be attached to Bonavista District! I think there is sufficient cause for the prayer of the petition being given consideration. I don't suppose that these people regard the representative of Trinity District as not having done his best, but owing to the geography of the place, and also from the point of view of Church and business connection, these people should be included in the District of Bonavista. A great many of the residents of these places are only transient and only go there for the fishing season and go back again to Bonavista. For these reasons I would support the prayer of the petition.

MR. ASHBOURNE gave notice of question.

MR. GRIMES gave notice of question.

MR. DUFF gave notice of question.

MR. HALFYARD gave notice of question.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

MR WARREN asked Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the House a statement showing Revenue of the Colony for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1924.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—In replying to the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay I am surprised that such an old member of the House should ask such a question. He should know that it is impossible to have that statement yet.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that in view of the rapid decline of the Lobster Fishery will any steps be taken this year by this department to enquire into the cause, and devise means whereby, to protect this fishery from further decline.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The department is fully aware of the decline in the Lobster Fishery and in the near future steps will be taken and the best possible will be done in the interests of the country.

MR. CAHILL asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (a) The quantity of soft coal delivered to Public Institutions during the Fiscal year 1923-1924; by whom the coal was delivered; and a copy of the contract in each case, also copies of all tenders received for the supply of said coal; (b) The quantity of hard coal for the same period, by whom the coal was delivered, and a copy of the contract in each case, also copies of all tenders.

In reply the MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS tabled the documents asked for. Briefly they were as follows:—

1. (a) Quantity of North Sydney Coal delivered by Messrs. A. E. Hickman & Co., Ltd., 5,114 tons.

(b) Price per ton, \$14.00.

2. (a) Quantity of Anthracite Coal delivered by A. H. Murray and Co., Ltd., 1,336 tons.

(b) Price per ton \$23.90.

3. The following tendered for the supply of North Sydney coal with the price opposite:—

	Per Ton
A. Harvey & Co., Ltd.	\$14.42
Nfld. Coal and Trading Co.	14.00
A. H. Murray and Co., Ltd.	15.20
A. E. Hickman and Co.	14.00
W. H. Hynes	15.00
M. Morey and Co., Ltd.	13.58

Tender of A. E. Hickman, Co., Ltd. accepted.

The following tendered for the supply of Anthracite coal with the price opposite:—

	Per Ton
A. Harvey & Co., Ltd., (Welsh Anthracite) with recommendations that tenders be kept open for one month as prices were going down	\$21.50
A. H. Murray & Co., Ltd.	23.90
M. Morey & Co., Ltd.	23.00

Tender of A. H. Murray & Company Limited was accepted.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House, before proceeding with the estimates I may say that on April 26, the late Government by Minute of Council removed the duties on pork, beef, molasses, flour, kerosene and gasoline. The Government has decided, however, that Minute be now cancelled and on tomorrow these things will come in as usual with their old duties payable

on them. The Government regrets the necessity for this but there is nothing else left for them to do. This Minute was rescinded as it was illegal and there would have been a deficit this year due to over expenditure last year if this were not done.

THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend 14 Geo. V. Cap. 7. entitled "An Act for the Improvement of Shipbuilding."

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes "Of Payment of certain fees and charges by Stamps."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Game and Inland Fisheries Board."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. GRIMES:—I think, Mr. Chairman, that it would be much better if we had copies of the estimates so as to follow the proceedings. We cannot follow them as we are at present.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—They were given out yesterday. There were thirty-six printed so that there should be one for you. I think, however, that I can get you one.

MR. DUFF:—I have no copy either.

MR. HICKMAN:—I think that it might be well for members to have books and papers locked in their desks before leaving.

MR. HALFYARD:—Before going ahead, there seems to be something confusing there. It reads, there the Loan Act of 1923, \$5,000,000.00. There seems to be something wrong with that. I thought that the loan was for \$3,000,000.00.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—That is a misprint. That makes a total of \$60,000,000.00. The Loan Act of 1923 was for three millions at five per cent.

MR. SCAMMELL:—With regard to the vote for the Harbor Grace Court, perhaps the Minister of Justice can explain it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—This has already been reduced by a hundred dollars. The explanation of it is that it is the survival of an old vote and practically all goes into a drop balance. With regard to the Labrador, magistrates used to go down there, but arrangements have been made to have an enquiry into certain things. They can not go down there this year because there is no steamer.

MR. HALFYARD:—There is no vote for the local constable of Musgrave Harbor.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The reason there is no vote for the constable for Musgrave Harbor is, that the last man resigned, and as there was but little or nothing to be done, and no request was made for an appointment.

MR. WARREN:—During the tenure of office of the late Government this constable resigned his office or died, at all events he resigned his office, and the late Government did not propose to fill it again.

MR. HIBBS:—I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a mistake to cut that office out altogether. It is the first information of the fact that he had resigned that I have received. Mr.

Warren said that he had died, however he is not there now, and I think that it is necessary to have a man there.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I am quite prepared to take the matter up with the representative of the district. I have no objection whatever to having a man there if the member thinks it necessary.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—We can provide for it in supplemental supply.

MR. HICKMAN:—What is the opinion of the Minister of Justice on the matter of having outports served by local constables?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I think, that it would be wholly undesirable. You would have men belonging to some places trying to handle cases which would arise and there might be temptation to act too sympathetically. They would be all right, of course, in detail matters, but I think it would not be an advisable action.

MR. GRIMES—Might I ask the Minister of Justice while we are on the vote for the Labrador Boundary if this matter is likely to be finished this year?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—For the information of the House I may say that the colony's case is completed. At present we are awaiting for the Canadians to have their's completed for the exchange of cases. I do not know when this will take place. When Canada is ready I suppose. After that there will probably be counter cases arising out of the first cases. Therefore I think that it is impossible to have the case finished this year. Newfoundland's position is that she is advanced as far as possible.

MR. GRIMES—There was a vote

for librarian in 1923. It has been cut out. Could somebody explain that?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—It was found unnecessary and was cut out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I was informed by Dr. Burke that this vote of one thousand dollars for libraries was not required and it has therefore not been put in the estimates.

MR. GRIMES—I would like to ask while we are on the vote for the outport relieving officers what is being done about the small merchants in the various outports who have advanced supplies at the instance of the relieving officers and are still unpaid? I do not know what is being done but you cannot expect these men who have distributed relief to have to wait for five or six months to be paid. As everybody knows it is difficult enough to do business at the best of times without having to wait four or five months.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—There is no money. There is a large sum to be paid to these merchants, but we were awaiting legislative sanction for the payment of these accounts. We cannot pay the money because we have not got it. We have no authority to pay the money and we have no money to pay. It was necessary to obtain a temporary loan from the Bank of Montreal to meet pressing needs of the various districts. Just as soon as possible that money will be paid.

MR. SCAMMELL—Do I gather from the Colonial Secretary that there is quite a lot of money due these outport business people?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Quite a lot, yes.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, that is where the Minute of Council comes in. Supposing for example, that an

extreme occasion should arise would it be necessary to hold it over for four or five months for the House to open to relieve the situation and keep the people affected waiting all that time? Twenty or thirty thousand dollars is not a big enough question to be held over like that for four or five months. If the merchants should give the supply it is not right that he should be made to wait. It is not easy to conduct business along these lines today.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—I agree with the honourable member and I am in sympathy with him but this is not our fault. Our predecessors should have paid these bills. I know that these should have been paid more promptly before we came into office. Since the House was opening at such an early date it was not considered necessary to act until the supply for this had been passed in the regular way by the House.

MR. GRIMES—When this vote passes, then I presume that these bills will be paid.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Yes these bills will be paid.

MR. HALFYARD—But this vote is for regular expenditure and the position with regard to these amounts will be the same as it was two weeks ago.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what N. F. T. means and what that vote of \$500 is for under the vote for Charitable Institutions?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I am just as wise now as I was yesterday. Although I have made enquiries about it I cannot find out what it means.

MR. WARREN:—I had an idea that it was for training nurses in the Maternity Home.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—That is the explanation of it. There

is supposed to be \$3,000 given to the Maternity Home for the training of nurses. There is \$500 under N. F. Training and \$2,500 under Salvation Army Maternity Hospital.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Chairman, I notice that there is no grant in the Estimates for the Notre Dame Bay Memorial Hospital. This Hospital is situated in Twillingate and it is a climax of ten years' untiring effort. About four years ago the people of Twillingate sent representatives here to interview the Government and it was the intention of the Government at the time to give financial support annually to the Hospital as soon as it was opened and ready for occupancy. In fact I think they promised a grant of \$10,000 per year. About \$50,000 altogether was collected for this institution by the committee in charge of it, \$20,000 of which was collected from the neighbourhood of Twillingate alone. The population of Twillingate is about 4,000 people and Twillingate District 26,000 people. In addition to that Fogo District has a population of 11,000. We feel that this Hospital, as it is situated between Twillingate and Fogo and also midway between St. Anthony and St. John's, will help considerably in taking off the shoulders of the St. John's Hospital quite a few patients. The idea of the Twillingate Hospital will be chiefly one for surgery cases, but it will also act as an educational centre, and I believe that it is the intention of the Directors to have Community Nursing done there too. I think, perhaps, that it was an oversight that a grant for this Hospital was not included in the Estimates and I would like to see that this vote for \$10,000 for the N. D. Bay Hospital be put in. I feel sure that the Government will give the matter favourable consideration and have this vote included in Supplementary Estimates.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY

—I have no doubt but that there is some correspondence in the Colonial Secretary's Department on the subject matter referred to by the honourable member for Twillingate. If I remember rightly, I think that the grant had to be supplemented by a proportionate amount of that already subscribed for the Hospital. I think that the same thing applied to the Harbour Grace Hospital. Some money was put up by the Government and some by the district. However, I will find out for the honourable member what correspondence there is on the matter in my department and shall endeavour to have it tabled on to-morrow.

Mr. Hibbs:—I would like to endorse what the honourable member for Twillingate has said in connection with that Hospital and I think it would be wise for the Government to do the best they possibly can in that direction. The people have made a very laudable effort in the District of Twillingate and in the District of Fogo as well to try and get that Hospital. There is not an honourable member of this House but who knows of the discomfort and inconvenience caused outport patients who come to St. John's to enter the General Hospital. Very often they have to wait a considerable while before they can gain admission to that institution and have to contend with much hardship lying around in boarding houses. Consequently I think that if the Twillingate Hospital was finished and properly equipped, it would accommodate the needs of Twillingate and Fogo Districts so far as patients for Hospital treatment is concerned.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Chairman, I may say that it is the intention of the Government to take the matter up in Supplementary Supply.

MR. HICKMAN:—I understand that

Mr. Weir started an Institute for the Blind here some time ago. I would like to know if that is still in existence, and if so, is there a Government grant for it?

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, about two years ago Mr. Weir received a grant from the Government of \$25,000 to equip and put in order that building known as "Waterford Hall" as an Institute for the Blind. Mr. Weir left here some twelve months ago to go to the United States and Canada to try and raise some money, and he has not since returned. In the meantime the matter is in the hands of a Citizens' Committee and Mr. Gosling and some other gentlemen are managing the thing. Lately Mr. Gosling has been in communication with Mr. Weir and I think certain developments are likely to take place shortly, but I do not know what the nature of them are likely to be.

MR. HICKMAN:—Do I understand that the annual subscription raised for this undertaking will offset the grant of the House?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I might say that the grant will be in addition to the subscriptions.

MR. GRIMES:—Mr. Chairman: In reference to the Twillingate Hospital it might be stated that the Government are not in a position to vote a grant for this purpose on the grounds that they cannot afford to do so. As a result of enquiries I have made, I find that patients for the General Hospital invariably have to remain here for as long as a month before they can get into the Hospital. Their board costs \$1 per day plus their fares to and fro, so that by the time the Government is called upon to pay money that way on some hundreds of people of poor circumstances it amounts to a considerable sum at the end of the year. Therefore, I think

that the large sum paid on board, lodgings and fares care be applied to the Twillingate Hospital and save much inconvenience as well.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Mr. Chairman: I think the point is well taken by the last speaker and I think that the whole Hospital life of this country will have to be thoroughly investigated. We are to-day "straining at a knat and swallowing a camel." The General Hospital to-day is absolutely inadequate for the demands that are made on it, and demands are made on it that are not bonia fide demands. People are sent here from the outports with trivial ailments that should never be sent here. They are forced on the official in charge here and put in boarding houses until such time as their cases are diagnosed. The Government has been considering if it would not be a better way—instead of Mr. Bartlett, a very good and excellent official that he is, looking after patients—to have a medical board or a doctor meet patients immediately on their arrival and diagnose their cases, because in that way a great deal of money would be saved, if their ailments were of a trivial character, they could be sent back home without delay. The principle of the outport Hospital is a very good and a very sound one, and although the additional expenditure of a grant may appear at first blush to be large, I am of the strong conviction that eventually it will mean the opening of an Hospital at Hr. Grace, the centre of Conception Bay, where people can be treated at less expense and at less inconvenience than having them brought on to St. John's. People of Conception Bay generally have to make a detour by train all round the Bay to get to St. John's, whereas with the Hospital in Hr. Grace cases can be handled more efficiently and economically. The same can be said of

patients of Green Bay. I think, Mr. Chairman that the principle is a very sound one and deserves the most serious consideration of the Government and I understand that the matter will be taken up in the course of a few days by the Executive Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman. I would like to say in reply to Mr. Grimes, the honourable member for Twillingate, that the Medical Association, at their Convention, here the other day, appointed a deputation to confer with the Government with reference to the number of people who are sent here from different outports and are compelled to lie up for any length of time, and, I might point out, that we hope to make improvements in that direction.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman. Some time ago I asked the Prime Minister if it was the intention of the Government to continue the bounty on shipbuilding, and his answer was in the affirmative, but I notice in the Estimates a substantial reduction. May I ask for an explanation?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The explanation is that there is not so many ships being built now, and there is a drop balance from last year.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman. I notice that the Marine grant is \$15,000. That amount I understand is to be divided up among eighteen districts per capita. The needs of the various districts amounts to ten times that sum but any how a half loaf is better than no bread. I interviewed the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago relative to the spending of the \$1300 allocated for the district of Trinity, and asked him upon whose recommendation that money would be spent. He very courteously

replied that he was going to supervise the spending of all monies coming under his department and he said that he was going to make himself acquainted with the spending of monies in every possible way. This is a very commendable idea on his part. He also informed me that if I had any request to make on behalf of Trinity district that he would be only too pleased to give it consideration, but there appeared to be a hesitancy on his part as to whether recommendations of members of the Opposition for the allocation of moneys to be spent would be strictly adhered to. So far as I am concerned, I would be only too glad to forward to the Minister any requests from Trinity district, but I would also like for him to consider that I am supposed to have knowledge of that district, as much or more than, perhaps, men who contested that district for the first time in their lives. The question was brought up in the House last year by the then members of the Opposition and who are in this House now, as to what was the intention of the Government of that day with reference to the allocation of monies for the various districts, and the question was asked would the elected representatives have charge of the spending of the moneys. I contend that the elected representatives should have the right to control the spending of all monies allocated and voted in this House for their respective districts. That was a right granted to us when in Opposition by the Morris Government and I am a supporter of that principle. I know that some members who are now sitting on Government benches and who were sitting in the Opposition for the past few years will agree with me when I say, that when they had occasion to see me with regard to the spending of moneys for their districts that I told them to go and do as they liked so far as I was concerned because they were respon-

sible to their constituents, and, therefore, as representatives, I think they would do the best possible with the bit of money voted for their districts. I have always believed, although they may make mistakes, that they are the proper people to administer the affairs of their districts and should not be interfered with by would be members of this House. It is only by accident we are here anyhow, but we are here, and we have to assume the responsibility for our actions. The policy of this Government was "clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all," and I feel quite sure that the Prime Minister will see that a square deal is given to Opposition members of this House and their constituents, who, unfortunately, perhaps, for themselves, put some of us in this House in Opposition. I may say that so far as Trinity district is concerned the people there are quite satisfied with the result as to the personel of their representatives, and I have no fault to find with the people in other districts throughout the Island who voted for our opponents. Now I do not want to quote statements that were made by members of the House last year, but I feel sure that the senior members of the Government will grant the members of the present Opposition the right to allocate the moneys that are voted for their districts. With regard to dismissals and the appointments of new officials, well that is up to the Government to explain. The Government can do as they like. That is their own business. Some things the Government may do may be in the best interests of the country, but that is only a negligible quantity or consideration. When you make new appointments for the sake of political expediency you are no better and evidently a lot worse than the Governments that have gone before you.

Questions have been asked by the junior members of the Government

this session. I am inclined to think that the tail is wagging the dog. These questions have been asked for political reasons. Nothing is to be gained by it. Questions have been asked about contracts for coal. I fail to see what good can be gained by asking such questions, when the member no doubt is in possession of the information. We do not want to have resurrected coal contracts for Government institutions for the last seven or eight years. Perhaps, I may be regarded as presumptuous and you may not want any advice, but, at the same time, some of us may not be quite as green as you may imagine because we have learned a little from experience and I would suggest to the Prime Minister and to the senior members of the Government that they insist that they be done the courtesy of seeing these questions before they are put on the Order Paper and thus avoid unnecessary friction and trouble, because we do not want to be here any length of time. If it is to improve matters by asking questions, all right. The Opposition must ask questions for the purpose of getting information that they otherwise cannot get. Anything I had to do with coal I am perfectly satisfied to bear the responsibility.

I notice that the Estimate are practically the same as prepared by the outgoing Government with some slight alterations here and there; but on this question of the rights of elected representatives of the different districts to send out grants we trust that the Government will see that the right thing is done. Most of the people in Opposition districts think that we have the same right to send out moneys as Government members have. Of course they do not know whether Government or Opposition shall have the right to make suggestions and recommendations then it is up to the Ministers of Marine and Fisheries and Public Works, respectively, to endorse such

requests the same being in proper order. I would really like for the Prime Minister to state, if he is in a position to do so, what is the intention of the Government in this respect?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES.

MR. CHAIRMAN:—The honourable member for Trinity said that he came to me the other day and that he got my decision with regard to Opposition candidates getting grants to spend for the different districts. I might say that I was in Opposition for the past four years and never got a cent to spend in my district. I was a member of the Government of Sir Edward (now Lord) Morris when Opposition members were allowed the handling of district grants on the terms that everybody got a square deal. Now so far as the money voted for the Northern districts for the past four years is concerned, I would like to say that none other than F.P.U. people got it.

MR. HALFYARD:—Do you include Trinity district?

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I am speaking particularly of Bonavista, the district that I have the honour to represent, and I will make the statement now that nine out of every ten dollars that was granted for that district was received through the hands of the Union. Any other man could not get a solitary dollar, even if it was to keep him from starving. Last Fall the sum of \$1200, Poor Relief money, was sent to Wesleyville, my own home town, to help out starving families and just because the majority of those men who comprised the Road Board happened to be Opposition supporters at that time a Commission was appointed to handle the grant and every man who was put on that Commission was a Union man, with the result that non-Union men's families got nothing. I know of a case in which one man whose family was

staving and who went to a common sense Union man and appealed to him for help. He was given forty barrels of gravel with which to do public work, but the very next day it was taken from him again. Do you think, Mr. Chairman, that men of that type are fit to be allowed the distribution of public monies. From the records of my department I know that bulls were sent out under grants for Marine works. I was asked the other day by the Auditor General about those bulls.. I could give him an answer alright, but I did not want to. I have another instance in my office in which \$100 was sent out for the purpose of making a collar for a tickle at Musgrave Harbor. I found since that this was for 100 fathoms of chain that was never put out. Now I know that the member for Trinity is asking for what is right for his district. There is \$15000 to go out this year and as far as I am concerned I have an official who will go from my department and examine every public work necessary to be done. He will make his recommendations to the Road Board and see that all work is carried out satisfactorily. I have no objections to the honourable member for Trinity making recommendations. If he makes a recommendation that is good, and if the people are in need, and if there is money to the credit of his district, I shall be only too pleased to see that the grant will be sent out. That is why I say that people of the Northern districts are getting a square deal to-day what they did not get during the past four years. I am not placing the blame on the members but on the people to whom the money grants used to be sent to.

So Mr. Chairman that is my reason for not allowing any one to come down to my Department, and order me or authorize me to send out one hundred, or one thousand dollars without I know where the money is going

and also if there is a need for it. There are requests for grants coming in to-day and how am I to know that it is being spent in the proper way? Orders are coming in for lumber at \$50.00 and \$60.00 per thousand feet, but I am not going to allow any of those orders to be paid until I have satisfied myself that the order was proper, and that it had been spent or used in the way that it should have been. So long as I am the custodian of the money in my department, not one cent will be paid out, without there being an actual need for same, and also that vouchers will be produced for every dollar spent.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries expound such principles. I wonder will he practice them? I agree with him to some extent, but I want to remind him that the practices that he complains of do not apply entirely to the Opposition. The Government members are the greater sinners in this respect. He speaks of the purchase of a bull by the Marine & Fisheries Department, I do not know of any case where that department made any such purchase, but I do know of a case where a bull was sent down to Fogo District. Mr. Corbett Rendell of Barr'd Island, was the keeper. It was a fine specimen, but he was only allowed \$75.00 per year for his expenses, which did not at all reimburse him for his trouble nor was it sufficient to maintain the animal. We could not get the money from the Department of Agriculture & Mines, so I asked the Department of Marine & Fisheries to transfer \$140.00 from storm damage account to the Department of Agriculture & Mines, so that Mr. Rendell's bill could be squared. Now, if the Agriculture Board would do their duty it would pay back that \$140.00 to the Department of Marine & Fisheries and thus square the account.

Now, with regard to that chain the

Minister of Marine & Fisheries speaks of, I happen to know the facts about that, although I did not send it down. I think it is very unfair for the Minister of Marine & Fisheries to refer to it as he has.

The trouble was that the chain was not long enough to reach across the Tickle of Musgrave Hr. where it was sent for the purpose of mooring craft. As the Hon. Members are aware, Musgrave Hr. is not a very safe place for a schooner, and by putting this chain across the Tickle, it would afford a means for vessels to moor while loading or discharging. It is now a matter of getting a few dollars to extend the mooring chain and complete the job.

With reference to the vote for the Block House, I notice that the grant this year is \$70.00 less than last year, and I would like to know how this saving can be effected. I would ask Hon. gentlemen to go up and have a look at this historic tower and see its conditions. There is something wrong up there, for it is certainly no credit to the city or to the country. A great number of tourists or strangers visit the place in Summer, as it has a certain historical interest, but the place is in such a wretched condition that it is an eyesore to all who visit it, whether they are tourists or local people. I do not blame the keeper, for I think he is deserving of a little more salary than he is getting at present, and would ask the Minister of Public Works to give this matter his attention.

Just one more word to the Minister of Marine & Fisheries. I am going to serve notice on him now that I intend to approach him to-morrow with regard to certain matters in the interest of Fogo District. The slips for the Offer Wadhams for instance, those are badly needed there, and they would be of very great benefit to the people, not only of Fogo district, but of Bonavista as well, and I am going to ask

him not only to be courteous, but to co-operate with me in attending to a few very urgent matters which I have already brought to his notice.

I would like to endorse what the Honourable Member for Twillingate has said in connection with assistance for the hospital at Twillingate town, and I think it would be wise for the Government to do the best they possibly can in that direction. The people have made a very laudable effort in the district of Twillingate and in the district of Fogo as well to build and get that Hospital equipped. There is not an honourable member of this House but knows of the discomfort and inconvenience caused outport patients who come to St. John's to enter the General Hospital. Very often have to wait a considerable while before they can gain admission to that institution and have to contend with much hardship lying around in boarding houses. In view of this, I think that, if that Twillingate Hospital was finished and properly equipped it would accommodate the needs of Twillingate, Fogo and other northern districts, relieve congestion here to a great extent, and would prove an inestimable boon to the people of the North.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Chairman, I may say that it is the intention of the Government to take the matter up in Supplementary Supply.

MR. HIBBS:—Thank you.

MR. CAHILL:—Mr. Chairman, I would here like to respectfully decline to accept Mr. Halfyard as my instructor on etiquette in this House. I have appreciated very much in a general way the tone of the speeches of the Members of the Opposition, but there is one thing that I would like to say, and that is, that they forget that things are not always done in the same way. They seem to want us to start an entirely new book. I do not propose to

take either orders or advice from the Member for Trinity. It is the privilege of the Members of the House to ask questions of the Ministers of the Crown in a formal way, and thereby bring out necessary information. Mr. Halfyard was probably serving in a far different administration during his term of office, from that which is in office to-day. I do not doubt but that Mr. Halfyard laboured under the crack of the whip very often, but things on the Government side of the House to-day are very different from those with which Mr. Halfyard was acquainted. I would like to say that times are changing, and that junior Members have their rights, as well as the senior ones. Whilst I have every respect for the Prime Minister, and the last thought in my mind would be to offer the slightest suggestion of discourtesy to him, whilst I, in common with all members on the Government side of the House, have every confidence in him, whilst we have every confidence in the Executive Government, yet the ordinary members retain perfect freedom of speech and action and are absolutely independent. Mr. Halfyard said that he was not ashamed of his part in the coal contract of last year, but if not he certainly should be ashamed of what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has just exposed. I intend to exercise my prerogatives as a Member of this House when I feel like it without reference to the Member for Trinity. I am pleased at the way the Opposition are treating the business of the House, and I hope that moderation and harmony will prevail.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, with respect to the speech of the hon. member for Hr. Main, Mr. Cahill, he said that I should be ashamed of the statements made by the hon. member for Bonavista, but I do not know of anything that I should be ashamed of. There is nothing so far as I know that

I did while in office that I am ashamed of.

MR. CAHILL:—I referred to the facts mentioned by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he said that grants for the district of Bonavista went through the hands of and were handled by F.P.U. men.

MR. HALFYARD:—I am not ashamed of anything that has been done, and it does not behove any members of this House junior or otherwise to speak of my connection with the F.P.U.; my connection was entirely an honourable one. Does it follow that because they were members of the F.P.U. they should not have anything to do with public affairs?

I beg to say Mr. Chairman that a great number of the members of this House do not know, nor have they any idea of the workings of the F. P. U., otherwise they would not speak as they do. The F. P. U. has done as much good for this country, as any other organization. I would here like to refer to the speech of the hon. member, Mr. Cahill, when he said "that the party whip had been cracked over us and that we were as blind slaves, and that they were not going to be led or driven by it." Now I can only say that that must be the backwash of speeches made by the hon. member during the recent elections in the District of Hr. Main. We on this side of the House who have been connected with the Union have been just as independent as some of the members on the other side of this House will be in the workings and procedure of their party.

MR. HICKMAN:—I beg to ask Mr. Chairman if the packers pay for the lobster labels printed by the Government?

THE HON. MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES:—Yes they do.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, while on this vote I would like to take advantage to speak a few words con-

cerning the Agriculture & Mines Department. There are certain licenses to fishermen to operate saw mills within the three mile limit, and the cut is limited to 10,000 feet. There is a royalty payable on the cut of lumber and shingles sawn, but this royalty in a great number of cases has not been paid and the amounts are still owed the Agriculture & Mines Department, and at the present time owing to the decrease in lumber the small mill owners find it impossible to pay the royalty and run their mills without going into debt and they may have to close down their mills within the next few months. I hope that the Government will give this matter their earliest consideration.

MR. HIBBS:—Might I ask with regard to that twelve hundred dollars, if it is the intention of the Government to employ a permanent carpenter at the Fever Hospital?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—No. I do not think. That will likely be a drop balance. It was put in, I think by the late Government, and we allowed it to stay in.

MR. HIBBS:—I am glad to see that the Government is launching upon an extensive road policy. That is not the point, however, that I rose to speak upon. I notice here, that there is a vote of ten thousand dollars, which is called Motor Association Grant. Of course, that is an error, because there is no such thing as a Motor Association Grant; it merely means the Road Commission Grant. Also, I was going to call the attention of the Government to the fact that in 1921, in connection with the Act for the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads, there was some discussion as to whether a vote of eight thousand dollars should be granted. Some members of the Opposition then, who are at present in the Government, asked to have that cut, but it was finally kept in. Some

gentlemen, I am not sure whether the present Minister of Finance and Customs, and the Colonial Secretary were not amongst them, said—alright, they were quite satisfied to let it go, provided the sum was spent in St. John's East and West. That was not the intention in granting this sum to the Road Commission, but rather that it should be spent as needed wherever the Road Commission was operating. I mean, the Act of 1920 does not specify that the money should be spent in St. John's East and West; but when the question of the Motor taxes came up, there was some discussion as to whether that amount should be dropped or not, and then some members of the Opposition agreed to let it go, if it were spent in St. John's East and West; and I think it was only under stress that that was put in.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—May I ask if you have any recollection of that money being spent in St. John's East and West?

MR. HIBBS:—No. But I think that when it was spent by the Road Commission it was spent where it was intended to be spent. It was not intended that that money should be spent in St. John's East and West, but you held us up, and I thought half a loaf was better than no bread, so I accepted that. I think your sense of fair play will show you that it would hardly be fair to confine it to St. John's East and West, but it should be spent all around Conception Bay.

MR. GRIMES:—I should like to ask the Prime Minister, who represents Bonavista District, if there has been any change of Ferryman at Salvage Arm?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I do not remember if there has been.

MR. GRIMES:—I would like to ask Mr. Russell, as Minister of Public Works if there has been any such change?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—To use a common expression—I do not recollect.

MR. HIBBS:—I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that there is a vote of \$125.00 for Ragged Harbor, at page 89. The ferryman there is not able at present to do the work for that sum—he could hardly do it for two hundred dollars, because he has to devote all his time to that work, and is not able to do any fishing—any other work at all. He must be right there on the spot all the time, in case any person comes along. I would suggest that the vote be increased to two hundred dollars. I would ask the Prime Minister to be good enough to give the matter his attention.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I would like to say that this matter has already struck me, and these votes to ferrymen seemed to me in some cases to be ridiculous. I may say that when I was in Bonavista Bay with my colleagues, Mr. Winsor and Mr. Little, I was very much struck with a little Ferry at Braggs Island, where the ferryman is paid thirty dollars a year. This man was sitting at the end of a small ferry, a man who had apparently been crippled from youth. His house looked more like a dogs kennel than that of a dwelling house. The man was unable to walk, and was climbing down on his hands to get to the boat and ferry the people across. I said that I would endeavour to get him a better place than that, and I think it is a disgrace to be paying thirty dollars a year for any kind of work. I think that the \$125.00 is equally ridiculous. These matters shall certainly be looked into, and given attention.

MR. HALFYARD:—With regard to the District around Snook's Harbor, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works who is as well acquainted with the particulars as I am to accord

me the courtesy of having a chat with him.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I may tell Mr. Halfyard that the latch string is always out.

MR. HICKMAN:—I would appreciate it very much, if you would give me a better opportunity of studying the estimates before proceeding further. I have no object of delaying the House, but quite a number of the members are not present, and I would like them to have the opportunity of attending.

In view of the statement made by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs, that the duty taken off certain goods are now put on again. There were duties paid on certain goods upon the understanding that those duties would be refunded, but they were never refunded. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Finance if it is the intention of the Government to refund these duties?

HON. MINISTER OF Finance:—It is not the intention of the Government to refund, as the thing was entirely illegal, and as there will be several people to-morrow who will have to pay duty on these articles, they would be at a disadvantage in competing with those people who had got them in free.

MR. HALFYARD:—When does this take effect?

MON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Immediately, because the Minute of Council was illegal.

MR. HIBBS:—I would like to be provided with a copy of the estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I am sorry that you should be without one, but I will try to get another copy for you, and I hope, if you get another one, you will hold on to it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again.

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

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

FLOUR MILL BILL.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—
“In moving the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions to confirm an Agreement entered into between the Government and the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited, I desire to state that the Agreement which these Resolutions are intended to confirm is to a large measure the same as the Warren Government had decided to adopt if they had remained in office. It differs to the former Agreement in only a few respects, and these I would like to point out to those members in the Opposition who gave consideration to the present document.

The changes give greater safeguards to the interests of the Colony. Under the former agreement coal was allowed in duty free, under this agreement the Company must pay the duty on coal as well as other manufacturers.

I would like to say that the promoter of this industrial enterprise is Mr. R. H. Palmer, a Newfoundlander born in Trinity Bay. He has made a complete

study of the Flour Milling industry, and being anxious to do something for his native land has interested Capitalists abroad to invest in a commercial enterprise which if successful must be of great benefit to the Country. He has placed his proposals before the Board of Trade in St. John's, and I understand they have met the approval of the majority of that body.

The proposition is to build a fire proof milling plant of reinforced concrete throughout for 2,000 barrels capacity, divided into two units each of 1,000 barrels capacity per 24 hours, together with the necessary boiler house, warehouse and reinforced concrete grain elevator of 500,000 bushels capacity equipped with marine leg capable of handling 12,500 bushels per hour. The mill building will be eight stories high with an addition of one end three stories high for locker rooms, tool rooms and a motor room and on the other end an addition two stories high, one story of which is devoted to warehouse and one story to offices. On each end of the mill building there is to be reinforced a concrete stair tower, so that there will be no openings or communication between the various floors. This is for fire protection. In one stair tower it is proposed to put a push button electric elevator. Adjoining the mill proper, which will commence on the third floor, will be a grain cleaning house, which will be divided from the mill by a fire wall. The packing and warehouse will be devoted to the two lower floors. The whole of this plant will be equipped with the latest and most modern machinery, fully equal to that in any mill in Canada or the United States.

It is intended to install initially one unit of 1,000 barrels capacity per 24 hours. The additional unit will be installed as soon as domestic and foreign markets warrant same.

While the agreement leaves it open to its promoters to establish the plant anywhere in Newfoundland, I am authorized to say that if it is approved, it has definitely been decided to erect the mill in St. John's although the actual location has not yet been determined.

The benefits to accrue to Newfoundland as a result of the establishment of this Mill appear to me to be as follows:

1. The savings in trade balance. If the annual importations of flour amount to a value of two to three million dollars in cost, freight and insurance paid to outsiders, a very large percentage of this expenditure would be saved to the country in labour and material for packages obtainable in the country.

2. The bye products of the mill should necessarily provide the country with cheaper feeds thus affecting the cost of diary requirements, meats, butter, eggs and other products and giving an impetus to farming enterprise generally.

3. With the operation of the milling company's elevator in St. John's it will be possible for importers of oats to bring in same in bulk and have them unloaded and sacked in this elevator and thus afford a considerable reduction in the cost of a commodity of very great importance to this country.

4. About two and a half million feet of log measurement lumber will be used in the manufacture of packages for a stave mill to be erected adjacent to a supply of timber, and this must necessarily give considerable employment and prove of a considerable benefit to the lumbering interests of the Colony.

5. The establishment of a flour mill would ensure that under fair and legitimate competition with outside interests, the people will not be charged undue prices for the essentials of life.

6. The plant completed will cost about \$650,000.00 and \$15,000.00 only is to be spent in machinery, the balance will be expended in labour and material, a considerable portion of which would be obtained locally, a great boon to this country under present conditions.

7. At least 100 to 150 men would be employed in the operation of the plant when completed, to say nothing of the hundreds who will receive indirect benefit therefrom in the cutting of cooperage lumber and the transport of same to headquarters.

"I commend the Agreement to the approval of the House."

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—As this is the first time we have seen the bill we would like to look is over. I would also ask if any stipulation has been made as to the location of the mill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—No stipulation has been made.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I think that Harbor Grace would be a suitable place but felt sure that the location was to be St. John's.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—As a matter of fact I would have no objection to seeing it in Bonavista Bay but I think from Mr. Palmer that St. John's has been practically decided on as the site.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Chairman, in rising to

move the second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery," I would like to point out that owing to an error of some official only typewritten copies are available for distribution.

You will notice from Paragraph 3 that the appointment and powers of the King's Printer are defined. In moving the second reading I think the House will agree that this step is in no way designed to place those previously interested in the publication of the Official Gazette in a disadvantageous position. The object of this Bill is to see that the large amounts expended formerly in this direction are brought under control and properly accounted for. There has been much discussion as to public printing and expenditure under that head. I do not know the details but I do know where debts for the publication of debates, etc. were paid for in full by the House and the work never completed. To-day the name King's Printer is a misnomer as we have no such official. We have the Trades Printers & Publishers who have acquired the rights from a family who printed the Royal Gazette for a century or more and I say now in justice to Mr. Thistle and those who are engaged in the printing that the work was never done more satisfactorily. I say this in justice to them because since I have been Colonial Secretary—and our department comes in close touch with them—we have had every satisfaction. The official to be appointed now will be under the control of the Colonial Secretary and his duty will be to give good value for the money spent. All printing will be put out to tender as far as practicable and it is not the intention of the government to make it a matter between one class of printers and another if the present parties are prepared to continue at the right

price I say "continue" as heretofore. Another matter is that special publications, such as the Hansard, Census, Journal, etc., which the Government have to print, will be put out to tender and the printing of same awarded to the one whose tender is lowest and most acceptable.

The printing of the debates of the House will also be attended to in like manner. We admit that we took a wrong step in attempting to introduce a system of giving a digest of the discussions here and we will be glad to go back to the old system. The printing bill last year was over \$100,000 and when I give the lists of these accounts you will all see that there will be great economy by the consolidation of orders. The practice has been for various departments to give different printers orders for work and they have had to accept the bill sent in without any previous arrangement or consideration of the price or quality of the job. Instead of this printers will now have to come to the proper official who will compile all work of the one kind into one order, thereby insuring the lowest possible price because of nothing else but the largeness of the order and the competition in tendering for the work in this way.

That is a well known experience with business men. The larger the order the cheaper. That suggestion should recommend itself to the favourable consideration of this House. If all requirements are bought in one large order and tenders asked we will save ten thousand dollars in the course of a year. The same thing could be done with regard to the stationery. To-day the system that is adopted is that each department make out a list of the stationery required. They send across to England or to Canada or the States and get their stationery or purchase locally. Since the order is comparatively small therefore they pay a high price on

all occasions. In this Bill we contemplate bringing together all requirements in one large order. Orders will be tendered for and samples submitted and thereby we will make a very large saving in this direction. I will now read the statement, that I informed the House some time ago I was having made, with regards to the amounts spent for printing during the past year 1923-1924. The total amount spent for printing and stationery is \$135,000.00.

The Auditor General referred to this matter and he says our yearly bill for printing and stationery is altogether too great. \$100,000 spent in printing and advertisements is meaningless extravagance. With regard to question of advertising, under the authority of the Government, I have issued orders to all departments that advertising is to cease, except that required under statutes. No more advertising in a spasmodic manner. Foreign advertising is particularly to go. We pay quite a sum annually on this account. Some advertising has been running for fifty years, and not a single person has visited the country on account of these advertisements. Make a clean sweep if the interest of the colony demands it then again take the matter up and re-consider it if necessary. I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House will appreciate the effort of the Government. In making this appointment we are not, as has been generally reported, creating a new department. We are merely creating an official.

His qualifications must be such that he will have a thorough knowledge of the printing business. He must be a man of business attainment; he must be capable and in a position to advise the Minister as to what tender should receive consideration. It can be done with very little cost. I hope the bill will be printed in due form and in presenting it I ask that it be

read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole house to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. The Colonial Secretary the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the department of Public Printing and Stationary" was read for a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—In the absence of the Min. of Agriculture and Mines who, I understand, is ill, I wish to present a certain report from his department.

MR. WARREN:—I beg to ask that the Government lay on the table of the House a statement showing all payments of loans which have been made this year and by whom made.

MR. HICKMAN:—Some of the Opposition are not quite clear as to the publication of debates. I have before me a verbatim report but we would also like to see the digest. As far as publishing the Hansard goes that is a record. There are two papers that have a large circulation that are supporting the Government. They print speeches by both sides. The speeches of those on this side are not properly reported. Many things are put in that should be left out and many things are left out that should be put in. We should be given the privilege of seeing the digest or some agreement made for the digest. We have made some complaints about this before, and reported in the Government papers as saying that if the financial condition of the country did not improve we were likely to be in confederation with the United States. I did not say any such thing. I think that we should see the digest before publication.

MR. HIGGINS:—Nothing in the official digest is for the city papers. It is a matter for the papers them-

selves. Particular interest is attached to a particular speech. An official digest is made for the weekly papers. The hansard will be prepared in the usual way. This is not referred to. What appears in the News and Telegram is their own report for which they are not paid.

MR. HICKMAN:—I understood at the beginning that the papers supporting the Government were paid so much.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That has now ceased.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I give notice that I will on Thursday move the House into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I give notice that I will on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill regarding the Rules and Regulations of the Boy Scouts similar to those in other countries.

It was ordered that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 22nd, 1924.

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

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Harry's Harbour for the erection of a Post Office and for a clerk for it. Also that money be allocated to dig a well at Herring Neck. I also beg to present a petition from the people of St. Patrick's, asking for the sum of one thousand dollars to be expended in extending the public wharf to allow mail steamers and other vessels to call there.

Mr. Kenneth Brown gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a Bill respecting the Shipbuilding Act was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, a Bill to amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, "Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, a Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Game and Inland Fisheries Board," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, a "Bill respectnig the Boy Scouts" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time, as follows:—

Premium & Management..	\$125,000.00
Civil Government	50,129.70
Pensions	76,717.22
Legislation	64,658.12
Dept. of Col. Secretary..	67,179.00
Dept. of Justice	341,479.16
Dept. of Education	23,880.00
Dept of Public Charities	376,861.71
Dept. of Mar. & Fisheries	333,589.39
Dept. of Agricul. & Mines	66,690.00
Dept. of Public Works ..	938,098.57

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and sec-

onded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. SCAMMELL—Asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the Dredge Priestman is now in Commission and if so where she is operating at present; also to give a statement showing when she was first commissioned this season, what work has been performed by her and what is the number of her crew at present.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman on the other side I may say that the dredge Priestman is now in commission at Bell Island at \$120 per day. She was commissioned previous to my coming into office. She was hired at the rate of eighty dollars per day previous to my coming here. I considered that this was insufficient and when the people of Bell Island asked for her and were told she would cost \$120 per day, they agreed to take her. Her crew is composed of five deck hands, captain, mate, two engineers, a cook, steward, and I think three firemen.

MR. ASHBOURNE asked Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a list showing what supplies have been purchased for Lighthouses since June 15th, 1924, and the names of parties supplying same.

MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I may say for the information of the honourable member that there has been but little bought since I came into the department because a considerable supply had been purchased before I came in. However, I wish to lay the statement on the table of the House. What is in this was bought before I came here.

MR. DUFF asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to give grants of tim-

ber lands in Newfoundland or Labrador to individual applicants, or will they sell them by tender to the highest bidder for the benefit of the revenue, and to furnish a list of timber lands in Newfoundland and Labrador in which rentals have not been paid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in reply to Mr. Duff I may say that the Government does not intend at present to grant any timber areas in Newfoundland or Labrador to individual applicants. They believe that the policy of putting timber limits up for public auction should have been adopted long ago. They propose to pursue that policy as far as may be considered reasonable, giving due consideration to the interests of those who are developing industrial enterprises and have spent considerable money in the course of their operations. The list of timber lands in Newfoundland and Labrador on which rentals have not been paid is in course of preparation and will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker, in connection with question No. 7. The Hon. Minister requested me to ask that this question be left on the Order Paper as he is too ill to come to the House.

MR. GRIMES asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House (a) a statement showing the number of persons from each district who came to St. John's for entrance to Hospitals for treatment during the calendar year 1923 and for the six months of the present year; (b) the number from each district who arrived and could not gain admission on their arrival and for whom board and lodging was paid by the Government.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I referred this question to the Commissioner of Public

Charities and the answer will be tabled on to-morrow.

MR. GRIMES asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if any new appointments have been made in connection with his department since he assumed office, or are in contemplation of being made, and if so what are the reasons therefor.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member I may say that there have been no new appointments made in the Custom House. With regard

to what may be contemplated or what dismissals are to take place I can give no information.

MR. WARREN asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing all payments made from the loan raised this year and for what object the payments were made and to whom.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—The present position of the 1923 loan stands as follows:—

Feb. 22—Cheque to retire Temporary Debenture	\$1,800,000.00
Mar. 15—Cheque to signature Company	35.20
Mar. 19—Draft for the American Bond Note Co. printing interims	461.68
Mar. 25—Sending cables	129.42
April 4—Glynn, Mills, Currie, Holt & Co. stamps duty etc.,,, 2149- 15-9 (British Loan)	9,469.82
April 5—Newfoundland Express Co.	30.58
April 11—American Bank Note Co. (Printing Bonds)	2,227.78
April 24—Insurance on Bonds	1,203.96
May—Cable	3.90
May 15—Newfoundland Government Railway Operating Account	100,000.00
May 19—Cheque to Hon. W. H. Cave out of Pocked Expenses to New York re Loan	1,250.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,914,812.34
	<hr/>

ITEMISED STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TEMPORARY LOAN, 1923.

Deficit 1921-1922	\$ 857,861.87
Deficit 1922-1923	675,529.00
Militia Expenditure	114,044.07
Codfish Refunds	115,000.21
Balance transferred to Loan, 1923	37,564.85
	<hr/>
	\$1,800,000.00
	<hr/>

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—With regard to this codfish refund I would like to lay on the table of the House a statement showing where some of this money has gone. In connection with that loan of 1923 of three and a half million dollars in which there was some little misunderstanding or somebody did not understand what the two millions

was. This two millions was paid in settlement of the railway transaction of a past government. The money was raised in London and we are paying the amount, two million dollars, and we are paying at the rate of five per cent per annum. That is all that we have been able to find out about it. We don't know how it was done or anything else. Like a good many

more things that have been done that we know nothing about.

MR. WARREN:—It makes no difference how it was done. Instead of paying for the railway in cash we gave the debentures. The Railway settlement Bill passed the House and after it was passed instead of paying the two millions in cash to the Reid Newfoundland Company we gave them the bonds.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—And that cost over nine thousand dollars.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved into a Committee of the Whole on supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of Whole on Supply.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Under the vote for Posts and Telegraphs there is a vote for \$14,000 for fuel and light. I would like to know the explanation of that?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The explanation is that up to now the department of Public Works has always bought coal for the department of Posts and Telegraphs and that amount is being transferred so as to allow the latter department to buy their own coal.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman: I understand that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has his own Secretary. There has always been a Secretary to the Minister; but I do not see any new vote for a new official in the Estimates. I am sorry that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not here now. If he was, perhaps he could explain; but I understand that the wish and intention, if possible, of the Government is to make provision in the Estimates for all expenditures in connection with

the civil service for the next fiscal year. Of course, I can appreciate that between now and June 30th next year the Government may find it necessary to make new appointments.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Chairman: I might say that the salary for a Private Secretary to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is being provided for in Additional Estimates.

MR. HALFYARD:—I am glad to know from the Minister that provision for this vote is being provided for in Additional Estimates because I would like very much, either by word, suggestion or act, to assist the Government in carrying out the suggestion of not spending any money that is not voted in this House.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman: While on the question of steam subsidies there is one point I would like to refer to in particular.

In answer to a question asked here the other day, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs said that it was the intention of the Government to take the Sebastapol off the Bay of Islands' route and have her replaced by a cheaper boat.

I want to point out to the Government that I trust the schedule of the new boat will be the same as that of the Sebastapol. Under the Sebastapol's schedule she went to Boone Bay once a week, and the service was very much appreciated. The position now is that we have hundreds of men from Bonne Bay and vicinity working at the Humber.

Naturally a great number are continually going back and forth to their homes. They find the Sebastapol very useful in this respect as the usual coastal boat is sometimes down the coast as much as ten days or more especially in the autumn.

I should like to say that whatever boat plies on the Bay of Islands'

route should call at Bonne Bay. Of course, I can well realize that Bonne Bay can be supplied with an intermediate mail from Curling by motor boat during the summer months. But a motor boat service while suiting all right for mails, is of little service as regards freight and passengers. In the Autumn a motor boat will not adequately perform the service, as the distance is long and the coast exposed and very rough. It often happens in the fall as well, that there is more freight accumulating at Humbermouth that the usual boat can take out, and if the Bay of Islands boat would call at Bonne Bay it would relieve the situation in this connection as well. We have frequently known cases where freight for down the coast has been left at Humbermouth because the steamer had been practically filled up with Bonne Bay freight.

The idea of the boat on the Bay of Islands' route calling at Bonne Bay is exceedingly popular with the people of Bonne Bay and vicinity, and I merely rose this afternoon to urge the Government to keep the schedule of the new boat the same as that of the Sebastopol, and include Bonne Bay as a weekly port of call.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I had occasion to refer to the question of the coastal service in Fortune Bay. I regret very much that the Honourable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not here this afternoon. However, what I have to say I will say, because I represent the District of Fortune Bay, and what I say will be said for and on behalf of every man, woman and child in Fortune Bay. A few days ago I asked a question regarding the removal of the S. S. Wren in that Bay and the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs was very impressive in his reply. In fact so impressive was he that he carried the galleries, and by the time he had sat down he had actually saved \$113,-

000 for the taxpayers of this Colony. We were told that the Wren was taken off because the value of the services rendered was not commensurate with the expenditure, and we were told that there was going to be no steamer engaged on the Northern Labrador this year and that was going to save \$25,000.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—More like \$40,000 will be saved by the elimination of the Northern Labrador boat.

MR. WARREN:—We were told by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that the S. S. Sebastopol was taken off the Bay of Islands route, that the S. S. Glencoe was taken off the South West Coast and that altogether there was going to be a saving of \$113,000. What the people of Fortune Bay and the people of the West Coast are going to say and what verdict they are going to give the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs I do not know. Now we were told that there was no steamer going to the Northern Labrador this year and we were told that the Wren was taken off the S. W. Coast because the expenditure of running her was out of all proportion to the service rendered. Now I picked up the Daily News this morning and I find an item reading as follows:—

“The S. S. Wren, which has until recently been on the Fortune Bay service leaves on Thursday to take up the Northern Labrador Service during the fishing season. Captain S. R. Winsor will be in command, and the ship will connect with the Meigle at Hopedale. This route was formerly taken by the S. S. Senef.”

Now I would like to ask if the cost of that service is going to be in proportion to the service rendered? The Government over which I happened to preside for a short time decided to do away with the vessel on the Northern Labrador. We took the advice

of people who were acquainted with conditions there and acted upon it. Seemingly the northern constituencies that are represented on the Labrador get everything they want. They get steamers, railways and practically everything they want, while the South West Coast gets little or nothing. Now the present Government were returned to power on the policy of "Clean up, keep clean and a square deal to all." I would like to know how it can be explained that the people of the South West Coast are getting a square deal, and I would like to know why they should be singled out by the Government in practising their methods of economy. I can name plenty of services that do not pay. In fact every branch of the public service doesn't pay for itself for that matter. For instance does the Trepassey Branch Railway pay for itself? As far as Fortune Bay is concerned, an Act was passed in this House some years ago for a branch line of railway there, and even that has been denied the people. Let me give a history of what the people of the South West Coast put up with as against what the people of the North put up with. Before the year 1909 Fortune Bay was served by sailing packets. At that time, under the contract of 1898, nearly all the other bays in the Island were served by railroad or up-to-date coastal boats. Later on, under that contract, the Glencoe plied on the South West Coast route. Subsequently the Bond administration gave a contract to Bowrings and the Portia was put on the service. When the Morris Government was in power the Susu was hired or built to run the Fortune Bay service, but when the contract was up it was not renewed. Then after that the service was performed by the motor schooner Sydney Smith. The people got so disgusted with the service when they saw the conveni-

ences given to other districts that they made forcible representations to the Government of that day, and just before the 1919 elections that Government put on the H. A. Walker, which was small with very little accommodation and was unable to cope with the service. I remember that strong recommendations were made to me about that service and people got so indignant with the H. A. Walker that they refused to take her lines in some places. Eventually we got the Wren on the route and the Wren has been performing the service for the past four or five years. The Wren did not give much of a service, but she managed alright to carry women and children all round that Bay. We admit that this service does not pay for itself, but I would like to know what branch of our coastal service does pay for itself. For some reason or other the Government have seen fit to start practising economy on the people of the district that got nothing, so that if any people in that Bay want to get from one place to another at present they either got to go in a small motor boat or swim, because I doubt very much if it is possible to do any travelling there by small boat. I canvassed that Bay in a staunch motor boat and travelled 1100 miles, and many a time we were held up by weather for as long as two days in a place. Now if a good motor boat and sail cannot withstand conditions there, I would like to ask the Government if the services rendered by the small motor boat that they are getting to run this route will be in proportion to the outlay; and how on earth do the Government expect people to go by motor boat from Bay L'Argent to Belleoram or Grand Bank. Besides, she would have no sleeping or lavatory accommodation and would be unsuitable in every respect. I do not think that the people of Fortune Bay are going to put

up with this thing and I fear that there is going to be trouble. Take the people of the Islands of Sagona and Brunette. How are these people going to do their travelling? Why many a time the Wren was unable to call at these places, much less a motor boat. On the second last trip of the Wren sixty-seven people travelled. How could a small boat handle this number?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—What are her total receipts?

MR. WARREN:—What are the total receipts for the Trepassey Branch railroad?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The Wren cost \$42,000 in Fortune Bay and not \$15,000 that we have in the estimates.

MR. WARREN:—I admit that, but I would like to know how the people of Bay D'Espoir, where a motor boat cannot get, are going to get in their supplies for the winter, whereas the Wren can go there at the edge of the ice with freight and the people can haul it home themselves. But after all, speaking of the cost of \$42,000, these people must get round like the people of any other district and they pay their taxes and their proportionate share towards the upkeep and maintenance of the Heart's Content, Bonavista, Bay de Verde and Trepassey Branch railroads. Does anybody want to tell me that the branch railroads pay proportionately. If it is the policy of the Government to start in discontinuing services that do not pay, well then start in right away at the Trepassey Branch. There is a railroad from here to Trepassey.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN:—Only up to Renew's; not to Trepassey.

MR. WARREN:—There is only thirty miles of a motor route there while we have a hundred per cent. longer route in Fortune Bay. Now,

I repeat, if you are going to cut out services that do not pay, start your economy at the Trepassey Branch. The members for Ferryland will bear me out that when the Trepassey Branch was closed down last winter it was a hardship on the people and we put a boat on for them.

MR. MOORE:—Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN:—The idea of shutting out people from any means of communication is a very serious matter. Now I would like to ask the Honourable the Prime Minister what arrangements have been made with regard to boats on Bonavista services for instance. I understand that the Malakoff is going to run from Port Blandford on the route that was originally performed by the Dundee; but I understand that two motor boats are doing the service on the north side of the Bay just now. What is going to happen in Trinity Bay? North, the people have railroads, motor boats, coastal steamers and other facilities, but the West Coast got practically nothing. Now the people of Fortune Bay do not see why they should not be given some consideration, and not alone from my district, but from Burin District as well. Men go to Lunenburg from both these districts in the Spring of the year and return in the Fall, and, under ordinary circumstances, their way of travelling to and from their homes is taken away from them; while the Northern Labrador service is being continued again in the interest of the northern men. In addition there are men from the South West Coast who go to Port au Port every year. Their boat has been taken from them and given to the men who go to the Northern Labrador. Everybody must agree that coastal services are a matter of debt, and I strenuously object to the Government taking the boat off in Fortune Bay because the service does not pay and leaving

alone other such services in other districts that do not pay either.

Then again look what happened to the crew of the "Wren". Here you are in the middle of the summer and without hardly a week's notice the Captain, Mate and the entire crew of the "Wren" are turned out on the street and Captain S. R. Winsor and a crew from North are put in their places. Is that a square deal? Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the Mate of the "Wren," is Royal Naval Reservist, served the Empire and his country well for five years during the war and made a name for himself, and all the thanks that he gets now is that he is given almost immediate dismissal and another man from the North is put in his place. His record was so good that he became a Skipper and Warrant Officer in the Royal Navy and was sent here to undertake the first mine-sweeping. As I said two or three days ago, the "Portia" is not able to run the S. W. Coast service alone. I do not want to be unfair in any criticism I have to make; but I would like to say again that the people of Fortune Bay are not getting a square deal. These people not alone do business in St. Johns, but in Grand Bank, Fortune and other places in that locality as well and that business is going to be crippled, if the coastal boat is kept off that Bay. I have a pocket full of telegrams from Doctors, Clergymen and scores of business men about the S.W. Coast service generally and I would suggest to the Government to have the "Portia" run from Argentia to Port aux Basques, although that will leave certain places in St. Mary's untouched.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I might say that that arrangement has been decided upon by the Government.

MR. WARREN:—Now you own the Sebastopol whereas you have to

charter the "Wren". Why not run the "Sebastopol" to points in St. Mary's and Fortune Bay, and run her as far as Sydney whereby the saving of coal and hire would be half as much as the "Wren" is costing now. But I want to impress upon the Government and upon the House the fact that this is the only chance that the people of Fortune Bay have to make their protest against the taking off of that boat they had. I think it is discrimination of the worst type and it is as unfair as it is unjust. If the Government wants to practice a policy of economy and retrenchment, start in on every district in the Island; but not to take away from one district the only convenience that they did have.

THE HON. MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear a few remarks made by the Hon. Gentleman opposite, the Independent Member for Fortune Bay. He said that the S.S. Wren was taken off the Fortune Bay Service and placed on the Northern Service. Mr. Warren further said that the service was not needed, but I say that the statement is not correct; the service is needed, and badly needed with that. There was a steamer down there last year, and I am frank enough to admit that she was not necessary, as there were only fifty schooners fishing on the lower part of the Labrador last season. During the past week it has been discovered, that all the schooners that fished in the Straits have gone to the Northern Labrador, and up to the present time there are about one hundred and fifty schooners fishing down there. Now last year there were only one hundred and sixty schooners cleared for the Labrador altogether, and that only fifty or less went down North of the Farmyards, whereas this year there will be at least one hundred and sixty North of the Farmyards. I do not

expect it is of much use to speak of the Farmyards to some of the Members in this House, it would be just as well to speak or talk of Niagra Falls, or some place unknown. These schooners on the Northern Labrador this year carry seventeen or eighteen hundred men, they are the finest men that the country possesses, and they need and deserve some consideration. There is no hospital or doctor down there; they have no means of caring for sick people; therefore I claim that this boat is badly needed this year, and taking all things into consideration, I have come to the conclusion that a boat should be sent down. I have subsequently asked for tenders, and yesterday I accepted one agreeing to perform the service for two and a half months at the rate of \$2,800.00 per month. This is far different in costs from the service of last year. Last year the cost was \$36,000.00, whereas this year the cost of the service will be only about \$7,000.00. If a large saving like that can be had, there is some reason for again starting the service.

It is not true that the service was withdrawn, or taken from Fortune Bay and sent to the Labrador; the service was not badly needed at Fortune Bay, and the returns certainly did not warrant the expenditure.

Now with regard to the crew, the people will think from the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay that I discharged the crew of the S.S. Wren. I may say that I never saw one of the crew before quarter to two to-day; one would imagine that I turned out the crew of the Wren, and put a crew of Northern men in their places. I deny that I had anything whatever to do with the Captain or the crew of that ship. I did not discharge the crew, neither did I recommend it to the owners, who have done so, and neither did I recommend any of the newly engaged crew. As a

matter of fact the Captain of the Wren admitted that he knew very little about the Northern Labrador Coast, and that he would not therefore assume the responsibility as Captain of the ship.

Mr. Warren also stated that the North was getting everything, the boats and all kinds of railway facilities. In reply to that I may say that I have lived North, at Wesleyville, for forty-seven years, and I have yet to see a railway track within a large distance. In winter time when I wanted to get to St. John's, I had to tramp on snow shoes, and tramp forty-five miles to Gambo, the nearest railway station to Wesleyville. The people of the North have been paying taxes for the past fifty years, for the people of the South. I want to see a square deal to every one in the Island, North, South, East and West, and I am prepared to see that the fishermen especially are given fair play to catch fish. I was asked by the fishermen of Trinity Bay, Bonavista Bay, and Notre Dame Bay, to have the steamer sent down there this year, and I promised that if I were returned, and if it were at all within my power to do so, she would be sent. There are some people walking around St. John's, drawing large salaries from the Government, who could afford to have some surplus cash lopped off their salaries as well as the fishermen, and the fishermen deserve all the consideration that we can give them.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Chairman just a word in reply to the Hon. Minister Marine & Fisheries, I am pleased that he by his suggestions and arguments has supported my argument and protest so well. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries, bears out what I said regarding people who are situated the same as they are in Fortune Bay, with no roads or other means of communication; they are cut off the same as the people on the Labrador.

The Minister Marine & Fisheries said that there were seventeen hundred or 1800 men down on the Labrador to be looked after, and that they deserve consideration and whatever service we could give them; there are 10,000 people in Fortune Bay, and if as has been expressed by the Minister Marine & Fisheries that 1700 men on the Labrador need and deserve consideration the 10,000 in Fortune Bay deserve the same infinitely more so. The cost of the Wren on Northern Labrador will be the same in proportion as her cost in Fortune Bay. I am sorry to say that Captain Winsor thought I was blaming him for dismissing the crew from the Wren, and putting in a crew from the North, but I did not say that at all, I said that the crew of the Wren had been dismissed, and that a Northern Captain and crew had been placed on board, and that the steamer had been withdrawn from Fortune Bay where her services were needed, and was being sent to the Northern Labrador.

THE MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES:— I do not consider Mr. Chairman that there is any comparison between Fortune Bay and the Labrador Coast, because on the South Coast there are Telegraph Offices every five or six miles, whereas down on the Labrador there is no such thing as a telegraph office, or any other means of communicating with civilization.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—Mr. Chairman I cannot possibly allow this thing to go by without saying a few words, because during the past four years, the people's money has been absolutely squandered, and it is through this that we have to cut down expenses at present. The whole fact of the matter is that economy has to be practised, and a start to put it into effect has to be made somewhere. Mr. Warren objected to it beginning at Fortune Bay. Now who knows more about Fortune Bay than I do? I was president of the

Nfld. Produce Co. when the S. S. Susu was up there, and she was not earning \$1000.00 per year, although she was subsidised at \$20,000.00 per year, I admit that our Government intended to start economy by cutting out the Labrador boat. The only difference is that Mr. Warren has started in one place, and we in another. If Labrador had been the victim, and Fortune Bay left untouched, the Hon. Member would have been silent. The cost of the service in Fortune Bay was altogether too much, \$15000.00 had been voted to run the service there last year, but the large sum of \$42000.00 has been spent. It is too costly for the country; the paring has to start, and it is just as well for Members to make up their minds that the Budget has to be balanced, or the country is beyond saving. During the past four years squandering has been indulged in beyond the wildest imaginations, and if thrift and economy had been practiced during these years there would be no difficulty in letting Fortune Bay keep her service now. The people of this country cannot be taxed sufficiently to carry the expenditures of the last few years, so the cutting down of expenses must take place. Again, with regard to the cost of the Labrador service, last year as compared with this year, last year the cost of the service was \$36000.00, while this year it will only cost \$10000.00 at the most, and whereas last year there were not more than fifty schooners fishing down there, this year there are over 150, and I admit that this service is needed, and that the fishermen deserve it.

Look at the squandering of the past few years take the expenditure on the Labrador Boundary for instance, it is something shocking. I have it before me at present, and I find that the Hon. Member himself got \$6800.00, Lord Morris \$5000.00, Sir Patrick McGrath \$20000.00. It is something shocking. Money was poured out

like water, and now we are going to reap a shocking harvest, in fact, worse than was sown. These expenditures were not only enormous, but unfortunate. The practise of late years was to vote some money as provided by the estimates, but to spend as much as it was necessary, irrespective of what was voted. Consequently \$15000.00 was voted for Fortune Bay service, but \$42000.00 was spent. The estimates for the past years were a joke; they were cooked, and not only cooked, but baked. They were treated with contempt. I know the Fortune Bay people, and that there may be a service needed, but they will only get it if we can afford it. The Government is trying to economize, and reduce taxation, and this can only be done by cutting useless, unnecessary and unprofitable expenses. In so far as it is possible I intend to inaugurate a different state of affairs. The House and country will be amazed when I announce the deficit that the country has to face for the year up to June 30th, last.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Chairman. I beg to thank the Hon. Minister of Finance for the defence which he has put up on behalf of his Government, but it does not help out Fortune Bay any; all the Government boats being run now, are running North of St. John's, and there are 36,000 people on the South Coast, and the only service they receive is from the running of one boat.

Now in so far as the Labrador Boundary is concerned, the Minister himself set a bad example, and his friend got \$5,000.00 and gave nothing in return for it, but I brought the matter to a head, and I gave value and service for what I got. I cannot see that this Labraodr Boundary question has anything to do with a mail boat for Fortune Bay. What I ask is why should you take from the poorest district a small service which

is badly needed, and let the other Government boats stay when they have the railways, and other means of communication. The other boats are not paying on the other services any more than the Wren was paying on the Fortune Bay service.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—If this country after a year can show that it is able to meet its expenditure with its revenue, I have no doubt that the Government I am associated with will consider the services, such as Fortune Bay, which may have to be cut off during this season.

MR. LAKE:—I wish to inform Mr. Warren that on account of the Glencoe and the Wren being taken off the Fortune Bay route, we have succeeded in getting the Portia to go from Placentia to Port aux Basques. I may say that I applied for information to several people, and their request was that the Glencoe be taken off and the Portia go from Placentia to Port aux Basques.

I also wish to inform those present that the district of Fortune Bay supplies eighty-five per cent. of the Bank fishermen, and I do not altogether agree with this side of the House in taking off the Fortune Bay boat; and while I may not altogether agree with Mr. Warren in all that he says about the Government services, I do not think myself that a Labrador boat is as necessary as a Fortune Bay boat. I must admit that in Fortune Bay we will have to go back to some sort of service—and I do not think that service can be conducted with motor boats; but I agree with the policy of the Government—the policy of trying to save money to finance the country. I agree with the policy of the Government that the Wren had to be taken off on account of the cost of operating her, and I think Mr. Warren will be satisfied that such a course was necessary—and he will be satisfied tem-

porarily. The districts of Fortune Bay and Burin are very much interested in each other, and I think I can speak for both. I may say also that about forty per cent. of the Lunenburg fishermen come from Fortune Bay. I am just saying this in fairness to all the people, there. There are at present about two hundred Fortune Bay fishermen in town. I do not know if Mr. Warren has seen them. I have seen them—they have called upon me, thinking apparently that they are in my district. I feel sure that Fortune Bay will be taken care of properly.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I would like to say that I sympathize to a very considerable extent with the member for Fortune Bay. I do not want—I do not think the Government wants in any way to do any more than try to give a square deal to all. When this question of the Fortune Bay boat came up, it was represented to us that the intake for passengers and freight service was practically nothing, and it almost appeared as if the people did not want the service—they did not seem to have either freight or passengers. For that reason, and because there did not seem to be very much use made of it we came to the conclusion that that was one of the things that could be cut out.

I quite sympathize with what Mr. Warren and Mr. Lake have said, and we want, so far as the capabilities of the exchequer are concerned, to give every district a square deal. We want to see that the service is wanted, and then we want to see that the people are using the service; else, the service whether it is in the North or whether in the South, it will be cut out.

MR. HALFYARD:—It is almost unnecessary for me to rise in support of the argument put up by Mr. Warren with reference to the Fortune Bay service. I would not say anything to take away from the splendid effect

which his remarks have made on both sides of the House. One point made by Mr. Warren has, no doubt, been accepted by the House. Those who have heard Mr. Warren would certainly infer—or will certainly question the sincerity of the Government in the statement they made some time since when that statement is compared with what is at present in practice. Just a few days since, it was said in this House that the Government would effect a saving on the subsidies for steamers on the Northern Labrador service, because that service would not be brought into effect this year.

Now, this matter was recently considered by the outgoing Government, and they unanimously decided that no boat would be sent down there this year, and no doubt they had knowledge of the conditions of the fishermen down in Northern Labrador, and it was not critically correct for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that they were ignorant as regards conditions in Northern Labrador. I do not know about the Executive, but in the Government party we had men who were thoroughly acquainted with the whole fishing coast of Labrador. I will mention the names of Captain Jones, Capt. R. G. Winsor, who has I believe prosecuted the fishery up there, and Mr. Guppy, a practical fishing and schooner master. Although Mr. Guppy was not a member of the Executive, still he was personally on the Labrador Mail boat last year, and I had a private talk with him, and he told me that it was absolutely a waste of money to have the service. I do not know what this big change is in conditions, that we have such a big number of schooners prosecuting the Northern Labrador fishery this year, but it just shows that we may all have good intentions, and we may all have certain ideas as to what ought to be done. About a fortnight or three weeks ago, when contesting the different dis-

tricts, you thought that a wonderful lot of money was being spent uselessly, and that certain services should be discontinued; and no doubt you had in your minds then that the Northern Labrador steamers should be cut off. But now you find that you cannot cut it off; and it shows that, after all, you do not know what you may have to do when you have the administration of the country's affairs. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had been governed by the information which he has recently received as to the numbers of people prosecuting the fishery in Northern Labrador, perhaps you would not have been so ready to state that you would not send a steamer down there.

Reference was made to the Malakoff, and I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to ask the Prime Minister what the Government intends to do with the Malakoff. The Malakoff is now prosecuting a service in Trinity and Bonavista Bays, the headquarters being the junction of the railway at Port Union, and it is the intention of the Government now to make the terminus of the boat at Port Blandford, Bonavista Bay—and from that we concluded that the Malakoff will not serve Trinity Bay. If the Government intend to take the Malakoff off Trinity Bay, I would like to know what substituted service will be given.

Certainly some parts of Trinity Bay must have a service and what object the Government can have in changing the present service, I really do not know, because the Malakoff will cost the Government just as much whether it is steaming on the waters of Bonavista Bay or on the waters of Trinity Bay. Her running expenses will be just the same, and I cannot see that it is in the interests of the country that the change is being contemplated, because it will cost from ten to twelve thousand dollars to put

the wharf at Port Blandford in a condition fit for discharging freight. Can you afford to do this at the present time just to carry out an election promise. The boat will cost just the same, and certainly Bonavista Bay, under the present circumstances is being served well enough. I do not think that the people there can complain of the services they receive with regard to the steamers. Wesleyville and Greenspond—there is not a boat going out of St. John's north but calls there; and they have a very good service on the Northern side of the Bay. From Newton up to Gambo they have a good motor service.

All of it is really and solely the business of the Government, and anything we may say on this side of the House will not alter their decision one iota, but we would not be performing our duty if we did not refer to these matters.

I do not know whether the Prime Minister is in a position this afternoon to let me know what the intention of the Government is with regard to the services in Trinity Bay, when the Malakoff is taken from that Bay, to serve Bonavista Bay solely.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I should prefer that the Hon. Member put his question in writing to be dealt with in the usual way.

MR. WARREN:—I just want to thank Mr. Lake for supporting my plea. I have done just what I consider it my duty to do, and what I am sure every man, woman and child in Fortune Bay would do if they sat in my place in the House here.

I desire again to say that so far as I am concerned, I am just as anxious for economy as the present Government. Let me tell the Minister of Finance and Customs that, as he has said, the estimates are reduced by eight hundred thousand dollars, but of that reduction, at least seven hundred thousand dollars was made when I was Prime Minister. He put

in these estimates, and the newspapers give his Government credit for reduction in the cost of running the country—for a reduction of eight hundred thousand dollars, and for seven hundred thousand of that, the late Government is responsible; and I should like to point out to him again, and to point out to the members for Burin and for Burgeo that we pay out for subsidies for boats North of St. John's, \$227,000.00 a year, and the South Coast at present gets \$35,000.00. In other words the total amount paid out for subsidies this year will be in the neighbourhood of two hundred and sixty thousand dollars, and the West Coast's share of that is thirty-five thousand dollars.

In addition to that the railway subsidies amount to \$62,898.00, and the South Coast does not get any share of it. In other words, we of the South Coast are paid subsidies of thirty-five thousand dollars, while the subsidies for the railway and the bay boats is nearly three hundred thousand dollars.

As I said before, I am only endeavouring to put the position of these people before you. They have no railway, no roads, and thirty-five thousand dollars a year for steamer subsidies, as against \$290,000.00 for railway and steamer subsidies in the North.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The hon. member is absolutely wrong in saying that \$290,000.00 a year is granted in subsidies to the North. Where is Port aux Basques? Does not the railway go there?

MR. WARREN:—I have not counted that in.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—We have taken nothing away from there.

MR. WARREN:—You have taken the Glencoe away.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Does not the whole general subsidy cover all of them?

MR. WARREN:—No. In going through the estimates, I have left out some estimates altogether, and taken certain other ones—Bell Island, Conception Bay, Notre Dame Bay—and the North Eastern Coast. That comes to \$227,000.00, and the estimate for the South Coast is \$35,000.00. Then there is the railway which serves practically all the Northern Coast, the subsidy for which is over \$62,000.00. The railway serves all the North, with the exception of Channel, which does not mean any service for the South Coast at all.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—But you must admit that the railway serves the whole country.

MR. WARREN:—But how can it affect them?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Certainly it affects them. Suppose you have a sick person on the South Coast. They can get a boat to Argentia and get to St. John's by train from there. They are served by having the train at Argentia.

MR. WARREN:—But you have taken away from Fortune Bay the only way they had of connecting with the railway. You take a person in Rencontre, who has to go from there to Belleoram, and from there to the railroad. How is he going to get there?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The amount of money spent on the Fortune Bay service is something over forty thousand dollars, and the amount of returns from that service, which is about one thousand dollars, absolutely proves that the people of Fortune Bay do not want that service.

MR. WARREN:—Well, take the railway down to Ferryland. There is a loss on that of \$113,000.00 per year.

I think the people of Ferryland do not want that. Take that away.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Certainly it will be taken away if it becomes necessary.

MR. WARREN: — It is absolutely unnecessary to have that service.

MR. HICKMAN.—As we will not be able to finish the estimates this afternoon, I would ask that the Committee rise, to sit again at a later date. There are one or two subjects which I wish to speak about and which I will take up later.

I notice that in going through the estimates, one of the most important of the Government institutions has not been included at all. That is the railroad. The railroad is now a Government institution, and as such has just as much right to be in the estimates as any other institution of the Government, and I think you should have the railroad included. There will be a deficit on the operation of the road and of all the steamboats under the management of the railroad, and, if we have to show to the public a fair and honest estimate for the coming year, we should show all the Government institutions, of which the most important is the Government railroad.

There is a deficit on certain branch lines, and I suppose there is a deficit on the railroad right through, and how the Government is going to meet that deficit I am sure I cannot understand, unless it is put in the estimates. Unless there is some arrangement made to meet the deficit it is no use to come before the country today and show the country that we are going to save eight hundred thousand dollars on the operation of Government institutions. It is plain here that the estimates are eight hundred thousand dollars short of the previous year, and I am very glad to hear from the leader of the Independ-

ent Party that seven hundred thousand of that eight hundred thousand dollars was raised in the estimates which were made to be put before the Government during his administration. That is a matter which I was going to ask about, but now that I have the information from Mr. Warren himself, it will not be necessary for me to put the question before the House.

However, I would like to hear what the Prime Minister has to say in reference to including in the estimates the Government railroad.

I have many things which I will have to talk about before the estimates close, and I would like very much for the Committee to rise at present and let the estimates be finished at a later session.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I have no objection to the motion of the leader of the Opposition, if you will just let the Posts and Telegraphs be finished.

MR. HICKMAN:—I have no objection to that.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Before retaking my seat I would like to say to the honourable members of this House that these estimates have pointed to certain reductions, but when they are passed it is hoped to effect a much greater saving than they show. During the past four years when the Government brought up their estimates they were cooked estimates, I may even say they were baked estimates, and they never could make the revenue meet the expenditure. There has not been one year in the past four years when the revenue could meet the expenditure, and the result has been a serious deficit for this Colony. Take 1922 and 1923. The Government had to go out and raise a loan almost every year.

I think the member for Fortune will agree that the money which has

been spent has been coming out of the funds of the Colony absolutely through loans. So far as concerns the Government that I am associated with to-day, we know that there is going to be a considerable saving take place, and there is going to be a considerable drop balance; and we know that we can show during the coming year that our revenue will meet our expenditure.

So far as Fortune Bay is concerned, it is impossible to continue the old service. It is far too expensive for us, and we have to cut our coat according to our cloth.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I would like to say in response to the leader of the Opposition that it is impossible to put in the estimates any amount for the railway. The railway might make a profit of a few thousand dollars in one year, and might make a loss of one million dollars the next. The present method of operating the railway is more or less experimental, and consequently you can see that any amount put in the estimates for the railway could only be calculated with very great difficulty.

I cannot see that there is any object to be gained by placing in the estimates any amount to meet a deficit on the railway.

MR. HALFYARD:—I presume that some estimate of the money which will have to be found for the railway will appear in the Budget when considering ways and means. I suppose some opportunity will be given to members to make further remarks on this subject?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Of course.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddester took the chair of Committee.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, If I remember rightly, the honourable Prime Minister in introducing these resolutions stated that they differed in some points from the original agreement, and I would like to hear what these differences are. I am sorry that I did not hear the Prime Minister particularly as regards the matter of these differences.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— I pointed out yesterday wherein the former bill differs from the present one, and I hardly think I can be expected to go through it again.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat what I said regarding this project at the last session of this House, on April 25, in moving the appointment of a Select Committee to the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne then presented. I said on that occasion that this proposition marked a step in the right direction, and that if it materialized it must result in great good to the country at large. Now, sir, first of all let me say that I am very proud to note that the originator and promoter of the proposition is a Newfoundlander who has made good abroad. I trust that this augurs well for the future, and let us hope that we shall from time to time see more Newfoundlanders who have

made good in other countries coming back to the homeland with ideas of developing industry for the benefit of Terra Nova.

In his remarks yesterday the Prime Minister outlined the good that will accrue from the establishment of the flour mill. I have no hesitation in agreeing with him that the production of flour locally will tend to greater competition with the outside manufacturers and will result consequently in the lowering of the prices of this important commodity to our people. But, to my mind, sir, one of the greatest benefits resulting from the establishment of this mill will be from the agricultural point of view, through its by-products.

We have, for years in this House, and outside it too, heard a great deal about the agricultural possibilities of this country, particularly as regards cattle and poultry raising. Nothing much, however, has come out of the various efforts that have been made in this direction, and one generally finds on analysis that the cause has been the high cost of feeds. If this mill, through its by-products lowers the cost of feeds, it will give a greater impetus to agricultural pursuits in this country than all the money that has been voted by Governments for agriculture during the last twenty years. I therefore think this is one of the strongest points in favor of the bill. As regards its location, the Prime Minister in speaking yesterday, stated that he was authorized to say that, though no definite locality for the mill had been decided on, he was pretty sure it would be situated in St. John's.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested Harbor Grace, and I remember when this project was first mooted some people opposed it, merely because Sir William Coaker was supposed to be trying to have the mill located in Port Union. Why not have

it at Port Union. We would be only too glad to welcome the project there, and if Mr. Palmer's mind is not already made up I feel sure that his project would get a greater reception in Port Union.

I have no doubt, sir, that the expenditure of half a million dollars for labor, in connection with this enterprise, will be welcomed by the people wherever the industry is established, and wherever it might be established the proposition will result in great good generally. I, consequently, Mr. Chairman, have much pleasure in supporting the resolution, and wish the promoters all possible success in their project.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the resolutions and wish to say that I heartily endorse the project because of the labor that it will give. Every effort should be made to get outside capital interested here as we have a large labor problem and this flour mill is one of the practical ways in which to solve it. The promoter of this proposition is a Newfoundlander and I have often thought that when we sit here to discuss various matters the credit is frequently given the House for bringing in industries though honor should also be given the promoters like Mr. Palmer who seek the capital despite many discouragements, that open up employment and help in promoting the general welfare of Newfoundland. As Mr. Scammell has said, not only will direct labor be given by this project but there will be the indirect benefits accruing to agriculturists. At present we are importing something like a million dollars worth of products which could be produced here if those interested in agriculture had the necessary assistance, such as this Bill provides for it will be of great advantage to them. Added to this will be the saving in price to the consumer of meats, eggs, butter, etc..

which will be of great benefit. These results will be achieved in the course of a few years with the establishment of a flour mill. I hope that the capital will be speedily forthcoming and that the enterprise will soon be started here or wherever else decided on, for the benefit of Newfoundland.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, the only item I would like to question in connection with these resolutions is No. 5 which says:—

5. The Government hereby grants to the Company for a period of twenty years from the first day of January 1927 the sole and exclusive right to erect and operate flour mills within the Dominion of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

I believe in protection but I would like to see this period reduced. I referred the other day to the proposed Mortier Bay project for transshipping to the Old Country, and don't know now whether to feel in favor of that or this. But perhaps other people have greater vision and the flour mill will be of benefit to the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In response to the honorable member for Carbonear I would like to say that the Government was very much impressed by the fact that the 20 year period was in the nature of a monopoly, but discussing the matter with Mr. Palmer we found it absolutely necessary that he be given that term of control. The plant will cost a large sum of money and he would not like others to be in a position to put him out of business by erecting mills to prevent his working satisfactorily and then clearing out themselves. While willing to agree with us on various other points, he held to this one of 20 years as his backers would not furnish the necessary capital unless that clause were in the bill.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—Mr. Chairman, I support

the bill on principle. The period to which Mr. Duff refers seems rather long and really means 23 years from now as it does not begin till 1927. I would like to know if the term flour mill refers to the elevator for the storing of wheat.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The clause means only what it says

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—It is an important point as if the West Coast short route project comes into effect, they also might need elevators. It is not clear as to whether flour mill might mean everything appertaining to a mill. The bill itself is a good one as it is bringing in a new industry but I fear we may not have it as it is almost too good to expect. Harbor Grace would be the proper site for the mill as there you have the railway and every other facility for its successful operation. I see that the promoter is erecting only one unit and I would like to know if he is under any obligation to put up the other in any given time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The promoter is bound under Clause 1 to erect a mill of 1,000 barrels capacity per day.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—If it is only 1,000 barrels I fear it will be a very small mill. But even that will be a benefit to us at present. The establishment of this enterprise will have an important bearing on our agriculture, because as has been said by previous speakers on this side, it will no doubt mean cheaper feeds for the raising of poultry, keeping of cattle etc. We should raise here all we need including chicken, butter, etc. All this will be aided by the cheap feed from the local mill. Another thing that will be needed is a cold storage plant for the keeping of the products of the country. We have to-day in Bona-

vista, Conception, Trinity and other bays the land necessary to raise all we require but it seems that Governments of the past did not have the proper idea of agricultural development. We should have cold storage plants into which to take the people's products and encourage them to grow more. When Hon. Dr. Campbell was in office I wrote him enclosing a clipping describing how a vessel was loading at St. John, N.B., from the Federal warehouse with potatoes for Cuba. The Government there had erected the warehouse so that the people could store their vegetables before the frost came and in this way they are encouraged to raise more. Here the grower has to sell some and put the balance in a cellar with the result that when the frost comes half of them are destroyed. Therefore there is no encouragement for agriculturalists but there is land in the bottom of various bays sufficient for the growing and there is no reason why a steamer should not be able to load vegetables here as well as in Canada. I think if the flour mill is erected we will also need a cold storage plant because if the people raise large quantities of turkeys, geese, etc., they must have somewhere to store them or overstock the market. I support the bill in its entirety but would again call attention to Clause 5 and hope the Government will endeavour to make some alteration in this direction.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, like the other speakers on this side of the House I wish to support the bill as it is practically the same as agreed to by the late Government. There is no material change and I will endorse any sane policy that any member may introduce. In this measure no guarantee is asked and there is no risk to the Government or the people. I congratulate Mr. Palmer on his enterprise and hope the venture will be a complete success. After all it is

a new project and an experiment but it has been well thought out and there is no reason why it should not be successful. The establishment of this mill will give a lot of employment but perhaps too much is anticipated from the bye-products as the quantity of such cannot be large. Whatever quantity it may be however, it will be a benefit if we get it cheaper. As to the 20 year period we need not worry as for 300 years we have been without such a mill and but for Mr. Palmer we might be another 300. I congratulate the representatives of St. John's on the city being the location of the mill and as a resident I am proud to see it erected here as it will be a valuable aid to our industrial resources.

MR. HICKMAN:—In reference to the clause "All plant machinery, engines, cooperage, elevator, cleaning house, and storage warehouse etc., shall be admitted free of duty" supposing other companies erect other mills would the same preference hold with them. Has this company the exclusive right.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—It is very plain "operating as necessary part of the said mill or mills."

MR. HICKMAN:—That is very plain At the same time.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The only clause, that is, objectionable clause 5, giving a period of 20 years as to operation. Removal of duty is a regular thing according to the customs, therefore, it reads word for word as heretofore. In the sense of what we call exclusive these would not get the duty. An elevator as a distinct matter would come in the ordinary way as happened in any other industry. It is affecting this particular kind of industry that is all.

MR. SCAMMELL:—With regard to sub-section 1 of section 6: "or erections operated as a necessary part of the said mill or mills." And then it

says "or any other buildings or erections and for the extension of the same." It appears that the first reference is sufficient.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The second last line of clause 1, Par. 6 beginning "or any other buildings or erections" might be eliminated."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said Resolution with some amendments, and recommended the introduction of a Bill to give effect to the same

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Chairman, as this bill was not distributed to the members yesterday and as we would like to have an opportunity to look it over, we ask the Colonial Secretary if he would be good enough to let this matter stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received

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

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 until Thursday afternoon next, at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 24th 1924.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency the Governor would be pleased to receive the Address in Reply, presently.

Whereupon the House attended His Excellency at Government House and presented the Address in Reply, to which His Excellency was pleased to reply as follows:

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

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which your present Session was opened.

(Sgd.) W. L. ALLARDYCE,
Governor.

Government House,

24th July, 1924.

Mr. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

(1) MR. BROWN to ask Hon. the Prime Minister, if the Government has begun negotiations with any person or persons, regarding the sale or operation of the Newfoundland Railroad, also if he personally, or the Government, has been approached by any person, or persons, with a view to opening up negotiations along these lines.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The answer to both parts of the question is in the negative.

(2) MR. WARREN to ask Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs how many motor boats are to do the work of the Wren in Fortune Bay, Hermitage Bay and Bay d'Espoir, if any of these motor boats have already taken up the service, what amount is being paid them or to be paid them and to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the notices or letters asking for tenders for the service.

In the absence of the Hon. the Minister of Posts it was ordered that this question remain on the order paper.

(3) MR. HICKMAN to ask Hon. the Minister of Justice if any inquiry is being held in the circumstances surrounding the accident at Wabana, in which Robert Yetman of Bryant's Cove lost his life and other workmen were injured. Will there be a report before the close of this session.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE replied that inquiry was being proceeded with by the Government Engineer as to the operations of the mines at Bell Island in addition to the usual magisterial inquiry and that both reports would be presented to the House before the close of this session.

(4) MR. SCAMMELL to ask Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what mail couriers are engaged in the District of St. Barbe for the Summer season and to show what service each performs and salary paid in each instance.

In the absence of the Hon. Minister of Posts it was ordered that this question remain on the order paper.

(5) MR. SCAMMELL to ask Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has as yet arranged to replace the Sebastapol on the Bay of Is-

lands service and if it is the intention of the Government when inaugurating this service to call for tenders.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER asked that this question be deferred until to-morrow.

(6) MR. HIBBS to ask the Minister of Public Works if it is true that his Department has refused to recognize the rights and authority of persons elected on February 25th last under the "Local Affairs Act," to serve as Members of Road Boards, and that other parties are being substituted in place of the duly elected Boards to expend public moneys, and if so, where, to what extent, for what reason, and on what authority is this being done.

THE HON. THE MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS replied that the Government was prepared to recognize duly constituted Road Boards. During the past four years there has been much money expended without the proper authority. This department is responsible for its expenditures, and the Minister has to answer for the expending of monies by this department for the various districts. I am prepared to listen carefully to, and to take into consideration representations made by the Members for the various districts, and in fact by any one who can give valuable information and assistance. But the department reserves to itself the right, to make its own decisions.

(7) MR. GRIMES to ask the Minister of Public Works if any new appointments have been made in connection with his department since he assumed office or are in contemplation of being made and if so what are the reasons therefor.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS replied that only one new appointment had been made, that of Mr. Penney to the Caretakership

of the Post Office at Carbonear in place of Mr. B. Quinn.

(8) MR. GRIMES to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if any new appointments have been made in connection with his department since he assumed office or are in contemplation of being made and if so what are the reasons therefor.

In the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs it was ordered that this question stand over.

(9) MR. DUFF to ask the Minister of Public Works the reason why Stephen Baldwin, Chairman of Road Board at Victoria, in the district of Carbonear, has been ignored in the repairing of bridges in that section, and Mr. Nicholas Clarke employed.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS replied that the department considers it advisable that this money should be expended by a commissioner appointed by the department. One allocation on main roads for expenditure on the Carbonear to New Perlican road was authorized by the Minister of Public Works on the recommendation of responsible parties to be expended by Mr. Nicholas Clarke, Commissioner.

(10) MR. HALFYARD to ask Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the number of miles of Telegraph and Telephone lines respectively erected by his department from May 2nd, 1923, to July 20th, 1924, also the location of each extension.

In the absence of the Hon. Minister of Posts. It was ordered that this question remain on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received the following communication from His Excellency the Governor, which he then read:

"The Governor has the honour to communicate to the Honourab-

le House of Assembly the appointment of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of Section 4, Cap. 7, Consolidated Statutes, Third Series, as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of a Minute of the Honourable Executive Council approved by the Governor on the 7th instant."

(Sgd.) W L. ALLARDYCE,
Governor.

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.
22nd July, 1924.

July 5th, 1924.

The following to form the Commission of Internal Economy of the Legislature, namely:

The President of the Legislative Council,

Hon. A. B. Morine, K.C.,

Hon. S. Milley,

The Speaker of the House of Assembly

The Prime Minister,

The Colonial Secretary,

The Attorney General.

Certified true copy,

(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time, as follows:

Department of Posts and Telegraphs—\$1,146,397.83.

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, owing to the circumstances under which we are putting through Supply at the present time, and with your permission I would refer to a point that comes under Marine & Fisheries Department. I intended taking the first opportunity of referring to this matter, and I trust that I shall be pardoned for taking advantage of the present time.

It has been intimated to this House by the Prime Minister, that all due consideration should be given to the dismissal of civil servants. My inference to that was that no person would be dismissed unless some reason or cause was shown, such as the taking of an active part in politics and so on. Now the person to whom I would like to refer is the light keeper at Hopeall, Trinity Bay, Mr. W. J. Thorne. I may say that the salary which he was receiving was exceptionally small. He was appointed four or five years ago, and at that time the department found it extremely difficult to get some one to take the appointment; there was absolutely nothing attractive, either in the way of salary, or otherwise to entice any person to apply for, or to take the appointment when offered, and I had to be communicated with before they could get any person, and eventually Thorne accepted the appointment. I have been assured by the department that he has been giving every satisfaction, and that there was nothing in particular against him. I am now informed that a Mr. Craniford has been recommended to be appointed in his place. My reason for taking advantage of the first chance to speak of this is why I am speaking of it now. Mr. Thorne is a satisfactory man in every way. I do not know how many of his sons went to France during the war, but I know that he lost two sons at the front, and as a consequence the mother practically died of a broken heart. Mr. Thorne now has three or four small children,

and owing to that, and having no wife, he has to stay at home at present, and he is therefore in a better position to look after the work now because of his having to stay at home, than when the appointment was made.

Mr. Field, an official of the Lighthouse Department, who happened to be in the district last week was wired to proceed to New Harbour, to ask Mr. Thorne for the key of the lighthouse, confer with Mr. Craniford, and instruct him as to the keeping of the light. That was all the notice Mr. Thorne received, and he took the trouble to come to St. John's and interview me—and he tried to interview the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but that official was out of town. He spoke of interviewing the Prime Minister, but I told him that the Prime Minister was a very busy man, and even if he did see him, the matter would only be referred to the Department to which it related.

As I have stated in any remarks that I have made relative to the dismissal of officials, I know there has been a number of dismissals made which I would not speak of in this House—which this House would not take any notice of. These are appointments which have been made under some old Liberal regime, perhaps, which were lost again on a change of Government. Then when there is another change of Government, I am quite satisfied to see the old man put back again. But this is a different situation altogether. There is no justification for any change being made in connection with this appointment. It means quite a lot to this man, who has got accustomed to the work, and possibly he would have made arrangements to go somewhere away from New Harbour had he known that he was going to lose this job.

I do not think it is necessary for me to stress the point any further, but I really would impress upon the

members of this House, and I feel sure the Executive will appreciate, the dangers of doing these things—and I feel sure that the matter was just spoken of without consideration. But I am sorry that the Minister is not here, because I think that the heads of Departments should take into consideration the recommendations of certain people, and the motives from which these suggestions or recommendations are made before doing an injustice to any individual.

I may say that during the whole of my time as representative of Trinity District, from 1919 to the present date, I think there were three or four changes made, and they were made to put back men who had been appointed by preceding Governments, that were regarded as perhaps politically obligated to certain individuals for reinstatement. If a new appointment was made, it was to a new department, or a new office, or a party had resigned, or his office had become vacated.

Politically, it is the worst thing you can do, and if I were only considering the matter from a personal point of view, I would not speak of it, because, possibly, I might be more favourably dealt with in treating with the Government if I were to remain quiet. But I am not constituted that way. That is not the kind of thing that I can do. That may be a personal reference, but I am here representing Trinity District, and as long as I am here, and any matter is brought to my notice that I consider an injustice I will bring it to the attention of the powers that be, and they can govern themselves accordingly.

I understand that the Minute has been made, but I do not know whether the Department has been officially notified, but I would specially draw the attention of the Colonial Secretary to this matter. I certainly think that the Government should hesitate

to put that Minute in force before making investigations and giving the matter further consideration.

MR. GRIMES: — Mr. Chairman, there is another point that I would like to draw the attention of the Government to in connection with the question of dismissals, and that is this. When you dismiss a man who has been at the particular work for some time, you go and appoint a man who has not the training necessary to qualify him for work that needs experience. I understand that the Government have come out strongly on the question of economy—they are going to save the money of the taxpayers of this country. If you are going to continue dismissals along these lines, I fail to see how that policy of economy is going to be carried out, because every time you dismiss a lightkeeper you have to get a man to go out to the lighthouse and take his place; and, unless that man is trained to take the position, you have got to pay for sending some man out to instruct him. You have to pay the travelling expenses of the Inspector, and his board and lodging all the time he is instructing the other. This is incurring expense that is entirely unnecessary.

If, as the Prime Minister pointed out some days ago, a civil servant is known to have been actively supporting and working for one party or another, then you have some justification for dismissal. But a man who has not been actively engaged in that manner should not be disturbed in his position.

I think, then, that the Government should hesitate before it makes changes of this kind, until they have all the facts before them. Otherwise there is going to be a whole lot of unnecessary expense in connection with all the departments.

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — Mr.

Chairman, I beg to say in response to Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Grimes that if there had not been so many political dismissals of people from office by past Governments there would not be anything like the present agitation from these districts to have the same thing done again. You will readily understand how difficult it is for us on the Government side of the House to answer these people, when we are being told that the other Governments did it once, and therefore there is no reason why we should not do it again. I do not agree with that argument because I do not think it is right.

I shall be glad to take into consideration this matter of Mr. Thorne, mentioned by Mr. Halfyard. If he has never taken any active part in politics I certainly think we shall hesitate before dismissing him, or replacing him. I do not know the circumstances of this particular case, but I have impressed this very situation on Capt. Winsor, and I do not think that he would have made this alteration unless he had reason for it. However, I shall endeavour to find out the circumstances and give the reasons to the House when it next meets.

I may say that I do not want to follow the policy of the late Government. I contended that it was wrong when done by the late Govt., and I do not want to do it myself. But it must be recognized that there are several men who are holding positions to-day who were put there for no other reason than because they were supporters of a certain sect of the community—put there for that reason and for that reason only, and not because of any qualification for the particular job which they hold. And while, as I say, the Government have made up their minds to try and get the particulars in any case where there may be some question as to whether the man has been politically

biased, still it must be understood that a man may be thrown out of his job for some other good reason, such as incapacity in his office. He may have been dismissed for some such good reason. But I promise these gentlemen that we will go into these cases, and we shall be glad to consider it, and see whether there may be any injustice.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear what the Prime Minister has had to say on this question of dismissals, and I believe that he is sincere in what he says. But that is beside the point. I want to speak now of a couple of instances in the District of Fogo. I may say that I never made any recommendation for the dismissal of any person in the District of Fogo as long as I have been representing that district, although in many cases my friends have requested me to have this or that person dismissed. Now, I felt that if he were dismissed for activities in politics, an appointment would be made of a person on the other side of equal activities. It is just a matter of dismissing an individual who has been indecently opposed to me in order to appoint a person who has been indecently supporting me, and who is then probably heading for another dismissal four years hence.

I think it is time that we made up our minds on both sides of this House to cut this thing out. It is not doing any good. Just as soon as a man becomes qualified for the position he holds, then you dismiss him just because he has been opposed to your party, and you appoint a greenhorn. Then the representative of that district—he makes up his mind that if he ever gets back into the Government again, he is going to have that man who was dismissed reinstated.

That matter should be given consideration. It only creates bad feeling, and does not do much good all

round. I think if both sides of the House made up their minds to cut this out it would create a better feeling.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, I would take advantage of this opportunity and the presence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in the House this afternoon. I am delighted to see him in that position, and I think he is well worthy of it. He has served this House, and his district, and I may even say the country as a politician and debater in this House, and I am delighted to see him occupying the position he holds to-day.

It was intimated by the Prime Minister in reply to a question about the granting of timber licenses that it will be the policy of the Government in future to dispose of any timber lands either by tender or by auction. That is a very commendable policy, but I do not think that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has the power to do that under the present Act, and I suppose the idea is to amend the Act so as to enable him to do that.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The Act will be amended.

MR. HALFYARD:—There is another matter, of which I am sure the Minister himself knows, and that is that there is a number of outstanding claims in his department against the railway for cattle killed by the railway. I would like him to give that matter his consideration. I have about twenty-three outstanding claims for the District of Trinity for cattle killed on the railway track. Some of these claims originated quite recently—in the month of May. It was no good for me, even as Railway Commissioner, to appeal to the Claims Agent of the Newfoundland Government Railway to get these people compensated for their losses—there is always some technicality in connection with these claims, and those

who have lost their cattle are, of course, the sufferers.

I think Mr. Cramm, the hon. member for Bay de Verde, is particularly acquainted with that section of the Railway Act by which the management of the railway is now governed with regard to any claims presented to them for cattle killed by the railway. I understand that where any animal is killed a mile from the place in which the owner of that animal resides, the owner of the animal receives no compensation. At New Harbour two or three people have lost cattle. These animals were killed between New Harbour and Broad Cove, and they were not a mile from any settlement, but being nearer to Broad Cove than New Harbour, they were more than a mile from New Harbour, the claim was disallowed.

I would like for the Government to give this matter their consideration. I think they will see that it is unnecessary now for the Government to refer these claims to the Department of Agriculture and Mines. The Government now runs the Railway—and the Government has to pay the claim anyhow.

Now, there is a clause which occurred in the manifesto of Sir M. P. Cashin that always appealed to me as one which I would support. It referred to the establishment of a cattle claims commission.

(Reads from Bennett Manifesto.)

Now it is no longer the Reid Newfoundland Company. It is the Government. I would like for the Prime Minister and his Government to give this matter their very first consideration. I tried to get the matter attended to, but we could not get down to it, and I trust that the Government will take some steps in the matter.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in response to the remarks made by Mr. Halfyard that the Government have

had under consideration this question of loss of cattle on the Railway, and have decided that that matter is really not one for the Department of Agriculture and Mines, but should be dealt with by the Railway itself, and so I have had these claims handed over to the claims agent of the Railway to take up, and have them adjusted to the best possible advantage. Mr. Halfyard was a member of the Executive and of the Railway Commission, and he has told us that there were little troubles which prevented these things from being settled in his day, and I presume the same troubles may confront the claims agent of the Railway now, who has the matter entirely in his hands, but we hope to be able to get these claims settled satisfactorily.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

MR. DUFF asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to give grants of timber lands in Newfoundland or Labrador to individual applicants, or will they sell them by tender to the highest bidder for the benefit of the revenue, and to furnish a list of timber lands in Newfoundland and Labrador in which the rentals has not been paid.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER replied as follows:—

ARREARS TIMBER RENTS, NEWFOUNDLAND.

Name.	Locality.
Thos. Bonia	Baie Verte.
J. T. Bisson	Grand Pond.
Wm. Campbell	Codroy.
Codroy Pulp & Lumber Co.	" .
I. Depnert	Clode Sound.
Jean P. Dupre	Burnt Is. Bk.
J. C. Gorton	Bay of Islands.
Horwood Lumber Co.	Gander Bay.
A. H. Howard	Terra Nova River.
F. J. Hubbard	Gander Lake.
R. J. Ivany	Clode Sound.
W. F. Lake	Bay D'Espoir.
Geo. Langmead	Canada Bay.
M. J. Mooney	White Bay.
J. J. Oxley	Garia Bay.
Geo. Penney	White Bear River.
A. A. & S. Pritchett	Butts Pond.
Joseph Poissant	Hare Bay, Burgeo & LaPoile.
L. T. Saunders	Bay of Islands.
R. W. Strong	Clode Sound.
Wm. Meyer	Birchy Lakes.

ARREARS TIMBER RENTS, LABRADOR.

Anglo Amer. Dev. Co.	Voisey's Brook 7 Big Bk.
Joseph Drouin	Esquimaux River.
W. J. Ellis	Stag River.
James J. Galway	Gilbert River.

J. A. Guilmette	St. Augustine River.
Hamilton Pulp & Lumber Co.	Hamilton River.
Geo. J. Jardine	White Bear River.
James P. Hearn	Kaipokok Bay.
Frek. LaPointe	St. Augustine River.
“	LaManche River.
“	St. Augustine River.
“	Esquimaux River.
Alfred McNamara	The Backway.
John S. Morris	Grand River.
Quebec Labrador Pulp & Lumber Co.	Forteau Bay.

MR. WARREN asked the Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs how many motor boats are to do the work of the Wren in Fortune Bay, Hermitage Bay and Bay d'Espoir, if any of these motor boats have already taken up the service, what amount is being paid them or to be paid them and to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the notices or letters asking for tenders for the service.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS replied to Mr. Warren as follows:—

July 17th the Postmistress was instructed by wire “ask tenders for mail service Garnish round to Belleoram after Portia arrives from St. John's.”

“Also ask offers for moor boat Belleoram to Harbour Breton calling at all offices Sagona and Brunette included.” In reply the postmistress stated an offer had been received for the Garnish Route or Fortune Bay proper at \$75.00 per trip, and the Department has received an offer for the Belleoram-Hr. Breton Route at \$60.00 per trip.

There is already a motor ferry starting from Gaultois serving all offices in Bay d'Espoir and mails will be sent by that conveyance.

At 26 fortnightly trips cost would be \$3510.00.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled “An Act Respecting the De-

velopment of Public Printing and Stationery.”

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, in connection with the discussion as to this bill I would like to ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary some details as to the saving he expects to make and to give some outline of them. It is true ehat he went over this matter the other day but I would ask for the information now for the benefit of the House and all in general.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—It is difficult indeed to give even an estimate of the proposed savings but Mr. Hibbs, who I know is a keen and observing business man and whose bills I have no doubt have been just and proper, will realize that printers in the past may have had a very expensive way of doing work, and this we propose to check by introducing the system of tendering. Take for instance the printing of the Hansard, Journal or Debates or Consolidated Statutes, I know that the latter in particular is a very expensive job costing generally about \$25,000. But it may be possibly done for \$12,000 if the machinery is to be put in motion in order to bring about economy by having all such work done by tender. As to the printing of stationery it is absolutely impossible to estimate what supplies may have to be provided for. As I tried to point out the other day, the system

in the past has been for departments to give orders for small quantities of stationery and when the bills were sent in there was nothing left but to pay them without consideration as to the justice of the price or efficiency of the work. But if the whole requisition were put into one order the price would be reduced accordingly. Therefore there will be a big saving when the objects of this bill are put into operation. I have tried to inform the House as to the Government's attitude in this connection and I believe that the new system will meet with the commendation of all. The haphazard ordering of stationery as in the past must naturally be expensive and I regret that I am unable to accurately state the estimated saving though it will likely be large. It is proposed to pass the bill as it stands though the Government is prepared to receive any reasonable amendments.

MR. BROWN:—Mr. Chairman, while the explanation given as to printing is very good, I would like to know why the name of the Royal Gazette is to be changed to Newfoundland Gazette. The Trade Printers and Publishers Limited, who for some time have been in possession of that paper have spent some \$15,000 in providing machinery for its publication and I do not think it should be taken away from them without some justification and authority. I am informed on good authority and am prepared to bring witnesses here to verify it that Mr. Long has stated the position of King's Printer is a Church of England job.

HON. MR. LONG:—I deny any knowledge of such a statement; Mr. Brown might have heard lots of things in the night time.

MR. BROWN—If my information is correct as I have little reason to doubt, I regret that such a statement should be made. As a matter of fact

the first King's Printer was Mr. Ryan, a Roman Catholic, and the second, Mr. Withers, an Anglican, and if a Methodist has now got it he should be allowed to retain it. I do not wish to stand for sectarianism but if printing is to be put out to tender the present holder of the position mentioned should be given a chance. In my opinion there is prejudice in connection with the job and while I am not against the bill I hope this matter will be given consideration.

HON. MR. BENNETT:—In reply to Mr. Brown I would like to point out that on the second reading of the bill I stated clearly that the present owners of the Royal Gazette have done their work as far as I know satisfactorily and that Mr. Thistle has shown every competence. As to the latter gentleman there is no question whatever of religion. While he is the manager of the firm I think that the principal shareholders in the firm are Anglicans and it is these who suffer by discrimination. He would get his salary anyway as manager. I think it altogether unworthy of this House that such a question should be introduced because if the work is to be given on denominational lines it would be far better to tear up the bill. If legislation is to be conducted in that way it would be better to have none at all.

MR. BROWN:—That is my idea.

MR. BENNETT:—As I said before the present firm have given every satisfaction in their work and I assure Mr. Brown that they will be given a square deal and every fair play. I for one do not propose to throw away a chance to economize because of reasons of religion. As to the change of the name from the Royal Gazette to the Newfoundland Gazette, that is only following the precedent of the other Dominions as in Canada it is called the Canadian Gazette and the term only designates

the Colony of issue. Originally the Royal Gazette was a business paper and was also known as the Advertiser and the only change now is from the "Royal" to "Newfoundland." There is absolutely no intention to discriminate against the present owners of the paper or to injure them and they will be given a square deal in every way.

MR. BROWN:—While I believe in the sincerity of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and his intention to give a square deal, I do not like to hear such reports as those mentioned as they can do no good. I trust that Mr. Bennett will see that matters in connection with the bill are put right.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, getting this matter down to a business viewpoint, it appears to me that the Government is launching out upon a new venture and entering into a proposition with which they are not acquainted. The Hon. the Colonial Secretary cannot be aware of the details of the project and if I thought there would be a saving I would support the bill but I believe that what gives rise to its introduction is mainly misrepresentation of facts. Last year figures for printing for the Postal Telegraphs and another department were given out and they were all wrong. In connection with the order for the Postal Telegraphs I found on investigation that the price given for the order would not pay for the paper alone. I enquired of the proper authority on the 'phone and he told me the figure stipulated was wrong though at the moment I had a copy of the tender on my desk. This giving of false figures in tenders is one of the things that Sir Michael Cashin in particular condemned and I am sorry that he is not in the House to-day. As a matter of fact the present bill is a dog in the manger policy and prompted by jobbers who if they cannot get

contracts try to prevent others from doing so. I greatly fear that the Hon. the Colonial Secretary will be disappointed as this bill is not going to do all that is expected of it. You are creating a sub-department of which nobody can estimate the cost.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—That is not so—the work will be done by one official and an assistant.

MR. HIBBS—I think that assistant will soon be applying for more assistance though I do not doubt the earnestness of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary as to his idea of saving. I would like to say Mr. Chairman that I cannot understand all this paraphernalia as to the printing of work. Under this system we will have deputy ministers calculating the amount of work necessary; he will send the order to another; then it will be passed to the King's Printer and by him to the contractor. Why not obviate all this by making it compulsory for the deputies to anticipate the needs of their departments for the year and ask for tenders for the whole job. If the Hon. the Colonial Secretary has to O.K. all the orders coming in under the proposed system, he will certainly be kept busy. There are a lot of departments and a lot of printing to be done and I do not think this system is going to work out satisfactorily. I am glad to hear the Hon. the Colonial Secretary and therefore I do not see the need of a change and the introduction of a new department which is bound to grow in cost and will not give returns. Another phase of the question that I would like to point out is that there is no provision against the King's Printer placing the order for the printing in Canada or England. As everyone knows the offices here can handle the work, and home industry should not be lost sight of. Hundreds of men are earn-

ing their living in the local offices and it would be an injustice to have them deprived of work and cast out. You say you will save money but I think this is false economy and if some 150 printers have nothing to do they will have to leave the country as they are not fitted for other work. Therefore I ask the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to insert a clause in the bill guaranteeing the giving of the work to local offices, provided of course that their figures are reasonable. Let the deputies of the departments do the work of calculating what is necessary for their offices without the overlapping proposed and send the requisitions to the Colonial Secretary. I must say that I think a clause should be inserted to prevent the proposed juggling with orders. I will give the bill my heartiest support as long as I am assured the rights of local offices will be protected and that orders will not be placed abroad on the basis that the price for 100,000 lots is cheaper there proportionately than for 5,000 lots here. Any firm here will give a lower figure for a large order than for a small one, that is proportionately. Before taking my seat, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that in less than two years the Hon. the Colonial Secretary will find more than one working in his new department and that its cost will be far more than calculated now while no saving will result. I wish to express the opinion again that the chief reason for the introduction of the bill is the giving of false figures for work by those who are desirous of cutting in under those who are at present getting the orders.

However, I wish this bill every luck. Before I take my seat I wish to repeat here now, and I want the Colonial Secretary to pay attention to what I am saying, that before 2 years he will have found that he has made a mis-

take. His hopes will not be realized and this department will not cost less than \$7,000.

MR. GRIMES:—I would like to ask the Colonial Secretary a question. In Sec. 3, "Such a power may be exercised," I think "shall" should be substituted for "may."

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—In reply to our friend Mr. Hibbs, I am very glad he raised the point with regard to outside printing. I want to inform the country that there is no idea of going outside Newfoundland. It never was contemplated and never suggested to do anything of the kind. Any work done in my department will be done locally. An article showing the necessity for economising in expenditures of public monies which I read the other day, shows there is great room for economy in the amount spent annually by this Colony, and I can only say that this measure is only decided upon in the interests of the country. It would be suicide for any government to bring in enactments to starve our own people. I would be the last in the world to be the means of taking money out of the hands of working men by sending work away when it could be done here. I don't care what the price may be, because we know many establishments in England where they do the work at ridiculously low prices, even in comparison with Canada and the United States; but we are not going to send money away to give other people employment and let our own people remain idle.

I may say that the act is so formed that the granting of the contract is in the hands of the Colonial Secretary and the Colonial Secretary will be the Minister in charge of this department.

The act also provides that tenders must be called for. Sec. 7 says "All

purchases and all printing.....after the tenders have been called for."

With regard to the future, I am perfectly satisfied to leave it in the hands of time, and should I be able in a year to show the House that I saved \$20,000, I hope you will be the first gentleman to rise and congratulate me on it. I thank the Honourable member as being very fair and giving me an opportunity of emphasizing the fact that no printing will go out of this country.

The King's Printer must be a man connected with the printing business. Next he must know local prices and conditions and also he must be a good judge of the quality.

MR. HIBBS:—Do you intend that no printing whatever shall go out of the country?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—You have got to make exception. We must allow for any work that cannot be done here.

MR. HIBBS:—Anything that cannot be done here should be specified in this bill. I would like to see that clause inserted.

MR. HICKMAN:—I want to put myself on record as being opposed to this bill. It is a Government bill and goes through in any case. I am waiting to hear the explanations to the question asked by Mr. Hibbs. What saving would be to the credit of this department. Mr. Bennett is not able to give any estimate whatever. If he cannot give this, he has no justification for introducing this bill and creating another department in the Government. The Hon. Colonial Secretary refers to the printing of the consolidated statutes where he says a saving can be effected. As far as I can learn the Consolidated Statutes are only printed once every ten years, so that there cannot be much saved under that. The King's Printer will be a Government servant and will n-

sist that Government patronage be given that King's Printer just as has been done in the past.

This is one reason why this bill to create a new department will cost the country nobody knows how much. The salary of the King's Printer, the stationery, and the office furniture, will cost more than the saving on the printing. I am opposed to the bill in that form for creating a department without knowledge of the saving to be effected.

MR. GRIMES:—I wish to endorse the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition. You are taking a leap in the dark as to the amount you are going to effect in saving. The Colonial Secretary gave out in the estimates that the cost of the stationery in connection with the Government was \$135,000. A great deal of the cost was for stationery and printing that will not be required in the coming year. The printing done in connection with the elections and acts of various kinds this year did not cost any more than \$100,000. Assuming that you would save 10%, which I doubt, that would be \$10,000. What is the difference going to cost—Furnishing the office and the expenses of getting stationery. I do not think you would get that done under \$4,000. Then there is the running of that office. The next question. Supposing you call for tenders and stationery fluctuates. You call for tenders today at one price. Six months later you get another price. Then you have the smaller job printer who might be able to do a much smaller job than a printer would. Where they do just one kind of work a job printer might be able to save a considerable sum. I say this thing ought to be left over until the Winter Session and let us have the figures that we have asked for.

I agree with the principle of the bill as far as it tries to effect a sav-

ing. But we want to know if it is really going to effect a saving.

MR. HICKMAN:—I confess that I am not quite clear on that. I cannot see how the department is to get any revenue. I agree with the principle that printing be done by Government tender. But the Government has to pay for its Government printing. I cannot see how any revenue will accrue unless it is doing a commercial business and turning out printed material?

MR. GRIMES:—Mr. Chairman, I beg to ask the Colonial Secretary if he would leave it stand over until tomorrow.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—What is the point now?

MR. GRIMES:—I want to get some idea about the stationery.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I can give you any idea.

MR. GRIMES:—Have you got the figures as to the value of stationery for the different departments?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY reads the figures.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to advertise for the government departments under the King's Printer. Perhaps the railway might advertise in this.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Oh, the railway will advertise in the daily papers. Any official advertisements will go in the Newfoundland Gazette.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—But the daily advertisements.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—The advertisements from the railway in connection with the sailings of ships, mails, will go in the daily papers, but the official advertisements would go in the Gazette and the

King's Printer will have all the business in connection with it. If the Minister of Finance wanted to advertise some thing in connection with the department he would send it to the King's Printer.

MR. HALFYARD:—The Colonial Secretary did not say anything about advertising from the Public Departments that has become a matter of course with many people. Much money is expended uselessly this way. I have come into much disfavor with many people who have been looking for advertisements with periodicals, magazines, etc. They are, of course, just trying to make a few dollars and their principal source of income is the Government advertising. Because, when I was Colonial Secretary, I would not give permission to advertise in these pamphlets for a certain amount, say, fifteen, or twenty dollars, as the case may be, I have been insulted on the public streets. Every new administration that comes into office expresses amazement at the great waste of money in useless advertising which is given indiscriminately in periodicals; leaflets which are gotten up at Christmas time and at the Annual Regatta. Of course the printers are very industrious and I am not blaming them. It is just as well to give the party, who is looking for some of these advertisements, the money, and have done with it, and I see nothing in the act which will prevent the King's Printer from doing advertising of the same nature.

I appreciate the energy of the men who are trying to earn a few dollars in this way. But then we are in for the public ridicule and censure and it all comes back to the Colonial Secretary. He is the scape goat.

MR. GRIMES:—I wish to endorse the remarks of the senior member for Trinity, and in addition would say

that the figures given by the Colonial Secretary a few days ago require careful perusal. According to the Colonial Secretary's statement last year, \$135,000 was spent on printing and advertising, of which \$25,000 was in connection with the General Election and \$10,000 had to do with the Census. In other words \$35,000 will be saved this year on these two items alone. Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Halfyard very properly asked the question, how much could be saved in advertising. It could be safely said that some thousands more could be saved on advertising and the Colonial Secretary had recognized that it could be done by the notice he sent out on instructions from the Executive Government to the Heads of Departments requesting them to cut down expenditure, in this direction. Mr. Halfyard, while Colonial Secretary, requested this to be done because much was being spent on Regatta Programmes, Song Sheets, casual periodicals and in other ways which were practically useless as advertising mediums. If the Colonial Secretary was intending his department to exercise supervision over the various Government departments to ensure this being done (and here is where much can be saved). Then there was no need of creating new jobs for the purpose. Deduct the several thousands of dollars that could be saved on this kind of advertising, then what would be saved on printing it would appear would not be large enough to equip an office and pay four or five thousand dollars in salaries, and practically no economy would be effected.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—The Government decided that and not the Colonial Secretary. He has something else to do besides finding out how many forms, etc., each department will need. The King's Printer will have all these things under his care.

MR. GRIMES:—But if the Colonial Secretary could not find time to do this work then somebody in his department could undertake the supervision.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—The Colonial Secretary absolutely declines the honor.

MR. GRIMES:—I think that somebody in the Colonial Secretary's department might be found who could have this position allotted to him and a considerable saving might be effected in this way.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—The honourable member was himself at one time a Minister of the Crown and he must know the conditions which exist with regard to this advertising. There has always been a kind of disagreement or unpleasantness in connection with it. And as far as the Department of Colonial Secretary is concerned I think that such supervision is absolutely improper. I think he should not have to supervise other departments. The formation of the King's Printer will obviate all necessity of this. When any advertising is to be done it will be sent to him. If it is in order it will be published and he will not be bringing the Colonial Secretary under this unnecessary odium. The whole matter is at the discretion of the King's Printer. Down at the Custom House if any matter comes up Mr. LeMessurier and Mr. Hutchings are there to do the work and the Minister of Finance does not have to be consulted unless it is a matter of grave import. As I said the other day, however, the man for the job has to be a man of intelligence and business training and character that will enable him to do the job properly. The Colonial Secretary has a whole lot of other things to do.

MR. HALFYARD:—The trouble has been that all Governments have been prone to put this matter of advertis-

ing over on the shoulders of the Deputy Colonial Secretary. If a person goes to the head of one of the departments and asks him for leave to print an advertisement, it is almost impossible for him in his good nature to refuse and he says "all right, then, I'll O.K. this, but you must take it to Mr. Mews, the Deputy Colonial Secretary." That puts Mr. Mews in a very awkward position as the Deputy Head of the Colonial Secretary's Department. The same thing might happen to the King's Printer. He may find himself in the same position and if he is to do his work properly the Executive Government will have to give him their support in spite of the feelings or dispositions of the departmental heads. Then something will be done which will effect a savings. But so long as the deputies or heads of departments approve advertisements the same conditions of things will go on. Every new Government issues circulars to the different departments to cut out indiscriminate advertisements. For a couple of months they are very strict in this kind of thing. Then gradually it drifts back again. Then one head or another—say my good friend Mr. Walsh, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, whose good nature will not allow him to refuse anybody, gives permission for an advertisement. Then perhaps Mr. Woodford gives another, and there you are. But give the King's Printer full authority and support him, check him, too if he is liable to give unnecessary advertisements himself. I hope that the conditions of things as predicted will be the case. Otherwise no savings will be effected.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I quite agree with Mr. Halfyard. It is high time that some light were thrown on this matter. It appears that the Colonial Secretary has to be the scape-goat for everybody. When ever there is trouble in any

department "send it over to the Colonial Secretary." The office is a regular dumping ground, for everything disagreeable that has to be done the Col. Secretary has to do it. If any letter or information that is likely to be displeasing to, somebody has to be sent out, then the Colonial Secretary has to do it, and he is no more responsible for it than any other member of the Executive Government. Mr. Halfyard has a practical insight into the nature of the work and he knows how certain people feel when the Colonial Secretary has to take some actions. Mr. Halfyard was no more to blame than any other of his associates of the Executive. He just happened to be the Colonial Secretary. As I said, if any minister has any matter of import which he does not like to handle for some reason or another he sends the stuff over to the Colonial Secretary for him to bear the odium when the work should really have been done in his own department. It makes life almost unbearable sometimes, and we do not get any consideration for it. The Colonial Secretary has no particular advantages outside the ordinary minister. I would like if we can get the unanimous consent of the House to have this bill read the third time and sent to the Upper House with some other business we have for them. I move the third reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 14

Geo. V., Cap. 7, entitled, "An Act for the Encouragement of Ship Building," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I may explain in connection with this Bill respecting the Ship Building Act, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that it is merely to substitute nineteen twenty five for nineteen twenty-four.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I may say in connection with this Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, "Of the Payment of certain Fees and Charges by Stamps." that there is only a slight change being made. It is of no importance. Just the changing of the word five to twenty five. That is all that is in the Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Formerly, a person could go down to the Finance Department and buy five dollars worth of these stamps and the Department was becoming a retail store. It is now proposed that these people who want the stamps are to buy at least twenty five dollars worth.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—We want to change the Department from a retail to a wholesale store.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, "Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In connection with this Bill respecting the Boy Scouts I think I may say for the information of the House that it is merely to put into effect the same arrangements which exist in other

countries of the Empire. It is not a measure of any importance to the House. The Bill is brought in at their own request and the passing of it will only be endorsing the movement which has done considerable good in this as well as in other parts of the Empire. It is hoped I think that this will have the result of further development of the movement. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further and Protect The Activities and Interests of the Boy Scouts Association in the Island of Newfoundland and Its Dependencies," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill for confirmation of an Agreement with the Nfld. Milling Co., Ltd.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—In moving the second reading of this Bill I would like to ask the indulgence and consent of the House to have it read the third time also this afternoon and have the matter disposed of. I take it that almost all the members are practically in favour of it and I do not know of any suggested amendments while it was in the committee stage. As Mr. Palmer wants to leave on Saturday he would like to have the Bill passed before he goes. He asked me if possible to have it railroaded through the legislature this afternoon so that it might go to the Upper House to-morrow. If the members have no criticism to offer I would like to move that it be read the second and third time.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm an Agreement with the Nfld. Milling Co., Ltd.," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred

to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

On motion, and by unanimous agreement the Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm an Agreement with the Nfld. Milling Co., Ltd.," was referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently:

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, by unanimous consent, the Bill entitled, "An Act to Confirm an Agreement with the Nfld. Milling Co., Ltd.," was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Duff gave notice of question.

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of questions.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, July 25th, 1924.

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

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition from the residents of Upper Island

Cove, for money for repairs to the road. I strongly support this Petition, and I would like to point out to the House that it is signed by practically every man there, and that the grant for repairs to the road is badly needed.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I also have much pleasure in supporting this Petition. I would like to say that there is a considerable amount of relief needed at present in the District of Harbor Grace, and more is likely to be needed from all appearances of the fishery, and particularly from that part of the District from whence the Petition comes, and that it is better to have the relief money spent on repairing roads, than to give it out as pauper's dole and get no returns for it. I have much pleasure in strongly supporting this Petition.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Petition. The repairs to the road are badly needed and will be of great benefit to a number of people as it leads to about fifty or sixty gardens which are a part of the support upon which a great number of the residents depend.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a Petition from about 200 people from St. Mary's Biscay Bay and Trepassey, asking for the sum of \$600.00 to repair a road leading from Portugal Cove to Trepassey. In presenting this Petition I would like to say, that while on this matter I hope that the Government will see its way clear to continue this road on to Renews. This is a very important road and would be of considerable benefit to the fishermen along that part of the shore. There are also very fine sporting grounds along this line, and no doubt when it was opened up it would be availed of considerably by Tourists visiting this country.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this Petition.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in strongly supporting this Petition apart entirely from the fact that it goes through a part of my District. I beg to say that it is a good idea to extend this road up to Renews, and that it would be a great benefit to the fishermen along that part of the Coast in particular, and for the vast number of people who visit there during the summer.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS:

Mr. Halfyard gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question No. 2.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question No. 2.

Mr. Chambers gave notice of question.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

HON. PRIME MINISTER, asked leave to table answer to Question asked by Mr. Scammell on the Order Paper of July 24th.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY asked leave to answer Question No. 9 on the Order Paper of July 22nd, as follows:

Number of persons from each district who came to St. John's for entrance to Hospitals for treatment during the calendar year 1923:

A.

St. Barbe	10
Twillingate	30
Fogo	100
Bonavista	150
Trinity	120
Bay de Verde	130
Carbonear	16
Hr. Grace	15

Port de Grave	13
Hr. Main	16
Ferryland	292
Fortune	26
Burin	38
Burgeo	12
Placentia	30
	<hr/>
	1328

Number of persons from each district who came to St. John's for entrance to Hospitals for treatment for six months of the present year:

A.

St. Barbe	2
Twillingate	7
Fogo	16
Bonavista	40
Trinity	51
Bay de Verde	23
Carbonear	4
Hr. Grace	9
Port de Grave	3
Hr. Main	7
Ferryland	53
Fortune	24
Burin	30
Placentia	100
St. George's	19
	<hr/>
	400

Number from each district who arrived and could not gain adm'ssion on their arrival and for whom board and lodging was paid by the Government.

B.—No record kept.

Total cost of board and lodging, showing amount for each district:

C.

St. Barbe	\$ 310.00
Twillingate	510.00
Fogo	1,810.50
Trinity	1,960.00
Bay de Verde	3,154.30
Carbonear	234.40
Hr. Grace	255.89
Port de Grave	200.00
Hr. Main	233.60
Ferryland	3,060.80
Fortune	589.90

Burin	772.40
Burgeo	318.00
Placentia	4,620.74
St. George's	655.60
	\$24,244.63

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works (1) the amount of money expended on Sudbury Military Hospital per year for 1921-22, 1922-23, 1923-24; (2) how much of this money was authorized by vote and who authorized other amounts; (3) how many Military and how many Civilian in-patients were treated during the years 1921-22, 1922-23 and 1923-24; (4) how many Military and how many Civilian out-patients were treated during the said periods; (5) the amount spent on electrical and other apparatus during the same period; (6) the amount spent on medical and other supplies such as X-ray during the same period; (7) the amount received from Civilian patients for electrical and X-ray treatment, Turkish baths, etc., during same period; (8) the amount received from Civilian in-patients during same period; (9) the cost per capita per diem compared with other Hospitals; (10) the number of visits paid the Hospital by the Board of Hospital Governors (11) when and by whom were the books of the Hospital audited.

MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS:—In reply to this question I may say that the several answers are in course of preparation.

MR. SCAMMEL asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a comparative statement showing the scale of freight and passenger rates charged on the S. S. Prospero under the management of the Shipping Department and the Newfoundland Government Railway respectively.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—

The information asked for will be available at the next session.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if the S. S. Malakoff will be taken off Trinity Bay on or before August 1st. If so, what arrangements are being made for a substitute service? If the S. S. Malakoff is exclusively confined to the Bonavista Bay service; state, if any, the difference in cost of present service, whether more or less? If Port Blandford is made the railway terminus for the steamer, instead of Port Union; what is the estimated cost of repairs to wharf and sheds at Port Blandford?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—It is the intention of the Government to place the S. S. Malakoff on her old route in Bonavista Bay. The change is being made in compliance with a demand from the people of Bonavista Bay to restore the service that was most necessary and advantageous in the interests of the Bay. No arrangements are being made for a substitute service for Trinity Bay, which is already served on the north and south sides by the railway. Those sections which are not directly served by the railway will probably be covered by motor boat service or otherwise. The amount of traffic and convenience afforded by the Malakoff are wholly out of proportion to the cost of maintaining the service on that Bay. The estimated cost of repairs to the wharf at Port Blandford is about 3,000.00. No repairs are being made to the sheds.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement (a) giving the names of the party or parties who asked him either verbally or by letter to dismiss Mr. William Thorne, Lightkeeper at Hopeall, Trinity District; (b) give the reasons why he as Minister of the Department re-

commended to the Executive Government the dismissal of Mr. Thorne.

THE SPEAKER:—With the permission of the honourable member this question may be deferred till the Minister is present.

MR. HALFYARD: — Mr. Speaker, with reference to these questions which are not answered because the Minister is out of the House, I do not know whose duty it is to see that they are answered, but I think the answers should be ready, because the Minister, of course, depends upon the Deputy or some official in his office to prepare them, and I think the clerk or somebody else should notify the Deputy of the question so that the answer may be prepared.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—That is a question which it would be pretty difficult for the Deputy to answer, because you have asked for the parties who “verbally or by letter” asked for the dismissal of Mr. Thorne, and I do not think the Deputy would be in a position to answer that.

MR. HALFYARD:—It may not particularly apply to that question, but there are other questions which are an encumbrance to the order paper—which have been on the order paper for some time. There are questions which I asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs some days ago which I think the Deputy or some clerk in the office should be able to prepare the answers to and have ready for the House.

MR. DUFF asked the Minister of Public Works to name the responsible parties who recommended a Commissioner to spend public monies in Victoria instead of the duly constituted Road Board for that section.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—In reply to my friend, Mr. Duff, I beg to say that I answered his question in part yesterday, and I may say in

reply to this present question that there were more than one who sent recommendations for the Commissioners who spent the money. I think Rorke was one of the names.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs if a building has been taken over for the examination and delivery of express parcels; where the building is situated, what is the rental per year, and what additional appointments will be made to that Department.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I beg to say in reply to that question that the building next door to the Custom House, belonging to Edens, has been taken over, but I am not yet sure whether it will be used for express parcels or for general goods. As to new appointments, I cannot tell you, as I have not yet made up my mind. I am looking around for a man suitable for the position. With regard to the cost, it is costing \$1150.00 per month, and has been taken for one year only.

MR. SCAMMELL asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing what mail couriers are engaged in the District of St. Barbe for the summer season and to show what service each performs, and salary paid in each instance.

In the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and with the permission of the hon. member, it was ordered this question be deferred.

MR. GRIMES asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if any new appointments have been made in connection with his department since he assumed office or are in contemplation of being made, and if so, what are the reasons therefor.

In the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and with the permission of the hon. member, it was ordered this question be deferred.

MR. HALFYARD asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay upon the table of the House a statement showing the number of Miles of Telegraph and Telephone lines respectively erected by his department from May 2nd, 1923, to July 20th, 1924, also the location of each extension.

In the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and with the permission of the hon. member, it was ordered this question be deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions to confirm a contract between the Government and the Gander Valley River Paper Co., Ltd.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, with your permission, though I know it is rather out of order to ask a question on a question, I think it has been allowed so often that it has become the custom of the House, I wish to refer to the reply given me by Hon. Prime Minister. There is one part that I do not believe he has answered fully:

“If the S.S. Malakoff is exclusively confined to the Bonavista Bay service, state if any, the difference in cost of present service, whether more or less?”

Now there is no estimate in the reply as to whether the Malakoff being confined to the Bonavista Bay service, does so at more or less cost to the country. I may say that when inquiring the reason why the Malakoff, which had been doing service on Trinity Bay, was being taken off that service and confined to Bonavista Bay, I impressed upon the Government that, as there must be a steamer on Trinity Bay, the Malakoff would cost just as much whether running on Bonavista Bay or whether it simply took in the both bays on

each trip. I was considering the cost of a steamer whether confined solely to one bay, or whether it was running in two. I cannot conceive that the S.S. Malakoff will cost any less to the country if it is confined solely to Bonavista Bay. With the transportation facilities already afforded Bonavista Bay, I think it is an act of injustice, when there is no saving to the country, for the Malakoff to be diverted solely to Bonavista Bay.

I intimated that possibly there would be a substitute service, and that will cost money. I consider that the change will mean an extra cost to the Government, but if the Prime Minister is in a position to state the estimated saving, if any, that may palliate the offence of causing such an injustice by taking the steamer off Trinity Bay at this season.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE— I beg to lay on the table of the House the figures in connection with the cost of the revision of the tariff.

Expenses re Revision of Tariff.

The Minister of Finance and Customs tabled a statement of costs of the Commission appointed to revise the tariff, as follows:—

Angel, F. W., Commissioner	\$ 500.00
Ayre, C.P., Commissioner	.. 500.00
Ayre & Sons, Ltd., Stationery	10.00
Barker, John & Co., per H. M. Mosdell 10.01
Brownrigg, H. J., Commissioner 300.00
Caldwell, Winifred, Typewriting 300.00
Carew, W. J., typewriting	.. 1000.00
Dicks & Co., typewriting, ribbons and stationery	.. 134.53
Dowden & Edwards, Cabinet File 160.00
Gray & Goodland, Rubber Stamp, etc. 8.80
Greene, M., Commissioner	.. 500.00
Harris, F. F., Commissioner	500.00

Hutchings, H. V., Commissioner and special services	1333.00
Johnson, Percie, stationery	30.00
LeMessurier, H. W., Chairman and on acct. special services	3500.00
McKay, J. J., Commissioner	500.00
Mosdell, H. M., Secretary and special services	2666.00
Nfld. Publishers, Ltd., printing, stationery, etc. .. .	241.65
O'Dea, J. V., Commissioner	500.00
Piercey, Wm., Commissioner	500.00
Redmond, Gertrude, typewriting	75.00
Reid, Florence M., typewriting	60.00
Richardson, John, Janitor ..	25.00
Royal Stationery, stationery	93.50
Saunders, L., typewriting ..	87.00
Voisey, R. H., cabhire, (Chairman)	24.00
	<hr/>
	\$13,559.31

I would also like to lay on the table of the House the cost to the country of the refund on the codfish export tax.

EXPORT TAX REFUND ACCOUNT.

Office Assistants and for Services.

S. K. Smith, services	\$1500.00
G. H. Badcock, services	600.00
B. R. Bourne, services	1425.00
E. L. Ellis, services	660.00
N. McKay, services	105.00
E. L. Gardner, services	20.00
W. Caldwell, services	20.00
H. V. Hutchings, services and Secretary	1500.00
H. W. LeMessurier, services	500.00
Hon. W. H. Cave, services	300.00
Captain E. Dawe, services ..	300.00
Hon. W. W. Halfyard, services	300.00
A. W. Piccott, services	300.00
R. G. Pike, services	300.00
	<hr/>
	\$7,830.00

Stationery and Advertising:—	
Nfld. Pub. Co., Cheques, Binders, Stationery, Advertising, etc.	\$ 716.01
Union Pub. Co., Envelopes, Receipt Books, advertisements, etc.	257.00
W. J. Edgar, Typewriter and ribbons	120.50
Munn & Oke, advertising ..	30.00
Evening Telegram, advertising	32.00
Nfld. Quarterly, advertising	30.00
Saturday Night, advertising	30.00
Western Star, advertising	39.50
Twillingate Sun, advertising	32.00
Free Lance, advertising ..	30.00
G.W.V.A. Magazine, adver.	20.00
Free Press, advertising ..	16.00
Daily News, advertising ..	32.00
Trade Review, advertising ..	30.00
Bay Roberts Guardian, adver.	28.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,443.11

Refund on 1,056,501 qtls. codfish at 10c. per qtl.	105,650.10
	<hr/>
	\$114,923.21
Balance at Credit	164.90
	<hr/>
	\$115,088.16

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:—

Department of Customs ..	\$439,552.25
Assessor of Taxes	14,840.00
Department Accountant	
Contingencies	184,617.00
Department Pension Board	
Commissioners	651,766.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery," was read a third time,

and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 14 Geo. V., Cap. 7, entitled, "An Act for the Encouragement of Ship Building."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HALFYARD:—I would consider that it would be interesting as a matter of information with regard to this Act to know the bounties that were paid on ships last year, and what is likely to be paid next year. I would like this just as a matter of information.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—So far as the estimates show, it is indicated that the bounties voted last year have not yet been exhausted. The present bill means nothing more than the extension of the bounty for another year. If you are not prepared to continue I am quite prepared for the Committee to rise. It is only a matter of giving the Upper House something to do.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Does 1925 in this Act mean the end of the Fiscal year 1925, or December 31st, 1925.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—What is in the Act?

MR. SCAMMELL:—June 30th.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Then that means June 30th. It is just a continuation of the Bill for another twelve months.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman, I think while we are considering this Bill is an opportune time to draw the attention of the Prime Minister

to a situation that has arisen in this country of some importance in connection with our fishing fleet. I refer to the large number of schooners that are badly in need of repair and the fact that repairs are expensive, that the owners are unable to undertake such repairs as are necessary. We are all anxious to see everything possible done to foster our fisheries and to encourage the promotion of the fishing industry, and I say now what better way is there than by giving some sort of a bounty to men who are anxious to repair schooners. This year in particular a great many more schooners were fitted for the fisheries than has been the case in recent years and I know cases of men who were anxious to fit for the fishery, finding it impossible to procure suitable vessels. Many people cannot afford to build new schooners, but there are several schooners lying around that could go on for many years yet if they were repaired. I really think that the Government ought to consider the question of a bounty for the repair of schooners and have some scheme developed under which such bounties might be paid. I remember that there was some debate in the House last year on this question and I think that the member for Placentia, Mr. Walsh, from this side of the House, expressed himself as very strongly in favor of something being done in this connection. I think the Prime Minister ought to give this suggestion some consideration and I would like to hear his views on the subject this afternoon.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that Mr. Scammell's suggestion has my entire sympathy, because I, myself, know of a great many men who have almost built new vessels, and have had nothing for it. I know of one man named Samson in Flat Island, who practically built a new vessel and was unable

to recover any bounty under the act. I am very glad to hear this proposition made by Mr. Scammel, and I think we shall be glad to give the matter our consideration. I think I can undertake to have the Government consider the question. It may be a rather difficult question, because it is rather hard to know how you can arrange to have a proper survey of the vessel made that will prevent you from being taken in, and to know whether you are not being taken in, and to know whether you are not being imposed upon by some person who has simply put a few new planks into an old vessel, but if there is any scheme which can be arranged whereby to overcome that difficulty, I shall be only too delighted to do something by way of granting a part bounty for repairing old vessels.

I think if the matter was left over until the next session of the House, we might then be able to introduce legislation in respect to this question. I think the bill will need to be amended considerably to meet the situation.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES:—Mr. Chairman, in regard to this matter, I would like to be permitted to express my opinions. I think Mr. Scammel will remember that I was the person who originally brought this matter up two years ago. I was then sitting on the Opposition side of the House and I was informed that consideration would be given to the matter. I think it should certainly be attended to, in order to give the owners of vessels throughout the country, who cannot afford to build new vessels, the encouragement necessary to make them repair their old ones.

I am delighted to know that the Leader of the House is sympathetically inclined to the matters presented by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe; but I think it would be a mistake to hedge the matter, and postpone the

amendment till the next session of the House, if the matters could be settled by an addition, or an amendment to the Bill this afternoon—a very short amendment which would settle the matter.

I know from personal experience that there is a large number of fishermen who have boats, but cannot afford to put them ashore and rebuild, whilst they would be able to repair with some little encouragement, but these people want to get to work on their boats now, and have them repaired immediately, and if we are going to wait until the House meets again to make the amendment, it will be too late for these people to bring their boats ashore and repair them in time for next season.

I would like then, for the Prime Minister to consider if this committee could not rise, and let some amendment to the Act be made, which would provide for a bounty to be paid for repairing old vessels. It is very important that these boats which have been in use, should not be allowed to be left unused, but some encouragement should be given to the owners to repair them. These people cannot afford to replace these boats with new ones, and it would be a good act for the Prime Minister if he would adopt some clause in the Bill providing for this party bounty. I think the time opportune to give some encouragement to those people who have boats suitable for repair, but who cannot repair them without receiving that encouragement.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to see something done in this regard also. I understand that under the present Act, a schooner, in order to earn a bounty, must have new sails, new chains new anchors, in fact absolutely new lock, stock and barrel. No doubt there will be a difficulty in that in regard to repairing. This question has been before

this House before, but it has never led to anything being done.

Now, if you are going to make any provision for a bounty for repairing, I hope you will make provision about partly used sails, chains, anchors, etc. I think something should be done about granting a bounty on repaired ships, especially when we know that the outports are dependent upon the fishery as a mode of living, and I shall heartily support any move in this direction.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the remarks made by the Prime Minister, and the attitude taken by the honourable member for Placentia, Mr. Walsh. I can appreciate the fact that it would be a very difficult thing to incorporate in the present Bill a scheme for a bounty on repairing ships. The Prime Minister has promised that legislation might be forthcoming at the next session dealing with this point, but unfortunately, that will be late and already there are many schooner owners who would undertake to repair their schooners this winter if the Government would give them some kind of an assurance that a bounty on repairs would be forthcoming. I appreciate the fact that this is a very difficult matter and is a proposition that raises many knotty points, but I should like the Government to consider the matter and if necessary, make some official statement very shortly as to what is the best to be done in this direction. In drafting a scheme under which bounties for repairs could be given I feel that they could easily avail of the services of experienced master-builders such as Captain Jones of Port Union, and others throughout the country. I really would like to see a scheme outlined and encouragement held out to men who might be contemplating repairs to schooners the coming winter. Any

action of the government could easily be confirmed by legislation at the next session.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, speaking this afternoon for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I would like to say that the Hon. Member for St. Barbe is quite to the point when he suggests that it would be difficult to put this amendment into this particular Bill. I think probably it will have to be done by a separate and distinct Bill altogether.

The Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding relates to a bounty payable entirely for newly constructed vessels, and the amendment now under consideration would have to be very carefully considered, and would be based on principles different entirely from the principle underlying this Act.

I think it would be very difficult to incorporate any amendment such as the Hon. Members have spoken of in this present Act, the Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding, and I think the views of the members would be best carried out by letting this Bill go through in its present form, because it relates to a totally different class of subsidy, and then some subsequent legislation may be introduced to meet the matter of repairing ships.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to move the third reading of this bill.

Whereupon, with unanimous con-

sent, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 14 Geo. V., Cap. 7, entitled 'An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding,'" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled 'An Act to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say in explanation of this Bill that the only change suggested is the substitution of \$25 for \$5.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provision.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the

House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Further and Protect the Activities and Interests of the Boy Scout Association in the Island of Newfoundland and Its Dependencies."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out for the information of honorable members that the sole object of this bill is to bring Newfoundland into line with the other overseas dominions and is introduced at the request of those who are carrying on the Scout movement here. The bill is the same as in force overseas.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act to Further and Protect the Activities and Interests of the Boy Scout Association in the Island of Newfoundland and Its Dependencies" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Second reading of Bill entitled, "An Act to amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of the Employment of men engaged in Logging.'"

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, as we have not yet seen the Bill I would ask that we be given the opportunity

to pursue it, and that the second reading be deferred till next sitting of the House.

(Deferred.)

Second Reading of Bill, "An Act respecting the Game and Inland Fisheries Board."

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to point out to honorable members who may not have been here yesterday, that it is practically a Modification of the laws as they exist at present. The only thing in the way of an addition, which I will explain fully when we go into Committee stage, deals with the right of appeal by the Board as well as the defendant. There is nothing much in the way of change from the present law except a few verbal alterations and we will take these up in detail in committee. The bill is introduced at the request of the Game Board itself, and I would like to say in passing that recently a serious attempt has been made by the Government and those members of the Board who have been active all along to put new life into the encouragement of our game and inland fisheries. I think all will agree that view of existing conditions and the great need of attracting tourists to our shores that this is a matter of importance, and the question as to salmon has an even more serious side as it is the nursery of the sea fishery. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the bill and particularly in paying tribute to those gentlemen who have served on the Board till now and done important and valuable work altogether voluntarily. I have always taken the position—and hope to do so even more strongly now—that more encouragement should be given the efforts of the Board. Personally, I firmly believe that money could be spent in no better direction than the protection of our game

and inland fisheries. I trust that in the near future the Government will be in a position to increase the amount for this purpose. It may be news to some honorable members that the entire vote to the Board is only \$15,000, and out of that they are expected to warden the rivers. Such a sum makes not only the members' services free but those of the wardens practically the same. I hope and trust that the circumstances of the Colony will soon be such as to permit not only the employment of more but better paid wardens.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, as I have only just seen it and have had no chance to pursue it, I would like to ask the Hon. the Minister of Justice if this Bill gives the Board any powers to sell, lease or dispose of any of our salmon pools or rivers.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE—No—there is nothing whatever of that nature in the bill. That is a line that should not be confined to the Board alone.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Game and Inland Fisheries Board" was read a second time and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

MR. WARREN gave notice of question.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion to adjourn I would like in justice to the Hon. Tasker Cook, Hon. Mr. Shea and myself, to draw the attention of the honorable members of the House to an editorial in this morning's issue of the Daily News, which says, in referring to the new Railway Commission:—"The late Commissioners received three thousand dollars each

for their services; one thousand being paid directly by the Railway, and the balance out of Government funds, so that in undertaking the duties without remuneration of any kind the Prime Minister and his colleagues are effecting an annual saving of nine thousand dollars."

I regret very much to say that we did not receive \$3000 each and would have been glad to get it if it had been offered, but unfortunately it was not and we received only \$1,000. We were glad to get even that and I think that the report of the work for the time that we held office as Commissioners will show clearly that the Railroad had a successful year. I simply make these observations, not so much because they affect myself, but in justice to my colleagues on the Commission. It is most unfortunate that any newspaper should publish such, to say the least, misleading statements and it is a very unkind act of the editor or whoever wrote it. The statement is entirely unwarranted and I ask the editor to be good enough to make the proper correction.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, July 28th, 1924.

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

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Norris Point in the district of St. Barbe, on the subject of a special allocation to extend the main road from Norris Point to a place called Wild Cove, in that vicinity. The petition is signed by Mr. Humber the Chairman of the Road Board, and by Mr. J. A. Squires, J.P. and also by thirty-eight or forty others in that place. I may say that several other signatures might have been obtained only there are a large number of men interested away prosecuting the fishery. There is very little that I want to say now in support of this petition, except that I know personally the absolute necessity of the grant asked for, and I shall do my best to co-operate with the Minister of Public Works, in getting the prayer of this petition acceded to, and a grant allocated for the purpose. I will merely refer this petition to the Department of Public Works, and take the matter up with the Minister personally later.

HON. MIN. POSTS & TELEGRAPHS tabled reply to question of Mr. Scammell No. 2 on the Order Paper of July 25th, 1924.

PASSENGER FARES—ST JOHN'S—COOK HR. ROUTE.

ST. JOHN'S TO	COASTAL CO.,		NFLD. GOVT. STEAMSHIPS.	
	1st Class	2nd Class	1st. Class	2nd Class
Bay de Verde	\$ 3.00	\$ 1.80	\$ 2.40	\$ 1.80
Trinity	5.25	2.25	2.55	1.90
Catalina	6.75	3.00	3.35	2.55
King's Cove	8.25	4.20	4.75	3.60
Greenspond	9.00	4.50	6.05	4.55
Wesleyville	9.00	4.50	6.25	4.70
Fogo	9.75	5.25	8.90	6.65
Change Islands	9.75	5.25	9.25	6.95
Herring Neck	10.50	6.00	9.60	7.20
Twillingate	10.50	6.00	10.50	7.85
Moreton's Hr.	11.10	6.30	10.50	7.85
Exploits	11.25	6.30	10.95	8.25
Fortune Hr.	11.25	6.30	11.50	8.60
Leading Tickles	11.25	6.30	11.85	8.90
Pilley's Island	11.25	6.30	12.45	9.35
Little Bay Islands	11.50	6.50	12.90	9.65
Nipper's Hr.	12.50	7.00	14.75	11.05
Tilt Cove	12.50	7.00	15.15	11.40
Coachman's Cove	15.75	9.75	16.90	12.65
Westport	16.00	10.00	18.55	13.95
Jackson's Arm	16.25	10.20	18.85	14.15
Harbor Deep	16.75	10.50	20.20	15.15
Conche	17.25	10.75	21.80	16.35
St. Anthony	17.50	11.00	23.20	17.40
Griquet	17.75	11.25	23.70	17.75
Quirpon	17.75	11.25	23.90	17.90
Cook's Harbor	17.75	11.25	24.60	18.45

Fares between ports constructed on basis four cents (4c.) per mile,

first class, three cents (3c.) per mile, second class, as per attached tariff.

MEMO FREIGHT RATES:

S.S. PROSPERO—ST. JOHN'S TO NORTHERN STEAMSHIP PORTS.

Commodities	Rates Under Ministry Shipping Operations		Rates under Railway Operation	
	French Shore; Englee to Cook's Hr.	Other Ports Call	French Shore; Englee to Cook's Hr.	Other Ports Call
Flour per brl.60	.45	.60	.50
Pork and Beef, per brl.60	.45	.60	.75
Pork and Beef, per ½ brl.50	.35	.55	.50
Kero Oil, per cask75	.75	1.25	1.00
Molasses, per puncheon	3.50	3.00	4.40	3.75
Bread, per bag, 112 lbs.45	.45	.55	.50
Bread, per ½ bag, 56 lbs.30	.30	.30	.30
Butter, tub, 60-70 lbs.30	.30	.40	.40
Bengas, in metal drums, per drum . .	4.40	3.45	4.40	3.45
Rope, per 100 lbs.40	.40	.40	.40
Salt, per bag, 100 lbs.40	.40	.40	.40
Salt, per brl.60	.45	1.05	.90
Coal in sacks, 100 lbs.40	.40	.40	.40
Gasolene in iron or wooden brls, per brl.	1.20	1.20	1.75	1.40
Gasolene or Acid in metal drums, per drum	4.40	3.45	4.40	3.45
Sugar, per brl.60	.60	1.10	1.00
Fish (dry) 4 qtl. casks each	1.50	1.50	1.30	1.30
Fish (dry) in drums, each50	.45	.50	.45
Fish (dry) in drums ½ each40	.30	.40	.30
Herring local cured, per brl.70	.70	.80	.60
Herring local cured, per ½ brl.45	.40	.45	.40
Herring Scotch cured, per brl.80	.80	.90	.70
Oil, common Cod, per cask or brl. . .	1.00	1.10	1.50	1.00
Per puncheon	3.50	3.00	3.75	3.75
Weight goods, per 100 lbs.40	.40	.60	.50
Cubic Measurement10	.09	.15	.11
Minimum charge40	.40	.85	.58
Lumber, per 1000	6.00	6.00	9.00	9.00
Clapboard, thousand	4.00	4.00	4.50	4.50
Laths, per thousand	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.50

Commodities	Rates between ports.	Rates between ports.
Per barrel30	.20
Per puncheon	2.00	1.50
Per cask	1.00	.30
Dry codfish, 4 qtl.	1.30 cask	.30 per cask
Weight goods30 100 lbs.	.20 100 lbs.
Minimum charge30	.20

• **TELEPHONE WIRE LINE 1923.**

3	coils	wire	for	Sandy Cove Telephone Construction.
19	"	"	"	Caplin Cove Island Cove Extension.
1	"	"	"	Adam's Cove.
11	"	"	"	Shoal Bay to Hare Bay.
50	"	"	"	Charlottetown to Port Blandford.
42	"	"	"	Jamestown to Lethbridge.
13	"	"	"	St. Jones' within.
2	"	"	"	Green's Harbour.
5	"	"	"	Murray Wood's Island.
46	"	"	"	Point Crewe.
18	"	"	"	Collin's Cove to Burin.
26	"	"	"	Salt Pond to Loon's Cove.
7	"	"	"	Canning's Cove.
9	"	"	"	Grand Bay extension.
11	"	"	"	Anderson's Cove Loop.
13	"	"	"	Harry's Brook.
18	"	"	"	Collin's Cove to Burin Bay.
30	"	"	"	Triton to Pilley's Island.
16	"	"	"	Botwood to Northern Arm.
13	"	"	"	Exploits to Surgeon's Cove.
26	"	"	"	Salt Pond to Loon Cove.
14	"	"	"	Show Cove to LaScie.
34	"	"	"	Lawrencetown to Norris Arm.
46	"	"	"	Point Crewe.
72	"	"	"	Little Bay, Beuabois, Spanish Room, Rocky Harbor, Burin District.
18	"	"	"	Rattling Brook to King's Point.
34	"	"	"	Coachman's Cove.
26	"	"	"	Englee.
2	"	"	"	Joe Batt's Arm extension.
50	"	"	"	Brig Bay to Shoal Cove.
50	"	"	"	Flower's Cove to Burnt Island.
8	"	"	"	Bay Bulls Arm to Come-by-Chance.
12	"	"	"	Boswarlos.
8	"	"	"	Chapel Cove.
13	"	"	"	Little Harbour East.
9	"	"	"	Bloomfield construction.
4	"	"	"	Renews.
11	"	"	"	Southern Arm, Seal Cove (White Bay.

TELEPHONE LINE 1924.

6	"	"	"	To connect private telephones near Codroy.
6	"	"	"	To connect private telephones near Codroy.
1	"	"	"	Monkstown, P.B.
4	"	"	"	Doyle's Station.
28	"	"	"	Doyle's Station.
8	"	"	"	South Branch.
3	"	"	"	South Branch.
5	"	"	"	Harry's Brook.

LIST OF TELEPHONES, 1923.

- 1 telephone Halfway House, Salmonier Road.
- 2 telephones Blackhead and Adam's Cove.
- 2 " LaCosta Piccadilly and Bessau.
- 2 " Hillview.
- 1 telephone Norman's Cove.
- 1 " Sandy Cove.
- 1 " Blackhead (extra phone).
- 2 telephones Caplin Cove to Island Cove.
- 2 " Shoal Bay to Hare Bay.
- 2 " Charlestown to Port Blandford.
- 2 " Jamestown to Lethbridge.
- 1 telephone Sandy Cove.
- 2 telephones Green's Harbour to Whiteway.
- 2 " Bailey's Cove and Cape Shore.
- 1 telephone Port au Port, Abbott and Haliburton.
- 2 telephones Plate Cove and Elliston.
- 1 telephone Nfld. Waling Co., Beaverton.
- 2 telephones Keels to Plate Cove.
- 1 telephone Whitbourne.
- 1 " Woody Island.
- 1 " Portland, B.B.
- 1 " Brooklyn, P.O.
- 2 telephones Port aux Basques to Grand Bay.
- 2 " Lethbridge to Canning's Cove.
- 1 telephone Holyrood, Moses Lewis.
- 1 " Holyrood, for Colliers.
- 1 " Abram's Cove.
- 3 telephones For public accommodation, W.
- 1 telephone F. White, Linesman.
- 2 telephones Exploits to Post Office.
- 3 " Botwood, Northern Arm and Laurenceton.
- 1 telephone Gambo.
- 1 " Shoe Cove.
- 2 telephones King's Point and Rattling Brook.
- 1 telephone Triton.
- 1 " Lark Harbour.
- 1 " John's Beach.
- 1 " Frenchman's Cove.
- 1 " Wood's Island.
- 1 " Humbermouth.
- 1 " Summerside.
- 1 " Each: McIvers, Cox's Cove, Middle Arm, Norris Arm.
- 2 telephones Joe Batt's Arm.
- 4 " Little River.
- 1 telephone Exploits.
- 4 telephones Lamaline, Point Crewe, High Beach and Lories.
- 5 " Burin, Burin Bay, Burin Bay Arm, Collins Cove and Loon Cove.
- 1 telephone Each: Coachman's Cove, Conche, Englee, LaScie, Fleur de Lys.
- 1 " Each: Brig Bay and Shoel Cove.

2 telephones	Currant Island and Flower's Cove.
2	" Peter's River.
1 telephone	Loreburn.
1	" Little River.
1	" Boswarlos.
1	" Little Harbour East.
1	" Bay Bulls Arm P.O.
1	" Private connection, Port au Port.
1	" Private connection, St. Andrew's, Codroy Road.
1	" Openhall, Bloomfield.
1	" Private connection, Little River.
1	" Chapel's Cove to Holyrood.
2 telephones	Doyle's Station.

TELEPHONES SUPPLIED, 1924.

1 telephone	Each: St. Kyran's, Bar Haven, Clattice Harbour, Little Paradise, Monkstown, Paradise, N.W. Brook.
2 telephones	Clarneville P.O. to Railway Station.
1 telephone	Birchy Cove, B.B.
1	" Clam Bank Cove, McIvers.
1	" New Harbour.
1	" New Melbourne.
1	" Private connections Arnold's Cove.
3 telephones	Private connections Codroy Road.
1 telephone	South Branch.
1	" Hickman's Harbour, Private connection.
1	" South Branch, Private connection.
1	" Black Duck Siding.

Mrs. Sarah House to be Postmistress at Gooseberry Islands instead of James Wells.

Mr. William Flynn to be Postmaster at Gooseberry Cove, T.B., instead of W. H. Seward.

Walter Andrews to be Courier, between LaScie and Horse Islands instead of William Swyers.

Mr. Moses Butt to be Courier Freshwater to Carbonear, instead of George Broderick.

J. W. Knight to be Telegraph Operator at King's Point instead of Charles W. Tilley.

Adam Seward to be Line Repairer at Clarenville instead of Zebedee Stanley.

Barnabas Moss to be Line Repairer at Salvage instead of John Dyke.

NOTICE OF MOTION AND QUESTION.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—1.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—2.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—3.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—4.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—5.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—6.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—7.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—8.

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.—9.

Mr. Little gave notice of question.—10.

Mr. Little gave notice of question.—11.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.—12.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—
Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the House into a committee of the whole to consider resolutions on ways and means.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

BUDGET SPEECH.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

In submitting this my first Budget, my only regret is that my incumbency of the office of Finance Minister has been too short to enable me to speak as one having the authority that a full personal knowledge of the financial activities of the past year would give and I am confident that Honourable Members will under these circumstances make due allowance for all shortcomings in connection with such matters as explanations with regard to the minute details of expenditure and so forth.

What I have to say with regard to Budget matters falls naturally under three heads, that is to say:

(1) The completed year 1922-1923.

(2) The practically completed year 1923-1924; and

(3) The Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure 1924-1925.

With regard to (1), the completed year 1922-1923:

I do not propose to inflict upon the House a tiresome array of figures dealing with the finances for 1922-23. A few extracts of a general nature from the Auditor General's report will suffice to acquaint Honourable Members with the position with regard to the finances of this particular year.

The Revenue received for 1922-1923 is as follows, viz:—

Revenue Received for 1922-1923.

Customs	\$6,481,068.40
Postal	228,882.30
Telegraphs	175,809.77
Inland Revenue Stamps .	38,484.52
Crown Lands	80,067.35
Liquor Sales	540,297.28
Fines and Forfeitures	5,785.56
Fees Public Institutions.	42,755.96
Broom Dept. Penitentiary	7,779.82
Excess Profits Tax	24,247.04
Income Tax	303,832.19
Mfg. Sales Tax	55,014.66
Bank Tax	123,905.58
Estate Duties	150,000.00
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	88,043.00
Taxes and Assessments.	70,141.45
Miscellaneous Revenue ..	460,657.86
	<hr/>
	\$8,876,772.74

The Revenue which I have just quoted falls short of the Estimate made by Sir Richard Squires by the sum of \$76,227.26.

The following comparative statement will show under which particular heads this shortage occurred, viz:

antly, to the general want of economy over the whole Public Service to which he referred and with all of which I am in perfect accord. He also recommended the advisability of appointing a Standing Committee of the House on Public Accounts, referred to the excessive cost of printing, stationery and advertising; and requested a re-organization of the system of expenditure on account of Public Charities.

With regard to Loan Expenditures for the year 1922-1923, the following statement will show the saturnalia of expenditure in the services indicated below:

Statement of Loan Expenditure 1922-1923.

Finance	\$2,370,038.88
Posts and Telegraphs ..	4,923.19
Agriculture and Mines ..	1,931.76
Public Works	2,474,136.81
Marine and Fisheries ...	453,114.77
Public Charities	590,756.06
Militia	20,591.31
	<hr/>
	\$5,915,492.77
	<hr/>

It would be wearisome to recite the details of this large expenditure to the House, and I shall content myself with referring Honourable Members to the statistical data at the end of the Budget for full particulars. I cannot refrain, however, from referring to the fact that even at this early date (June 30th, 1923) The Agriculture and Mines Department charged above with \$1,931,75 was actually in debt to the Bank of Montreal in the sum of approximately one and one half million of dollars, which sum the Auditor General refused to indemnify the Bank without the necessary legislative authority.

I shall reserve any further comment I may have to make on the financial transactions for the year under observation until I have given the House the information relative to the finan-

cial condition of the Colony for the year 1923-1924.

With regard to (2) that is to say the financial position of the Colony during the fiscal year 1923-1924.

The late date at which the House meets enables me to give a fairly close estimate of the result of the Colony's Revenue and Expenditure for 1923-1924.

While it is yet too soon after the close of the fiscal year to finalize the several accounts and so to furnish the exact figures, the several Departmental accounts, so far as expenditures are concerned, have been practically closed. Some items of the Revenue have still to come, but it is possible to estimate these fairly accurately. The Revenue estimated by my predecessor, Mr. Cave, for the fiscal years 1923-1924, was \$9,150,000.00. The actual Revenue as estimated by me will probably reach \$8,467,000.00.

This would indicate an over-estimate by Mr. Cave of \$683,000.00 on Revenue.

The Expenditure estimated by the same gentleman was \$9,006,153.57 but I consider, in the light of practically closed accounts, that the expenditure will be over \$10,000,000.00.

Mr. Cave under-estimated expenditure therefore \$1,035,450.00, less the Audit Act expenditure (which doubtless he did not contemplate at the time he made up his Estimates). My predecessor's Estimates were therefore \$1,268,450.00 erroneous. Adding to that the Audit Act expenditure and subtracting the anticipated surplus of \$143,846.00 which did not materialize, we arrive at an estimated deficit of \$1,574,600.00.

I attribute the shortage of Revenue to the repeal of the supertax of twenty-five per cent., to the removal of Export Duty on Fish, and to the placing of Flour, Pork, Molasses, Kerosene and Gasolene on the Free List for the last three months of the past year.

I estimate then that the Revenue which we will receive for the fiscal year ending 30th of June last at \$8,467,000.00, made up as follows, viz:

Estimated Revenue 1923-24.

Customs	\$6,700,000.00
Postal	270,000.00
Telegraph	200,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps	44,000.00
Crown Lands	100,000.00
Liquor Sales	220,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures ..	6,000.00
Fees Public Institutions	50,000.00
Broom Dept. Penitentiary	8,000.00
Cable and Bank Taxes	70,000.00
Bank Deposit Tax	112,000.00
Income Tax	335,000.00
Manufacturing Sales Tax	40,000.00
Interest on Guaranteed Loans	87,000.00
Estate Duties	25,000.00
Miscellaneous Revenue ..	200,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$8,467,000.00

The Expenditure estimated by me as above amounts to \$10,041,600.00 as shown by the following heads of expenditure:

Estimated Expenditure 1923-24.

Interest on Public Debt	\$3,000,000.00
Finance Department	255,000.00
Colonial Sect'y. Dept. ..	85,000.00
Justice Department	418,000.00
Education Department ..	850,000.00
Public Charities Dept. ..	540,000.00
Marine and Fisheries ..	300,000.00
Agric. & Mines Dept. ..	105,000.00
Public Works Dept. ...	1,115,000.00
Postal Telegraphs Dept.	1,340,000.00
Customs Department ..	530,000.00
Liquor Controller's Dept.	46,600.00
Tax Assessor	15,000.00
Accountant of Contingen- cies	205,000.00
Military Pensions Board	575,000.00
Shipping Department ..	50,000.00
Old Age Pensions	100,000.00

Militia Department	65,000.00
Miscellaneous Contingen- cies	7,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$9,601,600.00

Under Special Warrant Audit Act	440,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$10,041,600.00

Estimated Revenue as
per previous statement 8,467,000.00

Estimated Deficit \$1,574,600.00

It is clearly evident, therefore, that the Supply Act last year will have to be largely supplemented, and as a matter of fact I have calculated that the Supplementary Supply required will amount to over \$720,000.00 for the particulars of which I would refer Honourable Members to the Supplementary Supply Act which they will be asked to consider.

Dealing with the expenditure as shown by the accounts and referred to in the Auditor General's report under Section 33 (b) of the Audit Act, which he has brought down to the 31st of May last. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the serious overdrafts authorized in most cases by Order-in-Council which occurred during the currency of the last fiscal year, among which overdrafts I would particularly cite the following, viz:—

STATEMENT OF OVERDRAFTS 1923-24.

Customs.

Miscellaneous	\$15,603.40
Hire of Steamers S.W. Coast	14,304.18

Justice.

Civil and Criminal Prosecu- tions	9,410.74
Hire of Steamer Circuit Court	10,675.00
Royal Commission Inquiry	20,403.99

Education.

Interest Teachers' Pension Fund	10,000.00
---------------------------------------	-----------

Colonial Secretary.

Contingencies	9,248.52
General Election 1923	12,992.41

Public Charities.

Medical Attendance Paupers	24,767.94
Conveyance Sick Poor	21,019.89
Extraordinary Expenditure	11,421.79
Public Health Outports ..	25,407.54
Hospital Fees	19,191.11

Public Works.

Repairs Public Buildings	14,765.05
Repairs Lunatic Asylum ..	14,604.76
Repairs General Hospital ..	25,911.39
Repairs Fever Hospital ..	7,264.55
Repairs Sudbury Hospital	8,670.44

Notre Dame Coastal Service	13,500.00
Placentia Bay Coastal Service	9,740.00
Battle Harbor and Hum-bermouth	13,900.00
Telegraph Maintenance	42,824.94
Telephones	14,404.73
Construction and Main Line Repairs	12,030.82

The total of these overdrafts amounted to \$382,063.19, and the particular reason for drawing attention to these is the fact that with economy they might have been avoided.

The position then of the Colony at the close of the last fiscal year is to my mind a particularly serious one. We have incurred a deficit on the year's operations which I have estimated at approximately \$1,575,000.00.

Against this deficit we have to our credit in the Bank of Montreal the Surplus Trust Fund amounting to \$187,210.61, and that is practically all.

There are some small amounts as yet unallocated in connection with the 1922 and 1923 Loans, but these are all

earmarked for a specific purpose and cannot be disturbed.

As I have already stated, I am of the opinion that the shortage in the Estimate of Customs Revenue is due principally to the repeal of the twenty five per cent. super-tax, the remission of Export Duties on Fish, and the placing of Flour, Pork, Beef, Molasses, Gasolene and Kerosene on the Free List.

At the present juncture I regret to say that the Colony's finances are in such a condition as not to warrant the repeal of duties on the latter articles, however desirable it would be and however much it might afford relief to our people.

My predecessor, in his Speech, stated that his Government had decided that "the proper policy to adopt to secure an ultimate revival of trade was to make a sweeping reduction in ad valorem taxation on imported goods and to report a deficit."

Well, they did make a sweeping reduction in the ad valorem duties, and illegally repealed the Customs' duties on flour, pork and other articles, and the export duty on fish; and they did incur a notable deficit, which it is my unpleasant task to report, but the revival of trade was due to improved prices abroad, and in no manner or degree to our predecessors.

In a country having a representative Legislature, it alone can impose or repeal taxation, except in those special instances in which it has delegated that power. The repeal here was by an illegal Minute of Council, and at a time when a large deficit had accrued, and overdraft had been made on Banks to pay current expenses. That overdraft this Government has now to ask this Legislature to provide.

However, the result of these several reductions and remissions works out at about \$850,000.00 less on the

twenty-five per cent. supertax adding the Sales Tax on it; plus the \$187,500.00 on the Export Tax on Fish; and, approximately, \$125,000.00 on account of remission of duties on flour, pork, molasses, etc., for three months, to which I have already referred, making a grand total of \$1,162,500.00.

I can quite understand any Honourable Member of this House disagreeing with the imposition of the iniquitous twenty-five per cent. super-tax on an already heavily taxed country on an almost entirely ad valorem basis; but I have yet to be convinced that any country (after a quarter of a century of English Common law) can reduce the ordinary import duty **in the face of annual deficits** on the commodities common to all the people. Such a course can only lead to disaster and the insolvency courts. A bear may hibernate in winter and subsist on itself for a certain period, but the time comes when even the bear must become self-supporting.

The shortage between my predecessor's estimate of Customs Revenue and the estimated actual revenue amounts to \$280,000.00.

While this comparatively small shortage (viewed in comparison with the foregoing figures) seems to me to indicate a clear sign of improvement in trade. I think, however, a wise policy would have been to have made the process of reduction gradual in measure as our finances improved.

Before leaving the history of the past I wish to make some remarks in connection with the expenditure of the 1921, 1922 and 1923 Loans. I have already made brief reference to these Loans in dealing with the results of the financial year 1922-23 1923-24; and I should now like to submit the amounts allocated from the same Loans up to the close of the last financial year.

Loan Act 1921 (Whole proceeds of Loan)	\$5,960,031.20
Loan Act 1922	5,999,838.50
Loan Act 1923	3,511,237.39

The whole of Loan 1921 has been expended. Practically the whole of Loan 1922 has been allocated by Order-in-Council, and such balances as may remain on these allocations, being earmarked cannot be disturbed.

As to the 1923 Loan: This Loan was allocated by the Legislature and consequently must be spent on the services indicated in the Act. A small amount of the sum set aside by the Act for roads and public improvements under direction of the Governor-in-Council remains unallocated. For details of these allocations, I beg leave to refer Honourable members to the schedules which are attached to my Speech.

Loan 1921 contains amongst other things an appropriation made by the then Government for a Fishery Supply Guarantee. In reference to this matter, I should like to say that I strongly opposed the measure when sitting on the Opposition side of the House.

My reason for doing this was that I foresaw the abuse which would follow from the granting of such a Guarantee, and my objections at the time have been fully borne out by what has occurred.

The Government advanced money to certain suppliers for the Fishery, to enable them to give supplies. The supplied fishermen paid in whole or in part, but suppliers to whom \$141,423.00 worth of supplies were advanced, have not furnished statements for the adjustment of their accounts. The official who attends to these matters has been interfered with by the political head of his Department in his endeavour to bring the defaulters to account. The unpleasant duty of exacting statements and payments has therefore fallen on me.

Without any further comment I would like to say that the Fishery Guarantee account stands out as an everlasting disgrace to those who were entrusted to take care of the Colony's funds. The present state of the Fund will be found on Pages 23 and 23 (a) of the Auditor General's Report for the year ending June 30th last.

LOAN 1922.

With regard to the relief of the unemployed: The way this was undertaken and the mismanagement in the handling of the public funds of this Colony needs very little comment from me. If the employment given out and the money used therefor, had been applied to work of more permanent value, there would not be much ground for adverse criticism, but in view of the abuses which have taken place, it is impossible not to find fault.

If employment had been given to those who required labour and graft of every kind cut out, one could sympathize rather than criticize; and one feels it is unjust to blame those who used the pick and shovel when it is considered that those higher up did just as they pleased, taking good care not to neglect themselves, and yet were always ready to blame those under them.

Any sane man knows the Badger-Hall's Bay and Deer Lake-Bonne Bay roads were unnecessary. The expenditure on them was simply like throwing money in the ocean. To-day these roads are practically useless and of no value to the Colony. As foreseen by those who opposed this measure, grass is their chief product.

It will be noted that the Badger road cost \$12,500.00 per mile, whereas the Deer Lake cost \$18,000.00. Surely some explanation to this difference of cost should have been given.

As to able-bodied pauper relief: I am too well acquainted with

my fellow countrymen to think that they want this kind of relief. Here, again, abuses of every kind took place with regard to the expenditure of so-called pauper relief; and this is a matter which demands a far reaching enquiry.

The original allocation for the Normal School made by Order-in-Council from the 1922 Loan was \$100,000.00. This School Building has cost to date \$335,000.00 and will cost probably \$70,000.00 more for equipment still required and the laying out of the grounds.

An Order-in-Council directed that all goods required by the Contractor for the Building, should come in duty free, although it seems to have been clearly understood that the tender accepted was on the basis of duty paid material. It is estimated that the loss to the revenue from this concession was well in the neighborhood of \$35,000.00.

Adding this to the estimated cost which I have given, we find that the total cost of the school building, fittings and so forth, will be in the neighborhood of \$440,000.00 although the original appropriation made by Order-in-Council under the 1922 Loan was only \$100,000.00.

LOAN 1923.

With regard to the expenditure on Pit Props: Well, all I can say, Mr. Chairman and Honourable Gentleman, is that any comment of mine is unnecessary. It would be rather out of place and this matter can be very easily settled by referring you to the Auditor General's Report and to that of Mr. T. Hollis Walker, K.C. Need I say more? The amount allocated from the Loan to meet the loss on Pit Prop account, is \$1,000,000; not sufficient by at least \$160,000 to cover the actual figures. In his report the Auditor General asks for a special resolution of the House authorizing him to sign the cheque releasing the

amount voted to repay the advance made by the Bank of Montreal.

This, then, Honourable gentlemen, is all I can say of the financial affairs of the Colony for the two years we have had under consideration. This government assumes no responsibility therefor; it states facts as it finds them and leaves criticism to the people of Newfoundland.

Let me turn now to the future. I am free to admit that I approach the consideration of this subject without that confidence in his forecast that a Finance Minister is supposed to have. So much is uncertain; so much is more or less guess work (especially when dealing with revenue) that the financier who can at the beginning of a financial year, estimate with even a fair amount of accuracy, the result of the financial activities of that year in Newfoundland, has yet to appear. I can instance, as corroborating this statement, the huge supplementary supply which has been regularly sought for during the last twenty years.

Let us first examine the present position of the Colony; its financial condition; its trade; its industries and particularly the latter two. For, after all, the first is entirely dependent upon them.

With regard to the Trade and Commerce of the Colony generally; I am of opinion that there is a decided improvement during the past fiscal year. The financial condition of any country is bound to be reflected in its trade conditions. That is to say in the value of its imports and exports. And I am happy to be able to say to Honourable members that trade conditions during the fiscal year 1922-1923 have shown an upward trend.

As will be seen by the Table of Imports and Exports for 1922-1923 our total trade exceeded the previous

year by over two and one-half million dollars. The value of our Imports exceeded the preceding year approximately one million dollars; while the value of our Exports increased by nearly one million and one-half.

This, Mr. Chairman, is an encouraging sign and one which should give extreme satisfaction to every patriotic Newfoundlander in and out of this House.

I am of opinion that the trade outlook for the coming year should even exceed the figures just quoted, as from present indications it would seem that our fish will realize better prices in the markets abroad than it has done during the past three years. Such a happy condition is due entirely to the law of supply and demand, a law to which I have repeatedly subscribed in this House and elsewhere. And it is due principally to the interference with this immutable law by certain visionaries during the past three years that this country is in the deplorable condition which has to be faced by me now.

The increased revenue consequent upon improved trade conditions will, I feel confident, enable us to balance our accounts at the end of the fiscal year 1924-1925. And, while we have had to meet deficits by borrowing during the past four years, I hope by the exercise of strict economy to be in a position to change those deficits into a surplus during the present year. It may be quite true that this surplus may not be a considerable one, but in any case it is quite pleasant to be able to look forward to a surplus of revenue over expenditure (no matter how small) after four years of large deficits—deficits, gentlemen, due to the unlimited and not always well-advised expenditures incurred by those who were entrusted with the public funds of this Colony.

Here, gentlemen, I beg to quote Trade Statistics showing Imports and Exports from 1911-1912 to 1922-

1923, inclusive, and I may say that the figures are taken from the official returns compiled at the Customs Department.

TABLE OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Year	Imports	Exports	Total
1911-12	\$14,733,490	\$13,874,809	\$26,608,299
1912-13	16,012,365	14,672,889	30,655,254
1913-14	15,193,726	15,134,543	30,328,269
1914-15	12,350,786	13,136,880	25,487,666
1915-16	16,427,336	18,969,493	35,396,829
1916-17	21,318,310	22,381,762	43,700,072
1917-18	26,892,946	30,153,517	57,046,463
1918-19	33,297,184	36,784,616	70,081,800
1919-20	40,533,388	34,865,438	75,398,826
1920-21	28,909,727	22,441,267	51,350,994
1921-22	18,209,853	19,478,417	37,688,270
1922-23	19,321,824	20,956,863	40,278,687

While the catch of codfish fell in 1922-1923 as compared with the previous year, by over one hundred thousand quintals, the price was well maintained; and the value of our other exports increased as a whole.

The price of cod-oil, notably, advanced considerably. The export of iron ore in 1912-1913 (taken from the viewpoint of value) was very high. With the exception of 1913-1914, it showed a considerable drop in the succeeding years. I am very pleased to be able to say, however, that during the year 1922-1923, the exports over the preceding year increased more than 500,000 tons in quantity and over a million dollars in value, the greatest value in either war or pre-war times.

In paper, copper and lumber there was a pleasing increase in production as will be readily seen by the trade reports just quoted.

A considerable advance in lobster prices is also recorded, while the export of fresh salmon and the price realized were extremely abnormal.

On the other hand, it was regrettable to see that the output of frozen and pickled herring had declined not only in value but also in quantity. I

have arrived at the opinion that this is due to, in many cases, the poor quality of the fish packed for foreign markets. Unless greater care is taken with the packing of herring by our exporters, I very much fear that conditions will not readily improve in the herring trade.

One very hopeful sign of our fisheries this year, is the fact that it will be prosecuted by one hundred and forty four more sail of vessels than the previous year. This is very encouraging and indicates a revival of fishery trade so much handicapped by the too frequent undertaking of relief works by our predecessors in the past—relief works (to quote the Auditor General's report of 1921) which were unproductive in every sense of the word,—except to draw our outport brethren from their natural avocation which was the fisheries.

In this connection I am reminded that about six thousand men are now employed in and about the Humber project. That has relieved the employment situation. From a national standpoint, however, this cannot be looked upon as all gain; for many of these men, if not so employed, would have been engaged in the fishery last

year and this, and would have added to our exports at a time when they were profitable.

There is, too, this consideration: that the laboring class has been increased and the fishing class reduced. It may not be easy to provide work for the increased number of laborers. Construction work on the Humber will rapidly decline hereafter and though woods work will increase and absorb much of the present labor supply, yet new work must, if possible, be found for the excess.

Dissatisfaction has existed over wage rates and living conditions, and the Government has enquired into these matters. The principle of supply and demand works in this matter as in trade generally, and the greatest care has to be taken not to so hamper capital and the cost of construction as to prevent development work.

Labor conditions on the North American Continent are not good at present; many of our expatriated people are now glad to return, and if we interfere too strenuously with employers here, local labor conditions might grow worse.

TOURIST TRAFFIC.

It would seem as though the tourist attractions of the Colony might be its most quickly realizable asset, but to that end it would be necessary to provide increased and improved hotel accommodation, in St. John's, and elsewhere, to build motor roads, and to protect game and game fish more jealously than heretofore, and in addition to advertise widely to the outside world, the many attractions this Colony possesses for summer and even autumn tourists. The Government is investigating this subject in all its branches, and I am hopeful that even before this short session closes I shall be able to make definite proposals about this matter, looking to the immediate commencement of work.

ROADS, BRIDGES AND HOTELS.

The wastefulness of building wooden bridges is evident. Many important ones are now in complete disrepair. Under the superintendence of the Government Engineer several fine concrete structures have been erected. He has prepared plans for others. They will be used in connection with the construction of motor roads. Such roads should, of course, be built, not haphazardly, here and there, but as parts of a preconceived whole and the work should be done in a manner calculated to produce both quantity and quality, for while construction will incidentally employ many men, the chief aim should be to open up the natural resources and scenic beauties of the Colony to the admiring eyes of investors and travellers.

As hotels, motor roads and concrete bridges will obviously be for the benefit of posterity, and not merely of temporary advantage, it is proposed to provide for these by a loan bill which I shall introduce later in this session.

Our manufacturers generally are looking forward to better years, and I have no doubt their optimism is justified by the gradually improved conditions of the Colony.

The establishment of a Flour Mill, which Honourable members have been asked to consider, will I am satisfied prove a great boon to labour in the city of St. John's.

RAILWAY.

The condition and operation of the Railway continue to be matters of grave interest. Large capital expenditures cannot long be avoided. Operation at present is under make-shift control. Whether Company, Board or Governmental control shall be adopted for the future, is a problem which the Government must seek to solve before you next meet. Largely through the traffic caused by the Humber project, loss on operation was small in 1923-24, but this traffic cannot be

maintained fully, though it will not wholly fail. Next year the Gander project may add its quota. I am of opinion that much saving can be effected in the operating costs of the shipping now attached to the transportation system.

DOCKS.

To make St. John's the popular Port it should be for Atlantic shipping, considerable expenditure on the Dry Dock will be necessary. Its machinery is partially obsolete. Delays cause demurrage charges, and the Dock structure itself demands repairs. Improvements of dock and machinery, a provision for speedy coaling, the acquisition of a speedy and powerful sea-going tug; and co-operation between the Government, the artisans and the laborers, are all factors which would go a long way towards making this port what its geographical situation entitled it to be—the repairing station for all North Atlantic steamers.

Judging from the trade conditions as presented and from my own personal knowledge of trade activities, I am of opinion that the outlook is somewhat brighter for the Colony than it has been for some time past, as a result of which the financial prospect for the Colony has improved proportionately. On that opinion I have based my estimate of the revenue likely to accrue during the coming year. I expect to receive the following:—

Customs Revenue	\$7,300,000.00
Postal	265,000.00
Telegraph	200,000.00
Crown Lands	90,000.00
Inland Revenue Stamps	40,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures ..	8,000.00
Fees Public Institutions	25,000.00
Broom Dept. Penitentiary	10,000.00
Interest on Guar. Loans	88,000.00
Income Tax	320,000.00
Business Profits Arrears	10,000.00
Manufacturing Sales Tax	50,000.00

Bank Tax	112,000.00
Taxes and Assessments	70,000.00
Estate Duties	50,000.00
Liquor Profits	200,000.00
Miscellaneous Revenue .	100,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$8,938,000.00

Honourable Members will notice that I have made a considerable addition to the estimate of my predecessor for 1924-25, and I think I am justified in so doing.

Nobody regretted more than I have the extravagance of our predecessors and the necessity of liquidating the bills incurred by them, threw upon me the duty of recommending to my colleagues, and upon them the duty of agreeing with the cancellation of the illegal and dishonest Minute of Council adopted in April last, one day only before the Legislature met. This Minute rescinded the duties on flour, pork, etc., and those rescinding them knew quite well that these duties must be replaced. With countries as well as with individuals, bills must be paid or insolvency results, and this Colony must not default in its payments and so lose its credit.

It has, however, been decided that in view of the growing cost of flour following upon reports of a decreased wheat crop, and the absolute necessity of gasoline in the fisheries you shall be asked to wholly repeal the duties on these articles.

This may result in a shortage of the amount of revenue I have estimated for 1924-25 but if so it will be met by enforced economy in some of the public services.

You will also be asked to specially authorize the Government to reduce or wholly rescind the duty on certain other articles, in the hope that improved trade or greater economy may make such reduction or abrogation possible.

Consideration of the Revenue Act, 1905, and its various amendments and

of the Report of a Tariff Commission appointed by a preceding Government, has been deferred until we have had time to consider the whole subject, but the matter will be submitted to you at the next Session.

The Controller's Department is now self-contained, paying its expenses from its receipts, and passing over to the Exchequer its profits only. I have placed the revenue from that source at \$200,000.00, basing my estimate on the profits for the last eleven months, and allowing something for a possible increase which may be the outcome of a new policy regarding the liquor traffic from a stricter enforcement of laws against moonshining and smuggling.

Honourable Members will notice on reference to the Estimates of last year's Revenue, that I have omitted the items of receipts from Civil Service Reduction. The Government are of opinion that the reduction of Civil Servants' salaries has had a rather demoralizing effect on the whole Service; that faithful and efficient work cannot be obtained from a Service which is notoriously underpaid; so much that too many of the officials cannot possibly keep out of debt and provide for their families even the barest necessaries.

This condition of affairs has unquestionably much to do with the constant demand for pay for so-called extra services and overtime, and the proposal for a repeal of the Civil Service Reduction Act is made with the honest idea of: first, enabling all efficient servants of the public to support themselves in a decent manner; and secondly, to see that all extra payments in the Civil Service cease from this date. The Legislature of this Colony votes a salary for a certain position, and the occupant of that position should receive that and nothing more.

During the short time I have had

the honor to hold my position of Finance Minister, it has been impressed strongly upon my mind that this matter of granting money for extra services has been grossly unfair. There have been officials in the Service who no matter what their value was, no matter what they did in the way of giving straight, decent service in the stations allotted them, received nothing. If they worked long hours overtime, the fruits went frequently to other officials.

In order to give a straight deal to all, it is my intention to see that this regulation is carried out not only in the letter but in the spirit as well.

I have said this is a great injustice and, as I write, I have before me evidence of the fact that several officials have received for overtime sums exceeding their annual salary, while, as I have also pointed out, we are confronted with cases of hard working officials who never received, or thought of receiving, one cent more than was legitimately voted by the duly authorized body appointed to fix their yearly stipend, namely the Legislature of this Colony.

This injustice, Mr. Chairman and Honourable gentlemen, has actuated the Government in arriving at the decision of repealing the Civil Service Reduction Act, a decision which has been held out to some of the best men in this country of ours for some years past in the form of a mirage. Our policy in this respect is to deal fairly with all; give favour to none.

In too many cases Finance Ministers have estimated an expenditure which could not possibly cover a constantly expanding public service, trusting to an always complaisant following in the House to pass a huge Supplementary Supply. This Supply, which swells the original votes provided by this House, is mainly caused by overdrafts authorized by Order-in-Council, which Order usually con-

tains the provision "that Supplementary Supply would be taken when the House meets and authorizing the Bank of Montreal to honour overdrawing cheques."

This has been done despite the fact that the Auditor General had notified the Bank that he would issue no further letters of credit by reason of the fact that the votes passed by this Assembly had been exhausted.

My idea of dealing with this situation is to do exactly the reverse. I have estimated our revenue and I intend with the help of my colleagues to fit our expenditure to that estimate, and to see to it that the expenditure is kept within the votes which this Legislature will pass. I regret to say that too little attention has been given in the past by Ministerial Heads to the details of expenditure, and I am now asking them to help me, by exercising an earnest supervision over the minutest details of their respective departments in order that this annual supplemental bugaboo shall not recur during the current year.

In this connection I ask their attention to the 43rd Section of the Audit Act, which reads as follows:—

"The Deputy Heads of the several departments or the officers, clerks or other persons charged with the expenditure of public money, shall respectively audit the details of the accounts of the several services in the first instance, and be responsible for the correctness of such audit."

Following upon my determination to 'make the garment fit the cloth,' I propose to eliminate every item of expenditure which can possibly be done without, consistent at the same time with the real necessities of the public service. In a word, I hope to cut expenditure down to an irreducible minimum. All public luxuries must go. Some of them would be

all very well if they could be afforded, but the position as I see it to-day is that even some more or less necessary services should be curtailed until better times. It will be quite impossible, otherwise, to carry on the public service of the Colony.

Be our revenue what it may, and however strenuous our endeavours to keep within it, we must provide the essentials. What I consider essentials (services which if this Colony is to exist at all as a self-governing Colony it must have) I shall set forth later when dealing with expenditure.

I realize to the fullest extent the burden of taxation placed upon the shoulders of our people. I deeply sympathize with them. I observe their cheerful endurance under the trials and forced economies in even essentials which the high cost of living brings in its train. I appeal with confidence to them to bear their burden until growing prosperity enables the Government to decrease it.

Coming now directly to expenditure, I consider as essential the following services from which little if anything can be cut:—

Interest on Public Debt	
estimated at	\$3,159,000.00
Education	822,000.00
Pensions, Civil, Military	
and Old Age	836,000.00
Lighthouses	217,000.00
Permanent and Casual	
Poor	242,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$5,276,000.00

I estimate the expenditure on the foregoing at \$5,276,000.00, leaving \$3,662,000 of our estimated revenue for the remainder of the Public Service. These latter, containing many items that are indispensable, are capable of considerable reduction and have been subjected to that reduction.

I estimate then the total requirements of the coming year, 1924-1925, which compared with the estimates of 1923-1924, compares as follows:—

	1923-1924	1924-1925
Finance Department	\$3,655,943.78	\$3,438,110.21
Colonial Secretary's	51,554.00	67,179.00
Justice Department	382,954.46	341,479.16
Education Department	839,851.03	821,842.03
Public Charities	441,338.33	376,861.71
Marine and Fisheries	346,969.39	333,589.39
Agriculture and Mines	95,020.00	78,190.00
Public Works	994,416.26	938,098.57
Posts and Telegraphs	1,244,465.83	1,146,397.83
Customs Department	493,960.50	439,552.25
Liquor Controller	79,864.00
Tax Assessor	14,840.00	14,840.00
Contingencies	235,617.00	184,617.00
Military Pension Board	699,766.00	651,766.00
Shipping Department	50,000.00
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$9,626,560.58	\$8,832,523.15
	<hr/>	<hr/>

This shows a reduction in Estimates of \$794,037.43.

I do not now propose to enter into the detail of the several votes. These with their several changes from the last Estimates, have been placed before you will be explained by the Minister in charge thereof when the House is in Committee on Supply. Before closing, I should like to draw the attention of Honourable members to the serious state of affairs obtaining for some time past in the Customs Department. Undreamed of conditions have existed in that Department, certain things have been permitted there which no departmental head should have overlooked.

The Auditor General's instructions were frequently ignored, and I find today that there are duties outstanding from 1915 to the present date on goods issued to individuals under what is known as "Temporary Permits." These permits were given and the Department neglected to follow up the individuals for collection of duties.

The mismanagement, also, of what is known as bonded warehouses, in which at the present moment very great discrepancies exist, is respon-

sible for the loss of considerable duty owing to the Colony; duty which I fear in many cases will never be collected.

Considerable loss was sustained, moreover, through the presentation of fraudulent invoices which passed through the Customs without proper check.

I shall conclude my remarks on this subject by stating for the information of honourable members, that full enquiry is being instituted into the whole matter.

CUSTOMS BONDS.

There is another matter in relation to the Customs to which I desire to call the attention of the House. I refer to the large amount due in Customs' Bonds, some \$117,545.41 in all, including interest. Many of these unpaid Bonds date back to 1920, some to 1921 and the latest to 1922. Apparently very little effort has been made by the persons owing this money to pay it. In 1920, some bonds were extended, but since then no extensions were permitted, and some payments on account have been made from time to time. I cannot speak too strongly against the dis-

crimination which permitted the extension of bonds. As far as the present Government is concerned, it is their intention to secure the prompt payment in cash of these moneys, not in promises to pay or extensions.

I have here some statements which will be of interest to honourable members. They are too lengthy to read but they will be printed with my speech and will form an addenda thereto.

I should like, however, to draw Honourable members' attention to the increase in Savings Deposits which occurred during 1923.

At the close of 1922 there was on deposit in Savings' Accounts, the sum of \$20,133,975.51. At the end of 1923, this amount had increased to \$20,340,223.21, an increase of \$206,247.70.

This is a very significant fact and to my mind an indication of that resilient buoyancy for which Newfoundland in her financial history has been famous, and I feel sure that with that earnest co-operation which is so necessary in all serious activities we shall turn the corner in 1924-25 and enter the straight road to national prosperity and happiness.

Finally, I can assure this House and the whole country, that it is the earnest intention of His Majesty's Government to embark on an entirely new scheme of financing. We have decided that an energetic constructive policy has been necessary for this land for some years past. The policy is long overdue, but you may be sure that if I can secure the faithful co-operation of my fellow ministers in the Government, the time has now arrived and our ship has come home at last.

As I have already remarked, this Government accepts no responsibility for the disastrous effects of the policy adopted by the late Government, and our only desire is to remedy the dis-

ease which for some years has attacked our Island Home.

I beg leave to propose the following resolutions:—

(a) The reduction of present duty on spirits in transit.

(b) Repealing duty on Flour and Gasolene.

(c) Giving power to Governor-in-Council to reduce or abrogate duty on Molasses, Kerosene Oil, Beef and Pork when financial conditions in their opinion warrant same.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—To move the House into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions to confirm a contract entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Ltd.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to defer that matter until to-morrow as I am not quite ready.

It was ordered that this motion be deferred.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. HALFYARD—To ask the Minister of Public Works to name the party or parties who recommended Mr. A. Brown to spend the local and main line grants of Blaketown. State reasons why the duly elected road board is not allowed to spend such moneys.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY—In the absence of the Minister of Public Works would the Hon. member defer that question.

It was ordered this question stand deferred.

MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if the gentleman named Neamiah Short recently appointed Magistrate for the District of Fogo is the same person who has been for the last few months engaged as a school teacher at Change Islands, and if so, what especial qualifications does this young man possess for such an important appointment and on whose recommendation was the appointment made.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Yes, Neamiah Short is the same person that was engaged as school teacher. As to his qualifications he is a teacher of Associate Grade and impressed me in a personal conversation I had with him as a particularly intelligent man. As to the recommendation it was made under the usual procedure. If the Department of Justice thought he was not qualified he would not have been placed in that position. No objection was made by the Government, and in particular was the fact that other things being equal, preference would be given him because he was a returned soldier.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a list of duly elected Road Boards in the District of St. Barbe, as contained in the records of the Department, showing the name of Chairman in each case.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I ask that the question be deferred as the minister is out of town.

MR. SCAMMELL:—To ask Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (1) The total amount of duties collected for fiscal year 1922-23 on each of the following articles:—(a) Beef, (b) Pork, (c) Gasoline, (d) Kerosene, and (e) Molasses; (2) The total amount collected in each

instance on the same articles for the period July 1st, 1923 to April 30th, 1924.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—In replying to the member for St. Barbe I wish to table the answer.

MR. CHAMBERS asked the Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a statement showing (1) Total cost of Normal School building to date; (2) is the building completed? If not what will be the prospective cost of completion? (3) Total cost of equipment, viz., desks, furniture and fittings; (4) If any proposed expenditure on the grounds surrounding said building.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER in reply to the question of Mr. Chambers tabled the following:—(1) Total paid on Normal School to June 17th, \$311,687.40; (2) Building is completed but bills are still coming in; (3) Cost of equipment to date \$7,738.23; (4) There has been an elaborate scheme prepared by the late Minister of Education for laying out the grounds costing probably several thousand dollars. Outstanding accounts \$25,011.12.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER in answer to question 6 of the order paper tabled the following:—

Expenditure per Government Engineer's Office to date, (June 10, 1924) ..	\$311,687.40
Bal. due Horwood Lumber Co., General Contract about	9,668.77
Bal. due Horwood Lumber Co., Contract for laying Linoleum and supplying Table and other fixtures, about	2,300.00
Bal. due C. A. Hubley, Heating and Ventilation Contract, about	1,663.50
Bal. due W. C. Winsborrow, Electric Lighting Contract, about	5,003.00
Bal. due W. J. Ryan, Plumbing contract, about	3,995.00

Bal. due A. J. C. Paine, Architect, about	2,380.85
Bal. due A. J. C. Paine, Expenses	?
Furnishing	?

The Treasury grant was based on an estimate made of the requirements of the Education Department so that it is quite possible that there are other committments of which I have no knowledge. I am not advised of these matters until I receive the accounts certified for payment. There may also be extras on the Contracts of which I will know nothing until the Architect has made his final adjustments.

Bal. to credit of Account at Canadian Bank of Com- merce	\$38,312.60
Allocated by Government not yet received from treasury	50,000.00

There was an elaborate scheme prepared and a special gardener was got out to lay out the grounds and plant trees. I may say in that connection that I was asked the day before yesterday to pay a bill for \$800 for trees, ordered by the late Minister of Education through Mr. Canning. I discovered that there was no soil to plant them in, and consequently we have got to plant the soil first. The trees were ordered before the soil, so the only thing to do was to sell the trees.

MR. HICKMAN—Asked Hon. the Minister of Justice if any negotiations are going on for the settlement of the Labrador Boundary without reference to Privy Council.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In replying to the Hon. member, there are no negotiations that the department has any knowledge of or any connection with.

MR. WARREN—Asked the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House the report furnished the Government in 1924 upon which pay-

ments made to the Commissioners upon Tariff Revision for their services were based.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I beg to lay the necessary information on the table and in doing so I wish to say that the Minister of Finance was asked by the Royal Commission on Tariff for more money than the Government paid out. In other words the Commissioners did not get quite as much money as they were looking for. Here is a letter addressed to Mr. Cave:—

(Copy)

ROYAL COMMISSION ON TARIFF.

March 29, 1924.

Hon. W. H. Cave,

Minister of Finance & Customs.

Sir.—In accordance with your wishes, the Tariff Revision Commission, at its final session asked for an expression of opinion as to what remuneration should be paid the various members for their services during the past two years. While no vote was taken on the subject, the expressed consensus of opinion was that ranking members should be paid at least One thousand dollars each, and that the Chairman, the Secretary, and Mr. H. V. Hutchings, on whom devolved continuous and numerous extraordinary services should receive additional payment for their services. Taking the stated One thousand dollars as basis of pay for each member of the Commission, we beg to recommend to the Government a scale of pay as follows:—

Chairman, H. W. LeMessurier, C.M.G.

1. Commissioner's pay	\$1,000
2. Chairman's Fee	2,000
3. Preparation of New Schedule	1,500
4. Services on Special Commit- tees and Special Reports ..	500
	—————
	\$5,000
	—————

Secretary (H. M. Mosdell.)

1. Commissioner's Pay	\$1,000
2. Special Secretarial Work ..	1,500
3. Preparation of Report and Special Papers	1,200
4. Preparation of Index	300
	—————
	\$4,000
	—————

Mr. H. V. Hutchings.

1. Commissioner's Pay	\$1,000
2. Special Investigations into Hardware and Grocery Trade and Attendance at Special sub-Committee Meetings as per Attendance Report	250
3. Work on Report of Commis- sion	500
4. Work on Index to New Schedule	250
	—————
	\$2,000
	—————

Respectfully yours,

H. W. LeMESSURIER,
Chairman.

H. M. MOSDELL,
Secretary.

Royal Commission on Tariff.

MR. WARREN—The Prime Minister has heard my question asking to have the report tabled. That is the report I mean. There was a report prepared for the executive Government, and upon that report payments were made. I think that was all I wanted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—That is the only document my secretary could find this morning. But I may say that in connection with the Commissioners pay that Mr. C. P. Ayre told me that in discussing the matter at a meeting they had come to the conclusion that \$300 was very good pay. There were 60 meetings and \$5 a meeting was sufficient. He thought he was only getting \$300 and when he got \$500 he sent \$200 to a charitable institution.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend 12 and 13, Geo. V. Cap. 20 entitled "The War Pensions Act, 1922."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman, this Bill to amend the War Pensions Act 1922 was given notice of shortly after the opening day of this session of the House. The Amendments that are in the Committee stage before the House are as follows:—

**HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE
READS BILL.**

The amendment as Hon. members can readily see is only, as I have explained before, to revert to the original number of members which composed the Pensions Board namely three instead of two which has been the case for some time. I have said before also that the two new members have signified their intention of serving without remuneration. Doctor Parsons is the remaining member of the committee.

Since the time these amendments were decided on other proposals, which are more far-reaching in effect, were made. I mention this to explain why the matter has been deferred from day to day. We consider these further proposed amendments far more important from a financial viewpoint. I may say that the matter for serious consideration is the extent of our financial obligations in connection with war pensions. It is to the matter of the Soldiers Settlement policy that I refer and in moving in this direction we are only keeping up the pledges of a past administration, which pledges we approved of and at the same time falling in line with

what has been done in Canada and elsewhere. These proposals were submitted to the Government, under commission, under a different administration. The Government considering that there would be another session of the Legislature before the end of the present fiscal year and that a matter of such weight needs a lot of serious thought decided to defer bringing up the further proposed amendments until the next session. This determination was further strengthened by the knowledge of the fact that similar legislation is to come up at the present session of the Canadian Parliament and the action taken in connection with it might be interesting to us. I beg, therefore, to move the adoption of the amendments which are now before the committee. This War Pensions Act was passed by this House with a schedule attached to it providing for fifty per cent. bonus throughout. This schedule expired in 1922. Since then the payments have been made as if the schedule had not expired. This Act now corrects that defect and continues making the bonus payable up to the end of the fiscal year, June 30th., 1925. This bill also confirms the payments of pensions from the expiration of the schedule up until the present time, and I may say that these other payments were made illegally. However, as I said, the Bill now before the committee corrects the defect. I desire to apologize to the House for the deferring of the order until to-day, the reason for which being, as I explained the careful consideration which had to be given to such further extensive proposals.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent and on motion of Hon the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "The War Pensions Act, 1922" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Game and Island Fisheries Board."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON
BILL "AN ACT RESPECTING
THE GAME AND ISLAND
FISHERIES BOARD."**

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In relation to this Bill I would like to explain that it is not very much different from the original. The Bill is prepared at the request of the Board itself. It is practically a verbatim copy of the original bill except with regard to a clause in section twenty. Otherwise there is nothing of importance. There is no difference in the powers of the Board. In fact the Bill seems to be practically a repetition of the law except that it gives the board more facility in dealing with certain matters and in the method of procedure. It is to be hoped that in the near future the Government will see its way clear to give more financial assistance to the board. The sum which it now expends annually is totally insufficient for the purpose of carrying out the work for which it was started. Those

of us who happen to know can appreciate the work of men who are guarding the rivers and pools of the country. And when we learn of the remuneration they receive for the work we are astounded. The work is most arduous and it seems to me that these men must have some love for the preservation of the fish and wild animals of the forests; otherwise there seems to be no explanation. So again, I hope that in the near future the Government will be able to stretch itself sufficiently to render greater assistance to this worthy cause.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Chairman, while this Bill is before the House, I desire to express myself as being in entire accord with the views expressed by the Minister of Justice in introducing the bill the other day when he paid tribute to the commendatory work of the Board, and its officials.

Speaking from personal knowledge and personal observation, I can say that the wardens on the various rivers and at game centres, are certainly performing their duties with commendable care and attention. Many of them have large areas to patrol, and I agree with the Minister of Justice when he says that for the work performed many of them are underpaid. In fair weather or foul they are always to be found on the job and many of them have to undergo considerable hardships and inconvenience in the performance of their duties. I have in mind now the case of the game warden at Canada Bay, Mr. John Wilcox of Englee. He has three or four large rivers and brooks to look over, all flowing into Canada Bay. His work takes him twelve or eighteen miles from home, and he often has to camp in the open for nights at a stretch, as the country is

extremely isolated. For the work this man performs he receives the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars. It is not enough! and I feel sure there are many like instances. I trust that very shortly the Government will find itself in a position to be able to more suitably reward the various game wardens throughout the country.

As regards the Bill now before the House, I feel that we are conferring very large powers on the Game and Inland Fisheries Board, but I trust nothing is contemplated which will in any way interfere with the right of any man, as against a licensed hunter, of killing a deer for meat and food in the usual manner. I want to see no restrictions placed on our people other than the system at present in vogue permits.

In conclusion I would like to ask the minister in charge of the Bill if the Board has power to add to its numbers.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I would like to say in connection with this bill that it belongs in fact to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that the Minister asked me to undertake the introduction of the bill because it is more of a technical nature than otherwise. I may say in connection with this in passing that all the money which now goes to the Board at the present time is expended in paying the wardens. This is with the exception of the amount necessary for the administration of the work, such as stationery and the secretary's salary. The members of the Board serve without remuneration as the Board is composed entirely of men who are interested in the game of the country. The point that was made by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe is the crux of the situation. The great necessity is for finances to

suitably reward the wardens of the rivers. You cannot expect men to do work unless they are receiving reasonable remuneration. Then, of course, owing again to financial circumstances there are rivers all over the country which are entire unprotected. Those of us who are enthusiastic know because of that destruction is taking place to a terrible extent. There is a great possibility for this country in the salmon fishery—the sea salmon fishery. And this is a matter which is entirely up to our selves to see that the salmon rivers are left undisturbed except at the open season.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—I was out fishing myself during the past few days. I have heard that somebody said that I should not have gone. However I will deal with that later. I want to take this occasion to say that I would like to see some effort made to have the wardens paid better salaries. The best paid of these men get about one hundred and thirty or forty dollars per year while some go as low as forty or fifty. I do not think that it is right for this country to expect men to perform good service for a miserable pittance like that, and in some cases it is impossible for them to do so and in consequence the rivers are being netted. Now, many times the outport people have been blamed for the netting of the rivers. I can say for the information of everybody that if the people of the outports net the rivers then the people of St. John's should be blamed for jigging the rivers. And jigging the rivers is worse than netting them and this I know from my own knowledge because in the jigging many salmon are injured and never caught and they die there in the rivers and pools. And now to show you an instance of the advantage of having the wardens paid a proper salary and also of having more wardens I will

cite an experience of my own. About twelve years ago I was running the Labrador Mail Service and one of the wardens told me that he had heard that the river was being netted. About ten days afterward I was at the river in question and it was late in the evening. I caught the chap in the act. He was a young man of about twenty-seven. I was talking to him for a little while, and I asked him how many barrels he had caught the year before. He replied that he had caught seven barrels. I asked him how many that year so far and he replied twenty-seven. I asked him how many barrels he could remember having been caught in that river, and he said as far as he could remember his father and brother had caught two hundred and fifty barrels out of this river. I spoke to him for some time and I told him a few things that I thought would be a help to him, and I told him of the results of this netting of the rivers, and allowed him to go. The next season I got a report from a storekeeper at Canada Bay that he had received fifteen barrels from that man. The season after again I heard from the same storekeeper that he had got sixty-four barrels from him. That is the result which came from not netting the river. With the Game and Inland Fishery Board the great and crying need is for more money to employ more wardens and to pay those who are already working at this work better salaries. Until this is done the rivers will be netted and jigged, and it is up to us if we want to preserve our game to take some measure to protect the salmon.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and it was ordered that

the said Bill be read a third time presently.

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

Second Reading of Bill "An Act respecting the Employment of Loggers."

MR. K. BROWN:—Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill I am actuated by one motive only, namely to do something on behalf of the loggers of this country, whose wrongs cry out for redress, and I would like to make a few remarks concerning the sub-contract or piece-work system. The great majority of men who work at logging under this system find that while they have to work like slaves they cannot make anything like the amount of money they should make and therefore find it impossible, in most cases, to support their families under the above named system. When a man has to go logging under the piece-work system and find, after quitting work, he has not made enough to pay his passage home much less having anything to take home to provide the wherewithal for his family, it appears to him, and rightly so, that this country is not giving him a square deal and for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced the Bill now before the House, and as the introducer I intend to support it to the bitter end.

I strongly condemn the sub-contract, or piece-work system in the lumber woods of this country, as it is a condition of labor that does not permit the logger due return for his honest toil. The loggers of the northern districts are antagonistic to this system.

Nothing will induce the majority of these men to go in the woods under this system but absolute necessity, and it is high time, Mr. Speaker, that a stop be put to contractors making big money at the expense of the loggers. Hundreds of men have approached me on this very important matter and asked me if something cannot be done to remedy the evils that now exist in connection with the subcontract system.

How is it that these companies cannot pay wages as they did in years gone? Did they take advantage of the country's condition and watch their opportunity to inaugurate this system of slavery, if so, it is about high time the Government take action, and take it quickly, on behalf of the loggers who are looking to us to protect them and their families from starvation.

There was a time when the A. N. D. Co. had a winter train service between Millertown Junction and Millertown and conveyed their men to and from Millertown, but of late this train service does not exist in winter season and men have to travel from Millertown Junction to Millertown, a distance of about twenty miles, before reaching Red Indian Lake. Now this is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the representatives of the largest outport districts, in this country, which district, if I speak rightly, sends as many or more men to the lumber woods than any other district, and during my two political campaigns in Twillingate District, I have had numerous complaints against this system. As a matter of fact, only three men in my whole district spoke in favor of sub-contract or piece-work.

Some people may say if the companies pay big wages they will not get the same amount of work out of the men, my answer to that is, if when a man is getting paid and is not inclined to work, get rid of him, and employ the man who is inclined to

give a fair days work for a fair day's pay. Why should men have to work like slaves for a paltry day's work. Is not an honest day's work from any man good enough for any company? Why should the the hours of any workman be longer than nine hours, or ten hours at the farthest?

Last winter a large number of men went to Millertown Junction to go to Millertown to work, and when reaching the Junction and finding they had to travel to Millertown, refused to undertake the journey, with the result that the Government had to send Magistrate and Police to investigate and the result was, the men had to be sent to their homes at the expense of the Colony.

Mr. Speaker, there may be some men who engage in the sub-contract system that may make good money, perhaps \$60.00 a month, perhaps more, but not because some can make that amount that others must work with the hope of doing the same and in the end find it impossible.

The wage asked in the Bill now before the House, is not large, what is a dollar and sixty or seventy cents for a good day's work in the lumber woods and swings an axe from sunrise to sunset. Things are getting worse instead of better. It has been said that wages and labor are governed by the law of Supply and Demand, but I say that this does not apply here in Newfoundland, because the supply has always been, and in my opinion, always will be, greater than the demand.

According to present indications, there is no doubt but the catch of cod-fish will be very short this season and hundreds of men will be looking for employment of some sort, and are we going to allow this sub-contract to still exist, or are we going to try and get straight wages for the men who go at that hazardous work? Furthermore, this is a Presidential election year in the United States and many men are out of employment and many

Newfoundlanders are returning home and will be seeking work in their own country, and what are we going to do about it?

We need Labor Laws and need them badly, and if something is not done to protect the logger, things will go from bad to worse, and the children of to-day will be half starved as some of them are at present half-naked and uneducated, and education is one of the principal requirements of Newfoundland to-day. I feel sure that the Labor member for St. John's West will support this Bill now before the House, and I also think Capt. Winsor, the member for Bonavista, will also support it, in view of the number of men who go from his district to the lumber woods.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this Bill will be given consideration, and that the loggers will be given a living wage. I would like, sir, for every hon. member in this House to give this Bill the consideration that it deserves, and let it stand on its merits. I do not believe many of the arguments put up about logging expenses to be correct. Too much is charged to overhead expenses so as to make it appear impossible to pay more wages.

I would again, Mr. Speaker, be seech the Government to deeply consider this Bill, and to give it their support on behalf of the men who cut the logs.

I have much pleasure, sir, in moving the second reading.

MR. SCAMMELL—Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion that this Bill be read a second time, and in doing so I am reminded of a saying which goes to the effect "that in every moment there is embedded a golden opportunity," and I feel, sir, that this House and this Legislature has a golden opportunity before it in this Bill to do something of real merit and lasting worth on behalf of a class of toilers whose importance in our in-

dustrial life shows that they are second to the men engaged in fishing.

I have before me the Budget speech of the late Finance Minister, Mr. Cave, for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1923. In the addenda I note some figures with reference to our exports for that year, and on analysis it is shown that out of a total of twenty million dollars, fourteen million dollars consisted of fishery produce and four millions consisted of the products of the forest, namely, pulp, paper, and raw timber. It will thus be seen what an important body of men industrially the loggers are to the country. The loggers for years have always been a hard working class of men, engaged in a strenuous and hazardous occupation. But up to 1913 no legislation in their interests had made its appearance on the Statute Book. In 1913 Sir William Coaker introduced his Logging Bill and with the co-operation of the then Prime Minister, Sir Edward Morris, succeeded in having it placed on the Statute Book. That act was a step forward in revolutionizing matters for the loggers, as regards conditions under which they had to work before. It had no sooner become law than it was hailed with acclamation by loggers from all over the country and up to this day loggers everywhere are outspoken in its praise. But, to-day, sir, we are faced with a condition of affairs existing among the loggers where we find it necessary to go further.

Conditions have arisen which make it necessary for us to take further cognizance of the manner in which loggers have been treated during recent years. The large amount of surplus labour following upon post war conditions gave the logging companies ample opportunity for introducing what has since become known as the sub-contracting system. That system has already been outlined and ex-

plained by the member for Twillingate, Mr. Brown, here this afternoon. My experience in connection with logging conditions is neither as wide or as varied as that of the member for Twillingate, but from my own knowledge and observation, I must say that amongst loggers to-day there is a universal demand for the abolition of the sub-contracting system, and the introduction of a straight wage.

Last Autumn I attended the F.P.U. Convention at Port Union, and there must have been over a hundred and fifty delegates present from various parts of the country, and the Convention debated for a whole day, from early morning till late at night this system of sub-contracting in the lumberwoods. There were many experienced loggers present, many who had worked under the sub-contracting system and good workmen too. Various opinions were expressed but in the end the unanimous opinion of the delegates was that an effort had to be made by which the subcontracting system would be abolished.

If any honourable members have any doubt in their minds that there is not a demand among the loggers for the abolition of this system, let me set their fears at rest. I note that both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and Customs have on occasion stressed the theory of supply and demand as regards wages to be paid labourers. The theory of supply and demand is a large economic question that has caused much thought to the best minds of all ages. I do not agree that the theory always works to the best advantage of the labourer, but, assuming the Prime Minister's argument that it does there is all the more reason this year why legislation such as this bill should be placed on the Statute Book.

The Prime Minister anticipates that there will be ample labor to take care of all men offering this year, but I

fear that such will not be the case. What is the position to-day, Mr. Speaker?

The fishery promises to be an absolute failure and hundreds of men are already seeking work in order to be able to provide for the winter before it gets too late. I suppose that there is not an honourable member in this House who is not now daily in receipt of messages asking for work and honourable members will find that as time goes on the situation will be accentuated. Hundreds of men have been thrown out of work in Canada and the United States and will be returning home, and these will have to be taken care of as well. We are consequently going to have a surplus of men for labour. Looking at it which way you will the law of supply and demand will in this case operate to the disadvantage of the labourer because the situation I have outlined must mean plenty labour and consequently cheaper labour unless otherwise provided for. The Prime Minister and the Government must take serious cognizance of the situation, and in view of what the member for Twillingate has said here this afternoon, give this bill their earnest sympathy and support. I ask you, honourable members to seriously consider this Bill and realize that this is a good opportunity to do something for them, the deserving labouring class. Conditions under which men are working with the sub-contracting system are neither fair nor equitable and the only square deal which they can expect is through legislation such as we are proposing this afternoon. The Prime Minister to my mind is particularly committed to do his best with regard to this bill. I have his Manifesto before me and amongst other things I note that he said that he agreed that the labor man should have a living wage, should be well housed and clothed

and that he would aid if possible to bring this about. I point out to the Prime Minister that now is his opportunity of acting up to that pledge as I presume he was sincere when he uttered it. The bill now before us offers the logger a living wage which in the majority of cases under the present system he has not obtained. The question as to whether the companies can afford to give these wages ought not to my mind concern us a great deal. I feel sure they are in a position to pay such wages as we ask in this connection if one is to judge from the returns and earnings of the A.N.D. Co. and the ease with which their debentures are disposed of on the market. Anything less than this bill asks for is not a living wage and any company that wants to engage men for less is scarcely worth considering as an asset to the country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again commend this Bill to the serious consideration of every member of this House and call upon every member to give it and his fellow-countrymen a square deal. For the reasons outlined I shall give this Bill my strongest support and I have much pleasure in seconding the second reading.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I would like to remind my friend that "these golden opportunities that are embedded in every moment," were there during the last four or five years, and it strikes me as rather extraordinary that some pronouncement of this kind was not coming forth during the four or five years that he has already been in this House. The same applies to Mr. Brown's remarks.

I think that every member on this side of the House is just as sympathetic with the lumber men as Mr. Scammell or any other member on the other side of the House, and if you can give us the idea that this will work out for the benefit of the whole

Island and the lumbermen in particular, we shall listen to you very sympathetically, but I do not think that the lumbering man, or the labouring man is going to derive any great benefit out of this scheme. As I have stated before in his House, there is one industry in this country which pays sixteen cents an hour for another kind of labour. This is a very big question and one which we cannot jump into and accept at a moment's notice.

My sympathies are much more with the lumbering man than with the employer of labour, but at the same time, we must consider the manufacturer when we consider the lumberman. I state and I have stated before that the question of labour, whether in the woods or out of the woods is regulated absolutely by the question of supply and demand, and if we are going to interfere with supply and demand, and attempt to regulate labour, we may find ourselves in a worse position than we ever were before.

I have heard men saying that, though we have six thousand men working at the Humber, we are no better off, because these men are not earning a decent wage, and because they are not earning a decent wage, the country is no better off. I claim that the country is better off; and I claim that if the Gander Valley proposition goes on, and men are employed at the same rate of wages as at the Humber, the country will be better off still, because the more labour you employ, the greater the chances of the labourers getting better wages.

I may say again that my sympathies are entirely with the labouring man, but at the same time we have to consider the employer of labour. I would like to read this telegram:

(Reads Telegram.)

I am not saying anything about the truth of those statements, but these people have an absolute right to be heard before we put through any legislation of that kind. I would also like to read this letter received from Mr. H. D. Reid, this afternoon:

(Reads Letter.)

With respect to these letters I say I do not speak for the truth of them, I do not say that they may not be a huge bluff on the part of the employers of labour, but I do say this, they deserve the consideration of this House, and if we were to advance to the second reading without giving those people an opportunity of putting their case before us, we would not be doing right.

I suggest then that the matter be left over, and referred to a select committee for their consideration. I would not be satisfied to have it passed through under the present conditions.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in reference to this Bill now before the House. I do not know very much about the lumber business, but I feel sure that Mr. Brown, in introducing this Bill, has introduced it for the best interests of his constituents, and the people of the North. All the information I have in regard to this, I have from the representatives of Twillingate, Fogo, and St. Barbe Districts, and they all tell me that there is a strenuous kick from the men who have to go into the lumber woods and do their lumbering on sub-contract. This Bill does not prevent the A.N.D. Company or any other company manufacturing timber in Newfoundland from giving out their contracts, but it prevents the man who gets that contract from employing men, and getting from these men a large profit, without the men who cut the logs being sufficiently paid for their work.

It strikes me that \$1.50 a day is not very much to pay a man. If you include with that the cost of keeping the man, say eighty cents a day, that works out at \$2.30 a day. It would not cost more than eighty cents a day to keep a man out in the lumber woods. Any man around St. John's has to get three dollars a day, which is practically eighty-five dollars a month, whereas the man in the lumber woods is to get only \$45.00. I do not see that there is any hardship in a contractor paying a man \$45.00 a month and his grub. Certainly, if the business is worth doing, it is worth paying a man to do; and, as I said before, I believe that Mr. Brown is actuated by a desire to help the people of the North. He understands what they suffer when they go to work under these sub-contracts, and he has brought this Bill in with the sole object of trying to help them.

The letter which the Prime Minister read from Mr. Reid suggests that a Bill of this kind would almost make the project which he is behind impossible. Capt. Winsor, the Hon. Member for Bonavista stated in the House or stated to me, or in my hearing, that he would not support that Bill at all unless the men who worked in connection with that were paid a living wage, and I do not know whether he stated thirty cents an hour as a living wage. I know he made reference to \$2.50 a day, as the lowest wage he would entertain.

In Bills coming before this House for any large corporation they should be compelled to pay to the people of this country a decent wage, and while perhaps, it is not possible at the present moment to introduce a minimum wage Bill, still I am of the opinion that it should be introduced, and the people, to whom he makes reference as paying their men only sixteen cents an hour, should not be allowed to do business.

Now, we all know that the men

who work on Bell Island and the men who work at the Humber for twenty-five cents an hour are not able to save sufficient money out of that amount to support their families. I know about the men on Bell Island, because a great many of the labourers live in the district which I have the honour to represent, and I know that after getting paid, and having certain charges deducted, at 25½ cents an hour they have very little left for their families, and the wives and children of a great many men who were working on Bell Island during the past two years had to get relief from the relieving officer.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I should support this Bill, and I would not support anything that would injure any corporation, but I do not think that this Bill can injure them, providing as it does for the payment of \$45.00 a month to the people who cut the wood. The contract would not be let out at any higher price if the men were paid \$45.00 a month, or if they were paid as at present for piece work.

A man working in the woods has to work pretty hard. He has to get up at a very early hour, and work practically from daylight to dark, and if he cannot be paid more than \$1.50 a day, and board for that, it would be better for him not to be employed at all. It is for that reason that I can give my support to this Bill, unless some other members from the other side point out to me how it will injure the workmen.

MR ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion made by Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown knows what he is talking about, because he has been rubbing shoulder to shoulder with these people for years. I know that the consensus of opinion in the North is against this sub-contract system.

This year, owing to the failure of

the codfishery and the herring fishery, we can see that we are going to be up against a serious state of affairs, and men will have to go into the woods. The fishery is practically a failure already, and the herring fishery is one of the worst that we have had in Green Bay for several years.

Formerly, owing to the low expenses, the fishermen would earn enough in two or three months to keep their families over the winter, and the result is that these men are dependent upon their winter's work to supply their families' wants. Then the fact that these men are not organized into unions is against them when it comes to getting the full value out of the sub-contract system to cut lumber.

For instance, I understand that the A.N.D. Company, or any other Company can make a contract, and can let out that contract to certain individuals, who sublet their contracts to others—the fishermen. Now, when they are looking for work—to use a well known saying, “half a loaf is better than none at all,” and these men have to take what they are given pretty much; I think that we should see that their wages are looked after, that they are not exploited, or made the victim of this sub-contract system.

I know of instances in which men have gone to work and obtained sub-contracts, and have been told to go in the bush and start to cut. They hoped, at the end of the month, to have a certain amount of money, and to be able to come out of the woods, having a little extra money after paying for whatever their families had while they were in there. They found, and they did not know where the error crept in, that they were not making the money they had expected; whether it was because of a mistake in the scaling, or in some other way, they cannot say. At any rate, they feel that

they would be much better off if they had a monthly wage.

I think that these men who go into the woods and swing an axe all day to get his wood, deserve a definite minimum wage. We have the minimum wage proposition in the Humber, no doubt we shall have it in the Gander, although Mr Reid has written a letter in reference to this Bill. I think we should see that something is done here to protect the lumbering man.

I know of another instance, which I refer to in connection with this matter, where, owing to some unforeseen circumstances the men did not get paid for the wood that they cut, and it seems that the wood was hypothecated, or perhaps some person had taken a chattel mortgage on it. At any rate, I am told that a firm had let out the contract to another man and had given him certain supplies and he had given as security for the advance, this wood which was being cut. Now, that was not his wood at all until he had paid the people who had cut it. It appears that although the law says so, the men who are cutting the wood—not being legally schooled—did not know that they had first claim on the wood for payment; at any rate it seems that these men had to leave the wood in the hands of the contractor, and they are, at the present time, so far as I know, without their money. Whether or not they will ever get it remains to be seen.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that, unless the men are getting \$1.50 a day, the job can't be worth very much to this country, and that there is something radically wrong.

I think then that the members of this House, on both sides, will give this matter due consideration and see to it that something will be done to remedy it.

MR. HIBBS--Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of supporting this Bill. I am convinced that I would not be doing my duty to the people who sent me here if I did otherwise. Every Honorable member of this House knows, that for years past, complaints have been made against this iniquitous system of sub-letting logging contracts. If this wrong has existed during the past years, and now there is an attempt to remedy it, I do not see why the Honorable gentlemen on both sides of the House would not give this Bill their entire endorsement. The obviously unfair conditions under which our people have been laboring in the lumber woods have compelled me to form very strong opinions, and since every other remedy to remedy this evil, has, apparently failed, I feel that the time to introduce legislation with regard to this question has come and I think that if the Bill is not passed it will mean the continuation of a great injustice to this class of worker.

During the last two years particularly, I have been brought face to face with the grievances of my constituents against the sub-contract system, under which they have had to work as slaves, and barely exist while engaged at the work, and the result was that I made up my mind that the first opportunity that offered, I would do my utmost to wipe out his system. At the last F. P. U. Convention it was suggested that a deputation be appointed to call on the A.N.D. Company and present to them the loggers' case. I understand this was done, but to no avail. I cannot but regard this system as intolerable to the man who does the actual producing. I think that any system that allows one class of men to get rich at the expense of the toilers is not a just one, and it should not be permitted one day longer.

It may be that the Companies who

give the original contracts may not be required to pay more under the wages provided in this Bill than they have been paying under the system complained of.

We all know that there are certain men who are given contracts. We will assume that they are paid from six to seven dollars per cord for pulpwood. These people then sub-let those contracts to the lumbermen for, say, \$2.50 or \$3.00 per cord, as the case may be. I am not sure that these are correct prices. I speak subject to correction.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN--I do not think that is correct.

MR. HIBBS--Well, assuming they pay \$3.00 and get \$6.00. However, that is the principle upon which the thing is worked out.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN--Unfortunately we do not get so much.

MR. HIBBS--I understand the Hon. gentleman undertakes some of those contracts himself. I have heard that certain contractors in one year have cleaned up as much as seven thousand dollars, while the men who do the actual cutting of the logs cannot save ten dollars a month.

You cannot get men in the North to go cutting lumber on these sub-contract basis to-day, unless they are driven there by hunger. I know that from actual experience I have had hundreds of men from my district, asking me to get them passes for the Humber; of course I did my best, but when I found out that it was impossible to cope with the demands, my practice was to take the matter up with Mr. Gillingham, the labor agent of the A.N.D. Company, and very often I secured permission to send up fifty or a hundred men to the lumbering camps. I found in some cases I could not get one individual to go there under the conditions they were compelled to work. These men will

tell you it is just as well to stay at home and starve as to go out in the woods to slave and starve.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we should recognize the broad economic principle that our timber wealth can be regarded as an asset only in so far as it can afford remunerative employment to the laborers of this country. What is the good of our entering into contracts with foreign corporations if the laborers here, the people of Newfoundland, who do the actual work, do not get a fair or decent wage to support themselves, and families. That is the question we have to deal with.

There is another aspect of this matter which strikes one as very peculiar. It is strange that it is only in the actual cutting of the logs that the laborer cannot earn a living wage? To make myself clear on this point, whether it is in the manufacture of pulp, or paper, or in the erection of buildings that the wood may be used, the people engaged in this end of the industry generally get, at least, from \$2.50 to \$3.00 per day; but the man who does the actual cutting of the wood that goes into the manufacture of pulp and paper, or the erection of buildings, he is the only class of man that is not paid for his labour. I think the honourable gentlemen in this House will agree with me that the men who go into the lumber woods, and swing an axe from morning till night are performing the hardest end of the whole business. It is more strenuous than any labor in connection with the whole industry, and therefore, these people are entitled to a living wage.

I know that throughout the North there have been hundreds of men slaving in the lumber woods during the last two years that were not able to support their families. There have been hundreds of wives and children waiting for a pay day that never, never came. I state here, Sir, if we

are going to use our timber wealth in that way, I do not see much hope for Newfoundland from that source.

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Gander proposition, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that he would not support the Gander project unless a living wage was guaranteed to the men. I have said, and I say now that I will hesitate to support any deal, unless there is some provision made whereby the laboring men of this country will be protected. I repeat, Sir, that these timber lands are only assets in so far as they provide remunerative employment for the people of Newfoundland. The only reason why any of this wood should be cut, is to afford our people a means of livelihood. I do not know much about the A. N. D. Company business, but I know enough to convince me that those people are a class who can well take care of themselves. We do not have to lose any sleep over that.

It is the unfortunate toiler who cannot help himself that this Assembly has to take care of. Every man who represents a district from which loggers come must remember his duty in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, it is half past six, and I do not want to delay this House any longer, but I have noticed with some regret that each time matters of this nature have been spoken of, the Prime Minister has referred to some firm that paid sixteen cents an hour for its labour. The Prime Minister is not without his prejudices. That sentiment, I fear, inspired his remarks. It is plainly a reference to the Union Trading Company at Port Union. I do not know what is happening at Port Union. I only want to say that conditions at Port Union are quite different to the conditions in St. John's. The Leader of the Government pays more than sixteen cents an hour for labour, because he can't help it. The conditions under which

he and others in St. John's operate are entirely different to those at Port Union. There is a Union in St. John's which makes it compulsory to pay more, but he must not forget that the laboring man at Port Union enjoy conveniences that do not come to the workingman of St. John's; and I do not see the relation that this matter has to the question before the Chair.

I would appeal to the Government to be just to the producer and not to throw out this bill simply because it is introduced from the opposition side of the House.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the adjournment of the debate on this subject.

Mr. Puddester gave notice of question.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 29th, 1924.

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

HON. MR. BRADLEY:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of the District of Port de Grave for the re-establishment, for the convenience of those fishing at Bolster's Rock, Comfort Bight and vicinity, of the Marconi Station which through private influence has been removed to Shoal Bay. This station would be of inestimable value to the people engaged in this vicinity in getting reports of the fishery further down the coast and in keeping in touch with the movements of the coastal boat through the summer so that they could make proper

arrangements to meet her when leaving the coast for home.

MR. LINEGAR:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Boilermakers' Union to amend the Boiler Inspector's Act so as to prevent various objectionable matters which have arisen in connection with that trade. This petition is to provide against the further employment of those who have not served their apprenticeship to qualify for the repairing or making of boilers. I might say, Sir, that Sir John Crosbie and myself had an interview with the petitioners some weeks ago when they pointed out their needs as outlined in this petition. I hope their plea will be given every consideration as it is an important one and affects a considerable number of men. I beg that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker I beg to heartily support the petition as at present a lot of mere tinkers are engaged at boiler making, a condition that should be brought to the notice of the Boiler Inspector so that the grievance may be remedied. I know that the member for St. John's West is in close personal touch with, and is interested in, the boilermakers, many of whom are out of work while handy men are filling their places.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table report of the Marine and Fisheries Department for 1923-24.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

It was ordered that questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 12 stand deferred.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Col. Secretary: (1) How many line repairers are engaged in repairing the telegraph line between St. John's and Port aux Basques operated by the Railway; (2) The annual cost of such repairs and maintenance.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—

Nineteen repairers are being paid \$13,988.00 per annum between St. John's and Port aux Basques, inclusive, and the cost of repairs over the same section the past two years has averaged \$63,000.00—say a total of \$77,000.00.

MR. HICKMAN:—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amount of freight delivered at points on the Railway between Deer Lake and Humbermouth inclusive since the 30th of June last and taken from the said points to other points on the Railway and the amount paid in connection therewith.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—The reply is in course of preparation.

MR. HICKMAN:—To ask Hon. the Colonial Secretary whether any money has been spent upon or any goods supplied of any kind whatever to the Railway since its operations was assumed by the Government which money or goods has been charged to any account other than the Railway such as the Relief Account and if so to lay on the Table a copy of such account or accounts.

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

MR. LITTLE asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a detailed statement of all moneys expended up to the present time on Old Day's Pond, Bonavista.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I beg to table the following reply:—

**Department of Marine and Fisheries
—Expenditure on Bonavista Pond,
1922-23.**

October 12th, 1922:
Hire, George Abbott\$ 5.00
Freight, U. T. Co. 14.30
October 13th, 1922:
Labour, M. E. Hawco .. 313.50

October 20th, 1922:
Girders, B.P., C. A. Hub-
bley 276.40
October 23, 1922:
Pumps, B.P., A. E. Hick-
man 215.00
October 30th, 1922:
Fittings, etc., C. A. Hu-
bley 320.03
October 31st, 1922:
Hire Joseph Mouland .. . 10.00
November 1st, 1922:
B.P. Pumps, Angel and
Pippy 50.67
Expenses, M. E. Hawco .. 100.00
R. N. Co. on account .. 4,000.00
November 13:
F. U. T. Co., B.P. .. . 1,032.33
U. Elec. Co., B.P. 822.43
November 14:
Pay Bank N. S., M. E.
Hawco, Payroll 3,600.00
November 15:
R. N. Co. fare 6.65
November 18:
Hire Joseph Mouland .. . 10.00
Labour, Elias Whiffen 20.00
Labour, Richard Groves .. 20.00
November 20:
Services, M. E. Hawco .. 250.00
November 28:
B.P., U. T. Co. 493.80
December 3:
James Ryan 127.38
B.P., W. H. House & Co... 139.63
December 10:
Payroll, M. E. Hawco .. . 11,607.86
B.P., Sundry Cheques .. . 65.00
December 11:
Expenses, M. E. Hawco .. 100.00

\$23,599.98
December 11th, 1922:
J. T. Swyers 82.33
Jas. Ryan 10.50
Jas. Hunt 92.10
P. Templeman 36.29

\$212.22

B.P., Freight R. N. Co. ..	94.78
B.P., Freight C. A. Hub- bley	155.00
B. P., Freight W. H. House & Co.	92.36
B.P., Freight U. T. Co. ..	406.73
December 26:	
Labour, H. Rolls	32.40
December 27:	
B.P., U. T. Co.	12.85
January 9:	
Acct. Paysheet, Bank N. S.	41.02
January 10:	
Pump Hire, D. I. & S. Co., per C. A. Hubley	209.10
R. N. Co., on account ..	2,000.00
B.P., Coastal Co.	55.50
January 15:	
Timber, Bank N.S., Bona- vista	43.00
January 21:	
R. N. Co., Passages	19.10
Coastal Co., B.P.	11.25
R. N. Co., B.P.	11.25
B.P., R. Joyce	20.00
March 15:	
B.P., Coastal Co.	46.01
	<hr/>
	\$31,319.55
November 8th, 1922:	
P. Templeman	107.93
Jas. Hunt	48.00
J. T. Swyers	133.27
R. Ryder	27.00
W. H. House	285.81
U. T. Co.	136.35
	<hr/>
	630.43
Bank N.S.	1,968.86
December 12th:	
B.P., Board	1.60
January 9th:	
B.P., Susu	9.75
March 15:	
B.P., Coastal	2.44
April 2:	
B.P., Job's Stores	52.11
B.P., Sticks, J. T. Swyers	576.00
April 5:	
J. T. Swyers, Land, etc. ..	700.00
April 21:	
Bank N. S.	600.00

May 10:	
U. T. Co.	20.80
Richard Hounsell	27.00
July 20:	
Government Engineer ..	20,000.00
August 3:	
B.P., F. U. T. Co.	32.80
B.P., F. U. T. Co.	363.80
B.P., W. H. House & Co...	389.16
August 18:	
F. U. T. Co., B.P.	68.90
F. U. T. Co., B.P.	37.30
August 25:	
B.P., George Richards ..	553.70
August 30:	
Mrs. Ryan, B.P.	20.00
September 14:	
B.P., George Richards	26.91
October 15:	
George Richards, Sect. ..	3,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$60,502.04
October 20, 1923:	
A. T. Hall, G.E.	629.21
U. T. Co.	190.00
B.P., Job's Stores	188.45
November 15:	
B.P., J. T. Swyers & Co...	90.48
December 7:	
N. Government Railway..	6,203.73
December 21:	
B.P., House & Co., F. G.	150.00
January 2, 1924:	
Hire, Hy. Moulton	10.00
May 1:	
Government Engineer	5,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$72,914.91

MR. LITTLE ASKED Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the petition signed by the residents of Catalina asking that a Tax of 50 cents per ton be placed on all coal imported into Catalina for domestic purposes to be paid to the Road Board towards the lighting of the Public Street at Catalina.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY
—I beg to table the following reply.

To His Excellency the Governor in Council:

WE, the undersigned petitioners of Catalina, in the Electoral District of Trinity, humbly pray that in accordance with the Act for Lighting Streets a tax of fifty cents per ton be collected on all coal imported into Catalina, the said tax to be instituted at the earliest possible convenience.

John Hicks, Thomas Russell of Jas., Garland Clouter (X), W. T. Jeans, Joseph White, John Manuel, Wm. J. Gullage, Abe Courage, Robert Courage, E. J. Norman, Aubrey Gullage, Arthur Clouter, Jeremiah Lane, Albert Hicks, Wm. R. Pomeroy, Wm. J. Pomeroy, Ronald White, Henry Clouter, Thomas King, Selby Gullage, Eli Collins, George Gullage, Rupert King, James Joy, Peter Hiscock, Edward Bishop, Francis Diamond, William J. White, Walter Hunt (X), Robert Stagg (X), John Bursey (X), William Gullage, Charles Rowe, George Duffett, Joseph Bright, John Edwards, Robert Blundon, Bernard Mason, William Manuel, John Mason, Edward Mason, Joseph G. Manuel, Bernard Mason, Moses Blundon, Stewart Manuel, James Kiel, Albert Duffett, Edwin Gullage, Henry Blundon, Frederick W. Gullage, Thomas Lane, James White, William White, Abel White, Joseph Sweet, Patrick Humphries, Albert Blundon, William White, George S. Gullage, Sandy Sheppard, Frank Gullage, Chester Gullage, George Gullage of Geo., John Stickleby, John Hunt, Hubert Sheppard, Frank Sweet, Victorious White, J. Kean, Ensign S.A.; Theophilus King, Caleb King, Archibald Clouter, Frederick H. Gullage, George Stevenson, Stephen Gullage.

MR. HALFYARD asked the Minister of Public Works to name the

party or parties who recommended Mr. A. Brown to spend the local and main line grants of Blaketown. State reasons why the duly elected Road Board is not allowed to spend such moneys.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—In replying to Mr. Halfyard I may say that the person was recommended to me by Mr. Mitchell and some others as being a suitable person to spend money in connection with the main line grants. The department reserves the right, as I said on a previous occasion in replying to a question asked by Mr. Hibbs, to name any party they think suitable to spend the local grants in so far as the Government does not recognise the Road Boards elected throughout this country on Feb. 11th.

MR. GRIMES:—I beg leave to ask the Minister of Public Works why the Government does not recognise the Road Boards that were elected Feb. last.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—In reply to Mr. Grimes I may say that the Government considered the Road Boards were elected illegally.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled 'Of the Employment of men engaged in Logging.'" "

MR. HALFYARD—In rising to support the second reading of the Act respecting the employment of men Engaged in Logging, it is not my intention to take up much time of the House, and the members of this House especially those who spoke on the Opposition side at the last session, handled the subject in so convincing a manner that no doubt extended remarks in favor of the Bill would be altogether unnecessary. Both sides have made up their minds and cannot do anything but support this Bill. That, we trust, is the feeling that ob-

tains as a result of yesterday's debate. The question of a minimum wage should receive our serious thought.

Last year I had the opportunity to hear the opinions of a great many men who were experienced in logging operations, and I was not surprised to hear that 90 per cent. of the cases were opposed to the present system.

Some, I have no doubt, make a very good wage on the contract system, but still those are few compared with the majority. Numbers engaged in this work said they would favor monthly wages, although personally, it may not be any gain to them. I speak now of loggers and lumbermen who, no doubt, can earn a good day's wages on the contract system.

The returns of operating under the contract system is altogether unsatisfactory. And if this House can do anything to remedy the situation it should take the first opportunity to do so.

The Government will be up against a most serious proposition to find remunerative employment for the fishermen and laborers of this country next Fall and Winter. The supply will be greater than the demand and the directorate of corporations and capitalists are only human. They are made up of individuals and their chief object from a business point of view will be to try to make dividends and profits for the directors and shareholders.

It is only natural for any corporation to take advantage of the labor situation. And they certainly have shown to this House that they prefer the sub-contract system, therefore it must be of advantage to them. They must think that they get a greater return for the money that they pay for labor. Having knowledge of conditions that obtain through Mr. Brown for Twillingate District, who has been in close contact with the conditions for a number of years, also having

many reports of men engaged in logging, I feel that I would not be performing my duty to my constituents or to the laborers of this country if I were not to support this measure, because as sure as we are here, hundreds of men, if the old system obtain, will receive passes to go to the lumber woods. Hundreds of others will succeed in getting credit for supplies advanced to keep their families while they are away. There will be hundreds of cases where the men won't have enough to pay their fares in and out, and they won't have a cent left to pay the merchant or party who advanced supplies to keep their families alive. I know what I am speaking about in this respect. The Government, during the last year or two, have paid away hundreds of dollars to men who have been in the lumber woods and were not able to make enough money to pay their passage back. These men were not experienced loggers, but it is only poverty and actual starvation that forced them to go out there, and it would have been a much greater saving to the Government if they had advanced money to keep these men at their homes. These are the conditions that you are going to be up against during the coming winter. And if you can institute an Act which will give loggers \$45 a month and found, the Company will be able to weed out the men that are not good for that kind of work.

These are the conditions that we have been up against for the last two or three years, and it is regrettable that we have to anticipate similar conditions during the next winter unless the fishery improves and one can earn enough at the fishery to provide for self and family. Even now we are getting messages from Blanc Sablon, Labrador, asking for a pass to go to the Humber, as the fishery is a blank. I have received messages from New Waterford, N.S., from a

man saying that he cannot earn enough to pay his board and asking for work at the Humber. These men belong to Trinity District, who happen to be in North Sydney. It has been said that to get a minimum wage on the statutes may interfere with the introduction of new industries. This especially refers to the Gander Project. I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that if any company, corporation or business cannot afford to pay the man who produces the raw article upon which the whole manufacturing business depends, \$45 a month and found, it would be much better for us to have no industry at all. If the Humber industry or the A.N.D. Company cannot pay the man who cuts the wood, and we must get back to him, \$45 a month and found, it is better for that man to go to some sunny clime and live in his birthday clothes, and exist on the fruit nature provides. The only objection I would have to the Bill and the trouble with the corporation is that as soon as you make a minimum wage, capitalists take advantage and try to make it a maximum wage. \$45 is too small, and why any corporation would object to pay \$45 a month and found I do not know. Certainly no one can expect that anyone with a family dependent on him to exist on \$45 a month and board. Certainly he must supply himself with clothes and those dependent on him. But it is better than nothing. There is also the transportation expenses.

They sweat and work and swear and that is all the satisfaction they get.

The prosperity of a country does not altogether depend upon the large buildings or the extensive business premises. That is all very nice, but the man who lives in the cottage, he can admire the princely residence of those who make money in a different way. We cannot wonder at the state of discontent, and the revolutionary

spirit in many of those who cannot eke out an existence. I feel quite sure that this House, because there is not much difference in the House as a house whether we sit on the right or the left of the Speaker. We as a house are responsible for any act of ours dealing with the living conditions of the people of this country. And I do hope that something will be done to help those who have to eke out an existence by going to the lumber woods. This bill should not be thrown aside without the most serious consideration. We should not dismiss this Bill and say that it is impracticable.

I feel quite sure that all the members of this House whether Government or Opposition are interested in the workers of this country. Why should we not be interested? Not because some of us happen to be getting a livelihood in a different way. There should be a spirit of cooperation. Somebody had to introduce this bill and Mr. Brown, the member for Twillingate in the opinion of this side, was the best man to do so, as he has a knowledge of conditions in the lumber woods as good if not better than anyone else in the House. And it should not be looked upon as a party measure. It is too important a question simply to be regarded as a party measure, and because it was introduced by a member of the opposition, therefore it must be turned down.

Perhaps the question may be asked why it was not done last year or the year before. Anybody could ask that question. It can be asked of every new act put on the statutes. It must be brought to the attention of the House at some time, and if the Government has not time to consider the question we can appreciate that their term of office has been so short, and that they have been going about so many reforms that we must give them sufficient time to consider

the question from all angles before committing themselves to any new legislation. I trust that this bill will be received in this spirit, and that it will be the desire of this House to put this Bill into effect. We, on this side of the House, would support its second reading. We would support the adoption of this bill, and if the Government cannot see its way clear to do that at this sitting I do trust that it will show by its action that it is interested in doing something in the cause, and that it will be placed on the statutes at the earliest possible date.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to delay the debate on this bill but the motion which I propose to suggest comes in a sense from the Opposition itself, particularly from the closing remarks of the previous speaker, Mr. Halfyard. In the first place, I do not think that anyone, for a moment questions the motives for this bill. It emanates from a thorough association with the industry to which it refers and a keen and earnest desire to improve the conditions of those engaged in logging. I do not propose to be critical, but rather to take the bill as it stands because it appears to give justification for the motion which I wish to make. Now, as I stated this motion comes in part from the Hon. Member for Trinity and partly from the introducer himself. This matter raises a novel position in this country. It raises a position which is so serious that I feel sure that, when the honourable gentlemen opposite come to consider that the responsibility for the results of the bill will rest on the shoulders of the present members of the Government which will be credited with the undertaking of the measure, they will appreciate a proposal of this character. I do not dispute the rights of loggers or of workers in any other

industry of trying to get the best possible results they can from their work, but the ramifications are so great that one needs to consider very carefully the position with regard to the results. If this bill were passed it is possible that the same action might have to be taken with regard to every other kind of industry. A position arises immediately which is full of such vast possibilities and capable of spreading to such an extent that it would be highly improper to haphazardly pass the proposals. The Hon. member who introduced this bill declared in the speech in which he made in introduction that he could hardly expect the Government to come to a decision on this matter with but twenty-four hours notice. I appreciate this fully and I am aware that they themselves realise that it is not a matter which can be approached and decided upon in an afternoon. In this then, we know, as the Prime Minister said, that the honourable members opposite are in sympathy with us. It is no trouble for a man to get up and do a lot of talk and shoot off a lot of stuff from the top of a soap box but he will not have one half of the effect of a man who does something. I do not for one minute say that I am not in sympathy with it. Everybody sympathises with the man who toils of necessity. But I think that if we were to embark on some proposal haphazardly in an endeavour to remedy their troubles we might start something which would end most unfortunately. In reference to Bell Island, I say that no one in Newfoundland knows the condition of things there. The Prime Minister himself, the other day here in the House stated that matters were such in this country that it was almost impossible for any man to discuss them with any degree of accuracy. We are up against conditions. A load of ore can be brought from Japan to Cape

Britain as cheap as from here. The only practical course open is to have an investigation that will enable the Government to find out what is the position of the Companies. Take the case of the Bell Island Companies. There was an act passed here in this House at their own request and they demanded that a certain export tax be paid by them on ore. They refused to allow the amount to be lessened in any way.

They would not listen to proposals of having the duties on a sliding scale because we thought that it might be easier for them. But there has never been a dollar collected of this duty which was then placed on the ore. Year after year they closed down the mines and in order to have them re-opened the Government had to make concessions. And the sad part of it is that there is no man in Newfoundland who is able to say whether those shuttings down were justified or not. There are seventeen or eighteen hundred men over there working, as the Leader of the Opposition said, for a terribly poor wage, loading their ten trucks a day for a miserable two dollars and fifty cents, and that is the hardest kind of work. It is easy for a man to stand up on a soap box and tell those men that they are the whole thing, but what if the Company closes down the mines? The men are out of work and their families and themselves are soon hungry. We would readily introduce some Act if possible to try to render their conditions better. The same thing applies to the logging industry. I have no doubt that there is a reason why people should wish to see some change. But legislation in this respect is most dangerous to approach. It is outside capital that we need. Outside capital is our only hope. We have got to remember this is everything. I have stated this repeatedly. We have no capital for de-

velopment on a large scale. If then we want capital to come to this country we have got to give concessions or they are going to some other big country like Canada where there are such vast possibilities for the Capitalists. We must remember this and not advertise what might look like unfavourable labour conditions. We do not want to send out unfavourable reports of conditions here. Conditions with regard to loggers may not be ideal, but Mr. Speaker, and honourable members on both sides of the House, when we undertake to scale labour we embark on something which will have far reaching results. What would you think if we went to Grand Falls and told the company that it had to pay all its men a certain wage. Suppose we went to the Water Street man and told him how he should employ his labour. Organizations of men can do that. A body of men in a certain line of work can talk that way. They have to decide their own destinies. But a Government cannot tell a man how he should run his own business. Suppose you tell a man how he must ship his men for the fishery. Whether he must do it by the hour or the day or by the voyage. A thing like that would have far reaching consequences. I do not say that it is impossible, but I do say here before this House that the man who passes legislation of this kind has got to be prepared for what follows. Loggers are not the only people in this country who are in need of reforms. The conditions which apply to loggers apply just as forcibly in many other cases. If we pass this bill men in other forms of work will say that since you have done this for the Loggers you can do the same for us. Even this was mentioned in the remarks of the honourable gentlemen opposite themselves. They can appreciate the position. There are five hundred men on strike at Corner Brook. What the extent of the strike

is we do not know. It relates to the very thing we are discussing now. It is a question of wages. The mines have closed down at Aquathuna. With the condition at Bell Island and the prospects of a short fishery before us, we are facing a period of uncertainty through which we have to go with very great care.

I don't mean to oppose this bill. I do not mean to vote against the second reading. But I make the motion, as honourable members will understand, not that the bill may be thrown out without the chance of discussion, but rather that it may receive the careful consideration which it merits. You cannot decide this thing at forty-eight hours' notice. What we want to do is to obtain correct facts in relation to the case. So far we have only a party statement. A statement from some men to a certain extent. We want also the answer from the people on the other side. This will have to be obtained before the matter can receive intelligent consideration. The motion which I make then, Mr. Speaker, is that a committee be appointed to report on this matter. The committee is to take evidence and submit its report to the next session of the Legislature. I may say again that this motion is made not that the bill be shelved, but that we obtain information on which we can consider the matter properly.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker I understand that the committee would be commissioned to take evidence while the House is out of session. I know that the time is rather short to carry through this kind of thing and I was going to ask the Prime Minister that the commission to be appointed to take evidence, should have the authority to ask the necessary information from the companies and also to take the evidence of the men themselves, who are engaged in the logging industry. All this I presume would be

done while the House is out of session and the report would be given to the House at the next session. It will take time to get information from the companies and the men involved. Besides taking time there will be need of a good many men to do the work. Those commissioned to get information from the A. N. D. Co., will have something to do. I think that information is necessary from men engaged in logging in other districts. That will also take time. So, Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Prime Minister to give this his full consideration and before I take my seat I would like to ask the Minister of Justice who was the politician who was talking as he suggested over on Bell Island.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Oh, nobody, I just said that it was easy enough for a man to do that.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Speaker I rise to second the motion of the Minister of Justice for the appointment of a committee to go into the case of the men engaged in logging. I want to tell the gentlemen on the other side of the House that the Government has every interest in the welfare of the men engaged in logging and that we are only too glad when we see them get every cent they can out of the companies and corporations. We have to consider everything concerning the interests of this country and we have first to assure ourselves that we are doing the correct thing for the industry of the country by introducing legislation such as is contained in this bill. Again I am not sure that if this very bill were passed that it would not defeat the purpose which the introducer intended. Here in the first place.

Reads extract from the Bill.

Forty-five dollars a month! As honourable members can readily see it is not a very large monthly salary provided that the men who are re-

ceiving it are competent loggers. Again this bill fixes a minimum wage. If this is done immediately the company or corporation may make it a maximum wage and it will be a long time before there will be an increase granted. Some years ago a minimum wage was fixed at one dollar and fifty cents and it was seven years before an increase was granted. Now it seems to me that this is a most objectionable bill in some ways, because after all it shows discrimination for a particular industry. We have just as much right to go down to the merchant on Water Street and tell him that he must pay his clerks so much and found. Nobody would dream of going down to a merchant who was fitting out men for the fishery and inform him that he must pay every man from forty-five to fifty or sixty dollars per month and found. If this bill went through as it is similar legislation could be introduced to deal with every industry. This is what this bill wants to do. You would have a right to go to the Imperial Tobacco Co., to the Co-operative Cooperage Co., or the Horwood Lumber Co. and say to them that they shall pay so much to each labouring man and found. The same thing applies to the wages of loggers. If you promise them a guaranteed minimum wage you must do the same to everybody else in the labouring trades. If the men in the Lumber Woods get a minimum wage the fishermen and labourer throughout the country have a right to similar consideration. Clause one stipulates that no person can give a contract. It is not right to interfere with the way a man or corporation wants to run his or its business. Contracts are given in Scandinavian countries and Canada, and I cannot see why we should not have them given in our own lumber woods.

Reads extracts from the Bill.

That is not what is called British

fair play. Many men in the country will earn more than forty-five dollars a month and found. The man from Trinity and other districts who, goes to the lumber woods will make more than that.

Mr. Brown interrupts.

Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt Mr. Brown and I think that it is hardly right for him to do so, and I would like him to be courteous enough to allow me to continue.

Reads extract from Bill.

This penalty of twenty-five dollars a cord is too much. I certainly object to that. I see in clause three, that it is proposed that the wages of loggers shall not be attached except at the order of the Supreme Court or Stipendiary Magistrate. I agree with that. I go further than that and say that I would like to see the wages of all labourers not attachable. Number four clause provides that this shall not apply to saw mills operating on crown lands. This is peculiar. The mills operating on crown lands have to pay but few taxes and it seems to me that if it were to apply to others that it might also apply to them. However, it seems to me that this measure is entirely unnecessary even if it were acceptable in other respects because of the conditions which I think will soon prevail. I have every hope, and I have reason to hope, that loggers are going to come into their own at last. Why? I will tell you. The A. N. D. Co. has been in business for a considerable number of years now and for a long time they have been employing a large number of men in logging operations. By this means men are learning to log efficiently. The Company has the intention of increasing the output and are employing an increasingly large number of men every year. Next winter they will want twenty five hundred men in the lumber woods. The Armstrong Whitworth will want three thousand or more. The Gander Val-

They will want two thousand out there. So what I am beginning to wonder is where the men are going, to come from.

Any man of common sense knows that you cannot get the wood unless you get the men to cut it. The matter is entirely in the hands of the men of this country and it is not, nor should it be expected of this House to pass discriminate legislation which is so unjust and unfair. I remember when I went there first that the men who worked logging on the Gander got only \$8 and board per month, and even at that figure were not paid in cash. But that sort of thing is done away with now. In this country men were paid during the war \$60 per month and found, and in some cases were paid more than that, and I believe that the time is coming when that will happen again, because, as I have said before, supply and demand will put up the rate of pay. The demand for loggers next winter is going to be greater than the supply. Well, if that is so, the question of wages is going to right itself.

I have before me figures and I believe that the Honourable Colonial Secretary has them too, which gives the average earnings paid to loggers by the Central Forest Company for the years 1922 and 1923, that is, taking into account all men who stayed ten days, twenty days, thirty days and up to the men who stayed ninety days. The average monthly wages paid to the men who remained under thirty days was at the rate of \$38.74 and board. The men who worked over thirty days averaged \$40.30 and found per month. Figures were arrived at in the same way for the loggers who worked with the Company in 1923 and 1924 showing the total amount of men and the amount each man got. The average net earnings, taking into account the good and the bad, was \$45.24 and found per month, and tak-

ing into consideration men who stayed from ten up to 90 days; also the men who stayed on the job over 30 days averaged monthly \$46.28 and found, and there were some first class men who worked there who cleaned up \$60 a month and board. It is not a marvellous salary, it is true, but it is convincing proof that if this Bill went through this House as it is now it might defeat the very object for which it was intended. A copy of the "Canadian Lumber Mill" has just been handed me and it deals interestingly with the wages of loggers in that Dominion. (Reads from Magazine.) You will, therefore, see that the wages paid loggers in Canada is low to-day; but I do not say that we can get down to that basis here, because I feel quite sure that this thing is going to take care of itself in Newfoundland in the near future. If, Mr. Speaker, a Bill of this nature is passed in this House, we may be called upon to pass Bills dealing with every industry in this country. Otherwise we would not be playing the game. I agree with the remarks of the Honourable Minister of Justice and I have very much pleasure in supporting his motion and I ask that this matter be referred to a Select Committee to be dealt with. I am sorry the Honourable Member for Fogo is not present this afternoon because in his remarks yesterday he mentioned that some men on the Government side of the House were interested in a certain firm who had made \$7,000 on pit props. Well, I want to say that I am not the man. I am not conducting a pit prop business; I am just a representative of an English concern. But I do know of a firm that cleaned up \$10,000 on pit prop operations on Government account.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, the matter under discussion before the Chair is one not new to me nor was it new to the Government that I hap-

pened to preside over for a while or to the Government before that. We received complaints from the men that they were not getting full value for their labour, and at a later stage, I think about eighteen months ago, I looked into both sides of the question. I, therefore, say that it is essential from what is laid down in this Bill—and I know from my own experience—to make haste slowly in this matter. Personally I know the difficulties of the loggers and I also know the troubles of the employers, but there really must be members of this House who do not understand the situation, and while the Honourable Member for Twillingate made a very cogent and convincing speech urging the House to give this Bill a second reading, yet he did not explain sufficiently for honorable members to understand the real points at issue. It is a well known fact that some loggers have worked in the woods for many months and came out with little or no money to their credit, while at the same time there were men, as the Honourable member for Placentia and St. Mary's has said, who made \$60 per month clear of their board. Therefore, before the Bill is given Second Reading, the House should know why it is that some men earn not a cent and others earn \$60 a month. If it is because some men are skilled that they earn more money than unskilled men, then I think it a pity to put a premium on unskilled labourers in that way. My friend Mr. Linegar, the member for St. John's West, presented a petition asking that a certain class of journeymen skilled boiler-makers be allowed to touch boilers. Well I believe that there is also a science in logging and a man has to know how to go about his work and I believe that the man who knows most about logging can make more money than the man who goes haphazardly in the woods. I have listen-

ed to the arguments put forward by the introducer of this Bill, the Honourable Minister of Justice; also the Honourable member for Placentia and St. Mary's, and I see the force of them because in a country like this everything is done by contract or piecework by men who are engaged in our main industry, the codfishery, especially is that the case in Fortune Bay, the District that I have the honour to represent in this House. The fishermen who go to the Banks do not go for wages; they prefer to go on the shares, despite the fact that in bad weather men cannot fish as long as they would wish to. Still, the fishermen in my district would much prefer to go on contract; and I fail to see why they should be singled out, if other men are going to have a minimum wage given to them. I do not think we should rush this matter and I support the amendment of the Honourable Minister of Justice. In my opinion we have no power to appoint a Select Committee that will sit out of this Session, under the rules of this House, once this House prorogues; but as there are two sides to be held to this question I would suggest to the Leader of the Government that they appoint a Commission and put on that Commission men who are able to advise that Commission from the standpoint of the men as well as to the standpoint of the employers. I might say that for the arguments I have heard, it is more appropriate to refer the Bill to a Commission that will sit out of session than to allow the Bill to go through in its present state.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to delay the debate, but owing to certain remarks made yesterday on the floors of this House by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that I was prepared to support a certain motion, I wish to say that that

is not correct. I do say that I thought at least that no labouring man should be paid less than 30 cents per hour. I suppose that personally if it does not go through it will affect me and the Prime Minister more than it affects any other member of this Legislature, because we have to face the District of Bonavista in a Bye-Election. But I am prepared to stand or fall by the result. Some people might probably think that I am anxious to be returned for the district, but I can assure them that I would much prefer to be pulling cod traps at Cape Mugford or spreading fish day and night. But I am here and while I am here I am going to express my opinion and my conscience tells me that there are two evils involved in this Bill and I am going to accept the lesser evil. Now I am fully aware of the shortage of the catch of the codfishery of this country to-day. I am mindful of the effect of a bad fishery in the country. Now if we put this Bill through and shut out other industries opening up in this country, it will certainly have a bad effect on a labouring man. It is a matter of conscience with me, and I am convinced that such legislation as is proposed by this Bill will tend to shut down other industries and drive capital out of the country. It certainly will have a bad effect on the ordinary labourer and fisherman of the country. Now I am just as much concerned, as is the Honourable the Prime Minister, as any other man in this House, with all due deference to the Honourable introducer of this measure, as much as any other member of this House and I am equally as anxious as any other member of this House to protect the labourer of this country. If the Party now in Opposition who had been the Government for the past four years had been so much concerned during that period, as they apparently are now, we should

not have any need for the introduction of this measure.

MR. HALFYARD—I want to draw your attention to the fact that when you were in the Government——

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—You keep quiet and sit down and if there is any medicine coming to you, take it. If the honourable member for Trinity and his colleagues had acted right during the past four years on behalf of the toilers there would not be any need for this Loggers Bill. Because I was out of town for a day or two, I am told that I was abused. Well, I have been out of town I might say for thirty-five years out of forty-seven years, and I may say now that I like still to go out to enjoy the balmy breezes of the fresh air once in a while. And I am sorry that I was out of town, because I notice from the "Evening Telegram" that I missed the Logging Bill. However, I still insist that to bear out my own argument, if things had gone on well within the past four years, there would be no need of this Bill. If the moneys of the country had not been so extravagantly squandered the fishermen of the northern districts would not have to go in the woods to earn their living. I remember when we put up certain representations on behalf of the working classes of this country before an Executive meeting of the then Government for the purpose of getting reduced taxation, the answer we got then was that the finances of the country would not allow such taxation to be reduced. Well, if the finances of the country would not allow it then, surely heavens it should not allow it two days before a General Election, as was done by the present Opposition Party. Now I am just as much in sympathy with this Bill as any other member on either side of the House, and if we are going to appoint a Commission to sit on this Bill, all I have to say is for God's

sake be careful before going ahead. I say now without fear of successful contradiction that this Bill is going to have a certain effect on the honourable the Prime Minister and myself in Bonavista next Fall, because of a certain gang of men who are continually sitting around a certain table in a certain place are discussing this thing.

MR. BROWN—I beg your pardon, Sir, I am solely responsible for this Bill.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Well then somebody must know about it other than yourself, as far as my information goes. At any rate as far as my constituents in Bonavista Bay are concerned I am not in favour of this Bill, and the reason is that I like to move slowly in the matter because by signifying my consent that way I am doing more good than harm I think. No matter what happens to me at the Bye-election, I am inclined to the belief that I should consult my constituents in Bonavista Bay, and if they say to vote for the Bill, then I am quite prepared to do so. I think this Bill in its present form borders on class legislation. I certainly would like to see loggers getting \$45 a month and board and more than that; but I would just as much like to see other workmen in this country who are not included in this Bill get equal concessions. I think that the Amendment submitted by the Honourable Minister of Justice is a very good one and I am prepared to support it.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a remark made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I think I had occasion to refer to a question concerning his department during the Minister's absence, and I regretted that the Minister was not in his place, but there was no abuse in the observation that I made at that time. In fact the only regret

that some members had for the Honourable Minister being out of town was his loss during the debate on the measure affecting his department. I feel quite sure that it was through stress of circumstances that he was absent from the House, although he said that the object of his being away was to enjoy the fresh air to benefit himself personally, and we all appreciate what a distinct loss it would be to the House and to the country if the hon. member had been absent yesterday and to-day.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries said in his speech that he was not prepared to support the Bill, and he intimated that I was not the real person who brought in this Bill, and he said that some other people were behind me. I wish to point out to him that I am the real man who is solely responsible for this Bill and I am the man who started it from beginning to end. Furthermore, I make the statement now, without fear of successful contradiction that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came into the Opposition rooms and told me that I was doing a good thing and that he intended to support that Bill.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—But I did not say that you alone were responsible for the Bill.

MR. GRIMES—In rising to support this Bill I do so because of the principle involved: the right of the Legislature to enquire into the conduct of any person or Company in their relation to their employees, particularly when grievances arise that may become productive of harm to the country. The member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Major Sullivan says the State has no right to interfere in business. That position is not in keeping with the views of modern Statesmen in civilized countries to-day. Frequently in Great Britain, the

United States, Canada, Australia and the European Continent does the State step in disputes between employees and employers and often adjust their differences. The Factory Acts Legislation of Great Britain made it plain to manufacturers that they had to conduct their factories according to the rules and regulations laid down by the Government or else suffer punishment, and the Government has taken the same position towards Mine Owners and Railway Companies.

Is not the Employers Liability Act in this country an admission of the same principle? All of which shows that the State has its responsibilities and cannot hold aloof. The Minister of Marine & Fisheries takes the position that to support the Bill is to vote for class legislation. If it is then we have plenty of precedents. What will he call the special protection given to certain industries in this country which has made their products costly to the consumer for the giving of fancy profits. How many Companies have guarantees given them of free entry of materials as well as interest on capital while to others it is denied. If it is proper to do it for one or more it should be the same for all. If the Government is to be used for helping Companies or individuals to conduct a profitable business then it is proper to expect that it will help the logger, the miner, the fisherman, the factory worker and all other workers to obtain a living wage, a wage that will give him something more than that which will keep body and soul together.

I would suggest that the best way of handling the logging question so as to ensure a square deal to all, would be the appointment of a Commission to investigate logging operations in Newfoundland, and also find out what is being done elsewhere. It should have power to learn the financial position of those employing log-

gers and to know if any profits are being made and what the profit is. It should find out from experienced persons whether the wage system is the best for all parties concerned, or some alternative system.

We do know this to-day that among loggers there is much dissatisfaction over the sub-contract system. Many of the loggers have told me that they were not looking for soft jobs, but when they were put on areas where timber was scarce it was impossible to get sufficient wood that would give them a decent income. While it was true a higher price per cord was paid for wood cut on such areas, the difference did not allow them but little more than their boarding expenses. Others complained of having inexperienced men sandwiched in between them who by their inexperience not only could not earn enough for themselves but kept down the others income as well, which was disheartening. They were disgusted sick and sore. There were exceptions. Some got good returns but they were not in the majority.

This vexed question has to be approached with the greatest care. We have to understand the position of the Company, of the men and of the Country for the economic welfare of all is concerned.

On the motion of Mr. Brown that the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 216 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled "Of the Employment of men engaged in Logging" be read a second time: Hon. the Minister of Justice moved, and Hon. Mr. Sullivan seconded, in amendment—

"That the second reading of this Bill be deferred until such time as the House is in possession of a Report from the Commission to be appointed to take evidence on the matter."

Whereupon, the amendment being first put by Mr. Speaker, was passed, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 31.

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

MR. HALFYARD—I beg to present a petition from certain of the inhabitants of Hant's Harbor, asking for an allocation of \$1,000, to effect repairs to a road. It leads to saw mills and to the lumber woods in that locality. The petition is very largely signed by Reuben Thomas and others. I beg to support the prayer of the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. HALFYARD—I beg to present a petition from a great many of the lady residents of Gooseberry Cove, Trinity District. The ladies give as their reason for signing this petition that their husbands are not at home. They are all away from the place. The petition is in reference to the present Postmaster there, and asks that he be continued in that position. Unless it is proved to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs that Mr. Seward is an unworthy official. I beg to support the prayer of this petition or protest against the removal of Mr. Seward from his position. In reply to the question asked by Mr. Grimes, Mr. Seward was the name of one of the officials in Trinity Bay who had been dismissed, and Mr. Flynn had been appointed in his place. I favor the petition upon the principle that Government officials should not be dismissed from their position if they have given satisfaction in the opinion of the community whom they serve, and when there is no reason

given by any other parties, on account of inefficiency or otherwise for a person to be dismissed from that position. I may say further that Mr. Seward writes to say he received a notice on July 20th that his services would no longer be required after the last of July. I understand that postmasters are paid quarterly, and if the Government have made up their minds to dismiss an official they should give the usual notice of three months, or payment in lieu of notice. I am very sorry that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs cannot be in his place as I always thought that he was a most reasonable person, and certainly he would give such matters the consideration they deserve before dismissing an official in such a summary manner. It is unjust, iniquitous. And therefore, without any further elaboration of my feelings on the matter, I pass this petition on to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs.

CAPT. RANDALL—I beg to present a petition from Ireland's Eye, in the District of Trinity, in reference to a ferry service. I beg that such may be installed to operate between Ireland's Eye, Bonaventure and Trinity. I should like to read the petition; it is not very long.

(Reads petition.)

It is signed by some 20 or 30 Electors of Ireland's Eye and Bonaventure. As a great many of this Assembly know it, it is an island absolutely cut off from the mainland and with no decent telegraph connection. And not only that but from the fact that the service is being discontinued I think that this petition should have the consideration of the Government. And I think that my colleague, Mr. Halfyard will support me in presenting this petition.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole on the

subject of certain expenditures to be made under "The Loan Act, 1923."

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole on the subject of certain Resolutions relating to a Tax on goods imported into the Colony.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider an Act Respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace,'" without amendment.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled an answer to a question on a previous order paper, asked by Mr. Hickman.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY tabled reply to question of Mr. Puddester on the previous day's order paper.

MR. RANDELL gave notice of question.

MR. DUFF—I am sorry that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not at present in his seat, because I would like to ask why it was that the Post Office of Bristol's Hope, Carbon-ear, was removed to a distance of about a mile and a half from the settlement. The people are composed almost entirely of the fisherman-farmer class and are not receiving in this case the consideration which I think they should receive. I am sorry that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not here because I

think he is not the man to do this kind of thing. I should like to say that 237 years ago the people of this place repulsed the Frenchmen after St. John's, Ferryland, Placentia and other places had been taken by them. The people over there are composed of the same stock and are still able to fight their own battles if they are given a chance. However they have been defeated in this case because they did not get a chance from the Minister in charge. I hope that the Government will give this matter its consideration because it is a very considerable inconvenience to have to go out of the place for a distance of two miles to get mail, etc.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if the Government has given any consideration to the dismissal of Mr. W. Thorne, the lighthouse keeper at Hopeall. In reply to a question from me some days ago the Prime Minister said that the matter had not been dealt with finally. I would like to know whether the department has officially notified the man of his dismissal. Whether the edict has gone forth like in the case of Medes and Persians or whether the axe has fallen and the man has been removed from his job and is not to be reinstated.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In reply to the Honourable member for Trinity I may say that the Government has not yet reconsidered the question of Mr. Thorne's dismissal. We are waiting to get some extra information. Mr. Thorne is not out of his position. The matter is held over, pending the arrival of this information.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of the confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the

Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON THE GANDER VALLEY BILL.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman, the resolutions now before the Committee are in connection with the Gander Valley proposition. I think that the Committee might go ahead and consider the resolutions, one by one, as it has been in the habit of considering the various clauses of other Bills. I may say that the agreement in the main is the same as the Humber Contract, the only difference being that in the case of the Humber Contract the Government of Newfoundland guaranteed ten millions of dollars whilst in this case there is no guarantee whatever. The concessions and clauses in this are almost identical with the Humber Contract. I do not know whether the Members of the Opposition would like to have time to peruse this Bill before we have any discussion on it. If they are prepared we might go ahead and have the Bill read now.

MR. HICKMAN—I think that we would like to have an opportunity to consider this bill and read it over. It is the first time that we have seen it and as there are not very many here on this side of the House I would like to have the matter put off until to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD—Except for one or two of the older members of the Opposition there are few on this side of the House familiar with the resolutions contained in this bill and I would support the request of the Leader of the Opposition that the members on his side be given a little time to get a general idea of the matter before the Committee goes into the resolutions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — Since several of the members of the Opposition would like to have a little more time to read it, I am quite prepared to have the committee rise. I do not think that there is anything that I can say about this. It is a practical reproduction of the Humber concession. I move that the Committee rise.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg leave to say in regard to the question asked by Mr. Grimes, that I am having the answer to it prepared, and I hope to get it along to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, in the budget speech delivered the other day by the Minister of Finance the Minister referred to a schedule which I understood was to be printed. I would like to have a copy of it as it would be very interesting to us on this side of the House for debate. I do not think that there was any financial statement tabled by the Minister in relation to the railway operation up to the year ending June 30. This is an important matter and perhaps the Minister of Finance could get this statement from the Auditor General and have it tabled. I would like to get this at it would help us in debate to discuss matters more intelligently.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I may say to the honourable member for Trinity that the statement which he asks for was attached to the copy of my speech which was handed to the Leader of the Opposition. It contains all the matters relating to the railroad. I do

not know whether the hon. member has received it as yet. The speech is in course of being printed and this will go in with it. I understand that there will be a copy of the Budget Speech here to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD—in rising, to speak to the motion to adjourn, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the permission of the House for a few minutes of its time relative to a matter affecting Trinity District, which, in my opinion, is of outstanding importance. I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister and the Members of this House to a telegram published in the Advocate of July 29th signed by Sir W. F. Coaker and dated at Port Union July 28th. In referring to this matter, Mr. Speaker, I want this House to understand that I hold no brief for Sir William Coaker any more than I do for any other one of my constituents of Trinity district. Sir William Coaker is a resident of Port Union, which is a part of Trinity District. If the message came from Mr. Wm. Thorne, of New Harbor, or Mr. Brown of Blaketown, or from any person belonging to the District, then I consider that it is a matter in which I should be interested. Therefore, for these reasons I wish to draw the attention of the Prime Minister and the Members of this House to that article sent by Sir William Coaker to the Public Press. I would do the same if the article had been sent by Mr. P. Templeman of Catalina or from Messrs. McCormack and Walsh, or anybody else in the District. It is my business to protest against any injustice to my constituency. The article is of so far reaching and outstanding importance that I will read it for the information of the House.

(Mr. Halfyard reads letter from the Advocate sent by Sir William Coaker.)

I read that letter, Mr. Speaker, written in the forceful and character-

istic style of Sir William Coaker. It contains the protest which I wish to make. We were expecting a square deal. The election was won on the slogan or catch cry of "a square deal to all." A promise to clean up and keep clean. But where the square deal comes in, in taking the S. S. Malakoff from Trinity Bay at this season of the year and confining her activities to Bonavista Bay, I cannot see, nor can any other right thinking man who is acquainted with transportation conditions on these Bays.

You say that it is a square deal that at this season of the year to take the steamer from Trinity Bay, because Trinity District sent three men to this House in Opposition. To what extent is it just to the men of Trinity Bay? How is it just to yourself and just to the country? Trinity district has been unmercifully treated during the short regime of the Monroe Government. Why the representatives of Trinity District cannot receive the same courtesy which was afforded to the members of the Opposition during the regime of Sir Richard Squires and Mr. Warren I do not know? At that time if the steam or railway service of Placentia Bay or St. Mary's Bay was in question the representatives of that district were consulted. Their advice was sought and acted upon in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. So that is the treatment to be meted out to us. That repays our action with regard to Placentia and St. Mary's a thousand times over. No district ever got better treatment than these. I know of no party which dealt more fairly whether it concerned railway or steamer or relief for the districts. If the list of expenditures of moneys in these districts during the last three or four years was tabled in this House, it would be found that these districts have not been discriminated against. In many cases they received more moneys than districts repre-

sented by members of the Government.

No language of mine can fully express the mean, contemptible treatment which has been handed out by this Government to Trinity District. A man from Trinity District comes to town and wants to have an interview with the Prime Minister. He finds that is almost impossible. His name is sent in by a secretary or somebody else, and the most despicable part of it is, that the secretary has to inform him that the Prime Minister cannot see him unless he comes from Bonavista District. He must go to see Mr. Mitchell who is looking after the affairs of Trinity District. Is that good enough? That is how you treat a district because its members happen to be in Opposition. Go to it until the next election. If I were to go to Trinity District to-morrow, for an election on the policy and record of the three or four weeks administration of the present Government I would be returned with an overwhelming majority. Apparently the Prime Minister does not appreciate his position and confine himself to dealing with matters of state and public policy. One would think that he could leave the business of the district of Bonavista to his two colleagues, Captain W. Winsor and Mr. Little. Why should a man from Trinity district be not allowed an interview with the Prime Minister? The reason is that the District of Trinity is not a Government District. That condition of things did not obtain during the last few years.

When I was Colonial Secretary I treated all members of the community alike regarding interviews. Possibly there were many persons I could not see, not that it gave me any pleasure to refuse any persons, but interviews were so numerous that time did not permit. I tried to impress upon my constituents that I was not only elected to the Legislature to

serve Trinity district; but as the head of a Department I was the servant of the whole country. With our experience as a member of this House since 1913, and a representative of Trinity district since 1919, am I not worthy of consultation on matters pertaining to the civil service of that district, or spending of moneys voted by this House for public works in the district. It is nothing but a studied insult. You may call it a square deal.

What are you going to do about Trinity Bay if you take the "Malakoff" off? There is no provision made for any service, and why are the demands from Bonavista district any greater than they are from Trinity District for a steamship service? The larger places in Bonavista Bay, such as Bonavista proper, Greenspond and Wesleyville are served by steamers direct from St. John's; and if there is any one place where it is essential to have a steamer calling often, owing to the large amount of freight handled there, it is Port Union. One thing to the credit of the shareholders of that big enterprise at Port Union is that they own that place and every stick and nail in it. The same cannot be said of every Water Street concern. Now, as to why the people of Trinity Bay should be victimized because their political views were not the same as the Prime Minister's and his colleagues I am at a loss to understand. I have no brief to speak for Sir William Coaker, but I would be derelict to my duty if I did not speak on behalf of my constituents. It is most unfortunate just now that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works are leaving the House. I would like for them to remain and hear what I have got to say because I cannot tell when I will be in the same frame of mind as now. This is a matter that has given me an opportunity to tell the Government what I think of them. Who

is running the Government, anyhow, may I ask, when the Upper House is in session? Is Trinity district going to be run by irresponsible people who represent nobody but themselves, men who could not be elected in any constituency of Newfoundland. Captain Randell, Mr. Godden and myself, as the elected representatives, are responsible to the people of that district, and if we are ignored under protest, and let the Government put up with the political consequences, for just as sure as there is a sun in the heavens, the actions of the Government will only cause the defeat of your candidates when they go back to Trinity and Bonavista Bays for re-election, and if God gives me strength as far as Trinity district is concerned, I will be there, and I predict that there will be a repetition of 1919. I never had occasion to fight in a district or to fight in this House. Everything has come my way too easy. Therefore, now that certain matters of a questionable nature have come up that are affecting the constituency of Trinity, it is my place with the assistance of my colleagues, to let this House and the country know that we are not satisfied with things as they are going on, and that we are not prepared to lie down under such treatment. I cannot understand who is running the Government. There are certain senior members of the Executive Government who happened to be on the Opposition side for a period, and they know that we are absolutely correct in our demands. We look upon them as men who understand the situation in this country. We believe some of them are broad-minded, reasonable and honest men, and we are satisfied to work with them; but how such men can continue to remain with a Government guilty of practising such discrimination, to which I have referred, I cannot understand. I can readily under-

stand that very often members of the Executive Government leave the management of the affairs of districts in the hands of the representatives who are in the Executive, and it has frequently happened that certain matters of great importance have not received the attention of the whole Executive. No doubt steamer transportation on Bonavista Bay was left in the hands of the Prime Minister, and he and his colleagues are solely responsible for the treatment received by Trinity district.

The members of the Government do not want their party broken up after a few weeks of office, and the matter under criticism is one of the things that would smash the Government quicker than some people think, because there are men in the Monroe Government who will not stand for such treatment being meted out to any district. The general conclusion of the people outside, who have any knowledge of the conditions that obtain in Bonavista and Trinity Bays is that the Malakoff was taken off the Trinity Bay service and put on the Bonavista Bay service, and solely for political reasons, with no thought of how Trinity District is going to be effected thereby; but with the hope that when a Bye-Election is pulled off they will have satisfied some people around Port Blandford and the vicinity by having a steamer to call there two or three times a week. If you were saving by making provision for a steam service for Trinity to replace the Malakoff, I would not mind. The Monroe Government went to the country with economy as their watchword, and this is how they are practicing it. Recommendations were made by the United Fishermen to the Government of Sir Richard Squires and to the Government of Mr. Warren, asking that expenditure and taxation be cut in half.

On each occasion they recommend-

ed to the Executive Government to cut off the steam service on the north side of Bonavista Bay and to take off the export tax on fish so as taxation could be reduced. I have letters, memorandums and resolutions that were drawn up by the legal adviser of those men and who now is leader of the Government in the Upper House, as well as the dictator of the Government. Well, the present Government is going a nice way to cut taxation in half; instead they are increasing the expenditure, and the districts that got to suffer most because of the attitude of the Government is Fortune Bay and Trinity district, because they gave too many votes to the members of the Liberal Party, Mr. Warren in Fortune and Captain Randell, Mr. Godden and myself in Trinity Bay.

If there was any anticipation of saving \$1 by the transfer of the Malakoff, I would be inclined to support it, but the result is that a big business centre like Port Union is deprived of practically the only means of sending goods to its branch stores. It is no use for the Union Trading Company to depend upon a steamer from St. John's to be of any service to them. The Susu and the Prospero are filled up with freight every time they call there after coming from St. John's on their way North, so that now the Union Trading Company have no means of sending their freight to the Northern centres. Now, is that good enough, Mr. Speaker? And this, in spite of the fact that Port Union has such splendid wharf facilities, etc., for handling freight. The question might be asked why the steamer was taken off Bonavista Bay by the Government that I was a member of. It was broadcasted that we made no attempt to curtail expenses, but we did and we saved \$35,000 by having one steamer serve Bonavista and Trinity Bays and we saved \$35,000 by taking a steamer off Notre Dame Bay.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—What year was that?

MR. HALFYARD — 1922. One steamer served both Bonavista and Trinity Bays for a couple of years. It was represented to me that possibly a steamer could be done without in Trinity Bay, but there were places in that district that the steamer was of great service. Then arrangements were made whereby the one steamer did the two Bays, and a very fine and satisfactory service was inaugurated at a cost of four or five thousand dollars to serve the North side of Bonavista Bay. Getting back to the removal of the "Malakoff" again from Trinity Bay, I think the Government are duplicating the days of '98 and are using the axe on inoffensive civil servants in the same unjust and merciless manner. Certainly this is not being done by such experienced politicians as the honourable Minister of Justice or the honourable member for Placentia, Mr. Sullivan. They are too old at the game to be guilty of such political suicide.

You are going to pieces for certain if you continue the policy you have begun, because there are men of the Government who have "gone through the mill" and who will not tolerate any high handed proceeding on the part of any Government with which they are associated, and men who are not prepared to assume the responsibility for any unwarranted and uncalled for discrimination, as has been practised on the members for Trinity district who happen to be in Opposition. Forget uncalled for remarks and forget party bitterness and work together in the best interests of the country, and the proper way to do that is to combine the North with the South. It is just as well for me to speak to this matter as it is of far-reaching importance as

it affects Government officials, districts and the country as a whole.

I was hoping and the country was hoping that with a new man at the wheel with no old party affiliations, who would be broad enough and big enough to treat matters from a national standpoint and not tolerate any contemptible tactics or pay any attention to recommendations made by party heelers or would be members that would interfere with the well being of the country or the management of its affairs either on the Government side of the House on the floors of the Legislature or in a Government office. I cannot too strongly condemn such petty mean tactics as the satisfying of the whims of would be members or office seekers. We cannot get a satisfactory reply as to what representatives on this side of the House will be allowed to do with regard to the expenditure of moneys for their own districts. We are getting sick and tired as the session proceeds.

The Minister of Public Works had to admit that in connection with local and main line grants moneys were sent to Mr. Arch Brown at Blaketown in the district of Trinity instead of being sent to the elected Road Board, and that was done upon the recommendations of Mr. Mitchell, who was defeated in Trinity at the election. This Mr. Mitchell after making a flying visit through Trinity district hoped to be elected to this Assembly, and this is the man that people got to consult as to when, where and to whom moneys are to be sent. I have no personal grudge against Mr. Mitchell, but I can tell a story of the low, mean, contemptible tactics that he and his colleague, Mr. King, resorted to in trying to secure his election. Ninety-five per cent. of Blaketown did not vote for Mr. Mitchell, and that is the reason the local and main line moneys are not sent to the elected Road Board.

Now Blaketown was about the only inland town we had up to a few years ago, and it has nothing whatever to do with the fisheries or the F.P.U. I was not depending upon F.P.U. votes alone for my election. The people knew I was serving them to the best of my ability. Blaketown and vicinity never had an F.P.U. Council, and on two or three occasions I have increased my majorities there. Why? Because I treated my constituents properly and all hands alike. I did not try to get large places like Winterton, Heart's Content or Catalina at the expense of smaller places. I treated all according to their needs and requirements. But the humiliating part of it all is that the elected representatives, Captain Randell, Mr. Godden and myself are ignored, and the people of Trinity Bay have to go to Mr. Mitchell, the defeated candidate, to have their wants and necessities attended to. And that is what the Prime Minister calls a **square deal**. During the few weeks that this Government has functioned under the leadership of Mr. Monroe it has done things that have no precedent in the history of Newfoundland politics, and I say that without fear of successful contradiction. I must believe that there is someone outside of this House who is certainly dictating the policy of the Government. I can arrive at no other conclusion because I cannot reconcile my mind to the idea that men in this House with whom I have worked here would be parties to the matters that I have referred to this afternoon.

I am very sorry that I have to speak in this manner. It does me no good to have to speak in a way that may be regarded as heated; but if the Prime Minister and his colleagues who represents Bonavista Bay can give me a satisfactory reason why the steamer has been taken off Trinity Bay I shall be very glad to hear what they have to say regarding the

matter; also I would like to see an opportunity given to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Public Works to inform this House as to what they are willing or unwilling to do in connection with the spending of moneys in the district of Trinity.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I am utterly at a loss to understand the wandering, disjointed, and heated - argument of the Hon. Member on the other side. I want to say definitely that there has not been a single member for Trinity District ask me for an interview until yesterday when Mr. Halfyard talked to me over the 'phone. There has not been a single member that has asked for an interview, and there has not been a single member that has ever had the name of Mr. Mitchell mentioned to him, and I have never refused any honourable member an interview and sent him to Mr. Mitchell.

MR. HALFYARD—I did not say a representative; I said a man from Trinity District—a constituent of mine.

MON. PRIME MINISTER—I am not aware of even a constituent that has asked for an interview who has not got it. There have been times when I was particularly busy, when members of my own district, supporters of mine, have asked for interviews and have not been able to get them.

I wish to say further in reply to Mr. Halfyard, that the Malakoff is only taking the old "Dundee" route on the Bonavista service. When I went to Bonavista the year before last and last year, there was only one thing that the people throughout the whole district said to me, and that was that they must have the old Dundee route back. Certainly I do not see any reason why these people should be deprived of that simply in order to have a boat running to Port Union direct.

Now, the honourable member insinuates that our action is purely one of spleen, and that we want to put the Union Trading Company out of business. The Union Trading Company, are up at the end of the railway line there, and gets three services a week, and because they have not the bay boat in Bonavista Bay running to Port Union, they say that they are being put out of business. I may say that if I had a business at Catalina, I would be only too proud to have a railway service like they have at Port Union, and I would look for nothing more.

I have lots of businesses in various parts of the Island where I have not got any connection with boats. I have a business at Fermeuse where no boats call, but I am not put out of business just yet. I can find some other way of getting goods to these places.

We are going to give the people every proper service that we can, and in that way we are going to give everyone a square deal; but I do not think it is a square deal to give every kind of facility to Port Union and nothing at all to lots of other places.

There is nothing more I want to say except that anything that is recommended to us by any member of any district will get fair consideration. The Honourable Member for Fortune Bay was quite a little disturbed at the service being taken off Fortune Bay, and the members for Burin and other Western districts were equally hurt, but we have protests from various other places, and we are considering now a fair deal to all—a service that may take in all these places. In the meantime, we felt that the Glencoe and Portia were covering the same ground, and that there had to be some alteration; and if we do not find that the alteration which we are making now works to the advantage of most of the people, we shall try something else.

Our efforts are directed in trying to give a fair service to everyone, and there is no effort—no attempted spleen against any district by the Government in this House.

MR. LITTLE:—Mr. Speaker, in reply to Mr. Halfyard, I do not want to say very much. There are more able men than I am, but when any member gets up on the floors of the House to abuse me for what I have done I think it is right for me to take my stand in defence of my right.

Now, sir, he says that it was through spleen that this was done. I say it is false. I never heard from one of my colleagues, Mr. Monroe, or Capt. Winsor that there was any way in which they were going to cut out Port Union because of spleen. I would sooner see Port Union go ahead than see it go out. Why? Because the more merchants and the more businesses that are running in this country, the better it will be for the working classes.

I say that Mr. Halfyard is wrong, and what I would like to ask him is why was everything done in the past Government—through spleen?

With regard to Trinity Bay, I think it is right that some steam boat should run on Trinity Bay for the benefit of those people. I believe there is something going to be done in that regard. But as you know, in the past few years, everything ran to Port Union. No, I am not saying a word against Port Union. If Mr. Templeman, or any other merchant down there had two or three steamers running for him and Port Union was not served, I would say it was wrong. I say now that it is wrong for Port Union to be served by all the steamers, when Bonavista Bay is not served at all in some places.

I want to call the attention of the House to this—that during the past four or five years any place that was not supporting the side that was in

then, was cut out and ignored altogether. I should like to ask Mr. Halfyard if that is not correct. I should like to ask him to point out one place that was cut out that was supporting him.

I should like to say that we are treating all hands well under Mr. Monroe, and trying to give them a square deal. Mr. Halfyard says that he did not have much to do with arguing out these matters on the floors of the House of Assembly when he was in the Government, and I agree with him, because everything was being done without being argued with. Everything was done by the scratch of a pen. I think that those people whose names were in the list that came out the other day, showing how the money was expended, will agree with Mr. Halfyard.

Now, sir, this is the first time I have had anything to say here. I may not be doing it right. I may be going too fast, or I may be going too slow. I lie quiet for a while, but then when I do start, I am likely to say too much.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that some time ago Mr. Halfyard made reference to monies being spent, and the people who were going to spend them. That was partly why I asked for that Bill to come in. I want to show that of the people who were handling that money at that time, there was not one member of the Opposition side. The people who got work under them were altogether workers for the Government. I know of men who were starving, and went to them to get work, but were turned away, and would not be given any work, because they were not supporters. Did Mr. Halfyard make any protest against that then? No. Why? Because it was his party. But he is agitated now, sir.

With regard to the Government officials down through Bonavista Dis-

trict, I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that they were cut not through spleen. There is no cutting out of Government officials through spleen. It was the people who were there first that were cut out through spleen, and we are trying to rectify that, and put in the best men. I can give instances of people that were in the light houses for nineteen and twenty years who were cut out without any pension, while people supporting the other side, who were only three four or five years were given one. That is why Mr. Halfyard thinks that these people are being removed through spleen. I can understand him thinking it.

Mr. Halfyard was in the Government during the past four years, and during that time he has built a gallows, and now it looks to me as if he is going to hang on it himself.

MR. RANDELL:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on behalf of my constituents in connection with the removal of that steamer from the Bay. It is without doubt a hardship to the people on the Northern side of the Bay. A statement was made in this House a day or two ago that both sides of the Bay were served by the Railway. That is not exactly correct, because there is no railway touching on the points between Whitbourne and Clarendville, on the Northern side of the Bay except within several miles of the settlements, and from Catalina the railway runs to Bonavista Bay, and I think back to Trinity Bay.

Now, if there could be any saving by taking the boat off Trinity Bay, and running her only on Bonavista Bay, I should certainly say it would be alright. But that ship is going to cost just as much as if it were doing both ways. It may save a little coal when lying up

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—It will get more business.

MR. RENDELL:—It may get more business, but it will certainly effect no saving, so far as cost is concerned, and I consider that, if there is no compensation, then the northern side of that district is not very well treated after all.

I would like also to refer to the dismissal of Mr. Thorne, the lighthouse keeper at Hopeall. Last year, when I was first seated in this House, a question came up before the House with regard to the installing of a Postal Telegraph Office at Ferryland, and the two honourable gentlemen who represented Ferryland, objected strongly to a Postal Telegraph office being put there

MR. MOORE:—Two, not one.

MR. RENDELL:—One.

MR. MOORE:—We had one there, and objected to a second one.

MR. CASHIN:—We had one there already, and you were trying to unload another one on us.

MR. RENDELL:—I claim the right to speak in this House without being interrupted. The idea was to put a Postal Telegraph office in Ferryland. There was already another one there, but the reason why the objection was made was because the person who was in charge of that first telegraph office, or the reason why the Government should reconsider the matter, was that she had some one or two sons to the front during the Great War, and I think she had lost some of her relatives, and she was a poor woman, without any means of livelihood except that office.

Well, now, I was then one of the members of the Government party sitting on that side of the House, and in the course of the remarks made by one of the honourable members for Ferryland, we were all called a bunch of slackers, because sitting there we did not make any protest against that being done. Now, I feel like saying

that I am not a sacker. I never was. It may be rather late in the day to claim it. But I am not, nor have I been. During the War I offered myself, if it is any news to anybody, and I was told to go on as I was going.

If that is any plea against a person being turned out of office, I might say that Mr. Thorne's wife gave two sons during the Great War that never came back, and his wife went to an early grave on account of it. If that is so, I think that this House should consider, as it was asked to consider a year ago, a matter such as this. I think some one should take that into consideration. I do not think that there is anything against Mr. Thorne with regard to the working of the lighthouse, except that he was a supporter of the party that is now in Opposition, and I really think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should consider the dismissal of that man, just because he said, perhaps, a few words in favour of my colleagues and myself while we were touring that district.

I might say a word or two on behalf of Mr. Mitchell. It is rather news to me that Mr. Mitchell is managing the affairs of Trinity district, but if he likes to do that, I shall be obliged to him. I hope he shall be down there as often as I was, and hand out the dollars. He can continue that work if he likes it.

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I rise now in reference to the remarks made by Mr. Rendell and Mr. Halfyard. I would like to ask Mr. Randell who informed him with reference to Mr. Thorne having two sons and a brother killed. I would like to know that just for information. I am here to see fair play, and I intend to see fair play.

Now, Mr. Halfyard is still saying that he is not allowed to spend any moneys. I am of the same opinion as Mr. Monroe on that. I saw Mr. Half-

yard once, and I think I treated him kindly. I told him that any recommendation he made would get fair consideration. All the other members will get the same consideration. I think Mr. Duff was down to see me, and I do not think he has anything against me on account of the conversation we had.

I am sorry that I was not here at the beginning of Mr. Halfyard's speech, because it is not very often that you see lunatics around, and I always like to be present when they are around, and I may be blamed for keeping clear of this House—for being absent when he was speaking. I may say for the benefit of the members of this House that I was away because I am one of the members of the Marine Disasters Fund Committee, and there have been three meetings held which I have been unable to attend because the House was sitting. There was a meeting at three o'clock this evening, and I thought it my duty to attend, and that is where I have been since three o'clock. That meeting, as all this House know, has a good deal to do with the orphans and widows of fishermen of this country. That is my explanation to the honourable member, if he wants to know why I was not present.

With reference to my spleen against the Union Trading Company, I think I have done more for the Union Trading Company than Mr. Halfyard has. I challenge Mr. Halfyard or any other member of the Opposition to go down in Bonavista Bay and ask any solitary man did I ever make any difference between a Union man and a non-Union man. The trap was laid against me some six or seven years ago.

I received a letter from Mr. Will Job, saying that the Fishermen's Union of Bonavista district wrote up and said that I was turning off all Union men and taking on non-Union men. I knew where it came from, and I

knew it was not true, and they wanted me to throw my cooks off the boat; so I wrote back to say that I did not know a Union man from any other man.

I got another letter asking me to explain, and I wrote back again. When I was taking on men I did not ask whether they were Union men or non-Union men. I think Mr. Job will appreciate that when I say that out of eighty-five men that I had down there that spring there were seventy-two Union men. I think that goes to show that I am not against the Union Trading Company. Besides that, if you go down to the Union store at Wesleyville you will find that out of eight hundred and fifty dollars I left in Wesleyville, at least seven hundred dollars was spent at the Union Trading Store.

That is the very last thing I would ever attempt or try to do, to cut out the Union Trading Company, because quite a number of my friends have money in the Union Trading Company, and therefore I am prepared to do all I can to help them.

I do not think it was spleen to take the Malakoff off the Trinity Bay route. She was on the Bonavista Bay route some years ago serving a route where Union men as well as non-Union men were living. I say it was a wrong step for the Government to take the boat off her old route for the benefit of an individual firm. I came up on that boat about six weeks ago, and I was talking to the captain of the boat, and he told me that he was afraid sometimes to go into some ports in Trinity Bay because people told him she was only a damn nuisance; and I know it is the same thing in Bonavista Bay. Go down the north side of Bonavista Bay and find out how much frozen stuff perished at Port Union the first year she was put on that service.

I spent seven days down there my-

self with about forty fishermen trying to get a boat for Wesleyville, and the north side of Bonavista Bay, and the upshot was that all these men's money was gone. I will give Mr. Coaker the credit for giving them work in order to pay their board. That alone is enough to show that the proposition is not good.

We have got some ferry services on the north side of the Bay, and my friend the honourable member for Trinity said that we had a splendid mail service by boat on the north side of the Bay. I suppose he meant between Newtown and Gambo. Well, it has to serve a good many bays. I saw at the start that it was not going to be satisfactory, because instead of giving the boat to somebody at Newtown, they gave her to some man at Wesleyville. I have fed about two thousand people that came up from Newtown that had to stay there all night, because the boat could not be started that night. Go down and take over my house for a month and feed all the people that have to come to my house through that boat being at Wesleyville instead of Newtown. That was done purely and simply for political purposes, and then you get up here and chastise us for trying to get things a bit right that you put bottom up.

You referred to Mr. Monroe and myself as horses. Now, I am not going to swallow that down. If ever there was a crowd of horses you are one of them, who during the last four years—

MR. HALFYARD:—Allow me to correct that. I never made that statement.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I may tell the hon. member for Trinity that if he is prepared to sling mud across the floors of this House there are others who can sling mud too,

The service that has been run the past four or five years in Bonavista

and Trinity Bays has been no good to anyone. There are many places in Bonavista Bay now with no mail service, and if you want a sample of discrimination I will give you one. There are two places in Bonavista Bay, one called Bunyan's Cove and the other Charlottetown; both places are of equal importance. Ninety per cent. of the people in Bunyan's Cove are non-Union men and in Charlottetown it is the reverse. In spite of the fact that both places are of equal importance yet the boat calls at Charlottetown every trip and never at Bunyan's Cove.

We may not have common sense, and we may have horse sense, but I say that the party who looked after and controlled the affairs of this country during the past three or four years had no sense at all.

Again there is a service running from Newtown to Gambo that would have been an excellent service were it not for the fact that the captain, who is a great Coaker man, belongs to Wesleyville, when the captain should belong to Newtown, the terminus. The result is the people of Wesleyville have to take care of numerous passengers while the boat is lying up at that place, when they should not be there at all.

Mr. Halfyard should be the last man in this House to talk of anything in connection with finances when his Government was guilty of squandering millions of the people's money during their term of office.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Speaker, upon the motion to adjourn I would like to make a few remarks. I do not blame Mr. Halfyard because he says that he is wound up, it is good to see him wound up occasionally.

Now I would like to refer to his remark that we are slashing and cutting; may I ask what he means, and who, or what, are we slashing and cut-

ting? Why, if we followed the example set by his government the past three or four years there would be no one or anything left now. After all that has happened during the past three or four years I can only say that Mr. Halfyard is a bold man to express himself as he has. Discrimination was rampant after the 1919 election, and people were put on the street who had given years of faithful service. Up to twenty-four hours ago we had no intention to slash Coaker, and we did not slash him. If you accuse us of slashing Coaker by taking the Malakoff off the Trinity Bay service we intend to slash, as we are certainly taking her off. Why? Because she was not wanted there.

We are not half done trying to right the wrongs of 1919 and 1920. Men were dismissed, services were cut and the whole of the services of the Northern districts were made subservient to the Union interests, and men were put in the civil service who never should be there, men who were put there because of politics and nothing else. Mr. Cave, the late member for Bay de Verde, put some of them down in his department. There are three of them down there now falling over themselves looking for something to do. The taxpayers of this country are not going to stand for providing jobs for political supporters of that calibre any longer.

Mr. Halfyard has no grievance at all. He should be the last man to attack the Government. During the last forty-eight hours Sir Wm. Coaker has been befriended in a way that was perhaps too fair for him and perhaps not fair enough to the country, and Mr. Halfyard knows quite well what I refer to. There is too much of this "put on" and mock modesty practised by certain men. Why, if Mr. Halfyard had his way three months ago he would be Governor of the Penitentiary

to-day and snugly stowed away for life.

It is about time that this nonsense was put a stop to, or else I will have something more to say and probably something that some of you will not like. Why, I remember only about a year ago the Prospero was going North, Dr. Campbell was on board and the steamer was ordered post haste to Port Union to land Dr. Campbell and then she had to come back to Trinity and land her freight. In view of this it does not behove Mr. Halfyard to speak as he has in this House this afternoon.

THE HON. MR. CRAMM. — Mr. Speaker, I just want to refer briefly to some remarks of the Hon. Minister of Finance. I may say that from May 3rd, 1923, to April 24th, 1924, I take an equal share with Mr. Cave in appointments for Bay de Verde District. Fearing, Mr. Speaker, that there may be any misapprehension by the House as to a remark made by Sir John Crosbie, I want it to be understood that in Bay de Verde there are no government officials falling over each other. I think that what the Hon. Minister meant was that there are some men down at the Customs from Bay de Verde, but I did not make the recommendations for the appointments.

I would like to say that Mr. Monroe has done his best in the policy which he set out to pursue, and it really is remarkable how well he has succeeded so far. Mr. Monroe has treated everyone fairly and he has given all a fair show, and so long as officials and civil servants mind their own business and keep out of politics and attend to their work they will receive a square deal from Mr. Monroe and his party.

As regards the steamship services I would be pleased to have a steamer for my district as well as the train service, but I know, as every member

knows, that a train service and a steamship service for one district is utterly absurd. So should it be with Port Union and other places. They should be very well satisfied with one service. The country cannot afford more. I understand that on the Bonavista service as now proposed there will be increased earnings and thereby a saving to the country is effected.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that the remarks which I made refer to people from Bay de Verde who are down in the Custom House. I do not cast any reflection on Mr. Cramm whatever. The appointments that I referred to were made, two of them at least, before Mr. Cramm represented Bay-de-Verde.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Monroe government is fortunate in having such a Minister of Public Works. You are also fortunate in having young men. Some of the members on the opposite side seem to represent the whole country instead of one district. The Minister of Public Works looks out for his own district and he also seems to represent and look out for and attend to my district.

My grievances are that a man from Bristol's Hope was looked after by the Minister of Posts and the man really did not belong to that settlement at all. Then again I object to the spending of the Road Moneys of Victoria by some persons other than the duly elected Road Board. This is not only discrimination but a direct violation of the wishes of the people.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker, In speaking to the motion to adjourn, I may say I very much agree with what has been said by the Hon. Minister of Finance. I do not intend to say much at present, but at the same time I do not want to be dubbed the silent member. I am very silent until I get started,

and I would not be on my feet now if it had not been for some of the remarks thrown across the floor of this House by my friends, Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Duff. These remarks have been thrown across the House directly at me. I would like to put myself right with Mr. Halfyard and Mr. Duff. I have not discriminated against anyone. I have not up to the present received a solitary recommendation from Mr. Halfyard, and I fail to see where his grievances with my department are. Mr. Duff has called on me on one or two occasions and I treated him with courtesy. Certain matters were explained to him, and he left apparently satisfied. But since that time he has been haggling me with questions in the House and trying to make something out of nothing. Certain recommendations were made to me and I accepted them, and in acting upon them used my own discretion. I made an offer that I would consider any recommendations made to me, and I also told Mr. Duff so. I pointed out to Mr. Duff that his attitude was entirely a negative one, and since his visit I have not received any recommendations from him. So I would ask, What is all the fuss about? What is all this dissatisfaction over? My duty is to send the money to men whom I feel sure will expend it properly, and to have this done I will always be prepared to accept with this end in view, and I trust that my acceptance of recommendations will be in the interest of the policy of the Monroe Government—"A square deal to all."

MR. GRIMES—In rising to speak on the motion to adjourn, I must say again that the Government has not justified confidence in their recent declaration that they were giving a square deal to all. I again refer to the case of Mr. Geo. Roberts of Brigus, who was lightkeeper on the Labrador, who was dismissed without any reason being given him. This indicates

that the Government is dismissing and appointing men for political purposes and not for any interest it has for improving the service. To dismiss Mr. Roberts who is now in the eventide of his life, being over seventy years of age, is a gross injustice and no good purpose can be served by it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Did Miss Chalker take any part in politics when you dismissed her in 1919, or was it because her father supported me?

MR. GRIMES—I take the responsibility for her dismissal, it was not politics, other reasons were given which brought it about.

MR. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I have been much amused at the discussion of dismissals here to-day. Relative to the case of Mr. Thorne, I might say my colleague and I have been trying to get a Sub-collector at Calvert dismissed but we have not succeeded yet, though we think we have as much justification in having him discharged as there is for the re-appointment of the other in question. And now I will go on and ask Mr. Halfyard why during the election he asked Mr. Russell, the General Manager of the Railway, for the shifting of the Kyle from her regular route. There is no answer. And then we hear this stuff this afternoon of political intrigues. But we have also heard of the advantages that in 1921 and later you gave to certain sections but are not in a position to give now.

MR. HALFYARD:—We are trying to do the best we can for our constituents.

MR. CASHIN:—You cannot defend your previous position as your case is a very poor one. As to the moving of boats off the coastal routes it seems to me that formerly you had very little to say on this matter but since you got in opposition you have established a deaf and dumb school

and are now able to speak on it. In Trinity District last election you managed to get a majority of votes but if you have no more to show to your credit the next time than you had before, it strikes me you will make a very poor showing. Reference has been made to-day to Mr. Mitchell, the Monroe candidate, and the use of posters, published by the Advocate in the election in Trinity Bay. Do you of your own knowledge know anything of these circulars.

Mr. Halfyard—I know nothing of them.

MR. CASHIN:—You should be ashamed to criticize the present Government. You also have been talking of the price of coal, but who can you thank for reducing it 90 cents a ton. Tell it if you can.

MR. HALFYARD:—The Dominion Company was responsible.

MR. CASHIN:—No. We and Mr. Sullivan were tendering for it and the Dominion Company offered a reduction of 70 cents a ton but they had to come to Cashin who figured at \$6.50 instead of \$7.40 and thereby saved no less than \$63,000 to the country. We forced you, the late Government, to it, when it came to purchasing coal. Mr. Speaker, I would like to put myself on record as expressing the utmost indignation at the manner in which Mr. Halfyard has referred to the present leader of the Government, Mr. Monroe, and to his insinuations as to being run by anyone. But who runs the Opposition, and by whom is his objection inspired, but the Hon. W. F. Coaker whose article in the Advocate prompted his antagonism to-day.

MR. HALFYARD:—That is not the case.

MR. CASHIN:—I hope that in future, criticism of the Government will be conducted in a fairer manner.

It was moved and seconded that

when the House rises, it adjourn until to-morrow afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, Aug. 1st, 1924.

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

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the electors of Twillingate. I beg leave to read the petition.

Mr. Ashbourne reads the petition.

I would like to bring this petition to the attention of the hon. members as this is a matter which needs immediate attention. The canal is gradually being filled up with silt. During the past few years and to-day at low tide and even at medium tide a boat can scarcely get through. At low water one cannot get through at all. This canal connects Twillingate, the environments and several neighbouring harbours. The result is that men who go up to the bay for wood and use this canal to go backwards and forwards have often to wait for hours for the water to rise. I know myself that the last time I went by way of Shoal Tickle I had to leave the boat aground and walk home and wait for three hours for the tide to rise. This is very necessary not only for the men bringing wood but for many other reasons as well. It is necessary for the men who have to go squid fishing. This Tickle is a very easy means for getting to the squid fishing grounds. I ask that this petition be sent to the department to which it relates and receive there careful consideration.

MR. BROWN:—I have much pleasure in giving that petition my hearty support. I know very well the inconvenience felt by the people there on account of this tickle not being open at all times. I know that men

have to wait for a period of from four to six hours sometimes before they can get through. I give this petition my full support.

MR. GRIMES:—Mr. Speaker I also wish to give this petition my hearty support, and I wish to endorse all the remarks made by the previous speakers in connection with it. I hope that the petition will receive the attention it deserves.

MR. DUFF:—I wish to present a petition from the people of Bristol's Hope in connection with the Post Office which I spoke of yesterday. The petition is largely signed and I am sure that since the matter has been brought to the attention of the Government that the Minister of Posts will give the matter his consideration. Bristol's Hope is a very old settlement. It was founded by John Guy many hundred years ago and I feel that John Guy treated the place much better than the present Government has. As I said before the Post Office has been removed to a distance of a mile and a half from the settlement. I ask the department to give the matter its careful consideration.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Disembarking of Paupers."

MR. SCAMMELL gave notice of three questions.

MR. BROWN gave notice of question.

MR. HICKMAN gave notice of three questions.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—In reply to certain questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition on an outstanding order paper, I might say that I have had a re-

port from Mr. Russel, the General Manager of the Railway to-day. Here is the report for the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition. It says that one part can be answered shortly but the other part will take some time.

MR. SCAMMELL:—I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he has answer to question of Order Paper of July 29th.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—That is in reference I think to the Road Boards of St. Barbe District. I beg to lay the answer on the table of the House. I beg also to table answer to Question 7 of the Order Paper of July 29th. I beg also to lay on the table of the House the answer to question No. 12 of the Order Paper of July 29th.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions on the subject of certain expenditures to be made under "The Loan Act, 1923."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—There is nothing very much in these resolutions except to give the Auditor General authority to sign a cheque payable to the Bank of Montreal for a million dollars.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE reads the Act.

MR. HICKMAN—May I ask if that one million dollars is part of the authorized Loan of 1923?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—All the Loan for 1923 was authorized and this million dollars was earmarked for this specific purpose.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed

the said Resolutions without amendment, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill respecting certain expenditures to be made under "The Loan Act, 1923," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions relating to a tax on goods imported into the Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, In respect to these Resolutions I might say that this is a tax to be collected on goods imported by manufacturers to be used in the manufacture of their goods, and the tax is to be collected at the Custom House instead of at the Assessor's Department. The change will obviate considerable trouble, as recommended to us by the Auditor General.

MR. HALFYARD—It says that the tax on flour shall be three per centum. What does that mean?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—That is the Sales Tax that has been on it all the time. It has not changed.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, Before these Resolutions go through I would like to make a few observations in reference to the manufacturers and local industries, particularly those of St. John's. This Measure calls for a tax on goods imported into the Colony and on which an excise duty has to be paid. There are in Newfoundland at the present time a number of local

industries. Some of them are over-protected and some of them are under-protected, and I think that this is an opportune time for this matter to be discussed. It is not my intention to go into the details of any particular industry, but I think that every industry and every manufacturing concern in this country should be enquired into with a view to seeing that those that are under-protected should get proper protection and those that are over-protected should be re-arranged and re-adjusted. It is necessary for us to use in the country all the goods that we can possibly manufacture, and it should be the duty of the Government to see that all the employment possible be given our people by those manufacturing concerns. I would like to refer to one article manufactured here, namely, cigarettes and to point out the protection afforded the manufacturers. At the beginning of the present session I asked the Honourable Minister of Finance for some information with regard to cigarettes, and I have before me his replies from which I find that a certain concern manufactured last year nineteen million cigarettes, and it seems to me that this industry is very much over-protected. It takes but $2\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of tobacco to manufacture 1000 cigarettes, and for the manufacture of 19,000,000 cigarettes is used 47,500 pounds of tobacco. The duty on cigarettes imported into this country, including Sales tax and Sur-tax, figures out at \$14.60 per thousand; while on the other hand the duty on the locally manufactured article figures out at \$8.12 per thousand, which means a difference of \$6.48 per thousand. Thus this tobacco concern that turned out 19,000,000 cigarettes last year was protected last year to the extent of \$115,000 at the expense of the people of this country. That is \$115,000 protection on the manufacture of 47,500 pounds of tobacco and which is mostly done by

machinery. That, I say, Mr. Chairman, is over-protection for this particular industry, which is controlled by a large corporation in the United States and most of the dividends and profits made by this concern go out of the country and into the pockets of the people who are not interested in us. I claim that this industry should be looked into. While every industry should be given all the protection possible, no one industry should be protected to that extent. Sufficient protection should be given to any industry to enable it to pay a reasonable dividend to those who have money invested in it; but the protection of \$115,000 in one year on locally manufactured cigarettes is something that should engage the serious attention of every member on both sides of this House. The duty should either be reduced and let the benefit go to the people who smoke cigarettes or else the excise duty should be increased and let the country get the benefit. The ordinary man, perhaps, may not understand at first blush the difference between the excise duty and the imported duty, but let him consider that 1000 cigarettes is manufactured out of 2½ pounds of tobacco and that \$6.48 protection is given per thousand on cigarettes which are made here and consumed by our own people. It strikes me that between 50 cents and a dollar per thousand, say 60 cents, is enough protection to give to this industry. I think that the Government should take this matter into consideration and if necessary before these Resolutions pass, or else take it up afterwards and have that protection re-adjusted, preferably of having the excise duty increased. There are also other industries in this country over-protected and making lots of money, while there are other industries that are under-protected. Each manufacturing concern should be taken separately and gone into separately, in my opinion.

I trust that the Honourable Minister of Finance will take this matter into consideration and if there is not an opportunity of attending to the matter this session, that it will be looked into before the next session of the House comes round, which, we presume, will take place in the early part of next year.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill respecting "A tax on goods imported into the Colony," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee

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

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message, requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

(1) MR. RANDELL—Asked Hon. the Minister of Finance to lay on the Table of the House the amount of Duties collected for the year 1922-23-24: (1) St. John's Light & Power Co.; (2) United Electric Co. (Port Union); (3) The United Towns Electric Co.; (4) Public Service Electric Co.; also to Table the value of goods exempt from Duty for the same period and state class of goods for each; also amounts received from Government for street lighting by each Company for above period.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I might say that the answer to that question is being prepared and will be ready on to-morrow when I will table it.

(2) MR. DUFF—Asked Hon. the Minister of Posts the names of those that recommended Mrs. John Connolly to the position of Post Mistress for Bristols Hope, in the District of Carbonear, and to table all correspondence in connection with the same.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—In the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs I beg to table the information.

MR. HALFYARD—I would like to refer the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to question 4 on the Order Paper

of July 25th, and I would like to know if the information is yet available for the House?

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: I might say in answer to the honourable member for Trinity that the correspondence is still in course of preparation. Meanwhile with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a question asked a short time ago by Mr. Grimes, member for Twillingate, as to why George Roberts was turned out of the Lighthouse at Manuels Island, Labrador. In the first place I have received letters from the member of the district and from people all over the district dealing with the dismissal of Roberts. After having gone into the matter at the Lighthouse Department I made up my mind that there was something wrong, and to-day I have before me the records of my Department showing that Roberts had been receiving pay for two years for an assistant as well as his own salary. Now there is no such thing as an assistant to Roberts on the Labrador. I was surprised when I heard of assistant mentioned at first and I was wondering who that person could be. This morning I took the trouble to find out that Mr. Roberts got paid personally on April 18th, 1923, \$120.00 for passages of an assistant two years previously. On the order for the payment of that money is written the name of R. A. Squires. Then on December 12th, 1923, Roberts was paid \$35.55 for passage money on an order signed by G. Grimes. A similar amount was paid for passage money in 1922. This money was not paid him for an assistant; but for his wife to and from Manuels Island. I might say for the benefit of this House that all Lighthouse Keepers on the Labrador are paid an equal salary; but there are no assistants. If the honourable member for Twillingate wants to see this correspondence he may do so.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Speaker, I

am sure the member for Twillingate will appreciate the courtesy done him by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries by undertaking all this trouble in finding out for him what happened to this man Roberts; but I fear that the Minister does not understand the question that was asked him.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House received itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Supply.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE
—Mr. Chairman, in asking the House to pass this Supplementary Supply I may say that the total amount is \$709,712.52 plus \$3981.40, making a grand total of \$713,693.92.

The \$709,712.52 is as follows:

Finance Department	
Colonial Secretary's Department .. .	
Jusice Department	
Public Charities Department	
Marine & Fisheries Department	
Agriculture & Mines Department .. .	
Public Works Department	
Posts & Telegraphs Department .. .	
Customs Department	
Accountant of Contingencies	
.. . . .	\$ 50,730.70
.. . . .	89,887.52
.. . . .	56,835.00
.. . . .	129,460.08
.. . . .	1,400.00
.. . . .	23,832.48
.. . . .	171,228.24
.. . . .	137,000.00
.. . . .	36,968.50
.. . . .	12,370.00
	<hr/>
	\$709,712.52

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE
—Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain that these amounts were overdrawn by the late government and some provision had to be made by the present Administration.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if there was a contract with Read, Son and Watson for their work?

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE
—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition I may say that there was no Contract with Read, Son and Watson. There is a Bill to date amounting to about \$8,000.00. They have been paid \$4,000.00 on account, in fact there was no more money available to pay them at that time. It was really for the Hollis Walker report that this Bill was incurred. They are still engaged at work and are at the present time down in the Customs Department.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask at what rate they are being paid? So much per day or so much per month?

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE
—That question is difficult to answer. They are not paid by the day or by the month. They are as you know a very expensive Firm to employ. I may say that if the inquiries are to go on, there will probably have to be some definite arrangement made as to the cost before embarking upon the work.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I may say that when they were first engaged there was no contract, they were only engaged for the inquiry that was about to take place. I received the first bill just before I resigned and I saw Mr. Watson and I understood that he was taking so much per day.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to speak with regard to the Fortune Bay Service, and although I have heard rumours that there was to be a boat put on I would ask that something be done at the earliest possible opportunity.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Chairman, for the information

of the hon. member I may say that within the next 48 hours there will be something definite arranged.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has yet called together the Fishery Board? The reason I ask is that the herring fishery will soon be starting, and in view of the great waste in the operation of this industry it is necessary to give considerable attention to same.

THE HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—In reply to the hon. member Mr. Chairman, I beg to state that I hope to call a meeting of the Board next week, probably about Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Budget has not been printed just yet, but if the Hon. Members care to go on with their comments without same I am willing. I hope to have printed copies by Monday.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be better to have the printed copies before us before we enter into any discussion on the matter.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on 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 a Committee of the Whole on the Gander Valley Agreement Resolution.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON THE GANDER VALLEY AGREEMENT.

MR. W. W. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw the attention of the House to Clauses 5 and 6. The reason is that last year when we were considering the Resolutions of the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company, a certain clause in the Products Corporation Agreement was repealed and another substituted therefor. The Customs find it very difficult to collect duties on coal. The Solicitor for the Company, Mr. Conroy, pointed out that there was a difference between the Clauses in the Resolutions of the Newfoundland Power & Paper Company, and that of the Newfoundland Produce Company. And, as a result of the change made in the wording of the Clause the Company now claims the right of free entry for coal. If the Government understands that the Gander Valley Company under this agreement must pay duty on coal, it should be made quite clear, and the Minister of Justice should cause the wording to be such, that there would be no difference of opinion as to the interpretation thereof.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that Clause 5 of the present Bill and practically Clause 4 has been taken as amended in 1923, and the same thing applies to Clause 6, so that, as Hon. members can see, all the Government has done is to take the Clause as amended in the Newfoundland Products Act in 1923. The two clauses are a verbatim copy of the 1923 Act.

MR. HICKMAN—Is Clause 2 the same?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That is also a verbatim copy.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This clause does not appear in the 1915 Act because it is in the 1923 Act. It was an alteration or addition to the Products Corporation Act of 1923. I will be able to get the exact wording of the Clause in the minutes. I have sent to get the private Acts. It is in volume 4. I may say for the information of the Committee that these resolutions are practically the same as the Humber Agreement, except that it is minus the guarantee. As regards the exemption from taxation in Clause 2—that is a verbatim copy of the other resolutions. Clauses 3 and 4 are the same. 5 and 6 are the same. Clause 8 is the same. Really the whole resolutions are the same with the addition to the agreement of Clause 17 of the schedule in which provision is made for the erection of fish ladders, etc.

HON. MINISTER reads Clause 17 of the Schedule.

MR. HIBBS—Is Section 22 of the Schedule the same as the Humber Agreement?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—No. That is an improved wording. We take a little credit to ourselves for the improvement in this 1923 Act or what is called the Humber Agreement.

Reads section.

I think that is a considerable improvement. This measure provides that Newfoundland labor shall be employed in the conduct of the establishment with the exception of skilled labor which is not otherwise obtainable in Newfoundland. I think that the amendment is a little more protective to the people of the country. Of course we are not trying to rake up old sores.

MR. HIBBS—I have no intent on of questioning what the Hon. Minister of Justice just stated with regard to the improvement in the wording of this section. But I do not know that it has gone far enough. I candidly cannot suggest anything better at the present. But I fear very much that it will not meet with the requirements. I do not know to what extent the stories which we hear from the Humber are correct but I am lead to believe that there is discrimination in favor of foreign labor. I think that in connection with this agreement, and with the example of the Humber before us that we should do everything humanly possible for the protection of Newfoundland labor. It does not define just what should be Newfoundland labor and what skilled Newfoundland workmen can perform. I think advantage will be taken of this, and that foreign labor will be brought in. I have been told by men who came in from the Humber that there are Newfoundlanders out there who are working on certain jobs with foreigners or jobs similar to theirs and they receive thirty-five cents per hour while the foreigners are getting seventy. I think it is a disgrace. Of course as I said before I do not know any better wording for the resolution and I was going to propose that a commission be appointed to enquire into these matters.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—We had considerable difficulty to

get the Company to agree to this.

MR. HIBBS—Now we should profit by our experience. I am not going to suggest a minimum wage because I fear that the Company will not agree. But I would like to see some sort of legislation in this direction for the protection of our labor. I know that the Prime Minister's mind is full of worry as to how the situation at the Humber is to be settled. I do not know what he is going to do but I think that now is the time to take measures to prevent re-occurrence of the trouble. I think that some endeavour should be made to have the same wages paid as are paid in Canada and the United States. The men are engaged in similar operations. Their products are the same and the markets are the same and all other things being equal I think that the wages that prevail in Canada and the United States should also prevail in the lumber woods of Newfoundland. There is no reason for the difference of the salaries of the men if the conditions are similar and I think they are. I think that this is a matter which should engage the attention of the Government. I almost vowed when I became cognisant of the treatment which has been meted out to some of the loggers of my district that if some such measure as this were to come up in the House and if I were a member I would not support it, if there was not a more careful provision along the lines of protection of Newfoundland labor. It only seems right that the man who is really the producer should get a living wage. However we never seem to be able to do what we want to do. Because we are anxious to get the companies to come here we have to give some concessions and they always seem to have the upper hand, and we are left in a defenceless position. I merely call that to the attention of the Prime Minister. He

must feel along the same lines. I am not going so far as to say that I am not going to support the agreement but I think that the matter which I have mentioned is one which should attract the attention of the Government if it has not already done so.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Following along the lines of remarks of the hon. member for Fogo I think it only right to point out to the House the very marked difference of position in which we find ourselves to-day compared to the condition of affairs in connection with the Humber agreement. The protection afforded Newfoundland labour is much greater under this contract as I have pointed out before, and still further is our position better in so far as we have to give no guarantee. I think that there is some credit due this Government for that. I think I remember that it was stated in this House that the Humber contract was an impossibility without the ten million guarantee. Surely if the Government of that day could only get that contract though on these conditions then the members opposite must appreciate the fact that we are doing better to-day. This company is getting practically nothing from us. There is somebody who is endeavouring to create an unfavourable impression. We will if the occasion rises say more on this matter. In connection with the Humber situation at the present, I think that the party influencing the men is supposed to be cognisant of the difficulty of arranging the other contract when the other contract was being put through. I just take this liberty of speaking for the Government in connection with this situation on the Humber. We have got to be plain about it. The Government is not going to be played with. There is going to be no politics in connection with the Government's dealing with the situation.

Any attempt made at negotiations with the Company is going to be made in an earnest spirit and desire to do something to come to an amicable arrangement. There will be no exploiting of the Government, not that I think that the exploiting might have been more profitably employed. As regards the matter arising out of the Humber agreement it came from the Opposition side of the House. I remember that the Leader of the House said at the time that it was impossible to do more than was done. I accepted it. I thought that there was an honest endeavour being made to do the best for the country. I think that honourable members will agree with me, that, if, the case of the Humber agreement when the Government was giving a guarantee of ten millions of dollars they could not do any thing more than they did do in the way of protecting the labourer of this country, then we have done well in obtaining better protection whilst at the same time we are giving nothing in the way of a guarantee. There cannot be any discussion on the matter of minimum wage. The company has stated its intention of employing Newfoundland labour wherever possible. With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Fogo I think that that class of labour would not come under the heading of skilled labour and since that work can be done in Newfoundland the company will have the work done by Newfoundlanders. The company is compelled to employ Newfoundland labour except in the case when it is not ordinarily obtainable in Newfoundland. Finally then, we are not critical of what has been done in the past as regards concessions given etc., and we do think when we have done better for the country, that it is hardly fair for those, who could not do so well under at least as favourable conditions not to give us credit for what we have done. With regard to the

question asked by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition I may say that clause three is also a verbatim copy.

MR. HICKMAN:—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether there is a minimum wage agreement between the Government and the Newfoundland Products Corporation?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—No.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I may say in response to the Hon. member for Fogo that I discussed with Mr. Reid the question of establishing some basis of wages for the men. Mr. Reid pointed out to me that in the case of the Humber a large guarantee had been given by the Government while he is financing this scheme with no guarantee at all. I really believe that like the Gander proposition every pulp and paper business in Newfoundland will have to receive some concessions to live up to the precedent established in the case of Humber contract in order to raise money in the old country for an enterprise of this kind. I am in sympathy with the point raised by Mr. Hibbs and I may say the Government is trying to get the best possible bargain to protect the labouring men.

MR. HIBBS:—I give the Prime Minister credit for what has been done. I think I understand from the Minister of Justice that somebody had been. . . .

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—We will have much pleasure in naming him shortly.

MR. HIBBS:—I was going to say however that I thought that there had been a gentleman's agreement between the Government and the Company for a salary for the men of two-fifty a day.

MR. HALFYARD:—There was a letter from Mr. Janes to the Prime Minister agreeing to pay two dollars and fifty per day for labour.

MR. HIBBS:—In the light of our past experience there can be no doubt that twenty-five cents an hour is insufficient. I think that some effort should be made so as to try to come to some agreement with the company to get thirty cents per hour for labour. I think such an endeavour would obviate the danger of a repetition of the Humber trouble. Conditions demand it. I presume that prospects are more promising to-day than they were last year and that would explain why they did not ask for a guarantee. Last year it was impossible to raise the money without the guarantee being given. Now the project is good the guarantee is not required. In finishing I would like to say that I am in sympathy with the Government in their endeavouring to find some solution for the trouble in which they find themselves.

MR. GRIMES:—We should have the Minister of Finance present to know what difficulties have arisen over the interpretation of a similar clause in the Contract of the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Co.

The Company officials at Corner Brook understand it to mean one thing, the Customs another because articles are not specified by name. Where agreements have been reached on articles imported and not named in the Newfoundland Pulp and Paper Co. Contract they could be embodied in this contract and leave no doubt as to what can be given free entry or what is dutiable.

MR. HALFYARD:—Every day that question has been arising. Every Company that gets grants in the country is looking for concessions.

MR. GRIMES:—The Customs can easily furnish the information to the Minister of Justice and the alteration in the Bill can easily be made. Enlarging on the question raised by Mr. Hibbs as to what provision is being made to secure labor a fair days

wage, I make bold to say that the Government will be derelict in its duty if some machinery is not instituted to regulate wages and hours and adjust grievances that may arise from time to time.

We are becoming an industrial country. 2,000 men are employed in mining; 1,000 more are employed in St. John's factories, 6,000 are now employed in the interior and when the Gander enterprise starts another 2,000 will be working there. The number is increasing as more leave the Fisheries. In such enterprises the experience has been that disputes arise from time to time between the workmen and the employers. Strikes are resorted to which have in some instances caused much suffering to the strikers and their families to the Company and the country. Elsewhere machinery has been provided in the form of Conciliation Boards, Minimum Wage Boards, Arbitration Boards and such like so as to avoid disputes coming to such a head. In England, Canada and the United States they have often succeeded in preventing strikes by getting the company officials and the men together where by the influence of experienced arbitrators they get to understand each other better learning to know each others difficulties, and becoming less suspicious of each others intentions and more trustful where it is seen that honesty and fair play is really desired.

Take England this past winter, a serious dispute arose between the Dockers and their Employees, involving a strike affecting thousands of men. The Minister of Labor, T. Shaw used his good offices and effected a settlement in eight or ten days that before meant a two or three months strike with all the injury accompanying it. The same applied to the Tramway dispute and also the dispute between the Mine Owners and the Miners in which five hundred thousand men were affected. That dis-

pute was settled without a strike, all because there was certain machinery that could be brought into use as soon as it was necessary. More and more is such machinery being recognized and we should be ready to recognize it in Newfoundland. Such machinery will help men to know each other better and will surely though perhaps slowly at first do away with the suspicion and distrust so manifested to-day. The capitalist and the working men to-day, to a very large extent, look upon each other as out to do the other. Whereas they should know that all have a common interest. None are independent of each other and as they are made to understand it more and more they will recognize more and more the rights belonging to each other. I therefore submit that the Government should lose no time in establishing such machinery in Newfoundland to have this brought about.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker, in reference to clauses 5 and 6, may I ask the Minister of Finance and Customs as he may not be conversant with the particulars relative to the collection of duty on coal to allow these two clauses to be deferred until he has opportunity to take the matter up with the Deputy Minister. I know there has been a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of these sections and as has been intimated by several speakers we should try to benefit from experience. Certainly we should have the Customs properly instructed so that they will not be expecting revenues and find out that they will be disappointed by not receiving any. I think it would be only right to defer the passing of these clauses so that the Minister of Finance and Customs could take the matter up and get information as to whether any duty has been collected on coal from the Humber Companies. If the House decides to allow coal to be admitted duty free, all right. But let there be

no misunderstanding. I am quite sure that Mr. Warren is conversant with the different opinions that are held in the interpretation of these two clauses. We were surprised very much when we learnt that the companies under these two clauses said they are entitled to free entry for coal. Mr. Higgins recited Clause 12 of the 1915 Contract. The companies contended that they can get almost anything in under that contract. Now we are entering in to a similar agreement. We should benefit by experience. If it is the opinion of this House that this company is to have coal admitted duty free, all right. But let there be no misunderstanding.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What I want to point out is that I don't think it is possible to form a clause that will cover everything. If the Hon. member will give it a little thought I am sure that he will realize that it is impossible to enumerate in detail all the things that are to be covered. In many cases things are imported which it was inconceivable would be brought into the country. I think it will work out all right. There has been a little confusion, but if there was not what would us poor lawyers do. And after all 's it not a good thing. The Minister of Finance and Customs tells us that he has plenty of time on his hands. Nothing at all to do. Is it not good then to give him something to do?

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister as to Section 16.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That has been copied word for word.

MR. SCAMMELL—As to Section 22, I would like to ask if anything is being done as to wages in this connection.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I explained before that the Reids are anxious to raise capital abroad and have raised the point that the prece-

dent of fixing wages, as in the Armstrong, Whitworth case, would be detrimental to their enterprise. We will however, deal further with the matter at a party meeting to-night. The Government has been successful in getting an improved agreement from the Gander Company as to wages, and we are not unmindful of the working men and can be depended on to protect their interests in every way possible.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said resolutions without amendment, and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and The Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Now that the Order of the Day is finished, I would like to ask the Hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Grimes, why he has not given me the answer in writing as promised yesterday as to the charges against Miss Chalker and her dismissal in 1919 from the Civil Service.

MR. GRIMES—It is true I made the statement that I would submit the charges in writing, but I did not make the charges against the girl. In 1919 representations were made to me that she was performing her duties unsatisfactorily and I referred these charges to the then Minister of Posts, Mr. Halfyard, and I later learned that she had been dismissed.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — I will not allow any slur to be cast

upon this young lady, and insinuations have been made here that are not justified. Her dismissal was due to the fact that her people were connected with the members of the present Government and I intend to again bring this matter to the attention of the House though it is possible that written documents which the Hon. member states were submitted to the Minister of Posts have since been destroyed. I intend however to have a search made for them.

MR. BROWN—Mr. Speaker, in connection with the trouble at Corner Brook I have sent the following message:—"ALFRED PRINCE, Corner Brook—Correspondence between the Prime Minister and yourself published. I strongly advise you and committee not to lead men to do anything rash. Keep within the law and do no damage to property. Will do everything in power to help get men's grievances straightened out." I have been asked to go out to the Humbert to see if anything can be done. The situation is serious and I would like to see the men get a square deal. I am desirous of having the strike ended and I would like to suggest that a man from the Government side be sent out to Corner Brook to enquire into the grievances of the men and report. As to the logging situation I hope this will also be fully enquired into. I have seen by the papers, Mr. Speaker, that the warship was being sent to the scene of the trouble. This, I think, is entirely unwarranted, and I hope the Hon. the Prime Minister is not connected with such action.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am glad to know that the honorable member for Twillingate is anxious to have the strike called off and that he has sent a message to this man Prince not to do anything rash. It appears strange that the men who

have originated the strike have not succeeded in getting more for the strikers. I believe the strike has emanated from a place called the White House and is purely a political move to cause trouble for the Government. I do not say that Mr. Brown is implicated in the movement and I cannot prove it, but I have reason to think that such is the case. As far as Mr. Prince is concerned I do not know who he is and therefore I was not called upon to reply to him. When the members now in Opposition were in power they fixed the rate of pay for workers on the Humber at \$2.50 per day for all time, but now they seem to have sent a man to Corner Brook to agitate and arouse those honestly seeking a living there to strike. With Sir W. F. Coaker figuring largely in the affair it looks very much like a political movement and I believe if there were to be no election in Bonavista in the Fall there would have been no strike at Corner Brook to-day. It is simply a move to down the Government. In reply to the message of Mr. Prince I have sent the following answer:—"In view of your insulting messages, am not going to follow your advice." On the other side Mr. Alexander of the Armstrong Company states that the wages could not be increased and wanted to come over here to St. John's to interview me. I have wired him that it was no use for him to come here unless prepared to make some concession with respect to wages. I cannot believe the Opposition is sincere in their advocacy of the strikers as I am satisfied the whole thing had been rigged to make trouble for the Government and to get Coaker back to power. Mr. Prince by his threatening messages forces us to take steps to protect the property in which the county has \$10,000,000 at stake, though it may not be necessary to send the warship there, or to land a crew if she should proceed there.

MR. BROWN:—To the best of my knowledge I do not believe that this strike originated from the White House or was ever discussed there and I deny the charge that I had anything to do with its promotion. I had no more to do with it than you had and you may yet have to take your charges back. I know nothing of Mr. Monroe's insinuations.

MR. SCAMMELL:—I wish to confirm the denial of Mr. Brown as to any knowledge of the strike till to-day. I live with him at the White House and do not see how he could have been the originator of the strike. One man there who discussed labour troubles was Hr. Humber from Bell Island. I take it that up in that area there are hundreds of men from the North who are friends of Sir William Coaker. Don't get the impression that, because one district went by in the last election, that Coaker has no friends left in the North. He has a great many. When he needs them, they will be found. Coaker is a tried and trusted friend of these men and it is only natural that they should appeal to him in the hour of their trouble as they are undoubtedly anxious to explore every avenue of assistance possible.

MR. BROWN:—Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Prime Minister in his remarks said that Mr. Prince was a relative of mine. I do not know where the Prime Minister got the idea, but it is the first time that I realised that Prince was a relative of mine, or that I knew anything about him beyond four years ago, saying good afternoon to him as he passed by. That is the only time I have ever spoken to him I believe.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell Br. Brown where I got the information, but I apologize if the statement is incorrect. I was told that Alfred Prince was a cousin of Mr. Brown's. If it is incor-

rect, I take it back and apologize.

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Speaker, I was sorry that this should happen this afternoon—that the Prime Minister should get on the floor of the House, and address these remarks to the Opposition party. I am the Leader of this Party, and when he accuses the party, he includes me. He says that I am party to the strike at the Humber. I want to tell the Prime Minister that I am not. I never heard of it till I saw it in the papers. I did not know that Mr. Brown was implicated. I was never at the White House in my life, and I do not know anything at all about the strike at the Humber. I am not to be included in any of the insinuations that are thrown across at this side of the House, and I think the Prime Minister should name the parties whom he thinks are instrumental or implicated in having a strike at the Humber, because it is unfair to us on this side of the House who are not implicated to have these insinuations thrown across at us.

I do not know what the members of previous Governments have done, but there are some of us here on this side of the House—Mr. Duff, Mr. Ashbourne and myself at any rate—who never had any connection with old parties, either that of Sir Richard Squires, or Mr. Warren; and we do not want to shoulder the blame of anything said on the Government side of the House then. I think the Prime Minister is very unfair, and he should state the names of those whom he thinks are implicated in the strike at the Humber, because, as I said before, I am not implicated.

It is not my desire to have strikes at all, and everything that I possibly can do to help out the Prime Minister in any motion that he brings before this House that is in the interests of the country, I shall do. There is nothing that I can gain by being implicated in a strike of that nature.

MR. GRIMES:—Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised to hear the Premier attack my colleague, Mr. Brown, and charging him as one of the originators of the strike at Corner Brook for political purposes. He says he believes it, and also says that he cannot prove it. I have known Mr. Brown for nearly two years and have a fair idea of his views on the labor question. From what I know of him, I have concluded that he is neither an Extremist nor a Bolshevik. He has stated on more than one occasion that he recognizes that there are two sides to a dispute, and that the Company's position has to be considered as well as the men's position. Consequently I do not think that Mr. Brown would be a party to a strike until every other resource short of it had been used. Speaking for myself, I have to say I knew nothing about it until I read it in the newspapers, and I think the rest of those on this side of the House will say the same. The Premier's attack is therefore unjustifiable and he should retract his statement. As I know nothing about the strike or its causes, I am not able to comment upon it, but this I will say, that it should teach the Government a lesson. When there is no Board to deal with labor disputes to which employers or employees can appeal the grievances culminate in a strike, where, if a Conciliation Board existed, it might have been avoided. But the Premier hits back that our own interests in labor questions is for the political capital we can make out of it, and that is our object at the present time. It is untrue, and I want to tell this House that those who sit on this side of the House are as much concerned about the welfare of the country as anyone sitting on the other side. This is no time to play politics. When men will threaten that if their grievances are not remedied they will burn and destroy property, it is our duty to demand of

the Government that it act promptly and avert such a threatening danger. To reply to the men haughtily, to ignore their requests or demands does not cure the trouble but aggravates it, and the Premier should know that men in the heat of a moment will often say things which on second thought they would not say. It applies to all classes alike. He should therefore overlook that feature of it and send a commission to investigate the trouble and make a report at the earliest. Every effort should be made to conciliate. When you ignore these troubles it shows indifference. What happens? The men regard it as an evidence that those in charge of the Government are always on the side of capital and against labor. The longer you manifest indifference to their condition the more do they nurse their feelings of resentment. Countries where such indifference has prevailed has found themselves with a revolution on their hands and all the evil consequences that follow, and we should learn by the experience of others. I therefore urge upon the Government to promote the spirit of harmony and goodwill, which can only be done by getting the two sides together. It is remarkable what good can be accomplished when this is done, and both sides are ready to give due consideration to the welfare of each other. Difficulties soon disappear and trouble is removed. You have precedent for that. When a strike took place in this city a few years ago between the Reid Newfoundland Company and their employees, there were times when it assumed a very dangerous aspect. The Government of Sir Wm. Lloyd very wisely decided to step in, and appointed Sir Michael Cashin, the present Minister of Finance, and Sir Wm. Coaker to enquire into the dispute, with what result, that they succeeded in getting the Company to

meet the men's representatives and the strike ended satisfactory to all.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—What did your Government do in the March strike? What increase of wages did you get? You are tired of kidding people. We do not want that job.

MR. GRIMES:—I am sorry that Mr. Warren is not here to give the history connected with the March strike. I can relate what I know. When it took place Mr. Warren, who was then Prime Minister, telegraphed to the men to appoint a representative and send him to St. John's to confer with him, the Prime Minister, on the matters in dispute. This was done. The men selected Mr. Thompson, a native of Bay Roberts. He conferred with Mr. Warren and Sir Wm. Coaker, and in about 48 hours the strike was over. Concessions were made by the Company at Deer Lake. Board, instead of being charged one dollar per day, was to be seventy-five cents. Better hospital accommodation was to be provided, the men were to be paid fortnightly instead of monthly, and the question of wage increase was to be held over for consideration until the manager arrived from England during the summer.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago referred to himself, Mr. Duff and myself as three members on this side of the House who had no association with the last Government, but who have been included in certain remarks made by the other side of the House with regard to the policy of the past Government.

Now, I think that is rather unfair to us to say that we of the Opposition are all, so to speak, part of the same crowd, and that we are responsible for things over which we had no control.

Speaking of the Humber strike, I was very sorry to read these tele-

grams in the paper this morning, and I regret very much that these telegrams should pass over the wires in Newfoundland. It does not speak very well for us and may go against us in foreign countries, and that is particularly bad, because we are trying to interest foreign capital to come here and make investments.

I would like to disclaim all knowledge of anything with regard to this Humber strike, but I feel that the Government would be acting wisely in following the advice of Mr. Grimes. Since I have known Mr. Grimes, and have had an opportunity of studying him, I have become to feel that he is a student of labor matters, and also of certain socialistic problems, and perhaps I may say that he is quite an authority on these matters. I do not say that Mr. Grimes is a Socialist. Perhaps some of us may be idealists, but I believe that when Mr. Grimes is speaking he speaks as one who knows. He knows what he is talking about, because he has studied conditions in labor in Newfoundland, England, America and also in Russia.

I think the Government should take a hand in dealing with this situation at the Humber. Perhaps they may be able to do something if they interfere. I certainly think they should attempt to do something, otherwise it may grow to more serious proportions.

I hope I am not taking up too much of the time of this House, but I do not like these insinuations to be flung across at this side of the House, and I do not like to be told that we are dummies over here. Some of us have not been in this House very long, and perhaps we are moving very slowly, but I think that we can show that we are out to do what we can for the country, and that we speak sincerely. Personally I think that there should be no more mud slinging. I do not believe in it.

HON. MR. LONG:—Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Barbe has read to us a quotation from the Evening Telegram in connection with the Humber strike. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is connected with the Evening Advocate, and if he has read the editorial to-night. If that editorial is not Bolshevik I do not know what else it is.

I am sure that we are all interested in trying to settle up this labor situation at the Humber, but I feel that the Prime Minister has taken the right stand in the matter in what he has said this afternoon. I feel that he has taken the right attitude, and I admire the stand that he has taken, and when men like Prince or any other man in this country would turn round and send such insulting messages to the Prime Minister of this country I consider that the Government should take a stand in putting these men in their proper places.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words in connection with this matter. I do not think that there is any man in this country to-day who can feel more than the Prime Minister with labour. We understand this Humber situation fully, and we are considering the matter. This Government have done all they can, but this world was not made in a day, and we have only been eight weeks in power, and we are here now trying to get the business of the country through the House.

Now I would be inclined very much to accept a statement from Mr. Scammell and from Mr. Brown, if I had not read the Advocate this afternoon. It sounds very much like the voice of Jacob, but it is really the hand of Esau, and what the Prime Minister says is correct. This strike business is a little disease that springs up now and then. At any rate, the people who are responsible for that article in the Ad-

vocate this evening are not fit to take charge of this country, and I must say they are a pretty crowd of men to make this country better. We are out to bring better times to this country, and we are going to do it.

MR. GRIMES—Do you not think that the proper way to deal with this is to appoint a Commission?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Not when we have had an insulting message from a man like Prince. And let me tell you, Prince is a mighty good F.P.U. man too. I know Alfred Prince as well as I know you. You may have read about Russia, and you may speak about it, but if you got a little touch of Russia you would be the first man to run.

This strike—this whole strike at the Humber at the present moment is entirely due to politics—to try and induce the people of Bonavista to defeat Mr. Monroe at the bye-election, and no one knows better what is going on in the White House than Mr. Scammell and Mr. Brown. There are some of my officials who go up there, and to my knowledge, discuss what they can do to upset the Government. I know what I am saying, even if Mr. Monroe does not know about it. This Government is going to give the working man a fair square deal. You help to do that, and this Government will do its best.

MR. GRIMES—Mr. Speaker, about this party politics question in connection with this situation at the Humber, I do not think that any member on this side of the House has that in mind for one moment. We have said that we are willing to co-operate with the Government in settling this difficulty, and the way you are going to do it is by getting the Company and the people together.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Do you know that more than half these men are not striking at all. The men at Deer Lake and the other places

will not go out now. It is only at Corner Brook that the people are striking, and that is where the crowd was sent that is starting this strike. There are half a dozen of them trying to get the honest men in trouble.

MR. GRIMES—You speak about this disease that is spreading, and the only way you can prevent it, is by trying to bring about that harmony that should exist between employers and employees, and you can do that by appointing this commission.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Why did you not appoint a Commission of this House to settle the strike when you were in the Government. You would not do it then. Why? Because you were in the Government then, and you did not want to do anything.

MR. GRIMES—I think this matter was discussed before, and I am sorry that Mr. Warren is not here to explain the situation. I am glad that Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs has brought this up, because when that strike took place, the Government took a hand and had that strike settled quickly. The Government took the matter up with the Company at Corner Brook, and settled it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—What increase of wages did you get. You are tired kidding people. We do not want that job.

MR. GRIMES—We did get some concessions. They were being charged \$1.00 a day for board, and the Company agreed not to charge more than seventy five cents. They were also provided with better hospital accommodation, and they also agreed to pay the men fortnightly instead of monthly. And then it was agreed that the Company would take up the question again when Mr. Gibb came here in the month of June.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Do you mean to tell me that it makes

any difference whether a man is paid by the fortnight or by the month.

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Grimes is sincere I really cannot think that the members of that party who are connected with the Advocate can be. I cannot get away from it. I cannot believe in the sincerity of any of that party in this particular transaction. If they are sincere, surely they can see the reasonableness of my suggestion, that we should wait for a few days until we have got the House closed, and then go out and review the situation on the spot. Can anything be more reasonable than that?

You know very well that if you want to view the situation and see the condition of the men, the best way to see them is to go where the men are, where they live and where they are getting their work. We make a suggestion of that kind, and here we have the paper representing the Fishermen's Union come in and say that where bread was asked we gave a stone. That is written for no other purpose than to make trouble. We cannot believe in the sincerity in any of the people who are behind the paper that is writing that kind of stuff to-night. I am more than anxious to see the right thing done with the men. We want to get the business of the House through, and then go out and see the conditions out there. That is what I asked for, and that is what we told the men we were prepared to do, and then your paper comes out and says that we gave a stone instead of bread. That is not sincerity.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, Aug. 4th, 1924.

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

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Neddie's Harbour in the district of St. Barbe on the subject of an allocation for repairs to a road. The petitioners ask for the sum of \$250.00 and they point out that the petition would be more largely signed were it not for the fact that many people are away from their homes at the present time pursuing their various avocations in different parts of the country. I strongly support the prayer of the petition and ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works for consideration. Meanwhile, I shall be calling on the Minister of Public Works in a day or two to discuss this matter with him.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from Rev. Mr. Tulk and others of Portugal Cove in the district of St. John's East requesting the allocation of a sum of money for the building of a branch road leading from Portugal Cove Road to the residence of one Alfred John Churchill. The petition is unusual in character in the sense that it has public as well as private support. This road is used by a considerable number of people and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates for earnest consideration.

MR. VINICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to give this petition my unqualified support. This petition is influentially signed, and as has been pointed out, this road is used to a very large extent by the people of that locality, and I sincerely trust that it will receive the sympathetic consideration of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER gave notice that he would on to-morrow

ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled: "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors."

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Disembarkation of Paupers,' was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time to-morrow.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Mines how much Government pulpwood his Department estimates remains for sale in the District of St. George's, St. Barbe, Twillingate, Bonavista and Trinity respectively and to lay upon the Table of the House copies of all tenders received for the purchase of the same, to date, as per the Minister's advertisements in the daily City Press.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—In regard to the first part of the question asking for an estimate of how much Government pulpwood remains for sale in the districts mentioned, I might say that it is almost impossible to give a correct estimate, but the nearest we can give will be put on the table of the House to-morrow; as to the second portion of the question, I do not think it would be judicious to have the contents of tenders disclosed, as tenders do not close until August 15th. However, I will consult with the Attorney General and, if he thinks it is proper to do so I will have the information tabled on to-morrow.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I can answer that now. You could not do that.

MR. SCAMMELL:—I presume that before another session of the Legis-

lature takes place that the information will be disclosed.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Yes, but not before the tenders are opened.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs when Mr. George Leonard Hutchings was appointed mail courier between Cow Head and St. Pouls; on whose recommendation was the appointment made, and what is the distance to be covered by Mr. Hutchings on each trip.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—In the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, I beg to table the information.

MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs why Mr. William Sywers was dispensed with as Mail Courier between the Horse Islands and La Scie and on whose recommendation was he so dispensed with and who recommended Mr. Walter Andrews in his place.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—In the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, I also beg to table the answer to this question.

MR. BROWN asked the Minister of Public Works if it is the intention of the Government to call for tenders for the supply of drugs to the various Government hospitals.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I beg to say in reply to that question that the matter has not yet been considered by the Board regarding the intention of the Government to call for tenders for the supply of drugs for the various Government institutions.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House: (1) Copy of Correspondence between the Government and the Newfoundland Power and

Paper Co. in reference to the Newfoundland Power and Paper Utilities Corporation, Ltd.; (2) Copy of Correspondence and copy of Agreement between the Newfoundland Power and Paper Co. and the Newfoundland Power and Paper Utilities Corporation, Ltd.; (3) Copy of Minute of Council in reference to same.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay on the table of the House copy of the correspondence that was on file, but there is no Minute of Council in reference to same.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to pay a bonus on this season's catch of codfish.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In answer to that question I beg to say that my Manifesto stated that, if necessary and compatible with the ability of the country to pay it, a bonus would be paid on fish. But occasion has not yet arisen for the Government to consider the matter further.

MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table the Railway Accounts and Balance Sheet for the past year ending June 30th, 1924.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I beg to table the information.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE — Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answer to question on the Order Paper of Aug. 1st, asked by Mr. Brown. I beg also to table answer to question relative to the lighting of Streets.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask Hon. Prime Minister if any provision has been made to handle the freight and mails of Trinity Bay which was formerly handled by S.S. Malakoff, as I have a letter here from one E. G. King, of Deer Hr., T.B., complaining that there

is no system providing for service in that place after the Malakoff is taken off.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Halfyard have that question put on the Order Paper and I will answer it to-morrow.

MR. HALFYARD—I may say, Mr. Speaker that is unnecessary as the question has already been on the Order Paper. I ask if anything has been done up to the present?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— I may say that the question is engaging the attention of the Government at the present moment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting the Game and Inland Fisheries Board" with some amendment, in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the said amendments were read a first time and it was ordered that they be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the said amendments were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been concurred in without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationary" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Speaker, with relation to that amendment it has rather altered the color of the Bill, as it rather confines the question or possibility of being King's Printer to a very small number of individuals. I would ask that the amendment be allowed to stand over until to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Colonial Secretary the said amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that the said amendments be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Confirm an Agreement with the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Amendment is not of particular importance, nor does it alter the purport of the Bill. The first is only a change of the word "Dominion" for the word "Colony." As the second alteration is equally of little importance I would ask that the Amendment be read the second time.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Mr. Speaker, before this Amendment be read a second time, I think that it would be better for us to have a definite decision as to whether we are a Dominion or whether we are still a Colony. We are looked upon as a Dominion, we are ranked by the British Government as the Youngest Dominion, and I think that we should now decide once for all as to whether we are a "Dominion" or whether we are still a "Colony." Probably the Hon. Member for Fortune Bay, the late Prime Minister will be good enough to give us some enlightenment on the matter or question.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I do not consider myself an expert on this matter, nor can I say definitely whether we are a Dominion or if we are still a Colony. It would be very interesting to find out from the Legislative Council as to whether we are a Dominion or a Colony. So far as I know we are looked upon as one of the Overseas Dominions, although in so far as I know there are no Letters Patent or any other Official Documents granting us the Statute of a Dominion.

I have often heard speakers, Newfoundlanders, at public functions refer to us as a Dominion, and I have also heard it expressed that they would rather be the Oldest Colony than the youngest Dominion. We may have some Status as the Oldest Colony, but I do not think we have much as the Youngest Dominion. We are regarded by Official Acts and State Matters as one of the Self Governing Dominions.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good suggestion to let the matter lie over until to-morrow. My personal opinion is that we are not a Dominion. Personally, I am one of those who would rather be The Oldest Colony than the Youngest Dominion. I know that in practically all cases where Canada as a Dominion gets invitations and is asked her opinion upon matters we are never thought of or referred to.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY — Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a question that should be settled now once and for all, and I would suggest that we get in touch with the Secretary of State through the Governor and get a definite decision as to our official standing.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the said amendments were read a first time and it was ordered that the said amendments be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker informed the House

that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland," in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee according to Rule 293, Rules of the House, as it is a Private Bill.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said Bill was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Select Committee for consideration.

Mr. Speaker appointed as said Committee, Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Bradley, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Warren.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time, as follows:—

Supplemental Supply . . . \$713,693.92

The said Resolutions being read a second time, it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein, and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON WAYS AND MEANS.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, before going any further, I would like to have a few words to say about the Budget and the Estimates.

In reference to a question which I asked the Prime Minister referring to

a bounty on fish, there comes back to-day a reply which practically means that there will be no bounty given on fish this season. Now, the people of this country at the present time are expecting a bounty on fish. This is a part of the Manifesto of Hon. Prime Minister, which refers to the fishing industry:

(Reads From Manifesto.)

Now that is one of the strong planks in the platform of the present Prime Minister, and that is one of the planks on which, no doubt, a great many of the people of this country cast their votes for the present Government during the last election. Now, this is a season, to my mind, when a bounty should be paid on fish, but no allowance has been made in the estimates for a bounty, and I do not see how it can very well be paid unless some arrangement is made at this session of the Legislature.

We are told that the catch in certain places is very small. In the Straits there is practically nothing, and in the upper part of the Labrador there is a very small fishery. Then, if during the months of August and September, we have stormy weather and are not able to prosecute the fishery regularly, we are going to have an immense shortage, and therefore, the people will require some addition to the price paid for their fish. They will want the bounty which was promised.

The foreign markets are not good, and it looks as if there are not going to be any large prices paid for fish in this country, as it seems the Portuguese markets are already overstocked, principally from other countries, Norway and Iceland. Practically all Spain and Italy are well stocked with fish from Iceland particularly, and the Iceland fish is made up of Labrador cure. While the price of fish now is fairly high, it looks very much as if when the markets are supplied, the price will drop, and therefore it is the

duty of the Government to carry out their promise, and to see if they cannot arrange to pay a bounty to the fishermen of this country. The fishery is our great mainstay, and the thing that we must give our greatest attention to.

Now, the Minister of Finance and Customs, in his Budget speech makes reference to Herring. He makes the reference that one of the reasons why our herring is not saleable at the present time is on account of the people getting all the herring they want elsewhere. That is not the only reason why herring is a drop on the market, and cannot be sold as freely as it was a few seasons ago. The principal reason is on account of the duty put on our herring by the United States. Not very many years ago, it was a common occurrence for one house in the United States, in New York or in Boston to place a single order for one thousand barrels of our split herring. But the United States has since put duty on our herring, and also on our codfish, and therefore the markets in the United States and Porto Rico, which is under the United States, are debarred from taking our fish, except on payment of a very heavy duty.

This is a matter which the Government should take up. I do not know what the past Government did in reference to this. I understand that some recommendation was made to the United States Government at the time when the duty was put on; but we should not stop there. It is the duty of the Government at the present time to make another effort to see if this duty cannot be removed.

Now the duty on codfish is about \$1.25 a quintal going into the United States and Porto Rico. Last year I do not know how much fish went to Porto Rico, but it was a very large quantity, over a hundred thousand quintals, on which the people of New-

foundland had to pay \$1.25 per quintal.

Now, in a Bill which was passed in this House the other day the taxes were fixed on liquors going from port to port. I presume that is a law to enable liquor to come into this country, which can be stored here on payment of a tax, and then sent to some place in the United States twelve mile limit. The United States have spent a lot of money to prevent the smuggling of liquor, and they pay the upkeep of a fleet along the coast to prevent it. Would it not be possible for the Government to make some kind of a deal with the United States, whereby, if we get free entry of fish in the United States and protectorates, we would do away with this storing of liquors. Something of that kind might be suggested, and something might be developed which would be a great benefit to this country.

The fact remains that one of our chief industries is taxed, and taxed to such an extent that a great burden is thrown on the people of Newfoundland who catch the fish, because after all, the duty paid on fish in another country has to be taken into consideration here. The \$1.25 a quintal means quite a lot of fish consigned to the United States and Porto Rico, and it also means that our markets are very much reduced, and the supply going there is very much smaller on account of the duty we have to pay.

In the Budget Speech the Minister of Finance and Customs tells us that he has reduced the duty on gasoline and flour. But the duty still remains on pork and beef and kerosene oil and molasses. He asks the people of this country to bear their burden with confidence. Well, I do not see how the people of this country are going to bear their burden with confidence. Since this Government have come into power, the price of these commodities which are used by the

fishermen, which are their main means of living, and which are the articles these people must buy, are all gone up in price.

The price of pork in our market has gone up over three dollars a barrel—three-fifty a barrel, and you have added to that three dollars duty, which makes an increase of six dollars and fifty cents per barrel on every barrel of pork that the fishermen use. Beef has gone up two and a half dollars a barrel, and you put on duty of two dollars a barrel, which makes the cost of the fishermen's beef four dollars and a half per barrel more. Their molasses has gone up about six cents a gallon, on top of which you put the duty of eight cents a gallon, which is an increase of fourteen cents a gallon to the fishermen for molasses. This is very important to the poor fishermen who are not in a position to buy sugar, and has to use molasses. Therefore, you have burdened the poor fisherman who is not in a position to buy sugar, and has to use molasses. Therefore, you have burdened the poor fishermen of this country with immense taxation. You have burdened him with terrible taxation, which the poor man is unable to pay.

And what do you tell these people? That it is illegal—that the removal of these duties was illegal. If the removal of these duties was illegal, everything else that was done was illegal. It has been done by all Governments in the past, and I would like to know who is the man who has discovered what has never been discovered in the past, though there have been lawyers associated with all parties who never discovered that it was illegal. I would like to know who this man is.

I say that you have burdened the people of this country with terrible taxation. You promised a reduction in taxation, but that reduction in tax-

ation has not been carried out. You have increased the price of pork by \$6.50 a barrel, the price of beef by \$4.50 a barrel, and molasses fourteen cents a gallon.

This is not treating the fishermen of this country very well, particularly this year, in view of the poor fishery around certain parts of the coast. I know of men in this country with traps, and these people have not caught thirty quintals for the whole summer season. How do you expect that one man, who has to divide it up among two or three more people, is going to exist through the winter on thirty quintals of fish, when you have put on taxes of two and three dollars a barrel on the necessities of life, like beef, pork and molasses.

Now this illegality in reference to duty is only a technicality, as I said before, it is no more illegal than many other things. Some one connected with the Government has found out this illegality. It is hard to say who it is.

In taking the estimates for the coming year, you have not taken into consideration the Railway, one of the greatest institutions we have in the country, and one of the most costly institutions we have in this country. I see by the Budget speech of the Minister of Finance and Customs that the loss on the Railway for a certain period was forty-six thousand dollars. That was during the period when the railway was run by a Board, of which my associate, Mr. Halfyard, was a member.

That does not show the loss on the Railway at all, because in reply to some questions which I have asked, I find out there was nearly ninety thousand dollars expended on the Railroad last year which was charged to Public Charities. It is no trouble to run any kind of concern if you can charge up all your expenses to some other account. The Public

Charities paid towards the cost of running the Railway last year ninety thousand dollars, according to information which I have received from the Colonial Secretary. How are you going to pay the loss on the railway this year if you do not make provision for it now.

Then there are the steam boats. They are all run under the Railway system. All the members of this House know that the Prospero and Portia cost about fifty thousand dollars a year over and above their earnings. That is one hundred thousand dollars. That was the subsidy which was offered to the Bowring contractors when the Bowring contract expired. Fifty thousand dollars for each of these boats. Then you have all the other boats operating around the different bays, some carrying scarcely any freight, and meeting loss every day; and then the estimates do not take into consideration the railway, which is one of the most expensive institutions that we have in the country.

When you bring those estimates down to the House of Assembly, there is no reason why you should not bring the proper estimates down. It is no use to bring down estimates now, and then have to vote additional estimates, or bring in a vote to cover certain estimates later. It is just as well to estimate the exact cost of the country, and let the public know exactly what the country is going to cost. It just means that you are going to ask the House to pass certain amounts which could have been in the estimates.

You claim that eight hundred thousand dollars have been saved on the estimates. These are the estimates of the old Government, of which the leader, Mr. Warren, the member for Fortune Bay, tells us, that when he made them up, he made a saving of \$700,000. If that is the case

this Government have really done nothing to cut down expense, nothing that I can see to make the condition of the country any better financially at the end of this year than at the end of 1924.

The fact of the matter is that the railway is not only a dead loss to us, but it is also a depleted asset—something that a lot of money has to be spent on. It is run down—out of order. New rolling stock will have to be bought, and many other things to put this in order.

The Minister of Finance and Customs tells us that the dock is useless. It has to be rebuilt. All the machinery is out of date. Everything in connection with it has to be renovated. Where is the money coming from to build the dock, to run the steamers, and to fix up this, what they call, depleted asset. I say, Mr. Chairman, we have not got it. We have not been given a proper estimate of the requirements of this country for the coming year.

Now, in addition to the railroad and the steam boats, it is very difficult for us on this side of the House to know exactly what the Government is doing. We come in here one day and hear that they are going to take the Wren off Fortune Bay and save thirty-five thousand dollars. They are going to take the Northern Labrador steamer off and save another thirty-five thousand dollars. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs estimates that we will save altogether on steam boats between one hundred and twenty-five and thirty thousand dollars. The next day we come here, and we are told that they are putting back the steamer on the Labrador service. I do not know whether it is required or not. I am not disputing that. Then they come in and tell us that they are going to put the boat back on Fortune Bay. They say it is wanted. It is very difficult for us to tell what the Government are doing

when they change their minds so often, and in such a very short time.

I understand that the "Earl of Devon" has been chartered at \$150.00 a day, and that she is being sent down North. I also understand that there are steamers belonging to the Government, lying up and doing practically nothing. If the Government has a surplus of steamers, and they want to use another, I do not see any reason why expense should be incurred in employing boats outside. Of course, these are matters which can be explained by the different Ministers, and I shall be glad to have whatever explanation they can give.

The Minister of Finance and Customs told us a few days ago that he has taken over a building down on Water Street, in which the idea is to examine express parcels at considerable cost. Now, why cannot a good deal of money be saved there. Why not examine the parcels up at the station where they come in, instead of having to cart them all the way down Water Street, when they come in by express. If you are out for economy, and out for saving money, and trying to run this country within its income, you cannot do it by doing things of that kind.

We also, on this side of the House, look upon the creation of the King's Printer, as quite an unnecessary creation. Nobody has ever told us what saving there is going to be, but I do not see how there is going to be any in the creation of a new department to make positions for two or three people; and while that department might make some very good returns, and might make some very good purchases at the beginning, still I am of the opinion that as time goes along that department will be like every other department in the Government, and it will be forgotten what the bill was brought in for, and patronage will be given in the future as in the past. The department created at a

very great expense to the country will be another burden.

That is why you have to put back the duty on the poor fishermen, and after you have done things of this kind you say to the fishermen of this country "bear this burden with confidence". It looks to me as if the fishermen will have to bear the burden a long time before they get any remedy as things are going at the present time. There are many things upon which I would like to speak. It is not much use for us to suggest anything, because we know that it will not be carried out, but anything we can suggest may perhaps fall upon the ears of some one who will consider it, and perhaps do some good. Anything that I am saying, I am saying in the interests of the country, and I would ask all those listening to it to look upon it in the same spirit.

Now, in the outports of this country we have numerous officials. We have so many officials in this country—government officials, that if they all voted the same way, they could put in any party they liked in this country. If the Government officials all voted the same way, there would be no doubt which party would be elected. In any settlement of two or three hundred inhabitants in this country, you will find the policeman, and the customs official and two or three other officials, whereas a number of them have not got half enough to do. They may put in any Government they want. If the Government means business now, why should they not have one man to do all this business in the outports. The official would not be overburdened, and the salaries which have to be paid could be saved.

At the present time the telegraph service is controlled by the Government—the Postal Telegraphs. Now, there is a Postal Telegraph service all along the railway line, and also a railway service along that line. All these things cost money to keep up,

and there is no reason in the world when the Government is controlling both the Postal Telegraph service and the railway service, why they could not do all the business with the one official.

In answer to a question which I asked the Colonial Secretary a few days ago in reference to the repairs on the Postal Telegraph line from here to Port aux Basques, the reply is that it costs seventy-seven thousand dollars per annum to repair the telegraph line—the Postal Telegraph line between here and Port aux Basques, and at the same time we have to keep up the Railway line. Very often if you go along the railway line, and go into the stations and you want to send a message by the Postal Telegraphs, you will find the Postal Telegraph office on the platform, or right across the track. Here you have the Government running the two concerns.

Also, in this country, or in a certain section of the country you are served by the Anglo American Telegraph Company. They have lines, for instance, from here to Heart's Content, and also up the southern shore, and we have the Postal Telegraph line running along the same line. There is not business enough for two companies and I have no doubt that the Anglo Company would be very glad to have the competition of the Postal Telegraphs removed, and I would not be surprised if the Anglo would not pay a bounty of some kind to do away with the competition of the Postal Telegraphs, and we would be rid of the great unnecessary expense of the Postal Telegraph lines in that section of the country which is served by the Anglo Company.

The Anglo American Telegraph Company is a good reliable Company, and I think that all the members of this House have had to do with that company have no complaints as to the way they handle their business. I know that they have been strictly con-

fidential in anything that has gone over their lines so far as I am aware.

The late Government when they made their arrangement with the Commercial Cable Company should have taken up this Postal Telegraph question, and no doubt they could have arranged with them to control the whole telegraph services throughout the country, and save for us this large and terrible expense, which we have to defray by putting the duty on the necessities of life of the fishermen of this country.

The fishery is the industry which all the members of the House say is the mainstay of the country; and if the fishery is the mainstay of the country upon which we all depend, then surely it is the industry which should be first considered, and we should do our best to reduce the taxation of the fishermen in this country.

MR. CASHIN—With reference to the telegraph line running across country to-day, was it not only a couple of years ago that the Anglo tried to make a deal with the Government, and were turned down. They then made a deal with the Commercial Cable Company, and one of the conditions which the Government of the day undertook was to keep the line between here and Port aux Basques in repair.

MR. HICKMAN—I cannot answer the hon. member as I have not studied the contract.

MR. CASHIN—I think Mr. Halfyard will be able to tell you about it. We are under contract with the Commercial Cable Company to keep that line in repair. We are keeping it up on Water Street for them.

MR. HICKMAN—I shall be glad of any information that the Hon. member can give when I am through. There are in this country at the present time hundreds of rivers, small rivers, you might almost call them

brooks, that are teeming with salmon, and in which no one ever casts a line or hook throughout the whole season. There are lots of people in the United States and Canada who would be very glad to come here and pay a substantial amount for the sole right to fish in certain rivers and brooks for salmon. There are rich people in other countries who are willing to pay as much as ten thousand dollars for the right to use part of a river for the summer season.

Men in Canada are willing to pay as high as \$10,000.00 for the fishing privileges of a season, and while I do not advocate the taking away of the rights of local sportsmen I think we could lease out our rivers and thereby bring in a very substantial revenue. With the idea of the Government as to roads and hotels I am heartily in accord, and I think that tourists brought in by these attractions will remain here. In England and Scotland if sportsmen get only one salmon a day they think that they are doing well, and are willing to pay \$10,000.00 a summer for doing it, while if they go to such resorts as Salmonier they can easily get as high as eighty salmon a day. With the incoming of tourists the country must benefit. We have many advantages to offer and it only remains for us to provide the inducements in order to reap the benefit.

I now want to say a few words as to the statement of the Hon. The Minister of Fisheries in connection with the Logging Bill. I was not in the House when he referred to that measure, but I saw a report in the paper the next morning that the bill had been brought in to defeat him in the coming bye-election in Bonavista Bay. If that were the purpose we would have divided the House on it, but instead we allowed it to go through to a select committee. The same was done in connection with the Election Act. Referring to this Act I would

like to say that every voter should be given a chance to record his vote in an election, and if the man in power is sincere in his motives he should make provision for this, so that the people the electors want will be returned to the House. There are other things I could take up, but I do not wish to delay the House and will confine my remarks to what I have already said.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the House for more than a few minutes, as I think Mr. Hickman, the leader of the opposition, has covered practically all the important points on Ways and Means, and it would be unnecessary for me to deal further with them. The Budgets for 1922-23 and 1923-24 showed a deficit according to the statement of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs. As to the cause of such deficits we must remember that in those years we were passing through trying stages, and all Governments throughout the civilized world had to report deficits, so that we were not singular in this respect. This has generally been put down to the aftermath of the war. Therefore I would like to deal with the present and the future. The reference of the Minister of Finance to what he terms extravagance in connection with the repairs of public buildings is not justified. Similar statements have been made by every incoming Government, but I would like to state that the vote for the repairs of public buildings has never been sufficient, and an overdraft has always been voted in Supplemental Supply. It would only be a penny wise and pound foolish policy not to have these buildings repaired.

It was also stated that there would be a saving on the transportation system to which Mr. Hickman has already referred. The Government during the short time that they have been in

power have failed to bring into being the promised reforms. The Minister of Posts a week or two since stated there would be a large saving in steam subsidies. The "Sebastopol" was to be cut out. It was generally thought when this was done there would be a great saving. The "George L." can possibly give Bay of Islands a satisfactory service; but the Bonne Bay service is anything but satisfactory. I know from experience that last September no mail was received there for 10 days, and that passengers delayed there had to go over the Deer Lake Road to connect with the railway for St. John's, otherwise they would have to wait for a week for the S.S. Home. This service is not a luxury, but a necessity, and the boat which has been taken off to be put on another service will cost as much as if continued on the Bay of Islands-Bonne Bay route.

In any case we are faced with the Sebastopol being put on the St. Mary's-Fortune Bay service at a cost of \$5,000 per month, while the "Wren" which cost less is taken off her route and sent on Northern Labrador, which, in my opinion, is an unnecessary expense. I thought from earlier pronouncements that that service was to be done without. But now I find it is to be repeated at an increased cost. To cap the climax, it is said the "Malakoff" is to be taken off Trinity Bay. I say without fear of truthful contradiction that this will cost the country thousands of dollars extra. There will be the cost of repairing the wharf at Port Blandford, about \$10,000.00, and her earnings on Trinity Bay with Port Union as headquarters will be lost entirely. That means some thousands of dollars more. It is a most outrageous transaction. If the change was made with the idea of saving some thousands of dollars with the plea of poverty, there might be some excuse, but the contrary is the result.

The Prime Minister has had to admit in reply to my questions, that the business men and others of Trinity District are asking him what he intends to do in giving them a steamer or some means for the transportation of freight, passengers and mail? Trinity District being in opposition must be treated in this unheard of outrageous fashion, to satisfy the political animosity of certain individuals. You have no conception of the value of the services of a steamer to dozen of places in Trinity District. To dispel some of your apparent studied ignorance I will name a few places that are depending absolutely on the Malakoff for freight and passage service. On the South Side of the District, New Perlican, Winterton, Hant's Harbor, New Chelsea, New Melbourne, Brownsdale, Sibley's Cove, Whales Brook, Torquay and Lead Cove. Across from Heart's Content, St. Jones Without, Gooseberry Cove. Then you enter S. W. Arm, Southport, Little Heart's Ease, Caplin Cove, Hodge's Cove, Long Beach, Island Cove (even Queen's Cove and Hillview are three miles from Northern Bight Station on the railway), Hatchet Cove, St. Jones Within and Loreburn. In Random Sound you have Hickman's Harbor, Lady Cove, Foster's Point, and Elliott's Cove. Across the Sound from Elliott's Cove you have Inglewood, Adeyton and Deep Bight. Deer Harbor, Ireland's Eye, Thoroughfare and Ivanhoe absolutely isolated. Also Old and New Bonaventure, British Harbor, Pope's Harbor and Little Harbor. Further up the Sound you have Britannia, Petley and other smaller places on Random Island. Across from Random Island you have Burgoyne's Cove, Clifton, Monroe and White Rock. These are some of the places that depend upon a steamer for freight and passenger service, and in some cases for their mails.

What are you going to do about it? Is it a square deal to deprive these

people of their just rights to satisfy a few political malcontents or partisan political sycophants?

It was stated by the Prime Minister that Port Union had all the facilities necessary to get freight from St. John's. That the train went there three times a week.

Port Union is the distributing centre for the Fishermen's Union Trading Company, and what is the good to get goods in if there is no means to send them out to the Branch Stores in Bonavista and Trinity Bays. No business firm at Catalina or Port Union can depend upon the Susu or Prospero to take freight from them on their trips north. These steamers are filled to the hatches with freight for places north of Port Union when they leave St. John's. Therefore the Malakoff was the only means to send freight north.

It is terrible to contemplate that any Government could be so blinded to a sense of justice and common decency to be guilty of such a crime to the country, by loss of revenue, and to such a patriotic and revenue producing constituency as Trinity, which has few peers and no superior in the Island of Newfoundland.

Captain Winsor, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, stated in the course of his remarks a day or two since, that he had been delayed on a certain occasion at Port Union for four or five days waiting for the Malakoff. I would remind the Honourable Member and this House, that there will be delays, and no steamer can keep schedule time, whether their headquarters are at Port Blandford or Port Union, or any other place. Through stress of weather, boats are sure to be delayed, and I have heard it stated that the S.S. Dundee when she operated the service from Port Blandford, that passengers were delayed a week at a time waiting for the boat. Further, I may say while

the S.S. Dundee operated on Bonavista Bay she made several trips around the Bay and never had occasion to remove her hatches; in fact she didn't have a package of freight to handle. I fail to see why conditions re increased freight on that Bay are any different to-day.

Therefore in the matter of expenditure for the ensuing year, during the short term of the present Government they have done nothing to decrease expenditure, they have done everything with regard to steamer transportation to increase it. The fact cannot be contradicted.

The Minister of Finance in the present Budget Speech stated that any shortage in the revenue as estimated would be met by enforced economy in some of the public services. I trust that his colleagues will support him in that respect. I fear that he has had no support during the last three weeks, because no economy has been enforced in any of the public services that I know anything about. He hopes to cut expenditure down to an irreducible minimum. I hope he shall. His intentions may be good. He has started in to try to do his best under the circumstances. He has a hard road to travel. He will want united support not only from the members of the executive, but all the members of the Government.

I know from experience what it is to try to reduce expenditure and live within our income. No one man in a Government can do it. There is not a Finance Minister that can do it. If he does, life would not be worth living. I don't envy any Finance Minister the job who starts out to clean up and cut down expenditure, and try to balance his books at the end of the fiscal year. You want a strong man to do that and he must be supported by the members of the Government, rank and file. He hopes to eliminate every item of expenditure that can be done without. All public

luxuries must go. Well, we were criticised and we were misrepresented and it is not too much to say, libelled and abused, because we did not reduce expenditure according to their expressed views when we had charge of the Government. We were told then by men who professed friendship and our political opponents that the country could not exist. The business of the country could not be carried on unless the expenditure was reduced about two millions, and unless taxation was reduced by 30 p.c. We did reduce expenditure by about two million dollars during the last two years. We were told the Civil Servants were paid too much. They were far too numerous and getting paid too much. The backbone of the country, the fishermen, produced 80 p.c. of the revenue, and they had decided not to catch fish unless the Government showed determination to cut down expenditure. We were told by some members of the present Government to begin with ourselves and reduce our own salaries. Well now the Government, with some of these very same men, is brave enough and bold enough to say that the civil servants should not suffer any reduction in their voted salaries and have repealed the Civil Servants Reduction Act, and now they are to get their full salaries. And the heads of the Departments whose salaries were reduced because of the reports that they were making fortunes, where they got \$3200 they are now getting \$4000. An \$800 increase, to the heads of the Departments. And these are the people that were going to reduce expenditure. They were going to begin with themselves and show an example to others who were getting smaller salaries.

It was easy for you, for political purposes, to criticise when you were onlookers, and say what you would do if you had power. When you get power you find out that you can

do little worse than the fellows that went before you. You said that salaries would be reduced, but you have increased them.

You were going to reduce taxation. What have you done? Right the opposite, you have placed duties on molasses, kerosene, pork, and beef. Items that are used principally by the fishermen and laboring classes of the country. What a record for any Government for the short space of two months. The fishermen and working classes of this country can truthfully say "we asked you for bread and you gave us a stone." You can be defeated now on your policy and actions of just a few weeks.

Mr. Hickman, leader of the Opposition, referred to the cost of the telegraph system, and thought that some arrangement should be made with the Anglo American Telegraph Company whereby the services would not be duplicated. Mr. Hickman did not refer to the services between St. John's and Port aux Basques. What he had in mind was the service between here and the Southern Shore, and around to Harbor Grace. Of course that is the only service from Port aux Basques around to Burgeo. The service is competitive between St. John's and Harbor Grace. I think that is what he had in mind. Of course the A.A.T. Co. are compelled to keep the service going according to agreement entered into some years ago. If they discontinued the service they would be liable for breach of contract. They would be glad to get clear of the local business because they have several offices that do not pay. The cost to maintain the service is greater than their earnings. They are under contract and must keep it going. I believe they are willing to pay the Government a certain amount of money to get clear of what they consider a liability.

Now of course I should be expected to say something about the railway.

We are very pleased to find that in the operation of the railway for the last year, for 10 months according to the budget speech, we have come out with a small loss of \$46,848.23. Last year \$400,000 was voted for the operation of the railroad and we were told it would cost a million. Those who made these statements had reason to think the railway would never be run for a year at such a small cost. But owing to the Humber which has given increased freight and passenger earnings the income from the railway is beyond our most sanguine expectations. I trust that you will be able to report the same conditions next year.

With regard to the personal of the Commission of last year, I may say that the Commission was appointed and met with the approval of the whole House. The idea originated with the opposition. The point was that the railway was one of the biggest spending departments of the Government, and that there should be some one in this House to report and answer questions concerning the railway while the House was in session. I happened to be Colonial Secretary at the time. And the railway was always under the Colonial Secretary's Department. The first commissioners were the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Berteau and Mr. Hall. Mr. Berteau had the management of the finance. Mr. Hall, the Government engineer, was supposed to have a better knowledge of the railway than any one else. But Halfyard, Hall and Berteau were not accepted by the opposition last year. And the reasons given were these. I quote now from the Hansard of last year; Mr. Higgins, the then leader of the opposition, said:

"I had hoped that the Government would have lifted this railway matter clear of the realm of politics. It is practically a repetition of the old story, etc. The railway is going to

be made a political machine, I care not how honest the intentions of the Prime Minister are. It is a pity that an outside commission, so constructed as to be non-partizan are not taking hold of the matter."

That was Mr. Higgins' opinion just 12 months ago when he was in the Opposition. It would be interesting to know what his opinion is now as Minister of Justice. Mr. Higgins in the Opposition thought that a commission outside party politics should be appointed so that there would not be any shadow of suspicion as to any partisanship. Mr. Sullivan, the member for Placentia and St. Mary's, was more pronounced and was very much excited over the personnel of the commission. In fact we had to adjourn the House to give Mr. Sullivan an opportunity to air his grievances before his colleagues. But referring to the Hansard we find Mr. Sullivan saying:

"Why do you not appoint a Commission from members on both sides of the House. We, as Opposition members, want to get a fair show. We do not anticipate getting a square deal. I, for one, strongly object to the railway being made a party machine."

Well these are the opinions of the Opposition of that day. I am not questioning their sincerity one way or the other. Mr. Sullivan further said: "I am not going to stand for the make-up of this partisan railway commission. I am not prepared to let anything else go through the House."

Mr. Chairman, I am not finding fault with the new commission. They, of course, won't do anything of a partisan political nature, it would be unkind to suggest such a thing. Their actions since becoming members of the Government will not give color to such suspicions. The commission of last year, Hon. Geo. Shea, Hon. Tasker Cook and myself, met with the approval of the whole House. We knew very little about running a railway, no person expected us to know

how to manage a railway. We didn't even know when the express went out or when she came in. Apparently from the remarks made by Mr. Cashin, the member for Ferryland, that is one of the qualifications for a railway commissioner. We thought there was someone there to tell the people that. It was not our business. There was one thing we tried to do and that was to keep it outside the realm of politics. This we succeeded in doing. There was no discrimination. I defy contradiction from any one in the House. Be fair now Mr. Finance Minister. Do not draw a red herring across the trail. I am talking facts that cannot be contradicted. It is unfair to Mr. Russell, the Manager of the Railway, to say that he would be a party to anything unjust.

Mr. Chairman, I have the floor if you please. If the Finance Minister has anything to say, he will be given an opportunity to reply. This matter should not cause any heated argument. I am not saying anything for anyone to get excited over, for we tried to keep the management of the railway outside of party politics. I think we succeeded. The Government got no more concessions than the Opposition. Reference has been made to the expenditure of money on improvement to the track last year. The money was spent principally for relief purposes. The District of Placentia and St. Mary's got as many men at work in connection with the railway as any other part of the island. I daresay Trinity District got the most. But one reason why Trinity had more men employed on the railway, was because she had six or seven times as many people out of employment. They were satisfied to work for two dollars a day. Whereas the men from some other districts were not satisfied to work for two dollars. The men from Trinity district held on to the work. There was nothing else for them to

do. Placentia and St. Mary's district received special treatment with regard to work on the railroad. And I think two or three weeks after the work commenced, not a man in Placentia and St. Mary's who applied to Mr. Sullivan for work but got work. The Executive Government also made a special vote of \$10,000 for railroad work for Placentia and St. Mary's alone.

The Daily News which I understand is the mouthpiece of the Government, made a wonderful splurge over the appointment of the new commission. These patriots and saviours of their country were going to save all kinds of money. They were going to work for nothing. I am getting suspicious of people when they say they are going to work for nothing. I have heard of a Prime Minister who took no salary, but he took a cheque for expenses. When the bill for expenses comes in, the salary in comparison may look pretty small. I know the most of the Railway Commissioners fairly well.

They have knowledge no doubt of a certain line of business, selling goods, buying fish or coal, etc. But what knowledge they have of running the railway any more than Hon. Tasker Cook, or Hon. Geo. Shea. I don't know. And they are going to work without a salary. The fact of the matter is that the members of the Commission being members of the House of Assembly, two of them at least could only accept a salary for six months when they expect to be there for years with the pull and prestige of such a position. That is the reason they are not accepting any salaries. They will come under the Disabilities Act. The Railway Commissioners have a very responsible work to do whether they know anything about the running of a railway or not. As stated here last year, it is the biggest spending department

of the Government. One heavy item is the purchasing of sixty or seventy thousand tons of coal, and the purchasing of that coal, the price paid for that coal and the quality may mean a saving to this country or a great loss. And I trust that the Railway Commissioners will give the matter every consideration before they enter into contracts for the supply of coal for the railway next year. Two of the Railway Commissioners have agencies from American coal companies. That is freely stated. Therefore I conclude that the general public concludes that these men are not on the Railway Commission for the good of their health. I am not finding fault with them for having a coal agency. Not at all. But Mr. Chairman we have men interested in supplying coal to the railway who are commissioners on the railway. That is a fact that cannot be disputed. I am not finding fault, but the propriety of having such men on the Railway Commission may be seriously questioned. Last year Mr. Higgins, the representative of St. John's East, said, with all due respect to the Colonial Secretary, the work of his Department was quite enough for him without adding the job of railway commissioner on to it. It was very kind of him to say that. I however might say the same thing with regard to the Prime Minister. Mr. Monroe, besides being the Prime Minister of the Colony, is also the Minister of Education. He is also now a commissioner of the railway. And what time the Prime Minister can give to railway matters I really do not know. This year the commission appointed for the railway is made up of members of the Government. All from one side of the House. I trust it is not a case of party politics, and that the patronage and appointments of officials will be left at the discretion of the manager and his assistants, as last year.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—They were all from one side last year.

MR. HALFYARD—The House adjourned and the matter was taken up with you by the Prime Minister, Mr. Warren, and I think you came back with Hon. Tasker Cook as your nominee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—He was a Government nominee.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Sullivan says he saved the country sixty thousand dollars. We will let that go for the present. Do you not think Mr. Chairman, that the railway management could learn something from experience. If it could not it is a lot more stupid than we think it is. Captain Randell told me more about coal and the price of coal than ever I knew before. That was because he was in a position to know. And, Mr. Chairman, do you think that Mr. Russell was fool enough to give the Besco what it wanted before he found out what he could get coal for from other companies. The price of coal is not the same this year as last. I think that the company can get coal cheaper this year than last. However, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sullivan has shown that he is very much interested in the coal business. He was very much interested last year. He is now a Railway Commissioner and that railway has to buy sixty thousand tons of coal and Mr. Sullivan, the honourable commissioner, will surely say to the Manager, Mr. Russell, I do not want to secure an order for coal. Oh no! Mr. Sullivan is not made that way. Go and buy your coal from somebody else. That is what certain people will do? Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will have to wait till next year to find out what this wonderful Commission will do, where they will buy their coal. We will then have an experience of the self-sacrificing patriotic Railway Com-

mission. The Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's was absent when I quoted from the Hansard what he said last year on the personnel of the Railway Commission. I will read it again for his edification.

Mr. Halfyard reads extract from Mr. Sullivan's speech of last year.

I want to show this House the consistency of some of the hon. members. It seems that nothing can be done or proposed from this side of the House without the taunt being thrown across that it was done for some sinister motive. Last year we were on the other side. There could not be a railway commission appointed from the Government ranks without it being of a political partisan nature. Last year, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sullivan was so aroused as to rise in his place, in this House and say "that nothing so discriminating, nothing so partisan, nothing of such a nature as a commission from one side of the House should be tolerated, and he for one wouldn't stand for it."

I trust when this debate on the matter of coal is over that Mr. Sullivan will be kind enough to give the same treatment to my constituents as I did to his, and I will be satisfied.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that during the course of my remarks some of the hon. members signified their intentions of giving some interesting explanations. I shall be very glad if anything in my remarks will cause them to say anything illuminating on this matter of coal. I will not weary the House further, and I trust that the Railway Commission will have acted in such a way that the showing of the railway next year will be as good as it was or as good as it will be at the end of June this year. In fact, I am surprised that the loss was so small. I could not have thought that the Railway would have been practically self-supporting. That is good encouragement for the Govern-

ment, because this country could not continue this railway as a business concern if they had to pay a million or more dollars for its deficit every year. The country could not very well do without the railway and very fortunately for us that industry was started at the Humber and has changed the whole situation. If this industry had not started and thereby increased the earning power of our railway I really do not know what we should have done. It has given practically three quarters of a million dollars to the railway besides the millions of dollars the country has benefited otherwise. In spite of the hardships that some laborers endure, the Humber industry is a Godsend and the greatest blessing ever the country received. After all every new industry has its drawbacks and difficulties with regard to labor conditions. These conditions will improve with time. With regard to the labour troubles I trust that these will be adjusted, and that Capital and Labor will work harmoniously together.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, since there are certain other gentlemen on this side of the House who may have some personal explanations to make, I would like to say shortly that I am not a coal contractor. For that reason I have no personal explanation to make. I would like to say a few words with regard to the general tenor of Mr. Halfyard's remarks. I may say firstly that I approve of the manner in which he approached his standpoint in this matter, especially in the concluding portion of his remarks, on the industry on the West Coast, and the effect it had on changing the condition of the railway as to its earnings. He also very properly said that he hoped that the recent troubles would be settled soon and good results come out of an apparently disagreeable situation. I however want to repeat the statement

which I made from the other side of the House last year. We have to view this matter according to circumstances. Last year the railway had been taken over on the spur of the moment—after a couple of years had been spent experimenting on it. A commission of control was appointed. The Prime Minister of the day said that he had undertaken to settle the Reid situation. I repeat that that settlement was a dear thing for this Colony. It has proved that, and what I fear is that it will get dearer as the years go on. The Reids got clear of all their obligations. I use the same offensive term now that I used last year: The Reids put it all over the Government of the day. They got clear of all their obligations and got two millions of dollars for a broken down railway. It is going to cost a fine amount to put it in first class running order. The Leader of the Government of that day said that the Government's taking over of the railway was only temporary, and that he had been communicating with an English concern to take over the railway. Anyhow since the Government has taken over the railway temporarily it was proposed to appoint a commission to run the railway until arrangements were finalized with the concern referred to. A commission was appointed and the members were Mr. Halfyard, the then Colonial Secretary, Mr. Hall, the Government Engineer, and Mr. Berteau, the Auditor General. I repeat now what I said, that if ever there was a "one man commission" that was one. The idea of two civil servants forcing their views on Mr. Halfyard, their boss, is too foolish to talk about. The whole thing was a joke. Fortunately at the time the matter was intended to be a joke. It could not be seriously contemplated. If a man suggested to me that the railway would not be run according to Mr. Halfyard's ideas I would be surprised. It

would be his railway. It was a nice little scheme. Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Hall and Mr. Berteau. Mr. Halfyard was the Government man, because he was the most inoffensive man to present. His name was sufficient. Everyone knows Mr. Halfyard. There would be no trouble. Mr. Halfyard knows himself that it would have been a joke. What happened? Mr. Sullivan and myself were the only members of the Opposition present on our side of the House that night, and as the member for Trinity states we threatened to hold up the Estimates. We would hold them up until a commission was appointed that was not partisan. What was the result? The late Prime Minister will confirm what I say. He came to me and Mr. Sullivan's name was mentioned. The reason we wanted him on the commission was because he was a competent man. There was no other reason. We had no one else to go on the commission. The Prime Minister told me the next day that some followers of the Government would not have Mr. Sullivan because of the way he had criticized them the night previous.

There was no question of his competence. What happened afterwards? The Government came along afterwards and said that they would appoint a commission consisting of Mr. Halfyard, the Colonial Secretary, Mr. Shea, and His Honor Mayor Cook. They thought that the appointment of Mayor Cook would give it a less partisan color, because Mayor Cook was a friend of those on our side. I may say right here and now that I am not aware so far as I am concerned that Mayor Cook was even the least interested in party politics. Not in any way. However, the Commission was an improvement on the one consisting of the two civil servants of the Government and we let it go at that. There is now, one other point I want to make. We are now in a totally dif-

ferent position with regard to the operations of the railroad. I want to say right now that I do not believe in Government ownership at all. The quicker the Government can get clear of the railway the better I will be pleased. The changed situation has not altered my views. Any success that has been the lot of the railway for this year could not do that. There has been a lot of freight pass over the road for the past few months. But what is the condition of the railway now. What is the condition of the road bed? We will be called upon to pay through the nose to put that bed in a good condition or I am very much mistaken. So far as I am concerned I would almost give the railway to some contractor if he would take it over and run it. My views have not changed from what they were when I sat opposite. I still do not believe in Government control. The Prime Minister at the time of the taking over of the railway said that there were negotiations going on with somebody to take over the railway. I do not believe that these negotiations ever had any foundation in fact.

I may say with respect to the present Prime Minister that we have not received any serious suggestion from anybody for the taking over of the railway. I think that the whole thing was a dream. A dream of the gentleman who was then the leader of the House. We took away the railway and paid two million dollars for it and nothing was heard of the millions for counter claims which it was alleged we had against the Reids and now we have got to keep this railway going especially since the big industries were started on the Humber and elsewhere. Now to-day the Government has got to carry the responsibility for the railway and it is no place for an outsider on the Commission. We are in a totally different position. My stand is that if a Government intended to con-

tinue the railway as a Government business then it should create a Minister of Railways and have him devote his time wholly to his department. I do not believe that any man, or number of men for that matter can run an enterprise so great as the railway without devoting all his or their time to it. It has managed to get along largely because of a pretty good staff of management, of course. A pretty highly paid staff I may say. Some gentlemen up there are pretty highly paid for their work. It is up to the new commission to find out just how far the railway can possibly be run cheaper with regard to the matter of salaries. It is not for me to say just what can be done in this direction. And with regard to the present commission I think that we have been able to hand out a much better Commission than the old one, I say this is not in any way disparagingly to the ex-Colonial Secretary, the Hon. member for Trinity. The members of the present commission have been experienced in this kind of work. I am not casting any reflection on the old commission or on any of the men of which it was made up. There is I may submit a marked improvement in the Commission. However, I think that some of the members on this side have a few remarks to make in reply to the hon. member for Trinity and I will not delay the House further.

HON MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few things in reply to the hon. member for Trinity as he has been pleased to mention my name here this evening in connection with matters. The hon. member made some remarks about my looking for the contract to supply coal to the Government railway during the regime of the Railway Commission appointed by the late Government. Now I have here a copy of the Advocate of July 25th, which refers to the newly appointed Railway Commission. It is

headed Honorary but Remunerative Appointments.

(Mr. Sullivan reads the article from the Advocate).

Well, gentlemen, what did really happen? Did the late Commission make any attempt to find out in the coal markets of the world what they could get coal for? No, they did not, because the crowd who comprised that Commission were either too indifferent, too careless or too incapable, and I am afraid that they were all three. Their policy seemed to be in keeping with the policy of the Government of that day. They simply took the attitude of letting her drift and paying any price for coal that they were asked to pay. They did not call for tenders or find out where they could get coal the cheapest; they were prepared to swallow whatever the Besco people were prepared to offer them. On one occasion I found out that a cargo of coal was required at the opening of navigation for Humbermouth and Argentia, and I rang up the Commission stating that, provided my price was right, I expected to get fair play. But I did not get fair play, neither did I sell a ton of coal to the Railway Commission. Is that a strange thing, I wonder, for Mr. Halfyard to know? Still he gets up here and says that I sold coal while he, a member of the Railway Commission, was incapable and indifferent of what was going on. I was the Agent here for the firm of Evans and Reid of Newcastle on Tyne, and Mr. Lindstrom, the Business Manager of that firm, was here last year and he called on Mr. Russell, General Manager of the Railway. Mr. Lindstrom pointed out that he had good steam coal to sell and he asked for an opportunity to tender. When I was in England last winter there was a cargo of coal afloat that had been sold to a firm in New Brunswick and which firm had gone into insolvency. Now if that Commission that we had here then had had

their eyes open, they would have bought that coal for \$4 per ton c.i.f., but they were too indifferent. In March last Messrs. Evans and Reid cabled the Newfoundland Government offering coal at 31s. 6d., c.i.f. At that time, bear in mind, the Commission here were paying \$7.50 per ton c.i.f. Here was a concern offering coal cheaper and the Railway Commission decided to give them a trial cargo and that was all I had to do with that transaction. But I realized that we were not buying coal in the right place and I was not afraid to cable Philadelphia, Virginia and Pennsylvania, because I found out that the Armstrong-Whitworth people had bought their coal considerably cheaper in the United States than it could be bought in Sydney. When I was convinced that it was not possible to get coal from Newcastle at a price to compete with the Dominion Coal Company I went elsewhere. I might say what really happened last year was that the Dominion Coal Company sold the Railway Commission practically all their requirements of coal at \$7.50 c.i.f. I want the House to bear the figures that I am going to mention in mind. In 1922 and 1923 the Railway Commission paid \$7.50 per ton c.i.f. for run of mine coal. In February of this year the Railway Commission bought a cargo of coal c.i.f. from the Besco Company at \$7.40 per ton c.i.f. Do you think, sir, that if I had not competed this year and if Cashin and Company had not competed that the coal sold by the Besco this year would have been sold by them at \$7.40 per ton c.i.f. or 10 cents per ton less than last year? I can produce the documentary evidence to show what happened. I have a letter from Mr. McMaster, the Sales Agent for the Besco people, quoting me certain prices. Coal was sold in February, 1924 to the Railway by the Besco Company at \$7.40 c.i.f. In the early part of March I cabled firms in

Philadelphia, West Virginia and New York, people whom I had been dealing with during the war, and the price I received from them was \$1.00 per ton cheaper than the Besco people were prepared to sell at. Is not this a curious thing, that when I cabled those American firms in the early part of March, a broker walked into my office on Water Street two days after saying that he had a message from the Head Office of the Dominion Coal Co. in Montreal, and that they wanted to know who I was purchasing forty thousand tons of coal for in the United States. I replied that it was none of their business and that I was purchasing coal for clients of mine who were carrying on a large business in this country. This is how I discovered to purchase coal cheap and this is how I discovered to save \$60,000.00 for the taxpayers of Newfoundland. I said to the Broker that I would give the Besco a chance to quote a figure. I cabled them and I received an answer saying that they would deliver forty thousand tons of coal in any port in Newfoundland at \$7.50 for run of mine coal and \$8.00 for screened coal. I cabled them back that their price was too high and that there would be no business for them at that price. They cabled me back advising me to hold back until their, Mr. McMasters arrived here, as he was then en route. He arrived and offered \$7.50 for run of mine and \$7.65 for screened coal c.i.f. This was the Dominion Coal Co's quotation on the 27th or 28th day of March last on a forty thousand ton order, which was no small order either. It is needless to point out that I did not give them the order because I got coal cheaper afterwards in America. But later I was told by Mr. McMasters that he was prepared to quote at a considerably cheaper price and that Mr. Wolvin had told him to get the order at any price. If I had known that at first I would have quoted as low as

\$5.00 and they would have come down to that price. But some 48 hours after the 27th or 28th of March Mr. McMasters, after spending several days here waiting and smelling around found out what my quotation was and put in the tender to the Railway at \$6.50 c.i.f. I do not know where the leak was but I intend to find out. But we made him come down in the price. He would not have done it were it not for our competition. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, have I not got a right to do a legitimate business in this country? I am not asking for any favors. I am going to ask Mr. Halfyard presently for the information of the House why he gave the Besco people the order at all. I know myself why he gave it and he and the other men who comprised that Commission ought to be ashamed of themselves.

MR. HALFYARD:—I would like for the hon. member to take that back. I am not going to tolerate such language without a protest.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN:—I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the men who comprised that Commission ought to be ashamed of themselves over the way that contract was given to the Besco people. Why during the last three years that Company has cruified the people of Newfoundland. It is true that they paid a paltry export tax on ore; for a certain period but if they did, they got it back a hundred fold by overcharging us \$1.00 a ton on every ton of coal that they sold us. Those who comprised the first Railway Commission were bad enough, but the last one was the worst. Now I want to let the people of this country see if I have done anything that I should be ashamed of. In 1923 the Dominion Company sold the Railway Commission coal at \$7.50 per ton and in February 1924 they sold it at \$7.40 when the railway could have got it, better coal too, at \$6.40. We were prepared to supply this cheaper coal, which contained less

slack, more volatile matter, less ash and less sulphur. In April last Messrs. Evans & Linkstrom, Ltd., sold a cargo of coal when coal was a high price in England at \$7.20. What compliment was it for a firm that I represented to sell the Railway 3,000 tons at that figure I ask? I did not sell it personally though. In April also Messrs. Cashin and Company sold a cargo at the same price. In March, 1924, M. S. Sullivan quoted on 40,000 tons of American coal at \$6.40 c.i.f. That was the lowest price put in up to that time. I never altered my tender. I never got a chance to do that. That was one of the things allowed to be done under the late administration. Now I am going to cite a case where the price was altered. On March 31st last Messrs. Cashin and Company and myself both quoted at \$6.40 per ton on different grades of coal, and on April 2nd, after this man McMaster had smelled around and found out what our tenders were he quoted at \$6.50. My price was in a week before at \$6.40, American funds, and which was equal to \$6.55. Furthermore, it must be remembered that Cashin and Company and myself were instrumental in bringing down the price, because if we did not tender the Railway Commission would have paid the Besco people the same price probably as they paid them the year before. Now I would like to ask Mr. Halfyard why he did not give me a share of that large order, under the circumstances? Was there anything wrong about it? When I put in my tender Mr. Russell remarked that it was an exceptionally low price. In fact he said he never dreamt that he could get coal as low, and he said that on our quotation there would be a saving of \$15,000 a year on 60,000 tons of coal. Still, Mr. Halfyard gets up and tells us that they would not buy from my people.

MR. HALFYARD—We knew where

to get the best quality of coal.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—You knew you had a steamer on charter alright too.

MR. HALFYARD—That is incorrect.

MON. MR. SULLIVAN—It is not incorrect. I did not deserve to be written up in that way in the editorial of the Advocate. Was it done because I am a member of the Government? I do not want any favors from anybody. All I want is a square deal. But this assurance I am prepared to give to the honourable gentleman opposite, that no Company I am interested in will receive any favorable consideration from me as a member of the present Railway Commission unless their tenders are such as to warrant such consideration. Now that man who came down here for the Besco people was determined to beat any man competing against him. To show you how they are watching things they sent a Broker, W. B. Fraser, into my office 48 hours after I had cabled to the United States to get coal prices. If the latest Commission had done their duty and had realized that coal could be bought here so much cheaper than they were in the habit of paying for it the past few years, they would have made the Besco people give them a refund. When I found out that the Besco tender was \$6.50 I immediately rang up every coal merchant of this town and acquainted them of it so that every man who imports coal could get the benefit of the reduced price and incidentally every householder as well. I also informed the Armstrong Whitworth people what this man was down for at the time. This Besco Company made so much off us of late years that they were prepared this time to sell at a sacrifice. But the late Railway Commission never called for tenders in the proper way, just as tenders were not

called for in the proper way for the Normal School. That should make an interesting story I imagine, and I think that Mr. Halfyard would be the best to tell it, namely, what happened when the tenders were opened; was the man who got the contract thousands of dollars above others; will he tell what gentleman was ten thousand dollars out in his additions, and various other questionable matters in connection with that historic building? I have to again repeat that I think that the remarks in the Advocate about me were uncalled for. So far as I am concerned, I have always tried to play the game of politics fairly, and I do not think that I have been personally objectionable in this House, and all I expect in the business of the country in which I am concerned is that my tenders will be received and considered on their merits.

THE HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to take back the statement that I made to the effect that Mr. Halfyard sent the S.S. Kyle off without giving Messrs. Long and Lake a passage to Burin. I find out now that it was Sir Wm. Coaker who sent the Kyle off.

THE HON. J. J. LONG—Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that I am more or less interested in that Kyle movement, and I should therefore like to say a few words. I suppose I shall be told that as I am a junior member I have no right to ask questions or reply to anyone. Mr. Hibbs offered me fatherly advice a few days ago, but I say right here now that from neither Mr. Hibbs nor from Mr. Halfyard do I propose to accept advice. So long as I have a breath in my body and am in this House I shall express my opinions, that is what the people of Burin sent me here for. If I were in the place of those members whom I have referred to I would be ashamed to say anything considering past records when Hon. members were in power.

Mr. Halfyard has not yet explained why it was that Mr. Lake and I were not allowed passage on the S.S. Kyle last spring to Burin. Now with regard to contracts for coal, you have not yet explained either why Morey and Co. did not get the contract to supply coal to the Public Institutions when his tender was lower than any others, and the coal was of a better quality. Mr. Halfyard was a member of the Railway Commission and how did he act in that capacity as regards coal tenders? The Hon. gentleman was not slow in accepting \$1000.00 for work which he did not exactly perform.

Now with regard to a 10 per cent. cut on Civil servants, why if when you were in office you had paid the salaries that their work was worth, and had put less in your own pockets the Civil Service would have been better, and now you may have some room to talk in the way you are doing. I would here warn Mr. Hibbs that he had better be careful as his record has to be read to the country in a short while.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Puddister gave notice of question.

Mr. Grimes gave notice of question.

The Minister of Agriculture and Mines gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to repeal Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Agriculture," and the Acts in amendment thereto.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to read to the House a message which I received from Mr. Browne, the Member for the West End. He was on his way across country and I got in touch with him and asked him to stop off at Corner Brook and make an investigation relative to the strike there. This is the reply which I received from him:—

“At your request visited plant this morning, interviewed management, Butler and several men. Strike alleged to result from dissatisfaction on coal boat when 100 labourers were pushed harder than usual, as many cars waiting to be filled; also Bishop’s agent, without consulting Butler, took some 30 carpenters as labourers on booms for 30 cents per hour. Men at town site and plant have no grievance and were forced to quit. Company took the attitude that 25 cents was basic rate, and if increase were granted all other men would demand similar treatment. Prince suggested ballot, those not voting to be counted against strike. Only eight hundred voted out of 2,700—284 favouring continuance of strike. All men returned to work this morning. None penalized. About 400 left for northern districts during the week. Others coming in and company expects that all work will be in full swing in couple of days. No damage done.”

BROWNE.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 5th, 1924.

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

Mr. Hickman gave notice of question.

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that with the unanimous consent of the House he would presently ask leave to introduce a Bill “An Act to amend 68, Consolidated Statutes, 1916, entitled “Of the Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors.”

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled “Of the Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors,” was introduced and read a first time and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill “An Act to Amend 3 Geo. V., Cap. 14 entitled “An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador.”

Hon. the Minister of Finance gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill “An Act to amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled “Of the Departments of Finance and Customs.”

MR. HICKMAN:—I would like to ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary, without putting my question in the form of a formal question, why the schedule of the trains running down in Bay-de-Verde district has been changed?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I have no knowledge of any change. If Mr. Hickman would give me any information he has, I would be glad to inquire into the matter. When was the change made?

MR. HICKMAN:—I have received many complaints from friends of mine down there that the trains are arriving late in the morning, at three and four o’clock in the morning, instead of arriving on schedule. I have been asked if I could get that information.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I will make a note of it.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, the Bill entitled "An Act to repeal Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Agriculture, and the Acts in Amendment thereof," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in explanation of this Bill that I propose to ask this afternoon without notice to introduce a second Bill.

As we said in our Manifesto, we intended in connection with this Prohibition question to appoint a committee from both sides of both Houses to consider this Bill, and we want to live up to our promises in that respect, and I propose to suggest that this Bill be sent to that committee before its second reading, but at the same time I want to send a second Bill.

The object of this second Bill is simply to give a license to hotels to sell beers and wines at table. I thought that it was quite possible that when this main liquor Bill goes to a committee that we might not find time to be able to deal with it in this session, but we might be able to deal with the second Bill; and we think that it is important if the main Bill is going to be reported on sufficiently, to give the committee time to bring in a recommendation concerning it, while the second Bill might be passed without very much consideration.

I also have the idea that if we are

going to launch a policy of encouraging tourist traffic we will find ourselves very much hampered in the beginning if we are not able to give a license to hotels, and, consequently, rather than have the main Bill postponed—or if the main Bill is postponed, we want the second Bill to go through immediately, so that the scheme for tourist traffic can be progressing. We do not want to say anything about the Bill. It will be handed around now. The second Bill is not printed yet, but it will be sent round to the members in the course of the next day, before the House meets again; but I suggest that the main Bill be circulated now so that the members may have time to consider it; and I propose to nominate a committee on both sides of both Houses, consisting of fourteen members, to take up both Bills and make a report on them as quickly as possible.

I might say that perhaps I gave the impression that I was going to nominate the members of the committee from the Upper House. We will simply nominate the members of the Lower House. There will be nine members from the Lower House and five from the Upper House.

MR. WARREN:—You can hardly refer a Bill to a committee until it has had a second reading.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The Prime Minister has given a special reason. I understood that he was asking the indulgence of the House in having this matter referred to a select committee and a report from them. If either Bill was brought to a second reading the principle involved in it would be at issue. But if both Bills are referred to the select committee, they may report both Bills or neither for a second reading.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Speaker, it is a most extraordinary procedure to refer a Bill to a committee of the House before you discuss the principle of

the Bill at all. I am only speaking for myself, but it seems to me that in referring a Bill to a committee of the House, or to a joint committee of both Houses, you are committing yourselves to the principle of amending the present law. As far as I am concerned, if the Bill were to go to a second reading now I would vote for it, but I quite see that there may be a lot of dissatisfaction if you send the Bill to a committee now, before you take the voice of the House on whether they are satisfied to agree to the principle of it. As far as I am concerned, if the second reading were now, in five minutes I would vote for it.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that, from the standpoint of practice, Mr. Warren is correct. Mr. Warren will understand that the object of this unusual procedure is to deal with an unusual situation. Ordinarily the practice would be to bring the Bill to a second reading, discuss the principle and refer it to a select committee. The difficulty about the present situation is that the object behind the second measure is to endeavour to put machinery into operation regarding hotel sales here, whereas the other is practically a repeal of the Prohibition Act. Now, the Prime Minister to-day in introducing it, really asks for the unanimous consent of the House to waive the right of proceeding to the second reading. But I think, so far as the Government is concerned, we are quite prepared to go on with the second reading.

MR. WARREN:—Do I understand that you propose to go on to the second reading after the committee stage?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—No. The object behind this now is not to commit the House to a second reading of either Bill.

MR. WARREN:—When are you going to have a second reading?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The idea would be to find out which Bill this committee would consider best, and see whether the House could deal with either of these Bills this session. We are dealing with an extraordinary situation.

MR. WARREN:—I think it is a most extraordinary proposition. I candidly do not quite understand the situation.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—We assume that the House is not prepared to go to a second reading and commit itself to the principle of either Bill to-day. The object of sending them to the committee is to find out their views as to which Bill should be proceeded with.

MR. WARREN:—I am at a loss to understand the position. I understood from the Prime Minister that there is a general Bill to amend the Prohibition Act, which is the Bill that is now being laid on our desks, that there might be some delay in coming to any conclusion on that Bill, so you want to have a committee appointed; and then he introduced a second Bill merely dealing with the sale of liquors in hotels; and both Bills were to go to this select committee, and he proposed to get a report from them on this second Bill immediately so that he might be able to go on with it this session.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Both Bills.

MR. WARREN:—If you are going to get both Bills passed, I do not see the rush.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—We want to get both Bills considered immediately, and know which Bill is going to be passed.

MR. WARREN:—Are they alternative Bills?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—
Yes.

MR. WARREN:—I suggest that we should have both Bills before us so that we may have an opportunity of seeing them. It would be better to see them before sending them to the committee, especially if they are alternative.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—
The practice is established. It is nothing at all contrary to the rules of the House to have a committee appointed to bring in a Bill. It is quite a common thing for a member to bring in a resolution to have a committee appointed to bring in a Bill. Practically that is what this motion amounts to. It is a motion that a joint committee be appointed for the purpose of a general representation of views. It practically amounts to a motion for them to bring in a Bill. They may decline to bring in a Bill. As a matter of convenience, the two suggested Bills are to be submitted to them for their consideration as a basis for the Bill they are asked to bring in. It seems to me that it is quite a regular procedure. Instead of asking them to bring in a Bill without instruction, a general basis is given to them for consideration.

MR. WARREN:—I suggest to the Hon. Prime Minister or to the Hon. Minister of Justice that we see both Bills before we refer them.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to use the words used by the Hon. the Colonial Secretary yesterday. I think we should make haste slowly in this matter, but, nevertheless, I am in accord with the opinion of the Prime Minister in having it presented to a committee. The idea would be that this committee, being representative of both Houses and both sides, would consider whether or not they would bring in this identical Bill, or put in certain amendments; and whilst we should keep to the rules

of debate, as Mr. Warren has stated, I consider myself that I would be favourable and agreeable to having this Bill sent to a committee, but I do not think that we should commit ourselves to having it read a second time, though I would be favourable to its going to a committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—
The Bill could be read a second time and sent to the committee then. I do not see any reason at all why it could not be regarded as an instruction to a committee to go and report a Bill.

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it would meet with the views of the House if I should propose the reading of this main Bill for the second time this afternoon, and if the Bill which I gave notice of yesterday were read for the second time to-day then it could go to the select committee. This other Bill, then, could be considered by the select committee not as a separate Bill but as an amendment.

Could I have the indulgence of the House to read the Bill I gave notice of yesterday a second time to-day, so that we may proceed with the formation of the committee.

MR. WARREN:—Since both Bills have to go to the same select committee, then, so far as I am concerned, I am prepared to go to the second reading now. If you were going to refer the Bill to a select committee, and both Bills were going to the same select committee, and they were alternative, all I suggested was that you should not refer this Bill to a select committee before referring the other.

MR. HICKMAN:—We are prepared to accept anything that is not contrary to the rules of the House.

On motion, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors" was read a second time. On motion, pursuant to notice, and with the unanimous

consent of the House, the said Bill was referred to a committee consisting of nine members, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that body to appoint a number of Councillors to be joined with the Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker appointed the Committee as follows: Hon. the Prime Minister, Mr. Hickman, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Mr. Warren, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Mr. Duff, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Grimes.

NOTICE OF QUESTION:

(1) MR. PUDDISTER asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to table a statement showing the amount, if any, now owing to the country by certain parties for fishery supplies advanced in the year 1921. Who are the parties owing amounts and what steps are being taken to recover same and under what terms?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:— I beg leave to tabe the following reply:

Name of Supplier who did not furnish Account or Statement and which has been given to Solicitor for collection of Total Amount received under the Guarantee ,as per forfeiture clause of act.

J. C. Butler—Southside ..\$5,000.00

JOSEPH O'REILLY,
Commissioner.

Name of Supplier who furnished Statement but did not furnish itemized Accounts, which was given to Solicitor for collection. Before action was taken the required accounts were furnished and adjusted.

Supplier:	Guarantee:	Original Refund:
J. W. Hiscock—	\$10,000.00\$339.90

July 17, 1924:
Additional refund on adjustment of accounts1,104.42
Interest to July 17, 1924 174.08

Total amount refunded\$1,618.40

FISHERMEN'S UNION TRADING CO.
Balance due per Statement furnished with interest adedd to July 25, 1924 ..\$41,417.05
Less Cash received August 1, 1924 6,000.00

\$35,417.05
Amount to be verified as being refunded to Board of Works \$1,500.00

\$33,917.15

Names of parties and amounts owed by them to H.M. Government for refunds on 1921 Fishery Supply Guarantee and which names and amounts have been given to Solicitor for collection:—

Estate of T. P. Kemp, Trustees P. F. Fearn and J. J. McKay	\$ 1,239.01
George Kenendy, The Kennedy Co., Avondale	565.89
Wm. G. Parsons & Son, Ochre Pit Cove	302.85
J. B. Orr Co., Ltd.	600.75
Harold G. Maddock, Quirpon	2250.90
John M. Hearn, Colliers ..	151.81
James Curran, Brigus	309.70
John Moore, Dildo	180.16
Noah M. Smith, Norman's Cove	87.41
Wm. H. Seward, Gooseberry Cove	45.87
Nathaniel Piercey, Winter ton	100.72
Fredk. E. Reid, Heart's Delight	842.75
Lorenzo Noseworthy, Spaniard's Bay	109.06
Henry H. Hutchings, Do.	150.00

Wm. G. Howell, Old Per- lican	107.25
Alex. M. Dunphy, Petries Crossing	454.30
Hon. P. Templeman	743.40
J. T. Swyers Co., Ltd., Bonavista	2271.30
Francis W. Bernard, Woods Island	481.63
Roland Gillett, Twillingate	469.28
Walter E. Martin, New Perlican	213.41
J. & W. Abbott, Bonavista	213.40
Sydney Bursell, Topsail ..	36.80
Edward Breen, Bear Cove	6.59
Fishermen's Union Trading Co., Ltd.	28,230.03
	<hr/>
	\$40,164.27

Names of Suppliers in Liquidation
and amounts to be refunded tby Trus-
tees to H.M. Government:

Bishop, Sons & Co., Ltd. ..	\$2,733.27
Marystown Trading Co., Ltd.	2,287.45
Estate Wm. Thompson	1,515.52
	<hr/>
	\$6,536.24

Names of Suppliers who have been
notified to refund:

R. G. Rendell	\$1,306.33
Edward Roberts, Twillingate	370.07
Labrador Stores, Ltd.	223.28
	<hr/>
	\$1,899.68

Total amount due to H.M.
Government on adjusted
accounts \$48,600.19
to which must be added in-
terest at 6 p.c. from De-
cember 1, 1921.

Names and address of Suppliers
who have furnished Statements but
have not furnished itemized accounts:

Ernest Simmons, Harbor Grace	\$22,125.52
--	-------------

G. & M. Gosse, Spaniard's Bay	4,500.00
Mrs. L. M. Gosse, Do.	300.00
Wm. Ashbourne, Twillingate	8,000.00
Strong & Mursell, Little Bay Islands	12,000.00
James Murphy & Son, Pla- centia	2,500.00
	<hr/>
	\$49,425.52

Names and addresses of Suppliers
who have not furnished Fishery Sup-
ply Accounts or Statements:

Daniel O'Neil, Trepassey ..	\$ 250.00
W. W. Wareham, Hay Stack	1,000.00
Tobias LeDrew, Cupids	500.00
W. H. Greenland, Coley's Point	5,708.10
A. W. Piccott, St. John's ..	1,800.00
Jesse Gosse, Spaniard's Bay	300.00
Thomas Smythe, St. John's	2,561.42
Nathan Kean, Brookfield ..	1,447.69
Alex. Sansome, Friday's Bay	1,200.00
Prebble Bros., Bonne Bay	4,973.53
James Norris & Son, Conche	5,000.00
James Norris & Co., Coach- man's Cove	4,000.00
Fred J. Scott, Fogo	500.00
Benjamin Payne, Cow Head	1,000.00
J. B. Orr, Co., Ltd., St. John's	2,100.00
Croucher & Hatcher, Burnt Island	1,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$33,340.74

Total amount of Guarantees
not adjusted \$82,766.26

JOSEPH O'REILLY,
Commissioner.

MR. PUDDISTER—Asked Hon. the
Minister of Finance and Customs to
table a statement showing: (1) Pur-
chase price of the S.S. Senef; (2)
Cost of repairs and alterations; (3)
Is the ship now the property of the
Government; (4) If not who are her

owners and on what terms was she purchased from the Government.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—(1) Purchase price \$55,000.00; (2) None attached; (3) The Ship no longer the property of the Government; (4) The owners are Geo. Bragg 22 shares, The Union Trading Company, Port Union, 42-64 shares; (5) Purchased from the Government for the sum of \$14,500.00 Cash. No tenders were called for.

MR. GRIMES—Asked Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a statement of the number of arrests for drunkenness in St. John's and elsewhere in Newfoundland for 1914 and each of the following years up to the present time; also a statement of the number of arrests that were due to dope, moonshine or other beverages apart from the ordinary beers or liquors in use for the same period.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETAR—That is a question for the Department of Justice.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I will answer it to-morrow.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman, In speaking to this section of these resolutions I think the Government has made a very great mistake in not putting molasses on the free list. Considering that gasolene, which is used by the fishermen only a few months of the year, is exempt, would it not have been fair to put molasses, that is used all the year round, on the list of free entries. It seems to me that the Government, if they had gone into the

matter would have found that sugar could stand more duty. The putting of the duty on that and the freeing of molasses would not be discriminating against the fishermen. To-day molasses has increased in price and it is cheaper to buy sugar, but molasses is the more favorite article with the fishermen. I think the Government have grievously erred in this respect as the most of the molasses is imported from May to August, and a large quantity has come in under the no duty tariff. A considerable quantity will be sold in the Fall which has already been imported and on which no duty has been paid; this applies to bulk cargoes. What is the fisherman going to say when he comes to the city to purchase his supplies and finds the merchants asking for a duty that has not been paid? I protest against this measure on behalf of the fishermen. I would like also to touch on other matters relative to the Budget. I notice that the Government hopes for an increase in revenue, and we are told by the Hon. the Minister of Finance that undreamt of conditions have existed in that department which no ministerial head should have overlooked. I hope he will stop the leaks which so unfortunately should have occurred. I notice that many items of revenue are the same as before, though the Broom Department is expected to make something more, while the estate duties will be less. But in discussing the Budget I think the Government would be very unwise not to take cognizance of the fact that certain marine works and repairs must be carried on and do what things are absolutely necessary. We have been told that the railroad is now being run at a profit, but I would like to point out that the rates on the Prospero have been increased, and I think this is discriminating in favour of those who already have the railway at their backdoor. It should cost

less to ship goods coastwise than by the railway, and why should the fishermen at the northward have to pay the same rates by the Prospero as over the line. This is not fair and I question the wisdom of such a step. I doubt if the matter has been thought out in a businesslike manner. The rate of insurance by Prospero is more than by rail and Bay Boat to certain places. Why should the man who is not served by the railway be taxed to keep it up. I protest against such injustice. I would like to refer to the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday as to our exports and reciprocal trade with the United States, and think something should be done in this regard. We would be well advised to take steps to get some concessions in this connection.

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Chairman: I would like to move an amendment to the resolutions relating to the repeal of duties that molasses, Pork and beef be added to the free list.

MR. HIBBS:—I beg to second the motion and in doing so wish to say that it is regrettable that the Government should have chosen such important articles as pork, beef and molasses for the paying of duties. These are articles which the ordinary public use in large quantities. It was stated in the Budget Speech that the removal of duties from these commodities was illegal though probably the statement that it was dishonest was only a typographical error as the late Government did it in all sincerity to benefit the people. Probably it would have been rectified when the House met but they were defeated. I am not talking merely for the sake of criticism as I know the Hon. the Prime Minister has to raise a revenue, but I think the duties have been imposed by others who will not have to shoulder the responsibility like the fishermen.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Mr. Chairman: before the amendment is put I would like to express my views on this question and to repeat what I said the other day as to dishonesty of purpose in removing these duties by the previous administration, and as to the words used.

MR. HIBBS:—I do not think there was any dishonest purpose.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—That was the general rumour—that these duties were removed as an election dodge. Now I am tired of this annual swan song, this insincere appeal to the fishermen. The late administration had no right to remove these duties and the present Government remedied the illegal action. The Hon. the Minister of Finance removed by unanimous consent the duties on flour and gasoline.

MR. HIBBS:—It was not unanimous.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Your action to-day proves it was so—and surely you are not against it.

MR. HIBBS:—No.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—If it could only be done we would be only too happy to remove all the taxes, not alone on the fishermen but on all those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow including the laborer, the woodsman and the man who delves in the mines. But we have been forced by the misdeeds of our predecessors in office to put on duties which would not now be necessary if wise and just government had prevailed. I sympathise with others as well as the fishermen as all will have to pay the taxation which should be on the shoulders of the public according to their ability to pay. The Hon. the Minister of Finance would have free listed all articles of ordinary use if it had been possible

to do so, but to tell the truth they were only exempted by the late administration for party political reasons and we cannot follow that example. Why were these commodities put on the free list by the late government at the eleventh hour? Why were they not exempted before the approach of the election. I think the Hon. the Minister of Finance has gone as far as ever possible in removing duties and I believe gasolene means twice as much to the fishermen as molasses as it is essential they should have it. The Government has gone a long way in keeping faith with the fishermen by removing gasolene from taxation. I think that the fishermen and those who represent them will give the Minister of Finance full credit for his straightforwardness in connection with the matter of duties. I have no desire to delay the House Mr. Chairman, but I could not lose this opportunity of speaking on such a vital matter. I do not think the amendment is fair as the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows the Hon. Minister of Finance has to raise revenue and his policy in asking the fishermen to contribute a small share is a sound one. This Government has not yet had time to consider the tariff report though such was suggested at the opening of the session. Never before in the history of the country was a Government brought into power under such conditions and confronted with such chaos and confusion in every direction. There has therefore been no time to give that discussion to the tariff that it warrants. The people must bear with the Government a little in their efforts to get the affairs of the country on a sound business basis again and not allow things to be run on a "come day, go day, God send Sunday" style as they have been in the last few years. If the Government is to do anything they must have the forbearance and co-operation of the

public. I hope that at the next session which will probably be early after January the Government will be in a position to straighten out the troubles that now confront them although the task is a tremendous one. I have heard that members of the Opposition have declared themselves as glad to be rid of the responsibilities and out of the Government.

MR. HIBBS:—We were not in it for the money.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I wish you luck. We are not putting in a claim for money. Not under any circumstances. If that is the idea of the people who have the confidence of their constituents, well, then, all that I can say is that they are falling short of what a representative, statesman or politician should be. A politician should have the way cut out for him—should look ahead to see that the road is alright. No matter what he is called upon to perform, it is a very unpleasant task if done in the interests of the people of this country, no matter what evil we will have to remedy in order to carry out a policy of reform. I have no doubt I will be often called upon to do things displeasing to some of the people of this country, but as the canker is there it has to be removed no matter how painful may be the operation. No matter how we may dislike to do certain things, no matter how disagreeable it may be, because in the efforts to clean up and establish the name and credit of Newfoundland, we have got to face that. I believe it is the duty of every member to face that unflinchingly. Only in this way is there any hope. Only in this way can we raise the country out of the present despondency by the realization of our potential possibilities. The Government have under consideration many plans that spell hope and give inspiration to the future. There is hope for Newfoundland, Newfoundland has

possibilities that perhaps to-day are little dreamed of. And in defence of these possibilities we want a sound, sane Government that will see that the people's rights are protected. No burdens that will bear unfairly on the shoulders of any particular section of the people but will give them equal rights. Many things are under consideration. Possibilities that had not been dreamed of are before us. And I have no doubt that in the course of two or three years, no matter how we may suffer through going through the ordeal of the present operation, no matter how the body politic may suffer after the operation through which we have to go, I believe that we will revive strengthened and more hopeful and more satisfied for our future and the coming generation. We have to be up and doing. We have to keep a watch over our expenditure particularly. We have to get every dollar that can be legally obtained. Every dollar is required to get this country over the present difficulty. In acquiring that position we must do certain things that will hurt certain people and interests. But it has to be done. And I say that the Minister of Finance is to be congratulated for the straightforward way in which he told this House of the many misdemeanours and shortcomings in the country during the past four years. Unless there are strong men available, men determined to do the right, and work in the interests of the country and leave selfish interests alone; unless we have a body of men ready to sacrifice themselves for the common welfare—ready to put country above party, district, everything; unless we have such a body the day will be postponed when we will realize what we hope to transpire during the next two or three years. I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition is as sincere of purpose with regard to the future as any member of this House. I believe that he knows that the Govern-

ment cannot take off the taxes any more than has been attempted. I believe he knows, being a business man, and a very successful business man at that, that business is up against it.

Therefore I cannot vote for the amendment. I say again, I regret that the hon. member had occasion to bring in the amendment and try to show that the Government were not sincere in their efforts. Not alone will we help the fishermen but every other class of men that requires help. And there is no member but is most anxious and desirous for the improvement of the condition of those who have to go down into the earth to draw their labour from the bowels of it, and those who "go down to the sea in ships" to wrest a living from the deep. But when I heard the Finance Minister speaking with regard to the present financial situation, I realized its seriousness. We may be called upon to face a serious situation during the next couple of months. Large corporations have tied themselves up so that they may not be able to operate this winter. They cannot pay any wages if the story is correct. They should pay higher wages if possible. They are not paying enough for the work that is being done. But unfortunately the condition of the world is such, particularly Europe, and particularly Germany, where the exchange is against these countries, that it is impossible to market anything that can give remunerative returns. But this does not apply to Newfoundland alone but to every country, for England, America and Canada are in similar straits. In view of these facts, while I am very desirous of seeing men getting a living wage and proper remuneration for the work they give, I can see the danger of forcing things too far, and thereby not alone putting people out of business but also leaving thousands of men on the hands of the Government or somebody else. We will

soon have the care of four or five hundred men back from Sydney, men out of employment through the closing down of the steel works. I am informed that a part of the collieries is also closing down. We are depending upon our neighbouring province for the employment of a large number of people. We are trying to get employment for those at home. And when we have those others on top of us, we want to realize the seriousness of anything that might curtail the market of the country. Thank God the strike at the Humber has been settled. I heard the matter discussed in this House and was amazed at the flippancy with which it was discussed by certain members. This country had ten million dollars involved in the strike. Threats to destroy and burn woods; a most serious situation, if there were any backing to it. But our people have too much sense. I want to say in vindication of those who were not agitators or bolsheviks—for that is the only word for them—that the men who went out in sympathy were honest in their convictions. They went out peacefully and at such time when they saw and were convinced it to have been done to help them in their trouble. If that strike had to assume the proportions which some men wanted it to assume; if all the men had to go out, what would we have done in this country? Agitators and others coming in among us to stir up strife and discontent for some ulterior motive, absolutely without reason, but to carry on the same idea that they are talking in the interests of labour are not wanted here. Labour should have its rights, but there is a limit to every man's rights. If we had these men out of employment for any length of time something serious would have happened. Nothing could be done to cope with the situation and eventually they would become a menace for the safety of this country.

However, wiser counsels prevailed and all are at work to-day. I hope that this is the last time there will be any occasion for men to go out on strike. I hope the companies will see to it that the people under them are given a sufficient wage to keep them in a contented and satisfactory condition.

I realize that our men are not paid the same rate as in other places; I realize that the men on Bell Island are not paid the same as in Sydney. I cannot understand the reason for this, because comparing the work they had to do in both places, there is no comparison. A man shoveling iron ore if he has to shovel it, must be made of iron to stand it any length of time. The Companies say that they cannot afford to pay another dollar and prove it. And the men are satisfied. Now that is not the fault of the Company or the Government. It is the misfortune of the present conditions all over the world. We are suffering owing to conditions in Europe more than anything else. And until that is rectified; until conditions are more normal in France and Germany, things will be the same in this country. I hope that the situation will not be as serious as it has been during the winter months. But I do say we want just remuneration. But we want to be careful not to stir up and make matters worse; make confusion worse confounded, by making trouble at home. We will have all the trouble that is coming to us. And in doing our duty as we feel called upon to do it, we only hope for the endorsement and support of every member on the other side of the House as well as the intelligent people of Newfoundland. It is no time for trifling. I trust the hon. members on the other side will give us the benefit of their experience and advice and by co-operation we will get even greater results than were anticipated.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Chairman, with what is contained in the Budget itself I am quite unconcerned. But as I came in the House I heard the Hon. the Colonial Secretary emphasizing some statements that had been made before, about the remission of duties being dishonest and illegal. Now technically it may have been illegal and I purpose to show in a few words that calling the remission of duties illegal is only a distinction without a difference. But I do take issue not only with the Colonial Secretary but also with the Minister of Finance. I take exception to his remark that the remission was "dishonest" because after all I happened to be the leader of the Government which took off the duties, and if our action in taking off the duties was dishonest then I must bear my share of the responsibility. I am not going to argue the matter, but I am only going to state facts, and when I am finished I think the Hon. Members will say that there was nothing dishonest. No dishonesty of purpose whatever. Let me trace the history of it. Some years ago there was an export duty on codfish, and to satisfy the fishermen we took it off, by Minute of Council. I heard nobody on the Opposition side get up and say that it was illegal. Later on a band of fishermen known as the United Fishermen called upon me and asked me as Prime Minister to give a bonus on codfish, and in discussing the matter I pointed out that it was out of the question at the present. And as an alternative proposition they asked me to reduce the duties. They said that if I would remove some of the duties off things used by the fishermen that it would be equal to the bonus. I made no promise to them but afterwards when that delegation of fishermen had left, for the first time during the past four or five years, I asked that the most prominent supplying merchants would meet me. They were good

enough to come and give me the benefit of their advice on the matter. We discussed then the various threats made by the fishermen that they were not going to fish unless something was done to encourage them to go and fish. Unless some concessions were made. And after the meeting of the supplying merchants the Government came to the conclusion that in order to give concessions we would make a remission on some of the duties. After consultation with the United Fishermen and the supplying merchants themselves, the House opened on the 24th April. On the 24th by Minute of Council we removed the duties on sugar, gasolene, pork, molasses, and beef. It was done by Minute of Council at the earliest possible moment so that the fishermen could get the benefit. Done on the 24th April, I had a party meeting the night before, and as for any talk of an election coming, well I knew nothing of it. The party with one exception pledged themselves to support me, and I had a majority to carry it through. As far as I was concerned if the Hon. Member wants to suggest that the duties were taken off to get votes, there is not a single fact to support the argument. It was done on the advice of the both sides and as quickly as possible so that the fishermen could get the benefit of it. It was no use in removing the duties in July or August, as they would be all gone to the fisheries then. It was done at the earliest possible moment. The duties were taken off at nine in the morning, and this House met at three in the afternoon, and we were prepared to go on with it.

Now as I said there was no question of illegality. It was done with one motive. We tried to encourage the fishermen as far as possible. With regard to the other question of dishonesty. The Budget speech insinuates that duties should not be taken off because the account was

overdrawn at the bank, and could not afford to do it. If the Government saw a means of doing it, it is not dishonest. The Government had appointed a Commission to re-adjust the tariff, their report would be submitted to a Committee of the House to take it up, in which event the result would have been that \$600,000 would have been collected more than they got under the present tariff. We thought to bring the revenue back to the amount that is being collected by tariff to-day. We could take off the duties and still get the same revenue. We could have done it according to the Tariff Revision Committee. Therefore there was nothing dishonest about that. I may say in passing that I don't propose to vote for the amendment. I see no way that it can be done or the duties remitted now. As to the legality of it, I admit that technically speaking it was illegal. Was it any more illegal to take off or remit the duty on gasolene? Who is going to press for it? If we say there is no need to pay duty on gasolene who is going to say there is. We did not utilize the right method that is all.

It is no more illegal than for the House to deal with prohibition Law as they propose to deal with it. In half the charges there is nothing against it. If things are to be held up on technical grounds, the Minister of Justice is going to have difficulty in keeping within the four corners and still carry out what he particularly wants to carry out.

I have only one thing to say in passing. The Budget Speech while provocative to begin with was very optimistic in closing. But after hearing the Colonial Secretary I got a shock. The Budget Speech towards the end gave us and the country to understand that we had turned the corner. The days in the future were going to be bright. We need not feel as dismal as we had been in the past. But I re-

gret the Colonial Secretary should see coming unemployment. If that is the case, and the Government agrees that there will soon be a great deal of unemployment, then I say to them as was said to me, what are you going to do about it. I was asked what I was going to do about it. Terrible calamities are going to befall us during the coming winter according to the Colonial Secretary. We provided for it under the Loan Act but what provision are you making now. I am going to vote against the amendment. I do want to disclaim any insinuation that there was any dishonesty of purpose or in any other way in the remission of duties which my Government made. I admit it was technically illegal to do it. But illegal acts have been carried by the House as other things illegal have been carried before.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I would like to correct the Hon. Member with regard to his remarks saying that I saw difficulties that we had to contend with. I did not say these were obstacles to progress. It was the other way about. What I said was that there would be considerable unemployment this fall, but that it was no fault of ours but through the disturbed conditions of the world. There would be a large number of unemployed men this winter. I merely pointed out that these were some of the difficulties, not insurmountable, that the Government had to face. With regard to insurmountable obstacles I merely painted the picture of the other side. I do not for a moment think that the country is faced by any unsurmountable obstacles. I did not wish to convey the impression that has apparently been conveyed. I think that everything shows an immense improvement and that the prospects are very much better than they have been for several years.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FIN-

ANCE:—Before the amendment is put I would like to say a few words in reply to the criticism of the Leader of the Opposition, which criticism I am inclined to take in a congratulatory manner, and I feel that I do not need to disturb myself. There are one or two things, which as Minister of Finance for the Colony I think it up to me to say. The most unfortunate year that ever struck this country was nineteen hundred and nineteen. In the election of that year the Government of Sir Michael Cashin, the Premier of the time, was turned out and a crowd of men absolutely incapable of managing affairs, was put in charge of the Government of the Colony. They ran wild. There was never a partridge that ran half as fast. At that time I was associated with the persent leader of the Opposition, under the leadership of Sir Michael Cashin. As soon as this wild crew, that would wreck any ship, got into power, the first thing that they did was to introduce the fishery regulations which brought the country to the brink of ruin. No man could continue to run a country as this country has been run for the past four years, and the reason that we have to pay taxes on these necessary articles which have been referred to is because of these orgies of expenditures. It has been said by my hon. friend the leader of the Independent Party, that I said in my Budget that he was dishonest. He has explained the legal side of it. He misunderstood me. He was dishonest to this extent that while the country had a large amount outstanding at the Bank of Montreal which it could not pay, he went still further and took off the duties above mentioned which lessened the amount of the revenue at a time when it was most needed. There was a deficit facing the country even leaving the duty on. A deficit of One Million Five Hundred and Seventy-Four

Thousand Dollars. You say that I only estimated that. You left it for me to estimate. Now what I want to say to the leader of the Opposition is that if in a very short time the Government finds that it can take the duty off pork and beef as well as flour, then it intends to do it. Mr. Warren says he took off the duties to help the fishermen of this country, and then he goes and has the tariff revised and proposed to tax the country six hundred thousand dollars more. And this revision of the tariff was made at an expense of thirteen or fourteen thousand dollars. If that was the course he proposed to pursue, he had no intention whatever to reduce taxation. Just taking a little off here and putting more on somewhere else. Then again he is taking the part of the fishermen of this country. Is not the mechanic, the labourer and any other class of men of St. John's just as important? If some of the people of this country had paid their taxes you would not have need to tax the fishermen. The condition of affairs to-day is that crowds of those fellows driving about in automobiles and holding their heads up in the air, have not paid all their duties to the Custom House, and if a poor fisherman owed a few dollars he would be thrown out on the street. That is the position. It was your duty to see that that kind of thing should not go on. If the Minister of Finance was incapable of looking after his department, then get some other minister. I do not consider that if Sir Michael Cashin's Government had been in power during the years from 1919 to 1923 that it would have been necessary to increase taxation. I do not at all agree with the statement that because all the world was in a bad state that Newfoundland had to be in a bad state also. It was the best country in the world in 1919. There was a surplus of three and a half million

and since then you have borrowed twenty millions and paid the Reids two millions. No, the hon. member for Fortune knows that they were incapable of taking over the Government under the leadership of Sir Richard Squires.

Now, with regard to my young friend from Twillingate, I cannot understand his speech at all. How can a man hope to reduce taxation and then build wharves and improve harbours? You clearly cannot have public wharves and tickles dredged if there is no money to do it with. I am one who would like to see no taxation, but there you are. I am sorry that Mr. Halfyard is not here this evening. I would like to say a few words to him, but since he is not here, and I have nothing very much to say to my other friends opposite, I will not say much more. With regard to the amendment made by the Opposition, I can say that the Government cannot see its way clear to take off these taxes at present. It is proposed to have another revision of the tariff a little later and have the taxes bear more equally on all classes. All that I ask the hon. members and the country at large is to give the Government a chance. Give it an opportunity to do something. It has been in power only eight weeks, and has been faced with difficulty at every move. Everything is absolutely full of difficulties and it is going to take some little time to straighten things out. The hon. the leader of the Opposition in his speech, said that he did not believe that the price of fish would hold. He does not believe that the present price of fish will be maintained. I cannot agree with him. There may be a lull for a short time, but I do not think it will last. As long as there is a shortage of fish such as exists now there is no possibility of the fall in price. There is no justification for predicting a fall in price. That is as I see the

position. I don't think that a man receiving eight dollars for his fish under the present financial condition of the country needs to receive a bonus. Mr. Monro's Manifesto stated that a bonus on fish would be given if the financial condition of the country would warrant it. That is the position that I take. And that is the understanding that I went out on.

MR. DUFF—I would like to make a few remarks. I may say that I am in support of the amendment, in view of some of the remarks made this evening by some of the members on this side. I recognize that the question of bonus on fish is a very difficult question. Even fish buyers themselves find it difficult to handle a matter like a bonus on fish, and in view of that I would think that it would be a very difficult matter for a government to manage. But what I want to remark is that the work of the House is being held up to a considerable extent. Whether by the members of the Government or of the Opposition I am not going to say just now. The gentlemen on the other side have had considerable experience I presume in running a country, and by next year they will have had more when we will have a little more to say to them. But what I want to say to the Government is "Get to work and let us go home and get to work." I am of the opinion that the work of the House could be got through a little more quickly and I would like to see that done.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Before the amendment is put to a vote I would like to say one word in this connection. A short time ago I made reference to some members of the Union Party being concerned with the troubles at the Humber. I did not include any member of the Opposition Party. I think that I made myself clear on that point. It appears to me that the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition are not

sincere when he tells us that this is the year above all other years to pay a bounty on fish. The Daily Mail comes out this evening with a headline in which it states that the Prime Minister hedged when asked a question as to when the bounty on fish was to be payable. Of course it is only a political move, available to every member of the Opposition and used by most of them. But I think that Mr. Hickman being in the fish business himself knows the circumstances. He knows the difficulty besetting a country with a debit balance and I cannot see how it is possible to remove the duties from some articles essential to fishermen, and I think also that it is unfair for him to come in here suggesting the payment of a bonus on fish. He knows that fish is being sold for eight dollars and eight and a half in St. John's and at that price it is very remunerative to those who catch it. It is not remunerative to the fishermen who do not catch it. But of what use is the bounty to those who do not catch fish? As I see it, I think that it will not be necessary to give the bounty on fish if the markets keep up the price which is attainable. Again, if we were to give a bounty on fish to the men catching a large quantity, how are we going to provide for the men who do not catch any? Surely it is the policy of any Government to provide for those men who are so unfortunate as not to catch any fish. We have had to replace the duties on certain articles essential to fishermen, as was explained a short while ago by the Minister of Finance. It would have been much better for me and for Capt. Winsor, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when we go back to Bonavista Bay seeking re-election, to be able to say that we had not put the duties back on the fishermen's necessities. We shall be severely censured for having done so I have no doubt. However, it would

be much more unjust to take the duties off now and put them on again immediately after the election. There is something else I wished to say. The Government has been elected on a policy of retrenchment, and as far as we have been able to get in touch with matters we have retrenched and expenses have been curtailed in some respects. This is a thing which takes time and considerable patience to accomplish, and it will take some time before we will have completely finished this work. I think, however, that the suggestion that a bounty be paid on fish and that the duties be removed from certain articles necessary to the fishermen cannot be accepted and the Government cannot possibly be expected to consider the amendment.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—Before we take the vote on the amendment I have a few words to say. The Prime Minister charged me with insincerity. I can charge the Prime Minister with the same thing. I can recall the matter of a Bill which the Government refused to consider. This was a Bill which came from this side of the House to amend the Election Act. It concerned the placing of the booths for members of Bonavista Bay over in the Humber area. The Prime Minister refused to give his consent to that Bill. He refused to let it go through the committee stages. He referred it to a select committee. If I am not sincere, and he can judge me as others can, then if he is not sincere then I should be able to judge him. A thousand men on the Humber were disenfranchised because the Election Act amendment was not accepted by the Government. I just tell that to the Prime Minister to even up what he said to me. As far as the amendment goes I am sincere in my opinion that the fishermen ought not to be taxed and no one has a right to

tax them on their necessities of life. You know very well what the fisherman's necessities are—pork, beef, flour and molasses. Well, the duty has been taken off flour. The Colonial Secretary said something about having the fisherman taxed, but if the Colonial Secretary had ever been in contact with the fishermen as some of us have been he might not say what he did say. If you go into a stage and watch a man splitting a half quintal of fish as his day's work and two or three children standing around with bread and no molasses in their hands, and practically nothing to wear, you would not come into this House and put a tax of eight cents more on molasses. The price of molasses went up last month five cents and that means fourteen cents more to the fisherman. I am sincere when I say that I think this duty should be removed from these articles at the present time.

This season the fish catch has not been a large one. In the whole Strait, from Cape Norman to Bonne Bay, there has not been more than two thousand quintals of fish caught this summer. I claim that if the men have not caught more fish than that they cannot pay this tax on these necessities. The gentleman who is now the member for Fortune Bay took off the duties and I think that this is not the time to put it back at the expense of the fishermen of this country. For the past four or five years the fishermen have bought nothing but food. They have nothing to wear. They are practically naked. That is my position and I intend to stand by it. I have introduced the amendment and I am prepared to stick to it. I left it to the members on this side of the House to do as they please. Every man can use his own mind. I am not charging the Government with insincerity. I think that they are doing the best they can. I believe they took office at a time when

things were in a bad condition financially, and I agree with the Minister of Finance that the election of 1919 was the greatest disaster that ever happened to this country. I understand that the Government has a large debit balance at the Bank of Montreal. Let the Government get down to business and pay it. There is one small industry protected with one hundred and fifteen thousand dollars—the manufacturing of cigarettes. What is the Government going to do about it? I would advise the Government to look about and protect all those industries which are unprotected and thereby give employment to every man possible. I hope that the Minister of Finance is correct this evening when he says that there will be no drop in the price of fish. He and I have different views on the matter and I hope that he is right, because that is what I would like. I hope that the price will be maintained and now that the Minister has such large warehouses that he will assist in keeping the price of fish up by purchasing a lot. I have stated my position this afternoon and, as I said before, I am prepared to stand by it. I believe that the duties should be removed from pork, beef and molasses as well as the duties from flour and gasoline. I am going to back up that amendment with my vote when it is put to a motion.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they 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.

On motion this Report was received. On the motion for the adoption of the Report, Mr. Hickman moved and Mr. Hibbs seconded the following amendment:—

As an Amendment to the Resolutions (B) relating to the repeal of the duty on Flour and Gasoline "that the

following items be added to the free list: Pork, Beef and Molasses."

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared in favor of the amendment:—

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Ashbourne (3).

And against it:—

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister of Public Works,
Mr. Cashin,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Vinicombe,
Mr. Chambers,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Little,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Linegar (19).

So the amendment was lost.

Whereupon the original motion was put, when there appeared in its favour:—

Hon. the Prime Minister,
Hon. the Colonial Secretary,
Hon. the Minister of Justice,
Hon. the Minister of Finance,
Hon. the Minister of Posts,
Hon. Mr. Sullivan,
Hon. Mr. Long,
Hon. Mr. Cramm,
Hon. Mr. Bradley,
The Minister of Agriculture,
The Minister of Public Works,
Mr. Cashin,
Mr. Moore,
Mr. Vinicombe,
Mr. Chambers,
Mr. Power,
Mr. Little,
Mr. Puddester,
Mr. Linegar (19).

And against it:—

Mr. Hickman,
Mr. Hibbs,
Mr. Ashbourne (3).

— So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

On motion the Bill entitled "An Act further to Amend the Revenue Act 1905" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion for the second reading of the Legislative Council Amendment to the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery," Hon. the Colonial Secretary moved that Section 1 of the said Amendments be further amended by substitution of the word "five" in the second line thereof for the word "ten"; and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said Amendments with an amendment, in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion of Hon. the Colonial Secretary the Amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to confirm an Agreement with the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited," was read a second time, and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said Amendments had been passed without amendment.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to certain expenditures under 'The Loan Act, 1923,'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider

the Bill entitled "An Act relating to certain expenditures under 'The Loan Act, 1923.'"

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 matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "An Act relating to certain expenditures under 'The Loan Act, 1923.'" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "A Tax on Goods Imported" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "A Tax on Goods Imported."

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 matter to them referred, and had passed the said Bill without amendment.

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

Whereupon, with unanimous consent, the Bill entitled "A Tax on

Goods Imported" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Disembarking of Paupers," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the suspension of the Rules as to all matters now before the House or to come before it.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, August 8.

At quarter past three of the clock, there being no quorum, Mr. W. J. Browne only being in attendance, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House until Monday afternoon, 11th inst., at three of the clock.

MONDAY, Aug. 11th, 1924.

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

Petitions were presented by Mr. Ashbourne from Crow Head, re wharf.

Mr. W. J. Browne, member for St. John's West Electoral division, having been duly sworn, was introduced to the House by Hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance and took his seat.

Mr. Speaker informed the House

that he had received a message from the Legislative Council that they had appointed the following committee consisting of: The Honourables S. Milley, F. H. Steer, W. J. Ellis, Sir P. T. McGrath and A. B. Morine to consider jointly with the Committee appointed by the House of Assembly the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—
Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to present the report of the "Joint Committee on the Bill respecting Alcoholic Liquors" and to move its adoption. In dealing with this important subject I would like to make a few remarks and refer to the situation in 1916 when the advocates of temperance from different societies went to Sir Edward Morris, the then Premier, and asked that a plebiscite be taken on the matter. He, being astute thought the measure would not be carried and allowed the measure to go to the country, and when the result was made known he and his advisers were the most surprised people in the country. Sir Edward Morris, as he then was, knew that such a law could not be carried out, and neither he nor those associated with him made any (to use the phrase) desperate efforts to carry it out, as they knew it could not be done. The Prohibition Law, however was brought into force and certain doctors started selling scripts, though against their professional ideals. On the other hand certain medical men saw an opportunity to make money, and they indiscriminately distributed scripts, with the result that the law could not be carried out. People had to pay \$1 to \$2½ to get a bottle of liquor. The result was that everybody had to go as the law required and claim a hearing before a doctor. And the doctor had, if he thought it was required, to give a prescription on the Department of Controller. Equally profitable was

the dispensing as medicine. Surely, said the Minister of Finance of that time, we will get a half million dollars revenue for the sale of intoxicating liquor. We have been, gentlemen, for the last seven years, a laughing stock and disgrace before the world. And that is our position today, that is the intollerable position that my Government is determined it is not going to stand. And so, gentlemen, we come before you with a measure, with a report from a committee. Before this House goes into debate on the Bill, I will ask that the Bill be read a second time, and I give notice for putting it into Committee of the Whole House to-morrow. I would wish to make a few remarks in this respect. We have had numerous commissions of various Temperance bodies giving suggestions. The one idea held by all the representatives has been that the Prohibition Law must be carried out, in spite of the fact that four, no less than four, Attorney Generals and almost every politician is satisfied that the Law cannot be carried out.

Now what do we find when it was put into force. The very first thing was moonshine. That was the first evil, and I claim that the sale of moonshine in one instance is worse than the sale of liquor in ten instances. And we want to see moonshining stopped. But we can not stop it in this Island until the people are given a substitute. It is the rights of any people to get a certain quantity of liquor if they want it. The ordinary Christian is entitled to the ordinary amount of rum when he goes out in his vessel. The people that are talking of prohibition have no idea of what necessity it is to the fishermen on Labrador when they are wet through, chilled and tired.

But the way to treat the question is to give moderate supplies and then carry out the act and the proper regulations regarding it. I am not go-

ing to talk about the Act now, as I am going to talk about that when it comes before the Committee. We are putting before the country an Act that can be carried out and an Act that we will jealously see will be carried out. If a man gets a bottle a day or a week it does not matter what his rights are, if he gets a bottle a week and abuses it worse than a man who gets a bottle a day and does'nt. The man who gets a bottle of spirits and drinks it on the street and gets drunk will be arrested. Not only will he be arrested but he will be blacklisted and he will not be able to get a drink for 6 months. If he does not behave decently he will be treated harshly. A man guilty of moonshining has no authority to get spirits. A man guilty of smuggling has no leave to get spirits either. A man who breaks that Act is going to be punished. We are putting before the House what I think is the very best kind of a Bill. I said that the people who came before this commission were absolutely ardent prohibitionists. They considered that the amendment to give the ordinary person with his meal a bottle of beer, was bringing about a condition of things that would be so objectionable that we would not get our people to behave in any decent manner.

You cannot talk to people like that. Their claims are absurd. We get people getting up and saying that this measure is being rail-roaded through, is being hurried through and the outports have not had an opportunity to consider the matter and put their views before the Committee. Now as far as the outports are concerned, the outports have all the time they can possibly want. When an outport by a majority of 51% duly witnessed before sworn Commissions asks to have a booth opened in the Constituency for the sale of anything, they can have it. There is no doubt that the outports have got the

finest form of Local Option that can be suggested. And they need'nt consider this question at all, or they can consider it when they like. It does not affect its going through, whether in one day or one month.

As far as the other objections are concerned, it is simply a matter of trying to put off the evil day. They think that if we don't pass the Bill now there may be a hue and cry from certain sections. But if there was a cry from certain of the sections, how are we to know that they represent the people? They can't represent the people. We said in our manifesto that we were going to repeal the Prohibition Law. (Reads the exact words in the Manifesto.)

Now when we repeal the Prohibition Law we must put something in its place. And so we formed an Act which we claim to be the finest possible kind there is. We put this Act before the country to-day, in every way proud of what its effect will be. We are satisfied this Act will meet with approval throughout the country if properly carried out. It must be clear of Government control. The Commissioners who make the laws must see that they are carried out. Of course the Government will have control over the selection of the Board, to see that they are doing their duty and put out if they are not doing their duty properly. There is no question of their doing their duty. I have the greatest confidence in the Board. We claim that Prohibition as existing to-day cannot be carried out. I am confining myself to these remarks until the Bill comes into the Committee stage.

Hon. the Prime Minister then presented the Report of the Joint Select Committee as follows:

August 11th, 1924.

The Joint Committee of the Legislature, appointed to consider the Bill "An Act Respecting Alcoholic

Liquors," beg to submit the accompanying draft Bill, and recommend its adoption.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,

Chairman.

ALFRED B. MORINE,

Secretary.

F. H. STEER,

RICHARD CRAMM,

W. McK. CHAMBERS,

W. J. HIGGINS,

JOHN C. CROSBIE,

W. R. WARREN,

P. T. McGRATH

(With a reservation as to spirits for restricting the quantity obtainable to a bottle a week instead of a bottle a day.)

W. J. ELLIS

(With a reservation that there should be some form of registration or other machinery proposed to ensure proper restrictions upon issue of spirits.)

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the said Report was received.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker, the Committee on this Bill was made up of the members of both sides of the House. And also some of the members of the upper House. We heard the arguments of those who came forward to protest against the Bill. And we have come to the conclusion that it is the wish of the people that the Bill be deferred for the present, there being many protests and I understand many protests are being sent from nearby places, protesting against the Bill going through the Legislature at the present moment. Now as we were on the minority on that Committee we are compelled to bring in a minority report, which we will ask the House to adopt. Our report which we bring in is only in reference to the delay of the measure. It has

nothing whatever to do with the Bill itself. We all know that the present Prohibition Act as carried out in Newfoundland today is a disgrace, and we all know that some amendment to the act has to be made. It can be done better. Whether this Bill is the Bill that is going to satisfy the people I cannot say. That is a matter which we will discuss when the Bill comes into Committee stage. The system of dispensing of liquors at present in this country, is not the right system. It compels a man who wants a bottle of spirits to have resort to methods that he does not care to resort to if he can help it. But this Bill has only just come before the House. Most of the protests which have been made before the Select Committee have been for delay. And we think in justice to the people who are making these protests, that we should take a stand and assist them in their requests. Now as far as the Bill itself goes, with us it is not a party measure. Every member on this side of the House is at liberty to use his own judgment without being influenced as to which way he should vote with regard to this Bill or any other Bill. But as we said before we feel that in justice to the people who are making these protests and in justice to those who want to have the Bill postponed, at the present, we have to bring in a minority report which I will read.

(Reads report.)

I beg to move that this report be adopted.

MR. HALFYARD—In seconding the motion to adopt the Minority Report in substitution for the Major Report. I may say that following the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, my object in supporting this Minority Report, is solely to give the country an opportunity to consider the Bill from every angle. I may say that a Bill has been brought to the attention of this House, and

also to the General public. The time has been so short that it is impossible to come to an intelligent decision as to whether one should support it or not. And for that reason if for no other, I would support the report brought in by Mr. Hickman and his colleagues on the Committee Mr. Grimes and Mr. Duff. Reference has been made by the Prime Minister to the history of the Prohibition Act. He referred to what happened in 1915 when the matter was brought before the Legislature. Resolutions were brought in by Mr. Hickman who was then sitting on this side of the House, asking for the Prohibition of Alcoholic Liquors. The Government led by Sir. Edward Morris thought that resolutions of such a nature should not be decided by the House without first giving the whole country an opportunity to decide upon it and to vote upon it. Then late in the Session a Bill was introduced granting a plebiscite. Now I think we have the same conditions at the present time. A certain proportion of the electors voted for Prohibition as in the Act, not as we have it enforced today. We all regard that Act not carried out either in the letter or the spirit. And as a result all parties all politicians, and these forming the rest of the community, have seriously considered what can be done to better the condition of things with regard to the consumption of liquors in this country. Most people contend that the Act was a farce and could not be enforced. The reason that it could not be enforced, it is not worth while to go into now. But I may say in passing that the Act did not have the sympathy of those who made it. Neither had it the sympathy of the majority of those in a position to enforce the Law. Hence it was a comparative failure. But that does not say that the Law is wrong. Or that it is not law because it is not carried out.

There are lots of laws in the Decalogue that are not carried out, and we would not bring in resolutions to amend them. We try to carry them out as best we can. You should not first wipe away the Law, but if you have the public so antagonistic to any Law especially in connection with the sale of Liquors it is practically only right and incumbent on any Legislature to use certain measures so that it would be more popular with the people, and easier for you to enforce it. Of course the history of Prohibition in this country is something similar to that of the provinces of Canada. The law has been abused and in each case the Provincial Legislatures have appealed to the people. They asked the people what they were prepared to support, and as the people made this law I think it is only right that they should be asked again whether they are prepared at the present time to vote for the amendment to the present Act. I think that before any steps should be taken to make this radical change with regard to the sale of liquors in this country that in my opinion and that of the Leader of the Opposition, who said that it is a matter of personal opinion and not a party measure they should be given an opportunity now to decide whether to vote for the Repeal or the Amendment to the Prohibition Act.

I am acquainted with the importance of the Bill that has been recently printed and distributed. But we have to be governed by experience and you know that you should endeavour to get the sentiment of the Public behind every act if you want it enforced. And as far as the District of Trinity is concerned, I had a message from the Rev. Mr. Broughton, Heart's Content, which is as follows:—

(Reads the message.)

Therefore I ask for time. We only ask for the postponement of the Bill.

They want an opportunity to study the Bill and make comparisons with other measures. Therefore for these reasons I would support the adoption of the Minority Report in place of the Majority Report, which means deferring of the passing of the Bill through the Legislature until the next session.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I do not want to raise a wrong impression, but there is some misconception. We have never heard from the Select Committee of a Minority Report. We have never been asked to sign one. I attended all the sessions. The first I heard of it was in this House when the Committee never had an opportunity to consider it. I never heard of a petition from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Not a sound but I understood all approved of it. This is not a Minority Report as the Report does not say there is anything wrong with the Bill. Not only the Report does not say there is anything wrong, but I have not heard a sound of anything but approval of the Bill. Some of the Committee may have been absent. At least I never was. I don't think I missed a moment. I never heard any member proposing to consider a report of this nature. The report of the Committee is in. One and all signed it. We concurred and we believed in that Bill. Some members signed with reservations, as to the quantity of spirits to be supplied. And there was ample time to consider all that. This cannot be considered as a minority Report. I am in sympathy with the position that the Leader of the Opposition has to take. But I submit that under the rules as far as this House is concerned, what should come to this House if there is a difference of opinion, would be a report sent to the House showing who voted for this Bill and who voted against it. I never heard of any division. I have the report submitted by

the Committee. The Minority Report cannot be submitted in this way.

MR. CRAMM:—I recollect distinctly that a motion was introduced and a vote was taken and it was passed 12 to 1. The only person to vote against it was the Hon. Mr. Milley.

MR. GRIMES:—I have stated my position with regard to that. I was not asked to sign the report. We came up and were told that the report had been signed.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I beg your pardon. We were told distinctly that Mr. Hickman and the men from the Opposition were not coming to the meeting.

MR. GRIMES:—There appears to be some misunderstanding.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I may say Mr. Speaker that I was of the same opinion as the Minister of Justice that the members of the Committee from the Opposition party were not going to sign the report.

MR. GRIMES:—I thought that the committee was going to meet again to-day.

MR. WARREN:—What is the question before the House?

HON. THE SPEAKER:—The adoption of the report of the Joint Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill Respecting Alcoholic Liquors.

MR. WARREN:—If that is the question I think that the Prime Minister ought to move that the report be received. Then the discussion on the motion might take place. I surmise that the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Hickman, can only bring in his proposition as an amendment to the report submitted by the Select Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I assume that also.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Speaker, I

think that this point of Order is only a technicality which does not deserve the serious consideration of the House. I understand that practically all the members of the other side of the House had signed the report as read by the Prime Minister and that those who signed the report of the Select Committee have not signed the report submitted from the minority. As I said before the matter is only a technicality. It is up to those who did not sign the majority report to decide that they would like to put the motion that the bringing in of the Bill be deferred until the next session of the Legislature. That is the matter which is under discussion before the House at present, namely whether this Bill will or will not be submitted to the House at this session.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER:—There seems to be some informality in connection with these proceedings. What purports to be the Common Report of the Committee on this Bill has been submitted for reception and adoption. It has been suggested that was but a Majority Report and that there was a Minority Report as well. This indicates a division in the Committee, in which case the provisions of section 147 of the Rules of the House requiring a record of the division or minutes of the proceedings of the Committee to be reported to the House on the Report of the Committee should be complied with. Doubt is also cast upon the validity of the alleged Minority Report as not emanating from or coming before the Committee. If this is so it is irregular and can not be entertained by the House as a report of the Committee. Any difficulty in determining this question might have been obviated had section 147 been followed, as the circumstances seem to indicate should have been done, or a report embodying the division or disagreement, if any, might have been presented. I

concur with the Hon. Member for Fortune that the situation might be met by the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition introducing the text of the suggested Minority Report as an amendment to the question for the adoption of the original report.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I would like to say that there has been no division of the Committee at all. The Committee being satisfied that sufficient evidence had been taken we drew up the report for the members to sign. The Opposition members deliberately decided to remain away and when they did not come forward to sign the report it was taken for granted that they would bring in some amendment. The only point is I think that the Report from the Minority is out of Order. I do not see how it is possible to bring in a minute of the division because there was no division whatsoever.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—I would like to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if there were minutes of the Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Certainly there were minutes of the procedure of the Committee. The minutes were kept but there is no minute of a division because there was no division.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—We have no intention of departing from the rules of this House. I might say that this minority report has reference only to the delay of the Bill so that any thing that may have been done in connection with the bill is not affected by it. As I said in my opening remarks every member of this side of the House has full liberty to vote as he sees fit on any bill that may come before the House in connection with the Liquor Act. The members of the Opposition are not making a party measure of the matter. The Minority report only asks, in the interest of those people

of the country who want to get fully acquainted with the matter before the Legislature, that the act proposed by the Government be deferred for the present. Now, when the Committee was sitting to-day we were having a meeting in the Opposition Rooms. We advised the Clerk of the House that we were having a meeting of the Opposition and that we were not going to sign the Report.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—We were not informed of the Minority Report.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—I presume that anyone who did not sign one report signed the other.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—It appears to me that the proper place for the debate would have been on the Adoption of the Report.

MR. HALFYARD:—Just a little premature. That is all.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I move that the Report of the Committee be adopted.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—I beg to move the following Amendment:—

“That in view of the drastic nature of the Bill to them referred we respectfully recommend that further consideration of this bill be deferred until the next session of the Legislature in order to allow the country at large ample opportunity to acquaint itself with the provisions of the Proposed Bill.”

MR. GRIMES:—I rise to second the amendment. In so doing I wish first to say, that I had no desire to be a party to any injustice to any member of the Joint Committee regarding our Minority Report, nor do I think anyone else did who signed it. The irregularity has been due to a misunderstanding. When we

came to the Council Chamber with it we asked what had been done, and were told that a report had been signed by the Committee, but that Sir Patrick McGrath and the Hon. Mr. Ellis had signed with reservations. We therefore conclude all these members had decided their course just as we had decided ours.

The question is, is this the proper time to decide upon a matter which is fraught with far reaching consequences to the country. An Act which was placed on the Statute Book by the expressed will of the people, cannot be disposed of so hastily without doing a grave injustice to many who while they may have understood at election time, changes were to be made in Liquor Legislation never anticipated such a revolutionary measure as now proposed. The Minority Report expresses the views of not an inconsiderable portion of the country as proven by the delegations that attended the sittings of the Committee during the two or three days allowed. That many more requests and protests would have been received there can be no doubt, for where it was known letters and messages were received asking for delay till the next session of the Legislature.

The Government is bound by the Manifesto of their Leader to give full and free opportunity to all interested, of knowing what the measure is so that they can express their views upon its merits or demerits. To rush this Bill through the present session with such haste and not allow time to study it and know the full meaning of every section and clause, is bound to be reproductive of faulty Legislation. What may suit Quebec or Alberta may not suit Newfoundland. It will not. By delaying consideration till the next session you will have time to ascertain what will meet with the general wish of this country as well as enabling you to perfect the measure much better than it is

now. It has been said by Mr. Morine, that to refer it to the people through a plebiscite would mean the country being saddled with \$100,000 expense. I do not believe it. A general election does not cost that much and I am quite certain that plebiscite would not cost the amount of a general election. Why the election costs so much is because we are going contrary to the election act, which says the payments for Returning Officers, Deputies and Poll Clerks shall be half what we have been paying the last two elections. Cut this expense down to the amount provided for in the Act, which still can be further lessened, by a number who would be only too glad to give their services free on behalf of such a cause, I question whether the plebiscite would cost more than \$30,000.

Another reason for delay is that few members of this Legislature today, know what the real wishes of a majority of his constituents are. He has not had time to find out and this is a question in which he should ascertain what that wish is regardless of his own personal feelings. Take for illustration one section only which I will cite as an illustration. Any section of a district with settlements contiguous to each other and having 5,000 of a population can have if a majority in the section sign a petition, a Government Liquor Branch, although the big majority of the district in which this section is located may be against it. That alone should cause members to ask for time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—But that is the best kind of a plebiscite.

MR. GRIMES:—I do not think so, the majority in the District should rule. My own view of the matter is that a plebiscite of the whole country should be taken and let the people who placed the Prohibition Law on the Statute Book, decide whether

they want it to stay or whether they will remove it, and what they want in its place. I have an idea what the result of a plebiscite would be.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—So have I.

MR. GRIMES:—Well after all what the Minister of Justice and myself may think about what will happen does not matter. One thing does matter and that is, the Representative People of the Country were promised to be given full and free opportunity to express their views, and it is not being done. Two thirds of them live in the Outports, and time cannot be given them this session. The right thing to do is defer it and consider a plebiscite.

MR. DUFF:—I would like to say a few words in connection with the Minority Report. I must say that I am sorry that the Minister of Justice did not get an opportunity to sign it because if he had got the opportunity I feel sure that he would have signed. It was a great opportunity lost. I would also like to say that on Saturday evening I had to leave the Meeting of the Committee to make all haste possible to catch the train home to Carbonear.

I think that an act of this kind should not be pushed through this House too fast so that the people may have an opportunity to consider it carefully. I am fully aware that the people, of St. John's East and West had an opportunity to become aware of the contents of the Bill but outside districts have not had that opportunity. Now the Prime Minister spoke of stopping smuggling and moonshining. Well he knows very well that if it costs four dollars to get a bottle of liquor here and it can be smuggled or made for eighty cents then men will in all probability smuggle. I for one fought the prohibition act. And I think that there were a good many others who are in this House now did

as I did. However we did not succeed. The present Prohibition Act never should have been put on the Statue Books. The present state of things is very bad, but what guarantee have we that the act which is now proposed is going to be carried out. How do we know that where beer and wine are being sold that stronger spirits will not be sold also? Liquor of a stronger nature will be sold where wine and beer are sold. That is one of the things that should be considered and I hope a bill somewhat more capable of managing that difficulty will be brought before the House.

MR. HIBBS:—I rise to support the amendment. I think that the request for a delay of the action proposed by the Government is a reasonable one. I feel sure that the Leader of the House with every member of the opposite side agree with me that it is reasonable. As Mr. Duff pointed out there does not seem to be such a great need for haste in a matter like this. There is no necessity for such a great deal of hurry. We cannot possibly lose money, by not having liquor to encourage the tourist trade because we would not have any tourists at an advanced season like this. Of course I believe in encouraging the tourist traffic. It is a matter in which I have been interested for several years and when anything to encourage and promote tourist traffic is being done then I am sure to support it. There was a Prohibition Act in force in Newfoundland for the past nine years but no attempt was ever made to enforce it. I say that even though I was a member of the Government for the past four years.

However, it may be that your reason for amending the Act is to encourage the tourist trade. Well, if that is what you have in mind, I fail to see the objection in rushing this Bill through in the dying hours of this

session because it could not possibly affect the tourist trade for this season, and, I think that it is only reasonable to ask that the Bill be deferred until the next session of the House, which will meet again, so we were informed by the Prime Minister, in January or February next. Surely then, I repeat, it is not unreasonable for the Opposition to press for a postponement of this measure for a few months in order to give the country time to give it proper consideration, and to become familiar with what this Bill contains. The broad principle must be recognised by the Government and it cannot be overlooked that if it is right that the people of St. John's should be giving a hearing before a Select Committee, it is equally right to submit the matter to the people of districts that are not adjacent to St. John's. Why there are people in my district who do not know the contents of one section out of the sixty odd in this Bill. The few people who had an opportunity of expressing their views before the Select Committee must not be regarded as representing the whole country, and I am really surprised at the insistence of the Government over the passage of this Bill. Now I do not propose to deal with the merits or demerits of the Bill at this juncture. There are certain clauses in it that I might support and certain clauses in it that I might not support; but you certainly should not try and railroad through this House sections of the Bill that are of far-reaching importance and that certainly must need to be amended. I believe that if this Amendment of the Prohibition Act was put to a plebiscite that it would be carried, but I strongly maintain that the Act should not be repealed in the hasty way the Government now proposes to do it. The House is going to meet again five or six months from now and no harm can be done by delaying this Bill until the next session. I

notice in the Bill a clause that empowers people of a district to have a branch store opened there, that is, if there are five thousand voters or more there and who send in a petition.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—No, if a majority of the people of any area of five thousand or more send in a petition for a branch store.

MR. HIBBS:—Well do you think it would be right to do that without authority from the people?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Ask Mr. Halfyard? He will tell you. He has petitions piled up in his office the height of the ceiling from people all over the Island asking for the repeal of the present Prohibition Act. Surely the signatures of twenty odd thousand people is an evidence that the law should be altered.

MR. HIBBS:—That is why I contend, as I have already said, that the majority of people in the country are in favor of a change, and that is one of the reasons why a plebiscite should be taken, but that does not give the present Government the right to repeal the Act now. I am not talking now because I am on the Opposition side of the House because I believe that there are some very laudable changes suggested in this Bill; but I still maintain that we should not ignore the principle that if it is right to consult people in St. John's and get their views regarding this measure that it is equally right to consult the people of the outports and get their views also before rushing this Bill through.

I think that the Government, if they tried, could have arranged some way to get the views of the outport people on this matter. We must not forget that in 1915 the question was considered big enough to put before the country by plebiscite and everybody thought it was right, although, perhaps, it might have been done then

more for political motives than anything else; but at the same time, if the Morris Government had placed the present Prohibition Act on the Statute Book without having consulted the people all over the country, what would have been thought of it? Well you are practically doing the same thing now, because the Act now before the House is a repeal of the 1915 one. However, I would say to the Government to give some further thought and consideration to this matter, as I think it would be preferable to the people as a whole if it was postponed until the winter session of the House when I believe the repeal of the Prohibition Act will receive the endorsement and approbation of the whole country, after due consideration been given the question. If I were talking politics, I may say, I would be able to give some advice to the Leader of the Government in this connection.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—We are prepared to take our chances.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in favor of the amendment to this Bill. I am for dry legislation. People say that the Prohibition Act cannot be enforced. But I claim that the prohibition law received the assent of the people of this country and it was put on the Statute Book by the free voice of the people, and I claim that it would be right and proper to send it back to the people for their decision, and it is not for members of the House of Assembly to take the onus of repealing the prohibition law. I am quite prepared to recognise that the Prime Minister has received a mandate to repeal the law, but instead of applying it to one section of the country I think it should be referred to the whole country. The Prime Minister said in his Manifesto that this important matter would receive the earnest consideration of his party

and that he hoped to prepare for enactment a satisfactory law and that a measure would be introduced and that representative people would have an opportunity of expressing their views fully and freely. Now I see that, according to the official synopsis of the proceedings of the Joint Committee, as published in the Daily News, that he has undertaken to have the views of representative citizens taken in regard to this question. The word citizens is put in here. Now I consider that St. John's is not the whole island, and when a law is to be introduced taking effect over the whole population of 250,000 people I fail to see why the people of St. John's, representing 40,000 people, should have an opportunity to voice their sentiments before that Joint Committee while representative delegations of the outports were not given an opportunity to be heard before that Committee. I support the amendment and plead for time to consider the matter. We have on our Statute Book a prohibition law and we are told by the Government that it cannot be enforced. That is a matter of opinion. We have to look not only to ourselves but to the people outside. In October of this year a plebiscite is going to be taken in Ontario as to whether or not alcoholic liquors are to be sold there. Also in the Presidential election next November in the United States a vote may be taken as to whether or not the prohibition law is to be repealed there. Consequently, I think that, as the prohibition law came into effect in Newfoundland by the free voice of the people, the matter should be referred back to the people again to decide by plebiscite. This Bill is of too far-reaching a character to be railroaded through this House. While it is true that there may be sections of the Bill that are commendable, still I have yet to be convinced that the majority of the people of this

country are in favor of it, particularly in view of the protests which I have heard since this Bill has been introduced. We have heard a lot about the smuggling of liquor; but liquor is not the only thing that has been smuggled into Newfoundland during the past three or four years.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—
You are very well right.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—And I doubt if this law is going to do away with smuggling or the manufacturing of moonshine. I believe that if this Bill goes through now that we will be building on shifting sand rather than on rock, and I appeal to members of this House on either side not to rush this Bill into law during the dying hours of this session, but to delay it in order to give the country an opportunity of expressing their views, as promised by the Prime Minister in his Manifesto.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Amendment, but I do not propose to discuss the relative merits or demerits of the Bill now before the House. I am of the opinion that the Government is not well advised and would not be acting judiciously to press for the placing of this law on our Statute Book during the closing hours of this session. Legislation affecting prohibition must of necessity be important legislation. It is legislation which in every country has engaged the serious consideration of the best minds of the day, and it is a question which has been responsible for many national troubles. The history of prohibition in Newfoundland is well known throughout the length and breadth of the Island. Resolutions were brought here in 1915, we know the vigorous manner in which that campaign was conducted and we know the result on the issue at that time. It was the first opportunity I had, as a Newfoundlander, to cast a

vote and I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I voted against prohibition. I had learned, read and studied the question and the reason I voted against prohibition was because I thought at the time that the thing was too re-actionary. I thought that there was not going to be a sufficient backing of public opinion behind the Act to make it workable or enforceable. In my opinion this Act or any Act cannot be carried out unless you have a wholesale and whole-hearted public opinion behind it. Mention was made by the honourable Minister of Justice to the effect that because of the great number of people opposing the prohibition law that that was the reason it was not workable in this country. To my mind the reverse is the case. I think that the people of the country should be given a chance to consider this Bill before it passes this House, because the matter is of too far-reaching importance to be dealt with hurriedly. Take the Provinces of Canada. Has prohibition been repealed there without referring it back to the people? I have made diligent enquiries and I cannot find a single instance where it has not been reverted back without submission to the people. I admit that the present state of affairs under our so-called prohibition law is deplorable and very much to be regretted, and I congratulate the Prime Minister and his Government in endeavouring to place some kind of a repeal on the Statute Book; but for the life of me I am at a loss to know why this present Bill should be enacted into law so hastily merely to encourage the tourist trade, because that argument does not hold water, as the tourist traffic for this season is now nigh over.

However, I do not think that that particular reference in the Prime Minister's Manifesto to prohibition was as much talked about during the

last election campaign as he would like people to believe. In St. Barbe district I heard very little talk about it, and I think that my opponent will agree with me. There were more vital topics at stake, and I cannot take it down that the majority of the people throughout the country supported the Prime Minister because of this particular part of his Manifesto, nor do I think that the Prime Minister can strictly argue that such was the case. It might have had some effect in St. John's, but I still maintain and argue, that it is most unfair and unjust to give the people of St. John's a chance of voicing their opinion on this important subject while the same privilege is not accorded the people of the outports. I am not saying or declaring what my attitude will be when this matter is voted upon, but I would like to see the people of the outport districts given a square deal and allowed the same right and the same privilege as the people of St. John's. I believe that there are ways that could be devised whereby the Prime Minister could get representative opinion offered, and I would appeal to him not to rush this measure through without giving the outports a chance to express their views on such an important matter. The Bill contains some sixty odd sections and it is quite a job for any man to give this thing any study in such a short space of time, and I would ask members of the Government to give this matter their most earnest consideration and delay further discussion of it until the next session of the House which, we are told by the Prime Minister, will take place within a few months, and when a solution of the difficulty will not look so re-actionary as it does at the present time. For the reasons I have mentioned I support the Amendment.

Whereupon the House divided and

there appeared in favor of the amendment:—

Mr. Hickman.
Mr. Halfyard.
Mr. Hibbs.
Mr. Grimes.
Mr. Scammell.
Mr. Duff.
Mr. Ashbourne (7)

And against it:—

Hon. the Prime Minister.
Hon. the Colonial Secretary.
Hon. the Minister of Justice.
Hon. the Minister of Finance.
Hon. the Minister of Posts.
Hon. Mr. Sullivan.
Hon. Mr. Cramm.
Hon. Mr. Bradley.
The Minister of Agriculture.
The Minister of Public Works.
Mr. Cashin.
Mr. Moore.
Mr. Vinicombe.
Mr. Chambers.
Mr. Power.
Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Linegar.
Mr. Browne.
Mr. Warren (19)

So the amendment was lost.

Whereupon on the motion for adoption of Report the House divided and there appeared in its favor:—

Hon. the Prime Minister.
Hon. the Colonial Secretary.
Hon. the Minister of Justice.
Hon. the Minister of Finance.
Hon. the Minister of Posts.
Hon. Mr. Sullivan.
Hon. Mr. Cramm.
Hon. Mr. Bradley.
The Minister of Agriculture.
The Minister of Public Works.
Mr. Cashin.
Mr. Moore.
Mr. Vinicombe.
Mr. Chambers.
Mr. Power.
Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Linegar.
Mr. Browne.
Mr. Warren (19)

and against it:—

Mr. Hickman.
Mr. Halfyard.
Mr. Hibbs.
Mr. Grimes.
Mr. Scammell.
Mr. Duff.
Mr. Ashbourne (7)

so it passed in the affirmative, and was ordered accordingly.

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

Mr. Warren gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Hibbs gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice, and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 3 Geo. V., Cap. 14 entitled 'An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador'" was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Finance and Customs,'" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Rules of the House were suspended respecting all matters now before the House, or to come before it, during this Session.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland" was recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill as amended.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

(1) MR. HICKMAN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs: (1) What quantity of wire nails was imported into this country for year ending June 30th, 1924; (2) The quantity of wire imported by manufacturers for making nails; (3) The quantity of wire nails manufactured in the country during 1923-1924 on which Sales Tax was paid; (4) The amount collected as Sales Tax on wire nails during the year.

THE HON. MINISTER FINANCE—
I beg leave to table the answer.

(2) MR. WARREN asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the reports made by any Government officials and especially Messrs. MacFarlane and Ledingham respecting the value of the S.S. Senef before her sale by the Government.

THE HON. MINISTER FINANCE—
I beg leave to table the answer to that question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Disembarking of Paupers.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill en-

titled "Of the disembarkation of Paupers."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE
—Mr. Chairman: On the last day we were in session I did not get a chance to draw your attention to this Bill. The object of this Bill is to get rid of the burden often imposed upon this country of having to feed and otherwise support undersirables from foreign lands. Occasions have occurred where vessels come along here, and drop off some of their crew, they are really paupers, in the sense that they cannot provide for and have no means of providing for themselves, and consequently they become a charge or a burden on the Colony. There is no possible way of getting at those who are responsible and of late it has been practised by people on their way to the United States, and having been refused admission often find their way here, and become a charge on us. One way of getting over this matter would be to refuse clearance to vessels leaving people here.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY
—Mr. Chairman: I did not get a chance of seeing this Bill before today. At the present time there are conditions existing in this country that should no longer be allowed to exist. I am not speaking about those who are affected by this Bill, but of immigration and particularly of emigration to the United States. There have been hundreds of cases where our people go to the United States to seek employment, and we find that they are returned as undesirables. It is time that we enact some laws to protect our workmen against imported contract labour. The treatment accorded our workmen when they seek entry into the United States where contract labour laws exist is appalling, it is certainly a great contrast to the treatment given strangers coming here. These strangers often times not only receive better wages than our

own, but they become domineering and insulting. Some necessary provision or department is lacking when numbers of our men are permitted to undergo hardships and disappointments at the gateways to the United States when a little practical advice before leaving our shores would remove all possibility of those discomforts. It is only about two years ago that some twenty seven men belonging to Trinity Bay were sent back from the United States because of some trivial rule enforced there. Those men were good labourers, men that any country may feel proud of possessing. Those men were in New York, and then they were sent to Ellis Island, and then deported here at the expense of the Shipping Company, and their own passages up. The simple reason is that there is no one to instruct them. There are not sufficient facilities providing for the instruction of those people. They go off to New York and because of some trivial technicality they are sent back again, they lose their time and their money.

Now what is our position here? The United States have a perfect right to make their own laws to limit the number of immigrants, but at the same time the United States are protecting themselves, and we have no protection. The United States' number of immigrants are watched by their big unions up there. I have here a printed form which those seeking entry into the United States are required to fill in, it is an appalling document and well might puzzle the educated not to speak of the poor half illiterate fisherman or labourer. I think it a shame that while we are being discriminated against we admit all and sundry without question, even when they are coming in here to elbow our own out of positions. I know of a case where four telegraph operators went up to the United States from Heart's Content. They were perfectly competent and capable operators. They got em-

ployment at Detroit, their positions were secured through the Western Union Telegraph Co. and what happened? The immigration authorities were going to send them back as undesirables. The Western Union Co. took the matter up, and the Detroit Immigration Authorities appealed to the Washington Authorities, and the Washington Authorities sustained the immigration authorities of Detroit. One girl who seemed to be more plucky than the others consulted a lawyer on the matter, and fought the case, and judgment was given in her favour, and rulings regarding the other three had to be made accordingly. But what are we doing here? What about Corner Brook where the imported labourer is given preference to our own. Are we preventing the importation of undesirables in this country? Why, we sometimes even pay them to come here. I know of another case where a man was sent back from the United States to Nfld. when he had seventeen hundred dollars in his pocket. Another case was where a woman who had been living in the United States for some years and all her family and relations were there and because she was insane she was sent down here to us away from all her friends and relations, although they were prepared to look after her, and pay all expenses. We cannot even send an insane Russian out of Newfoundland, if he goes insane he is kept here at the expense of the Newfoundland Government. I say Mr. Speaker that this Bill does not go far enough, it only protects us in one of the many instances that we meet. I would suggest that the Bill be made more elaborate. I would also suggest that some means be provided so that every possible instruction be given to our people going to the United States. I am glad Mr. Chairman to support this Bill, but I certainly would like for it to be extended to cover other cases.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: I am very glad indeed to tell the Hon. Colonial Secretary that the very point he has made is one which I have been considering for some time. The present Bill is intended to put into application readily and quickly legislation that can only be put into effect by the Governor-in-Council. It is intended to add to the Act already in force. We are only now provided for in cases where alien persons are insane, and we want to add to that.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—Mr. Chairman: I am glad that I am here when this Bill is being discussed. I was particularly interested in what was said by the Hon. Colonial Secretary. When I was coming through Sydney a few days ago, I was talking to the representative at North Sydney, Mr. Shano, and he told me of several instances where he had helped those who had been turned down by the immigration officers of the U.S.A. One case was that of a woman with six children who was proceeding to join her husband, and she was prevented from proceeding because she had not the birth certificates of her children, and in this case Mr. Shano fixed up birth certificates for her, and she was allowed to proceed. But although his power to give birth certificates, may be questioned, I think the authorities at Sydney are seemingly more obliging than they are in the States, and particularly at Ellis' Island.

Now in the United States the authorities are very strict with regard to allowing people to enter, but here we have no law to protect ourselves and we know that we often have people coming in here who are anything but desirables. I would like to point out to the Minister of Justice that in my opinion an alteration could well be made to meet certain cases. I would suggest that the words in section 2 "Not born in the Colony" be substitut-

ed by the following:—"The Minister of Justice (on recommendation of the Inspector General) may make an expulsion order respecting any person not a citizen of this country."

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the object of this Bill which is to give the Government the authority to send alien undesirables back to their own country so as not to become a charge on Newfoundland. Newfoundland unhappily owing to the lack of industrial labour does not have a great number of people coming in, but it would be a very desirable thing to have some protection.

I quite appreciate the remarks made by the Hon. Colonial Secretary regarding industrious Newfoundlanders who go to the United States to look for employment, and I say that if Newfoundlanders going to the United States were given the necessary instructions they would be saved considerable annoyance, expense and trouble. Newfoundlanders now going into the United States are asked the question "Are you under contract for work," and as we would imagine if the answer was in the affirmative it would be to their advantage, and a great help to them in getting in, but such is not the case, it actually spoils their chances of being admitted. Whilst we are not in a position to alter the laws of the United States one iota we can at least protect ourselves against undesirable aliens.

MR. W. R. WARREN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to draw attention to para. 3. It strikes me that there would be a possibility, or we would find ourselves confronted with a possibility, of having to penalize innocent Ships' Agents. From the wording of the Bill a responsibility would be placed upon ships' Agents who may be perfectly innocent in the matter, and quite ignorant of the landing of strangers on our shores.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

—I may say Mr. Chairman that a provision could be inserted protecting an innocent agent. We do not expect the Bill to meet every possible feature or reach every case, but it would act as a lever for the inforcement or as a prevention in keeping masters from disemlarking undesirables. I may say that I am agreeable to amend the Bill and insert a clause refusing to grant a vessel its clearance so as to protect innocent agents; but with regard to the other point of "persons not born in Newfoundland" it would be rather difficult to meet that.

MR. W. J. BROWNE—I would suggest Mr. Chairman that we would use the term "Persons who are not citizens of this country."

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: I think myself that it would be rather hard on the Agents. There would also be, or would seem to be, a difficulty in the definition of the word Agent. Would the word "Agent" apply to a person who had chartered a vessel for a particular voyage? Take for instance a Norweigan vessel coming out to Newfoundland, she may have an agent here or she may not, and supposing I send her to Fogo or Twillingate to bring up a load of fish, would I be looked upon as the vessel's Agent?

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Agriculture, the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture, and the Acts in Amendment thereof,'" was read a second

time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture, and the Acts in Amendment thereof.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "Of the Encouragement of Agriculture, and the Acts in amendment thereof."

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—Mr. Chairman, I beg to say shortly that this is a Bill merely to repeal the Act in connection with the Model Farm. As you all know the Model Farm no longer exists, and it is of no use to have the Bill on the Statute Book. I may say that in pursuance of the policy of economy, it has been found necessary to abolish the Agriculture Board Commissioners and the Experimental Farm.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, while this matter is before the House I would like to take this opportunity to ask what is the Government's policy in regard to the cutting of pit props. It has been brought to my notice recently by quite a few people who, in a great many cases were mill owners. On behalf of the licensed mill owners the Government should take into consideration that the cutting of pit props is a serious disadvantage to their operations. The cutting should be discontinued except in absolute cases of necessity as it is a most destructive policy. I would strongly suggest that if it is found necessary to again permit the cutting and export of pit props to afford relief, that before granting permission, the Government would

carefully consider the interests of mill owners who are threatened with the complete destruction of the timber convenient to their mills.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the point raised by the hon. member for Trinity. I also appreciate the fact that a bona fide mill owner who has gone to considerable expense in keeping his mill going, should receive some consideration. I may say that I may have occasion to take this matter up with the Executive, and I shall do all possible in my power to protect the small mill owner, and also his limited timber areas.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to Repeal Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Agriculture, and the Acts in amendment thereof" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. The Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—This Bill is in connection with the duties on gasoline, flour, pork and molasses.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to place myself on record as advocating the repeal of the duties on flour, pork, kerosene oil and molasses.

MR. HALFYARD:—I would also like to place myself on record, Mr. Chairman, in connection with this Bill, and to state I cannot understand why the gasoline which motor car owners use, is placed on the free list, while the kerosene which the fishermen use in their motor boats is not. I hope the Government will see their way clear to remedy this.

MR. GRIMES:—Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with Mr. Halfyard that the laboring classes should get their oil cheaply, and in view of the predicted increase in revenue, it should be possible to arrange it. Conditions are not as they were before, and I think the honorable member for St. John's West will recognize that many families are not earning \$600 a year and that employment is scanty. The fishermen are coming back from the Labrador with short catches, and I do not think they ought to be asked to pay for articles such as those mentioned. The fishermen are burdened enough already, and I join in the protest of my colleagues against the imposition of these duties.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I would like to ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance when he will table the Public Accounts.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—I was wondering why that was not asked before—I would now beg to take them.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow afternoon at three o'clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, Aug. 12th, 1924.

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

MR. WARREN—Asked Hon. the Prime Minister what steps have been taken since the House opened to convene a Commission of Enquiry into the various departments named by the Warren Ministry and if any steps had been taken by the present Government to obtain the services of a Commission either here or through the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The only steps taken by the Government have been to seek a Commissioner to conduct an enquiry, Mr. Hollis Walker being applied to to take over this work. I have a reply here which I received from him yesterday in which he says he will not be able to act on this Commission.

(Reply read).

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Committee of the Whole on a Bill entitled "Of the Disembarkation of Paupers."

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd

Series) entitled "Of the Disembarkation of Paupers."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—In connection with this Bill the House will remember, there were two points raised in connection with it. One was the elimination of the agent's responsibility and the other. Any undesirable could be deported on an order from the Inspector General.

I may point out for the information of the member for St. John's West that as it is a case of the Inspector General exercising his prerogative in which power is given him to exercise, there is no danger of any hardship to any Newfoundlander.

In connection with Par. 3 we propose to make a change in this Law and we intend making it compulsory upon the Agent. We propose to eliminate Section 3 and substitute what is a provision under the Emigration Act. This should come into effect by order of the Governor in Council. Similar power is given to the Minister of Justice.

I trust this will meet the point raised by the Hon. member. Sole charge rests upon the master and in the event of failure to comply makes him liable for proceedings at Law. I submit the substituted Section to the House. Section 3 is to be eliminated and the Section I have read is to take its place.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Disembarkation of Paupers" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said

Bill be engrossed, being entitled, as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON AN ACT RESPECTING ALCOHOLIC LIQUORS.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, as we go through this Bill I would like to ask the members of the House to note some alterations that have been made. They are merely typographical and can be noted as we go along. In moving the House into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Chairman, the foremost question that has to be considered, and the one question that is involved, in this legislation, is whether the alcoholic liquors shall or shall not be sold as a beverage. The Prohibition Act has been in force for the past seven years and has been debated and amendments have been suggested from time to time. In 1921, two years ago, under the Squires' administration an enquiry was instituted into the act. A committee was formed of which Sir William Lloyd was Chairman, Rev. Doctor Jones, Rev. Dr. Levi Curtis, Mr. Grimes and others were members. The committee brought in a report. I am not going to trouble the House by reading that report which consists of ten or fifteen pages of typewritten matter. The result of the Commission was that they recommended that liquors be sold as a beverage. They recognized that the law could not be carried out and they brought forward the pro-

position that liquors in small quantities should be permitted to be bought by every householder. This report came before the Government and was never acted upon by them. Temperance people disapproved of it because they thought that liquor should not be sold as a beverage. The Government disapproved of it I suppose because they thought that they would not get sufficient liquor revenue under the amended act. The act remains that the recommendations of this Committee were pigeon holed, with the consent of the temperance people and the non-temperance people.

Prohibition was allowed to go on in the same farsical way as before, making us a laughing stock and a disgrace in the face of the entire world. I am not going to detain the House this afternoon with a very long address on prohibition or anti-prohibition but I mean to put myself and my Government right with this House, as far as it is possible, on the attitude it has adopted in this proposition. I took the position in my manifesto that the Prohibition Act was impossible and could not be carried out and I stated that definitely in the manifesto. I said I was not going to have a plebescite but declared for a policy in favor of a repeal of the Prohibition Act. We cannot repeal the Act without putting something in its place. We had to have some alternative measure. We promised to give the people an opportunity to come before a commission to express their views. That has been done. A committee composed of members of both sides of both Houses invited the people to come before it and if we remained in session for three weeks or three months we would not have got any more evidence than we have got. We have got the opinions of four Attorney Generals who say that it is impossible to carry the law out. In 1919 Mr. Morine, a strong prohibitionist,

thought that the law could be carried out. He now says it is impossible. He took one act on to attempt to carry it out. He sent a man-of-war down to the District which I represent and arrested men for moonshining. What happened? The next Government came in and the men were allowed to go and given carte blanche and a promise of not being prosecuted and I suppose that the moonshining is going on there ever since. Mr. Warren the late Attorney General told me that last year he received a report from a certain District that moonshining was going on. A clergyman sent in the complaint and asked that a prosecution be proceeded with. Mr. Warren acted on it and sent down two policemen to investigate. What happened in that case?

The clergyman changed his mind. In the first place in making the complaint he said that the man was making the moonshine and feeding it to his children before they went to school in the morning. When the police went down, the clergyman said, he found that the man was a poor man with a family dependent on him and refused to give evidence and so in the absence of any evidence the police had to come away again. I suppose that the moonshining is going on as before and whether the man is still feeding the stuff to his children before breakfast, or not, I do not know. But gentlemen I say that before Prohibition we never heard of moonshining. We did not have such a great lot of smuggling as we have now. There may have been a little on the South and West Coasts but not nearly so much as there is now. Now smuggling is the practice all over the country. Liquor is being brought in everywhere. In my opinion smuggling is even less harmful than moonshining. Only last night I was coming up from Water Street in the car. While I was on it two men got on who were absolutely drugged,

not with ordinary liquor but with moonshine or some other kind of concoction of that sort. Now gentlemen whilst we cannot hope to abolish drunkenness completely we can hope to reduce it to the greatest possible extent and the act with which we hope to do it is one which the Government can justly feel proud of. I know that this will be called a reactionary measure. It will be said that from total prohibition we are going to be able to drink all we wish. On the contrary gentlemen, we are going to have less drinking and drunkenness than ever we had before. We are bringing an act before the House and we are going to see that it is carried out for it is up to the Government that introduces such a bill to see that it is carried out. If the Act is not enforced and things are allowed to run as before the condition will be as bad as before. But under this act a man who is guilty of a breach of it will be arrested and any man for instance who buys a bottle of spirits and then takes it down to a wharf and drinks it with three or four others will also be arrested and not only will he be arrested and come before the Court but the fact that he has come before the Court will be reported to the Controller's Department and his right to procure liquor will be cancelled for six months. If anybody else then purchases liquor for that man who has lost his right to purchase liquor the same punishment will be meted out to him. Now, gentlemen, the Government having brought this bill before the House to-day is perfectly satisfied that it is the best measure that can be brought before the country. One class that came before the commission the other day was composed of those who wanted absolute prohibition. I can only say that they were asking what was absolutely impossible. The other class that came before us were those who advocated

that we proceed slowly. They did not want the measure rushed through the House this session thus wanting to give everybody a chance to consider the bill. Well I think that the time that we devoted to the hearing of the evidence was just as far reaching in results as if we had sat for three months. We could not have improved this measure which we bring before the House by any further delay. We would receive a great number of petitions I have no doubt. I have received numerous telegrams already, but none of them, like the speakers from the Opposition side of the House, have suggested any improvement to the bill; they want to have the bill deferred until the next session of the Legislature, and they give no substantial reason for that request. Some people are asking for a plebiscite to be taken. We considered that the taking of a plebiscite would not be necessary and we stated our intention to repeal the act without taking a plebiscite and the country returned us with a mandate to go ahead and do it. Nothing could be more distinct than our statement in this connection.

We said that we were going to alter the law. We said that the prohibition act had to be repealed because it was not found to be workable and I say now that I cannot see any reason why we should wait until the next session. If we waited until the next session we might receive many petitions from the various outports, but in any case these would not represent the opinions of the people and the only way to get the opinion of the people would be to take a plebiscite. As I said before we do not consider a plebiscite necessary because if the proposal to abolish the prohibition act were put to the people of the country I feel quite sure that the reply would be to abolish it. And now gentlemen we come to the position taken up by the members of the

Opposition. Three members of the Opposition sat on the Commission and everyone of them was in favour of the bill and every one spoke in favour of it. They admitted that the present prohibition law had got to be amended and something else had to be put in its place. They made no plea while the commission was in session, and the first intimation of any objections on their part that we received was when they came into the House and brought in their Minority Report. Mr. Hickman was of the opinion that something had to be done. Mr. Grimes was the only person who suggested that we should move slowly, and wait for the next session. No one used any reasonable argument why we should wait. No one showed any benefit that could be derived by waiting. I want to point out why the change should be made as early as possible. It is the intention of this Government to do some constructive work. And one of the things which we propose doing is the development of the tourist traffic. We want to see this country of ours entertaining tourists from all over America. We contend that we have got the country to attract. We are sure that we have the most excellent fishing and many, many other attractions to bring tourists here. We can interest hotel companies to build a chain of hotels through the country and by this means bring a large amount of revenue to the country. Now the gentleman on the other side of the House who referred to the tourist traffic said that it was practically over for this year, so that there was really no hurry. He thought the next session would be soon enough for the tourist traffic. I want to point out that if we want the tourist traffic we have to prepare for it. Hotels are not put up over night. Arrangements for the financing of these hotels are not made overnight. It takes a long time

to prepare for the tourist traffic, and for that reason if for no other we want to get the bill through the House at the earliest possible date. Now with regard to the request for delay so that people of the outports may have time to consider the measure before the House, I say that any outport can have six months if it wants it to find out what it wishes done, because as soon as this bill has gone through the House not a drop of liquor or a bottle of beer can go to any district until fifty one per cent of the people of the district have asked for it. The majority of five thousand people have got to ask for it before they can get it, and if that is not a safeguard for the people of outports against having liquor unless they want it then I do not know what else it is. It does not matter to the outports what happens in St. John's. With regard to the smuggling and moonshining I say that moonshining was never heard of before our so called prohibition. Smuggling was not common in most districts. I may say in conclusion that the people of the outports have every opportunity of prohibiting liquor if they do not want it. They cannot get it if they do not demand it. With these few remarks I commend the bill to your consideration.

MR. GRIMES:—I rise to oppose the bringing in of this Bill at this session of the Legislature. I have listened very attentively to the Prime Minister while he stated the reasons why it should be brought before the House at this session and nothing that he has said has been able to convince me that the action taken by the Government at the present time is an advisable one. He has stated himself that he has received telegrams from all over the country protesting against having the legislation go through at the present time. We find to-day that the Bill before the House is entirely different from what was anticipated from the Manifesto of the

Prime Minister when he promised to change the prohibition law. We did not expect that, when the Prime Minister said he would repeal the law, he was going to bring in a Bill so that every man could get a bottle per day and beer and wine in unlimited quantities. There are very many different opinions as to what is necessary. I was a member of the commission, as the Premier said, in reference to that report which was presented to the House in 1921. and that commission took evidence from all parts of the island—north, south, east and west, and we found that a large portion of the people of this island do not consume more spirits than a gallon and a half yearly. The Prohibition Act provided that the use of spirits as a medicine should be allowed. It seemed to the commission that it would not be right in this case that if a man lived out in the country that he should be compelled to travel twenty or thirty miles to a doctor to get a script. And when we considered the hardship to a man of very limited means, such as the fishermen are, we recommended that a gallon and a half of spirits should be distributed in equal weekly quantities or perhaps monthly quantities. A gallon and a half of spirits a year would not make a drunkard of anyone. But I cannot see how in the present case why an opportunity should not be given to the people to decide for themselves how they would like to deal with the present situation. I can agree with the Prime Minister that the present condition of affairs is bad. But the trouble was this, that when the plebiscite was carried in 1916 and prohibition was placed on the Statute Books, public opinion, which was very much alive during the fight for prohibition, became inert and the consequence was that the condition of things in Newfoundland and St. John's in particular, became a disgrace. But I do not

think that this is sufficient reason for this Bill to be brought into the Legislature at this time. The remedy for the present situation is not contained in this Bill. The Prime Minister in his remarks said that it would be the means of lessening drunkenness because it would only permit a man to get a bottle a day. Now, since this Bill came up before the Legislature I procured some information on the condition of things as they exist in Canada. This Bill is modelled on the Quebec Act, and in Quebec the conditions which exist to-day are those which I predict will be the case in Newfoundland. Well, what is the condition of affairs in Quebec? A newspaper that supported the Tachereau Government said the other day in an editorial that the condition of things in Montreal were never worse. The cabarets are a disgrace to the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—
We have no cabarets in St. John's.

MR. GRIMES:—We are getting very modern in these days, and we are likely to have it here the next time. This not only applies to Quebec but to many other places where liquors have been sold. And I have right here what Cardinal Begin has said on the question.

Cardinal Begin has said that the conditions are entirely different from what is being represented to us here. I am referring to statements made with regard to moonshining. If the Bill had been carried out there would have been less wet places than at the present day. You know what a vigorous fight has been fought for the views of the temperance people. After about one or two years' work they had almost conquered. But, alas, there is now spreading everywhere an intolerable abuse which is more harmful than any other form of liquor to both the body and the soul. He did not make a statement

without knowing what conditions prevailed. And because he knew these conditions he took this stand. Not only in Quebec, but if you go to Vancouver you will find there that the men are very strong in opposition now to the Government sale of liquors. They say over there that the clubs are a disgrace to the city of Vancouver. They are used as bootlegging establishments, and the chief of police says that there are 125 in the city of Vancouver alone. And do what they can in the way of fines, they are only too glad to pay fines. Get such a revenue as if there was no law on the Statute Book at all. That is the condition of things that prevails in Vancouver. You say that the free sale of liquor will stop moonshining. If you went across to Ireland, where they have a saloon for every 400 inhabitants, the conditions are the same as in British Columbia and Quebec. The same evil exists there. Illicit liquors turned out in places where they get all the liquor they want. Still going on larger than ever in the history of the island; only repeating the same thing as is going on in British Columbia, and then to say that because we were going to have a greater sale of spirits that we are going to lessen the use of moonshine. After the experience of these places it is only blinding ourselves to the facts. Now the Prime Minister went on to say that ever since Adam and Eve were in the garden, and they started prohibiting things, we have been in trouble. I think they were very happy until they disobeyed the law, and when they disobeyed the law all the trouble came. And it is because we disobeyed the law that all the evils that we have to-day exist. I would like to know if we should prohibit stealing in the country to-day. If you think it is wrong to prohibit things why not remove the statute law with regard to stealing. I don't think our

homes our families or our business would be safe if stealing should not be punished. The same thing applies with regard to the excessive use of intoxicating liquors.

Now, I have a statement here with regard to Quebec. Here is the condition that exists in Quebec today. Last year one-third of the crimes of the Dominion of Canada occurred in Quebec, several firms were compelled to discharge at the rate of 12 men a day on account of intorication. The workingman became disgusted and many of them migrated from wet Quebec to dry United States. The funded debt of Quebec is increasing. It is said that if we bring in this Bill we will get an increased revenue. With the getting of an ncreased revenue we will also get an increased expenditure. The figures will show that.

Now, with reference to British Columbia. It was said that the price of moderate drinking would soon wipe out the public debt. But it has more than doubled in three years. In 1920 it was \$30,631,000. In 1921, \$54,000,000; in 1922, \$64,000,000, and in 1923, \$68,000,000, with Govt. sale of liquors. The point is, it was going to lessen the debt. It has been increasing all the same. But they don't want to go back under prohibition. Not so far as those concerned find it very easy to find excuses.

For every \$10 spent on liquor in Quebec there was only \$1 coming back for the revenue. In Saskatchewan it is much the same. So much money was spent on liquor that the retail groceries have petitioned for putting through a Bill claiming that they were interfering with the other business of the country. That same thing is going to happen in Newfoundland. It only stands to reason, if you have a million more spent on liquor than there is to-day, that is going to be taken from the grocer and the dry goods man. It is the people who are living

on small incomes that suffer. They will be taking it from their little children and their wives. They ought to receive the greatest consideration of this House. Can they afford to spend increased amounts? Can they afford to deny them the education that they should get? They are taken away from school at an early age. we cannot afford to run risks after the experience of Quebec and British Columbia. That is why I ask that legislation be deferred so that we could have information as to conditions that exist in other places. I venture to say that when they would get other information they would hesitate to pass this Bill. I submit that the best way to tell is to refer it back to the people. Get the people to decide whether they want the Bill or not. You have no right to do it. It is true, as the Prime Minister says, that he got a mandate to do it. I say it was in his manifesto. Whether it was discussed or not I doubt it very much. It might have been in St. John's and in isolated cases in the outports. It was never discussed in Twillingate. I doubt whether in Ferryland or on the West Coast you said were going to repeal the Prohibition Act. They do not interpret for the whole island. It is only fair to give an opportunity to everyone to express themselves on this question and two-thirds have not been given an opportunity. He said that he would give an opportunity for the representatives to be heard, and the only representatives that have been heard are those in St. John's and one in from Carbonear. Is that fair? Do you say that St. John's and one man from the outports represent all the people of Newfoundland? You have made a flagrant breach of trust. People have been deceived by it. If you are determined to push this Bill through, and I say that you have no business to put through legislation of this kind until the people are given an opportunity to discuss it very

carefully, give them plenty of time to decide. If they decide for prohibition put it on the Statute Book. If you do that you will have done fairly by the people. Otherwise, if you deceive the people, the consequences will be yours.

MR. WARREN:—Any mention of liquor or rum seems—but not universally—to imply that there is something immoral about it and therefore it is with a certain amount of temerity that I get up to give the reason for signing the report of the Committee to which I belong. I have yet to hear, Sir, a sound argument against this Bill. I have listened to many arguments in favor of prohibition and many sound arguments in favor of temperance. We are not discussing temperance or prohibition. We are here to discuss this Bill and later on I propose to go more fully into that. As far as I am concerned it is no use to come to me with arguments in favor of prohibition or temperance. I have my own views and all I am concerned with is whether the Bill meets with the approval of those who put us here. The majority and not the minority. The Prime Minister in the course of his remarks referred to the statements I made to him. That happened while I was Minister of Justice. I heard a lot about the law not being enforced. It could not be enforced. Consider the psychology of the matter and you will find why it is not enforced. Compare the points of the prohibition law with those of the ordinary criminal law. Compare this with the other criminal laws. If any man steals from me or assaults me or libels or slanders me I appeal to the criminal law for vindication or the punishment of the individual. And my make-up is such and the make-up of every man is such, that having been injured, a wrong having been done him, he appeals to the criminal

courts and the person is punished. What happens under the Prohibition Law. If you drink or somebody drinks it does not matter to me. I am not injured or wronged. It is not the same as if anyone assaulted me. In the ordinary course I am not going to worry about it. Why should I punish him, he has not injured me. There are people who make it their business at certain times to look after that person. But those people who do that at certain times do not keep it up long. The instance that the Prime Minister quotes goes to show that. Complaints were sent into the Department of Justice that children going to school were drinking moonshine and had to be taken out of school drunk. They sent policemen down there. They went to the gentleman who sent in the complaint and he said "No." He did not want to proceed any further. I suppose he thought that if he proceeded against the man he would probably have to look after his family so he decided not to do it. If the Dept. that had to do with enforcing the law cannot get the help of the people, it is just as well to wipe out the law altogether.

My friend on my left, Mr. Grimes, was quoting from various pamphlets and papers to prove to this House how detrimental to the neighbouring provinces of Canada has been the introduction of a modified prohibition law in Quebec. And I am afraid that the facts we know of do not fall in with the statements he has read. Up to a few years ago we find Canada wet. Then it becomes dry, carried away by the prohibition fever that was rife at the time. But the province of Quebec which is regarded as the most conservative province in Canada, decided that they would do away the open saloon but not interfere with the liberty of the individual. Now at that time every other province was dry. Quebec had this

modified law. What happened? After the people had seen what was happening in Quebec the other provinces decided to try the same law. First British Columbia had it modified after a plebiscite. Then Manitoba. And as I said earlier in the session, the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan were the most rampant prohibitionists in the whole of Canada. After the neighbouring provinces had modified their law, Alberta, which had carried prohibition by a tremendous majority, went wet again. Quite recently Saskatchewan went wet too. If the Province of British Columbia or Quebec was the sink-hole of iniquity which Mr. Grimes said it is, if these have retrogressed under the prohibition law, why is it that sensible people living next door vote for the same law. Alberta and Saskatchewan know more than we do 3 thousand miles away. If they are in such a bad state on account of modified temperance the facts don't bear out the statements. I am sure that the majority of those are prohibitionists who voted and they have all turned the other way. Now, Sir, that would be an answer to some of the arguments

It may be asked why do I hold to this Bill, and why do I support it? The reason is that it provides the finest plebiscite that we ever had on the liquor question. If the Royal Assent is given to this Bill to-morrow, I cannot get a drop of liquor until the majority of the people say that they want it; in so far as the majority of the people ask for it they can now have it. With the exception of St. John's, not a single man can get a drop of liquor in any place unless the majority in that place say they want it, and they will then be given a chance to obtain same in that particular place. I say to those members of the House and those ardent temperance workers who say not to pass the Act, that they should go to the

people and get a majority to support their opposition to the Bill, and maintain same. I say to them who are against it, that it is their duty now to persuade the majority outside this House. I say quite honestly, that so far I have not heard one sound or convincing argument against the Bill.

I do not feel that I am doing anything wrong in giving my support to this Bill, nor do I feel that I am doing any other person wrong or harm by supporting it. I can support this Bill quite conscientiously, without in the least feeling any prick of conscience for my actions.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Chairman: It is quite evident that the Government have made up their minds to go on with, and put this Bill through. I am very pleased that so many ladies are present this afternoon, and I believe Mr. Chairman that if the ladies had the vote we would not be considering this Bill at the present time. I take this opportunity to say that I hope it will not be long before this country will get into line with the other Dominions, by giving the ladies the right to vote. I represent an outport district, and I say that the outports have not had any opportunity to consider this Bill. It has been said by the Prime Minister that the outport men cannot secure a bottle of liquor unless a majority of over fifty per cent. of the people vote for it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They can come to St. John's and get it, but they cannot get it in the outports without the majority from particular outports ask for it.

MR. ASHBOURNE—I feel pretty sure that the country is aroused at the present time against this measure, and I say that if the Government put this Bill in force, that at a very early day the people will want a vote to be taken on it. If this Bill goes through I have no doubt whatever, but that within a very short time the majority

of the voters in the country will be seeking its repeal.

They say that the Act cannot be enforced. I ask have we not a department that should see that not only should one law be carried out, but every law that goes upon the Statute Book. I do not think for one moment that the Department of Justice has done its duty in trying to enforce the Prohibition Law which we have on the Statute Book already.

Evidently the Government has considered that the time is come when liquor should be sold as a beverage. I said yesterday that I was not in favour of this Bill, and I spoke accordingly, but I do not see anything in the press about it. I said that I was not in favour of the measure, and that I could not support it. I also said and I repeat the same now that as the people voted for the Prohibition Act which we now have on the Statute Book, they should be given the right, to repeal same if they think it necessary to be repealed.

As I said yesterday I am in favour of dry legislation. I hope that I am consistent in this as well. I have seen the disastrous effects of alcohol upon people who have imbibed too freely. I am sorry to hear Mr. Monroe say that it is impossible for the Act as it stands at present to be carried out, but I say that what is impossible to some people, is not impossible to others. Now there are several sections to this Bill, and I intend to speak about them as we go along. With regard to tourist hotels,—I understand that a license cannot be granted to any place out side of St. John's except the majority of the people in that particular place have voted for it. I would now ask the Minister of Justice if a license can be granted to a hotel, or a tourists hotel which may be situated in a place where a majority of the people in that place have not asked for it?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

—Tourists Hotels are separately mentioned in the Bill. I take it that they would not be allowed licenses in places such as you referred to. In fact they would not be allowed to operate, or obtain licenses.

MR. ASHBOURNE—With regard to wines and beers, the Act says that those can be sold on trains and steamers. I really think that that is going too far. I am afraid that it will result in a good many abuses, and I have no doubt that people who sell wines and beers will also sell alcoholic liquors. As I said before I am in favour of bone dry legislation, and if we cannot get bone dry legislation, then let us have it as dry as we can.

With regard to Quebec, in spite of what has been said here I have had my eyes opened to the conditions existing there. If this Bill goes through I feel certain Mr. Chairman, that it will be necessary to make new appointments in the Civil Service. You will have to get people to operate this system, than you now have at the Controllers Department, and that of course will mean an increase in expenditure.

The mover of the reply to the Speech from the Throne commented upon the Prime Minister's fairness by not having the Bye-Election in Bonavista Bay until the Autumn, so as to give all the people in that district a chance to vote, and I submit Mr. Chairman, that the same thing should apply to this question. At the present time the majority of our people are away from their homes, either fishing or engaged at other labours, our churches are practically empty and therefore this matter should be deferred until the people are at home and have a chance to express their opinions upon the matter, and cast their votes according to their convictions and opinions.

With regard to Moonshine, people say that it costs more to make a bottle of Moonshine than it does to buy

a bottle of spirits, now I do not know about that but I fail to see how this Bill is going to prevent people from making Moonshine. I intended to speak on each section of this Bill as it was read, but as the Bill is so lengthy it seems almost impossible.

With regard to Penalties, I understand that the penalties have been changed since the Bill went to the Committee. I think that the penalty Clause is a good one. To-day we find that in the case of people who are brought before the Magistrates the fines are not very large, and I wonder Mr. Chairman whether or not that counts for the laxity of the law, or the laxity which is so evident in the enforcement of the law. I am yet to be convinced that the Prohibition Law cannot be enforced better than it is to-day. It reminds me of British Columbia; we are told that British Columbia is the bootlegger's paradise, and I do not believe that this Bill is going to have any effect towards decreasing smuggling. I also think that the Government is not going to make any money out of this Act, and I consider that there will be a good many families who will be without the necessities of life in order to make the Government grog shops do a roaring trade.

As I said before I want to put myself on record as being against this measure. There are things that make and break Governments, and I believe that this is one of the things, that is going to break the present Government.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman: I do not want to say very much, but I just want to emphasise the fact that yesterday, I had a telegram from Carbonear, signed by over two hundred people protesting against this Bill. I think that the people of Carbonear are fairly intelligent (with the exception of myself). I have been asked by those people to announce that they were

particularly asking for a delay of this measure.

I may also say now as I said yesterday that Moonshining will go on in the same way as it did before. This is supposed to be a Prohibition country, but we all know that it is not. The whole trouble is that we have a law, and no one seems to bother about enforcing it or seeing that it is carried out. I say now as I have often said before that when the Prohibition Law went into force it was too drastic to be properly carried out. I am in favour of some amendment to the Prohibition Law, but this Bill is not an amendment, it is a repeal of the Act. I am opposed also to such hasty actions as is being adopted at the present time, and I must offer my most earnest and strong protest against this measure.

Now, as I said before, I got that telegram yesterday, but there was no comment on it in the Daily News to-day. The least they might have done was mention the fact, but we are not expecting anything along those lines from that source, and we have to go elsewhere to get our statements published.

Another matter that I would like to mention is that I am reported here as saying that I was one of those who fought the Prohibition Act. Well, Mr. Chairman, I never did, and how the reporters can make up these things as they go along, I do not know; but I did say that I did not keep the Prohibition Act, and there are quite a few more like me. But, I am not a hypocrite when I ask the Government to put off the passing of this Bill until next session; and I also feel that the Government to-day are taking their lives in their hands. I am not what you might call a "party politician" either. I feel sure that when the wives and mothers of this country wake up to the fact that this Act is in force, they will consider that the Gov-

ernment is hoisting back liquor into this country, and you will find that they have some influence.

We are told that the fishermen are to get a small ration of rum when they come in cold and sick; and we are also told that the fishermen drink all the rum on the first day of the voyage, and when they get cold or sick there is no rum for them. I am positive, as Mr. Grimes says that no man who is normal does drink rum, and anyhow, they are better off without it.

MR. CAHILL:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to express my approval of the Bill now before the House, and at the same time to express my disapproval of Prohibition generally, and in particular of Prohibition as exemplified by the Prohibition Act now on the Statute Book in Newfoundland. Without wishing to delay the House, for any lengthy period and at the risk of advancing arguments that are already familiar to hon. members, I would like to state briefly just a few points that influence my mind in this manner. I consider, firstly, that Prohibition is wrong in principle when it assumes that drinking as such is an immoral act. Total abstinence from alcoholic beverages is no part of morality; and the moderate use of alcohol has been the universal practice of christendom has been from the example of the Divine founder and of the Apostles down through all the ages to the present day.

Again I claim that absolute Prohibition is subversive of true democracy. Because I do not indulge myself, I have no right to prohibit my next-door neighbour from the legitimate and temperate use of alcoholic beverage. Then again I claim that absolute prohibition is founded on a deception and an untruth, in that it assumes and takes for granted that alcoholic liquors are medicines, which they emphatically are not, instead of

being beverages which they emphatically are.

All these arguments, applying to Prohibition generally, would apply equally provided the Prohibition Act could be enforced but the sad part of it is that it cannot be enforced. It cannot be, and it should never have been passed because it is fundamentally wrong.

Everybody must recognize that prohibition is its own greatest enemy and paradoxical though it may seem, it is a fact that the minute an absolute Prohibition Law is put on the Statute Book, then the death knell of Prohibition is sounded. The people discover the iniquity of the Act, and the fact that it cannot be enforced, and the other evils that follow in its train—its general unfairness—and they change their minds and repeal the Act.

Another objection which I have against the Prohibition Act is the fact, which follows as a natural consequence from the fact that it cannot be enforced, is that it does not really prohibit. I am quite of the opinion that under the Prohibition Act in Newfoundland, for instance, just as much "hard" liquor has been consumed year by year as there was previous to Prohibition. I recently read an article in a high class American periodical which amply bears me out in this opinion. In the United States of America in 1917 something like one hundred and seventy million gallons of what are known as "hard liquors" were consumed in America, and this was topped off with over two billion gallons of beer. In 1923, after five years of enforced temperance, the American Public consumed about two hundred million gallons of hard liquors, or an excess of thirty million gallons over the pre-war period. At the same time, however, the consumption of beers dropped to less than one billion gallons, so that you see Prohibition re-

forming the drinkers of beer and wines into drinkers of hard liquors, which is not a very desirable state of affairs. Whilst I am on this point, I wish to say that I consider one of the favourable points of the present bill is that it loosens up somewhat the sale of light beers and wines, and I am quite confident that the comparatively easy access to light beers and wines will have the result of a reduction in the consumption of the harder liquors. I think, by the way, that that Statement of what has happened in America is some answer to the remarks of Mr. Grimes with regard to Quebec. I have no figures with regard to Quebec, but I have what after all perhaps counts a lot more—personal experience. I spent about a week in the city of Montreal last summer, and I visited a number of places there. Apparently I did not run across any of these cabarets that the Hon. member has referred to, but when I was in the City, I did not see any sign of intoxication. I did not see a drunken man in Montreal for the week or more that I was there. And Montreal was pretty well crowded at that time. The hotel where I stayed was crammed with American visitors. I saw them drinking beer happy and contented, but no man was intoxicated.

Another objection which I have to the present Prohibition Act is that, whilst it does not do very much towards promoting real temperance, it does bring even greater evils in its train. There is no need to particularize these evils, but they would include smuggling, rum running, illegal manufacture, graft, fraud and hypocrisy, and a general disrespect for all laws.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Gentlemen will perhaps bear with me at this stage if I try to make my position clear. Whilst I am opposed to the Prohibition Act, I am not anti-temperance, and it is precisely

because I believe that the Prohibition Act does not promote temperance, and that this Act will go very much further towards promoting temperance and I disavow the former and support the latter.

There are many arguments that can be brought forward in favor of the present Bill, but of these the one that appeals to me most is its absolute fairness. The Prohibition Act is not like this. Its unfairness is evident. The fact is that distinctions were made so that certain classes could get pretty well all the liquor they wanted, whereas the poor man had to go through all the tiresome formalities to get a bottle. The present act is not of that kind. It is fair to all classes; everybody is treated absolutely alike . . .

HON. PRIME MINISTER—A square deal to all.

MR. CAHILL—A square deal to all in this as in other matters. Another important point is that this Act can, and will be enforced strictly and impartially, and this being done, will be a great benefit to the community. Now, I listened carefully to the remarks of the members of the Opposition in support of their arguments yesterday, and this afternoon to the speeches of Mr. Grimes and Mr. Ashbourne, and it seems to me that, outside of Mr. Grimes and Mr. Ashbourne, all the members of the Opposition are quite opposed to the present Prohibition Act, and in favor of the present Bill; the only thing they ask for is delay, on the ground that they want to get the opinion of the general public. I agree with the Prime Minister that we have public sentiment absolutely behind us in this Bill. It appeared in the Manifesto of the Party that if this Government were returned to power, the Prohibition Bill would be amended. The public knew this and voted for us, and we know that they are quite prepared to ac-

cept the amendment that the Government are bringing in now. I spoke of the matter in my district of Harbour Main from every platform, and I have no hesitation in saying that I know the public sentiment in that district is in favor of the present bill. After all I think that the opinions of the Hon. members of this House give a very good indication of the opinion of the country at large. I think that the report of the joint select committee is another very good indication of public sentiment, and I am quite confident that this Bill will absolutely have public sentiment behind it. Just one other objection was advanced by some of the Opposition speakers, and that was in regard to the Outports not being consulted. I think that objection has already been largely answered in what I have just said; but, in addition, as has been pointed out, the Outports under this Bill have got the very best kind of local option. This Bill does not follow the principle of the Prohibition Act and tell them that because St. John's has got a Controller's Branch open they must have one. Not at all; it simply leaves it in the hands of a majority of the people as to whether they want a Department of the Liquor Controller in their District or not.

I see no good reason for delay in getting through with this Bill. I can quite appreciate the fact that some people may be surprised at promises made by political parties being taken seriously, and brought into effect promptly by those who make them; but the Monroe Government's making history in many ways, not the least of which is in its sincere and prompt efforts to keep its promises.

I have pleasure in congratulating the Prime Minister and the Government for their prompt recognition of the promises made by them in their Manifesto with regard to repealing

Prohibition. I congratulate them on their honesty and sincerity of purpose; and I have pleasure in according my entire support to the Bill now before the House, and I do so in the absolute and sincere conviction that the Bill will result in promoting temperance. I sincerely believe that it will do far more for real temperance than the old Prohibition Act, and that it will at least do away with the evil consequences, gross scandals and general demoralization which have resulted from the old Prohibition Act.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to place myself on record as against every clause of the Bill, especially that dealing with the sale on trains and passenger steamers.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That refers only to beer and light wines—and that must be served at meals.

MR. HALFYARD:—A man can get drunk on beer as well as on liquor.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—He would need to have some capacity.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Is it the intention of the Government to have one man as a dispenser on each boat?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—No, it is necessary for some one person to receive the permit to sell and then if a breach is complained of and sustained on enquiry, he will lose the permit. He will not be paid any special salary. For example—as was formerly the case the Chief Steward will have charge of the sales and he will be held responsible for violations. There will not be any special sellers appointed.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say much on this matter, but I have to record my protest against the passing of the measure at the present time, and I do

so so as to be consistent with my stand in supporting the amendment to the Report of the Select Committee yesterday. I have not prepared myself with statistics as to the results of the use of liquor in other provinces as set forth by Mr. Grimes who furnished the facts as to crime in places where the free distribution of liquor was tried, when it was claimed prohibition had failed. I know that no law is carried out to the letter, and I think that in connection with this, like every other, there will be infringements no matter how strict the officials in charge may be. My reason for not supporting this Bill at the present time is that the prohibition law was passed by the people in accordance with the conditions laid down and the enactment became the law of the land. If no more effort is made to enforce this than was the case with prohibition, then I fear we will shortly have to speak of this as we do now of the other. I think it will be found difficult to enforce it though the law may be all right. At the time the matter of the plebiscite for prohibition was before the House it was approved by both sides, and it was thought if we got light wines and beers, but others held that men would make beasts of themselves with these just as with strong liquors. I suppose they spoke from experience, and the argument holds good to-day. Therefore by this present Act a man can get all the beer and light wines he needs on steamers and trains—but I fear that if he does not get to the first table he will have a considerable wait. I know that those who deal with the management of the railway would like to see restrictions on the sale of all drinks, as they have enough trouble already from the use of such, and I believe if they were asked they would oppose any let-up in the obtaining of liquor. The Hon. the Prime Minister, in introducing the

Bill said, the freer the giving of liquor the less drunkenness and less smuggling, therefore I suppose people ought to be allowed to sell it how and when they will. Probably he intended to convey that the less distribution the less drunkenness. He has also said that the law will be enforced, but I would like to say wait and see. He has also said that if a man buying a bottle takes it to the wharf for consumption, he will be arrested. But where will that man go? If he goes home his wife will likely object, but the ordinary man is not in any club to go to as he cannot afford to be. I feel that when this Act becomes law and the man can go to the store and get his bottle, it will be drunk under all kinds of circumstances and in all kinds of places. And I fear that he will not be arrested either. As soon as the House opened, the Government cut out the horse police, but I fear it will be necessary now to increase the force to catch those who go drinking in the by-ways and hedges. There will be need of an army or there will be no arrests. Another thing the Hon. the Prime Minister said was that there had been ample opportunity given to those opposed to the measure to express their views, but if he can put through the law so hurriedly as he is doing, it would be just as well to have Minute-of-Council rule. As a matter of fact if this thing had been left to the former Executive, they would not pass it without having deputations from those opposed before them, and only then would it have been passed subject to ratification by the Executive. No opportunity has been given to objectors to voice their opinions, and this is one of the reasons why I cannot support the Bill. The passage of this measure is not in keeping with the spirit of the Premier's Manifesto and no specious argument can overcome the fact that time has not been given,

even to those residing in the city, to consider the Bill. Railroading is no name for the manner in which this legislation is being put through. It is only the opinion of the Government and some are supporting it against their better judgment as they would not like to see the administration broken on a Bill of this particular kind. The Prime Minister said yesterday, that the fishermen needed rum and graphically described their hardships in all kinds of weather, pointing out that they ought to have the facilities to get it after being exposed to the elements. I do not suppose he spoke from experience, and I would like to discountenance the idea that any proper member of a community does not know and appreciate the conditions under which the fishermen work. It is not in this spirit that I wish to refer to the Prime Minister's remarks. But I speak as a fisherman myself, having fished at Ochre Pit Cove, my former home, and at Labrador and with my knowledge of most of the places on the North Shore of Conception Bay, I say that the fishermen there hardly knew what liquor was, though this is contrary to the belief of some who think it is necessary for them. It is claimed that it is a stimulant, but there are other things that can be used as a substitute and will leave the fishermen in better health than if he had used the liquor. It is not my intention to speak of the effects of liquor upon health.

I congratulate the member for Hr. Main on the very excellent speech he has made with regard to the impossibility of enforcing prohibition on the prohibition people. I am sure he deserves the thanks of the House for affording us an opportunity to hear such an eloquent discourse, whether we agree with him or not. Of course it is not often we get anyone in this House—I am guilty myself—to prepare

anything worth while, for one to sit and be pleased to listen to.

Certain people who are opposed to the present prohibition act, argue from different standpoints and say that under the present law with regard to the importation of manufactured liquors, we will never have a tourist traffic in this country. We must make the country attractive and we must have our hotels and provide them with the stimulants they require. Certain people in the United States and Canada—what is the reason why they want to get away from the States during the hot summer. Is it because they want to go somewhere and have a booze? Is that the reason why the men, women and children try to get in the country during the hot summer months? Is it because they want to have a different kind of stimulant? It is to get away from the dust of this city. And at present that is the chief reason why people from the cities of the United States try to get away. Our climate has been so much advertised, and correctly so, that it is like going to the Garden of Eden to come down here and breathe the air. They don't want to be drinking stimulants. If you are depending upon that kind of tourist, the man who will not come here unless he is provided with spirituous liquors, then I think the tourist traffic is going to be very small. We may attract more people, especially those accustomed to drinking beer and wine at their meals, because the United States is dry. There are two sides to every story and every proposition and every argument and since we are carried away with the idea that if we do attract a tourist traffic the results will be advantageous. I have often seen that when we put these propositions in actual performance we are sadly disappointed. And I believe that if that is the only thing upon the granting of licenses to hotels, the results will not be equal to the anticipation. We may have had

the best of intentions but we find that as these things are being enforced, results will be altogether different. I am not finding fault with anyone. I am only voicing an opinion. I don't want to delay the question.

I don't think it is advisable that wines and beers should be sold on passenger steamers and the Minister of Justice interjected a remark at that time in reply to Mr. Ashbourne, as to who should sell liquors on the trains, that they had men on the trains who were paid and that there were certain men who were connected with the railway paid too high a salary. I don't think you have any officials that are too highly paid. I think that if any man outside Newfoundland had managed the railway during the past two or three months, if it had been any one from Nova Scotia, or any part of Canada or even from Ireland, that man would have been eulogised and he could not be paid too high a salary. But because we have Newfoundlanders up there who spend their life in railway matters, and who have been studying the matter from their hearts and who have the experience of men from Canada and other places there is no show for him although the country has such a splendid showing which everybody should eulogise. They should try to speak of the railway as a paying proposition. And the railway was never in a better position than it is to-day. I am on the subject of railway matters. Brought up by no less a person than the Minister of Justice himself. We are working under suspended rules. Well, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the sale of liquors, wines, and beers on the railway I don't think that we should put a clause in this Act that would interfere with the management of the railway. I fear that the introduction of the measure for free disposition will cause endless trouble. We have

trouble enough now. People will get liquor whether illegally or not. And as has been said drunken persons are in no proper condition to perform work and the safety of life and property depends upon those in charge. We should be very careful not to do anything that would cause any less safeguards for life and property in the transportation over trains and the same applies to steamers. I want to put myself on record as being opposed to voting for any clause of this Bill at this sitting of the Legislature.

The Government apparently have made up their minds to put this Bill through and anything that I could say could have no effect. Therefore I would be taking up the valuable time of this House if I were to continue further in making any remarks. Therefore I hope to be here when the Bill has got to the final stages when we can place ourselves on record in moving an amendment on the report from the Committee to the Speaker.

MR. WARREN:—It is the duty of those on the other side to make the Bill as workable as possible. Now under this section to the Bill as it stands, any person who goes to the Branch Office, goes to any of the Branch Offices under control of the Board and buys a bottle of spirits, he is liable to be arrested and fined because he is taking it home. There is no provision made for taking it from the Controllers to his house, or if he were to leave his house no provision by which he can take it to his new place of residence. I therefore move an amendment to this section by adding "possessed or transported."

This is taken from the Quebec Act. It was probably put in after the Act came into force because it was found unworkable without it. You buy spirits from the Board, one hundred yards away you are arrested for having it in your possession, you are not allowed to have it. This is

the Section of the Quebec Act that was put in the original. But a person who gets it illegally can be arrested for having it in his possession afterwards.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—We have no objection to that amendment.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Would'nt this come in under Section 4, Clause P.

Reads the Section referred to.

MR. WARREN:—Every time you go to buy a bottle you have got to get a permit to carry it home. Let me say that these prohibiton acts lead to all sorts of extraordinary complications. Under this act it is provided that if a person is in possession of spirits in contravention of the Act not only can you take the bottle of spirits but the receptacle it is in. If he is carrying it in a grip you can take the grip as well as the spirits. And I remind the Hon. Member that it would be very dangerous to carry a bottle in his hip pocket, they might take his trousers.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to the motion before the chair I wish to repeat that true and well-known proverb, that things done hastily are seldom done well. I fail to see why the Government has shown such haste in rushing this measure through. At first I took it for granted that the matter would receive the consideration that its importance warranted, but we find now that the Government has made up its mind to railroad the measure through and it seems that no words uttered by Opposition members will do anything towards deferring the passage of this Bill.

I have to strenuously object to certain sections that I think should be amended. Within the short time available I have not been able to give the Bill that serious consideration necessary to digest its full contents,

but from what I have observed I find that there are certain sections in that Bill that are decidedly objectionable and gives scope for serious abuses.

My position with regard to the present Prohibition Act has been publicly defined long ago. I agree that the present prohibition law may not be perfect, but then, as I remarked this afternoon, no strenuous attempt has ever been made to enforce the law properly, and the Government will find that the radical repeal act now being forced through the House will, if no serious effort is made to enforce it, become as inoperative as the prohibition law. It all depends upon the earnestness of purpose and the determination of the Government to carry out the law.

I heard the Leader of the Government say that the Bill now before the House will be rigorously enforced, but I think that by the time the Prime Minister has had the actual experience of enforcing this "bottle a day" law he will find matters entirely different to what he imagines now. When you leave the door wide poen you will find that the law will be more honored in the breach than in the observance, and I make the statement now that if the Attorney General, during his tenure of office, intends to carry out the provisions of this Act strictly that he will have his hands full.

I am not doubting his sincerity of purpose, but he must know how some people will take advantage of any lophole in a law of this kind. Since you have decided to legalize the use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, I agree with the licensing of hotels whereby light wines and beers can be served to bona fide guests during meals. That is a reasonable section although it may be termed commercializing the liquor traffic, at the same time it will not be taking the money out of the poorer class of our own people. I would like to see a scheme

inaugurated for the erection of decent hotels for the encouragement of tourists, and in my opinion there could be no serious objection to such people in hotels being permitted the use of light wines and beers during meals, because despite all that those holding extreme views may say to the contrary, the average tourist is not addicted to drink and certainly is not the type who will indulge in intoxicating liquors to the extent of demoralizing a community. At all events with that section of the Bill I agree, because it may serve as an accommodation to tourists, provided you have the other essential facilities here.

Hon. the Prime Minister stated here this evening that if we make it easy for the people to obtain liquors that there will be less drunkenness. Now that is a statement that I would require more explanation on in order to see the wisdom of it. As a matter of fact we have not as a country consumed one quarter of the liquor since the passing of the Prohibition Law that was formerly consumed.

In reviewing the statistics that I have before me I find that not more than fifty-five to sixty thousand gallons of liquor were imported into Newfoundland in any one year since the advent of Prohibition, while figures secured from some old but authentic records show that 100 years ago there were five times that amount consumed in this country. I have not the exact figures of the quantity used immediately prior to the passing of Prohibition, but there was approximately four times as much liquor consumed previous to 1915 as there has been since. Therefore, after all, perhaps the establishment of Prohibition was not such a great mistake as the Government appear to think. The best argument in its favour is that not more than sixty thousand gallons of liquor was legally imported in any one year by a population of over 260,000 people

since the Prohibition Act was made law, while a much smaller population of one hundred years ago imported annually over 400,000 gallons.

-HON. MR. CRAMM—That does not prove the amount of liquor consumed in the Island.

MR. HIBBS—Mr. Chairman: I quite agree that it is not all. I have an idea that a considerable quantity of liquor is being smuggled into the country but the same applied to pre-prohibition days, the illegal traffic in liquors was not unknown to us then anymore than now. And by the way it's up to the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, live man that he is, to see that the revenue boat is kept on the alert to prevent smuggling, if there is much of this illicit traffic going on. The Prime Minister apparently thinks that the introduction of this Bill allowing people to obtain liquor easily is going to cut out the manufacturing of moonshine. The object is of course a very laudable one but I fear his expectations will not be realized.

If certain people, as it is claimed, have acquired a taste for this stuff and can manufacture it easily and at little cost, you will have to make your rum pretty cheap to compete with it, and if you do that, to say the least, you will have discovered a poor way to make people sober.

I am very happy to be in a position to say, however, that there has been nothing like the quantity of moonshine manufactured during the last couple of years that was manufactured in the years from 1916 to 1921. I have gathered that knowledge from a fairly close contact with the people of outport districts.

Mr. Chairman, the main feature of the Bill that I object to is the section which allows anybody to obtain a bottle a day. That is an outrage on the morals of the people of this country. I wonder what is in the minds of the Government, and especially the Prime

Minister, to remove in this way every restraint and obstacle to the indiscriminate obtaining of liquor. Personally I can't understand it. I never looked upon Mr. Monroe as a radical. I have tried to regard him as somewhat conservative. I think he should be satisfied with a bottle a week.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER: — That would be enough for me.

MR. HIBBS:—If the Leader of the Government is satisfied with a bottle a week, I think the average man should be confined to the same allowance. What is the difference in the result of selling a bottle a day and the open saloon? Just this difference: During the days of the open saloon a treat may mean a glass of spirits divided between two; under your bottle a day law the same two persons will have an opportunity to consume a bottle containing 24 ounces; and you can rest assured, Mr. Chairman, that people inclined that way will find a place to drink it. How are you going to prevent a man from getting two bottles a day under this law? I know you will say that the Board will make rules and regulations to safeguard the law, but I predict that you will never have machinery enough to control it, or confine it, to a bottle a day and not give people a chance to get two or three. Surely you will have some means of identification to prevent repetition of the evil.

Since the gentlemen on this side of the House cannot prevent the wrong being done, the next best thing we can do is to offer suggestions as to how to do the wrong in the safest way possible. It will be horrible enough, but don't allow a man to get a bottle of liquor at one of your Government saloons and then go somewhere else and get another.

Surely there must be some purpose behind all of this. I suppose you will

tell us that you have such respect for the rights of the people that you are going to give them a chance to buy a bottle of booze just as they buy groceries. I want to tell you that there is a vast difference between buying rum or whisky and buying other useful commodities. If you are so zealous for the rights of the people your present policy will do them more wrong than right.

If your object is to raise revenue, you are entering on a penny wise and pound foolish method of doing it. Your revenue is going to come largely from our own people; and if the Government have made up their minds to raise revenue in that way, then I say, God help Newfoundland.

Of course if the Government is anxious to popularize themselves for the time being, and gain the clamor from certain quarters, then by all means give them a bottle a day; but remember it is not always what is popular that is best for the people. If you had to legalize "a bottle a week," and that under certain specified conditions as to identification, in order to prevent abuse I think you would find that the thinking public would be much better pleased. As it is your scheme of raising revenue will now be at the expense of many wives, children and mothers in this city and throughout the country.

We have a certain lot of people in Newfoundland who will not, whether they can or not, take care of themselves. There is the twelve and fifteen dollar a week man, who has got a wife and family waiting for his wages on Saturday night, while your Government rum shops will be enriched at the cost of misery and want to the innocent family whose breadwinner is tempted into the snare. Working men, as a rule, found it hard to obtain liquor, and have been, if I may use the expression, weaned from it to a great extent during recent

years, but now you remove the lid, so to speak, and see what will happen. I want to say to the Leader of the Government that he will live to realize that he has made a grave mistake. One year from now there will be a different story to tell.

I find myself in the unfortunate position of not being able to support this Bill, yet there are certain sections, taken by themselves, that I can agree with, but I cannot support a Bill in its entirety that threatens to bring misery, unhappiness and demoralization on the people of this country.

Again, as to the serving of wines and beers on steamers and trains, I think that is going to be greatly abused. This Act permits passengers to obtain wines and beers, and I have seen men just as intoxicated on those as on rum, whisky or gin. I am sure the Minister of Justice will bear me out on that, because he has been very strong on that point himself. I remember the report of the committee on liquors in 1915. At that time he spoke very strongly against the discrimination between beers and other alcoholic liquors. He then stated that a man can become drunk and make a beast of himself on beer. I hope that he thinks the same now.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That was with reference to beer and wine being sold all day long; this provides for its sale only at meals.

MR. HIBBS:—The passengers on trains and steamers will, I fear, be spending a very long time at their meals. You will have to bring in an amendment to this Bill next year regulating a time limit for meal hours, or the second call for meals will be very late.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—If you accept that principle you cannot make any laws.

MR. HIBBS:—There must be some maximum—some limit, but you make practically no limit at all, no reason-

able, sensible restriction. I listened with a great deal of attention to my friend, Mr. Cahill, and I congratulate him on the very precise manner in which he delivered his remarks; but after all it is just the same old-time argument that has always been advanced by anti-prohibitionists. People may talk about interfering with other people's rights, but of course they are not sincere when they talk that way. There are certain people who think that they have a right to do as they like, and we are told that we have no right to make laws to prevent them. There are people who, if they were to use their own free wills unrestrained, could not even take proper care of themselves. We must remember that we are living under some form of prohibition in almost every move that we make. We are prevented by law from doing certain things that would, if indulged in, be harmful to ourselves as well as the community; so this question of interfering with other people's rights is not to be taken seriously.

Personally I favor a workable form of prohibition. In 1915 I was asked by the Campaign Committee to carry the standard of prohibition in Fortune Bay, which I did; and I think Mr. Warren owes me an everlasting debt of gratitude, because I helped to induce his constituents to vote dry; and I hope they have been sober ever since.

Mr. Chairman, I maintained that the passage of that Act was a blessing to hundreds of people in this country. Men are not all made alike; the resisting powers of some are much lower than others; for instance, everybody is not like my friend, Mr. Puddester. They have not got the same self-control. Mr. Puddester has never committed himself in that way, in fact by the look of things I do not believe he is going to commit himself in connection with this Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Did you ever find a man who did?

MR. HIBBS:—They are very rare.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— I was just wondering what you were doing now. I do not think you have committed yourself very much.

MR. HIBBS:—Well I am not here pretending to be what I am not. I am just an ordinary plain outspoken individual, expressing an honest opinion, and I think my views on the matter are fairly well understood. Those who profess to be opposed to the free dispensing of intoxicating liquors have an opportunity to express their disapproval of this Bill on the floors of this House at the present moment. There are people to-night sleeping at this hour in absolute ignorance of the contents of this Bill and its far-reaching effect while you railroad it through the House.

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — They have been asleep for seven years.

MR. HIBBS:—I might remind the Prime Minister that his Government is administering a dose that will put some to sleep for all time. You will find now that there will be some people put asleep who have managed to keep awake during the last seven years.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, an old proverb says "Those who won't be advised can't be helped." If the Government, because of their weight of numbers in this House, defy the wishes of the people and the good name of Newfoundland, then they must only go ahead; but I repeat, sir, they will live to regret their action in respect to the repeal of the Prohibition Act and the passing of Legislation that legalizes the free sale of intoxicating liquor in Newfoundland.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Having listened to the Honourable member who has just taken his seat,

and to all the Honourable members who have spoken on this Bill, I think at this juncture a few further words ought to be interjected, and I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to do so.

As a matter of fact the Bill has gone through the House practically without any real objection. It may be said that, with the exception of a couple of speakers, the Bill, generally speaking, meets with the approval of the House.

It has been practically admitted that liquor is a beverage, and there can be no doubt about it; liquor is a beverage, and has been used as a beverage; and as a matter of fact this Bill, as the last speaker has said is only an attempt to be honest with ourselves on this subject of prohibition. When I interjected a remark a moment ago, I had in mind the matters of which I am going to speak now.

Take the Honourable member's own case. He admits a number of things. He says that this prohibition, this so-called prohibition which has been attempted to put in operation here has been a failure. He is absolutely correct. It is the only statement, of course, that could be made by a man who had simply kept his eyes open, and saw what was going on.

But he made another statement, and that is this: that the principle of the Act is that you have got to control liquor because it is being drunk as a beverage. There he recognized the real difficulty to-day in carrying out the present prohibition laws.

The Honourable member has said that so far as he is concerned to-night he would vote for this Bill except for one section. He said that he would vote for allowing light wines and beers to be sold in hotels for the encouragement of tourist traffic, and he says that so far as he

is concerned he would support a measure allowing a man to get a bottle a week. No such measure as that could be prohibition, nor would it be an amendment of prohibition—it is repeal of prohibition.

The question that was put to the people in the plebiscite some years ago, about which we have heard so much, if it is what I understood it to be, was, "are you in favour of prohibiting the use of spirituous liquors as a beverage?" and when the prohibition laws were put into effect, it was understood that the Government was putting into effect a law under which the Government was to sell liquor to be consumed for use as a medicine.

To use a popular expression the lid went on for good and all. The remarkable point is this, that liquor has been consumed to a very much greater extent in those years, why? Because it was found impossible to obtain the quantity required upon scrips. The Bill that is now before the House attempts to meet the situation. I venture to say that 90% (per cent.) of the liquor which has been purchased during the past three or four years was purchased not for the purpose of medicine, but as a beverage. Why, if all the liquor that has been drunk since prohibition was in force was used as medicine we must be the sickest race in the world. We are supposed to be a fairly robust people, we are often termed "The hardy Newfoundlanders," but the quantity of liquor which we consume presumably as a medicine would indicate that we are the greatest race of consumptives on the face of the earth. If that is not so, then the people outside of Newfoundland are convinced that we are consuming it as a beverage. Not one out of every 1000 who goes down to the Controller's Department to get a bottle of liquor goes down to get is as a medicine; therefore the anomaly is that

we have been pretending that we are sick when we are not, and we have therefore converted ourselves into a race of hypocrites and liars. Then again another worse evil has come up, and that is that you can now get it without any scrip at all, which makes the obtaining of same absolutely illegal. If the obtaining of liquor on scrips has been illegal then the second way of obtaining it, that is without scrips at all is infinitely more illegal. There is also their evil, and that is the wrong of smuggling, which is too well known to most people in this country to need any explaining, and probably the worse evil of all is the fourth evil to which the people have been driven, and that is the making of moonshine. Now the Hon member (Mr. Hibbs) has said that he is in favor of a bottle per week; now you cannot be a prohibitionist and an anti-prohibitionist at the same time, you must be one or the other. Now we must decide whether or not we are going to recognize drinking liquor as a beverage. The Hon. member has said that he is in favour of it, and what we are recognizing is that it is the common desire. Now it being the common desire the next question that arises is how can you do it? I suggest it is by giving a Board the powers to give the people what they want and to control it.

It is no good to attempt to create a law, and then break it. What you got to make up your mind to is what does the ordinary man want. No man or no person except it is a fool is going in and sit down, and drink until he gets drunk. There are very few people who do that. The real evil of prohibition has not been brought about by the outports. Now under the present law you will have no places where you can get liquor as you can now at the drug stores. At the present time almost every drug store dispenses liquor, and that

could not even be done in the old days before prohibition. The Committee therefore decided to change that law, and we have expressed in this Bill that no person can get more than a bottle per day, and that is a much better condition and a decided improvement over the old system, because under the old system if a person got ten scrips he could get ten bottles. To hear this talk of one bottle per day one would imagine that every man is going to hike to the Board store every morning on his way to work and get a bottle of liquor, stick it under his arm and walk to his work. Does any one within the sound of my voice think that because a man has to pay \$1.00 for his scrip that that is going to prevent him from getting a bottle if he wants it?

The sale of a bottle a day is a decided improvement on the present system which sets no limit. It is a better state of affairs which permits the poor man to get a bottle of spirits without first having to pay the doctor \$1.00 for a scrip. In this Bill an honest attempt is being made to make things better. It is a real prohibition measure which at the same time does not rob any man of his privileges as a citizen. Under its provisions a man is free to get a drink while all inducements to abuse are practically eliminated.

In the first place we are not going to sell liquor to any person who is not of the age of twenty-one years. Now in the old Act there was no provision similar to that. To-day if we are honest with ourselves I say that we must admit that it is our duty to protect the man who is getting drunk every day, you could not do that under the old system. Now in this Bill we are preventing that by saying that a person who gets drunk forfeits his right to get liquor for six months. Now that is the strictest form of temperance imaginable. It may be asked

how can you do that, well that is to be considered by the Board. John Jones of 42 Bond Street, or some other place if he gets drunk is black-listed, and he is then prevented from obtaining any liquor for a definite period. The people of this country will find that this Bill is really a Prohibition Bill.

Now take the next section, which says that any person who drinks to excess will, upon the application to the Board by his mother, father, sister, etc., be kept from getting it; now can anyone imagine a more strict rule than that? It is a misfortune for any man to get drunk, but one would imagine that because a person got drunk he has committed some great crime. I repeat that this measure is the idea of those who have been prohibitionists. I am not one myself, I never have been, and I do not believe in it, but I give credit to others. There has been a difficulty formerly to bring home conclusions and circumstances. I would like to draw the attention of the honourable members to page 16 regarding stills. Now that is the provision to put into law something that we have not got at the present day at all. To-day the mere possession of liquor makes a man ipso facto guilty, and for which he is liable to punishment and even imprisonment. This Bill provides that no person is to consume any alcoholic liquors in any public place. It cuts out all things that are objectionable. It cuts out all drinking on the streets, or in small shops such as you find around, and where people often go with bottles for the purpose of drinking. It also prevents the selling of liquor to any person under the influence of drink. I recognize the fact that the honourable members on the other side of the House see the evils of the present day, and that they now favour this proposed system of prohibition. I thank them heartily for their sup-

port, in backing up the general principle of the Bill, and I particularly wish to thank the Hon. member for Fogo, as he said that he was in favor of a bottle per week. I am glad to hear that. In this Bill we have the greatest protection possible, and I have no doubt but that, except in cases where a man is an expert in evading the law, the measure will work well.

I wish to refer to an article in today's paper from a man who has been prominent in politics for years. He practically says that we should take the money off tourists and not off our own people. Surely if liquor is such an evil we could not bring those people in here and load them up with liquor, and then take their money from them. If we did that we would be branded as a crowd who looked about the world to get drunkards. I may say to the people and even the Hon. members themselves that we are trying honestly to meet an evil that has been in the midst of us for years, and I would therefore suggest that when we go through the different sections of the Bill, the Hon. members will give it their best consideration and thought.

HR. A. E. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I wish to have a few words to say on this measure, which my friend the member for St. John's East says is a prohibition measure. Mr. Halfyard put himself on record this evening that he was not in favour of the measure, and I am pleased to see that other members on this side of the House expressed themselves accordingly, and I hope that the papers will not come out in the morning and say that we were unanimous.

Now I want to make myself clear on the connection which I and the other members of the Opposition had with the Committee which was appointed to hear the speeches from the various people who came before it. Now the

Premier in his remarks inferred that whilst we were on the committee we went along and made no objection whatever to the introduction of the Bill. Now I want to explain that the position which we took was that we wanted the Bill not to be brought in at such an early date so that the people who did not live in St. John's might have an opportunity to express their views on the measure. Now the Prime Minister who brought in this Bill referred it to a Select Committee. The Speaker of the House then appointed the Committee and he appointed three from the Opposition side of the House. Mr. Grimes and Mr. Duff and myself were the three members from this side. We could not decline to act on that committee because we were appointed by the Speaker of the House. The other members of the Committee included members from the Government and the Upper House. Now we sat on that Committee and the first thing that came up before it 'Shall spirits and alcoholic liquors be sold as a beverage or a medicine.' On that point I said that if spirits and liquor were to be sold as a beverage then the present law on the Statute Book would have to be changed and if sold as a medicine then the present law would have to be enforced as the present law on the Statute Book confines the supply of liquor to a scrip issued by a doctor. If the present law was to remain on the Statute Books then it was the duty of the Government to see that it was carried out as far as possible. The next thing that came up was whether the Bill should be brought into the House and it was moved that it should be brought into the House. I insisted on calling it 'A Bill' and not 'This Bill' and the motion was put and carried that 'A Bill' should be brought into the House to amend the Prohibition Act. During the Procedure of the Committee a great many protests were heard against the Bill and as the news of the Bill reached the outports the

people sent telegrams immediately and petitions were also got up protesting against having the Bill come before the Legislature without giving the people a chance to examine it. We considered that the petitions and protests of the people should be given some consideration and when the Majority Report as it was called was made out advising that the Bill be brought before the House immediately we with one member from the Upper House declined to sign it. We prepared a minority report and it was signed by those who did not sign the Majority Report. We asked the House to adopt the Minority Report as an amendment to the Majority Report brought in by the Committee and instead of rushing the Bill through the House at once have an opportunity to examine it and make any suggestions which might make improvements from a public standpoint. I speak in this manner because the Prime Minister said that the members from the Opposition made no suggestion or protest against the Bill while it was in the Committee stages. Now, I know that it is no use in making a protest against the Bill which is before the House to-night. The Bill is going through and the Government thinks that it is a good Bill and I have no reason to doubt its sincerity when members say that they are not making a party measure of it. Every member of the House has his own conscience to direct him and he need not be influenced by any other person. The statement from the member for St. John's East that he intended to support the Bill is no surprise to me. The members from the other side are going to vote for it because they think it is a good thing. The Prime Minister in bringing this Bill before the House used the argument that he had a mandate from the people to change the Act because in his Manifesto which was written before he went to the country he said that if

returned he would change the Prohibition Act. If the Prime Minister thinks that he should do this because he promised it in his manifesto he should also give a bonus to the Fishermen of the Country and for which he has made no provision in the estimates which had come before the House. Mr. Monroe's Manifesto stated positively that there would be a bonus on fish. Now I say that if he feels under an obligation to carry out one promise in the Manifesto then he is under an obligation to carry out every promise. Another thing he promised was the cutting out of excess Government Officials. There has been nothing done in that direction to my knowledge. Now as far as this proposition is concerned one member from the Government said that prohibition should never have been passed in this country. Now I say that prohibition should have been passed in this country. Prohibition has done a lot of good. I was the one who was responsible for the introduction of Prohibition and it is a strange thing that I should be again here when this proposal comes before this H o u s e. I introduced prohibition into this country because I wanted to do away with some of the suffering of the wives and children of the workingmen of St. John's. Men were spending their wages on drink and then had nothing to bring home to their families. I am by no means a rabid prohibitionist but I am an employer of labour and I find that many men, good men, having begun to drink become useless and consequently lose their earnings. I also know men who have run up a bill during the week and at the end of the week it took three parts of their wages to pay it and the result was that there was little left to bring home. I have had wives and dependents of some of these men come to me to get a little help to carry them over until the beginning of the next week or until they should be able to get more wages.

These men of whom I speak were earning fifteen or twenty dollars a week. I was also an owner of ships and it nearly always happened that we could not get a ship away on time because when she was ready to go two or three men would be missing and the ship would be held up in the stream two or three days when she should have been well on her voyage. I went to the Leader of my party at that time Mr. Kent and asked him if he would agree to my bringing in a bill to introduce prohibition into this country. He consented and the bill was introduced. The bill was taken up by the Government of Sir Edward Morris and the plebiscite was taken and we have the prohibition which they brought in. If prohibition is not a good thing why, when prohibition was introduced, did the women and mothers of St. John's parade through the streets with flags. Why are there ladies in this House at the present time in protest against the present measure. Now one member of the Government said that they had the people behind them. That the sentiment of the people was behind them. Now I can tell them that the sentiment of the people is not behind them. The sentiment is against them. It is not because there are twenty members on that side of the House and only ten on this side that the sentiment of the people is with the Govt. in this measure. Some of the members on that side were elected with only three hundred and fifty and four hundred majority. If the majority is as small as that the sentiment of the people is not behind them. Now whether this Bill is good or bad I do not know. The hon. member for St. John's East said that it was a good Bill. I did not say that it was a good Bill. If I said that it was a good Bill I would stand by it. I did not say whether I thought it good or not but what I did say was that I objected having it rushed through the Legislature. I have here a protest against the Bill going

before the House at the present time signed by five hundred people of St. John's. It is not a protest against the Bill. But a protest against having the Bill go through without having a chance to see it.

Mr. Hickman reads petition.

There are over five hundred names to this petition. It deserves some attention. It was gotten up in St. John's to-day. I knew nothing about it until I was asked to read it before the passage of this Bill. I have also another petition from Bay Roberts signed by:—

Mr. Hickman reads some of the names to the Petition.

I have also another from Coley's Point. I have received many more as have other members of the Opposition representing the various districts. They all request the deferring of the Bill until the next session of the Legislature. We ask that consideration be given to the requests of these people that they be given an opportunity to say what they would wish before the Bill takes its place on the Statute Books of this Colony. Now one of the hon. members tried to show that by the putting of this Bill on the Statute Books that smuggling and moonshining would to a great extent cease. I do not agree with the hon. member. Now I would like to tell the hon. member something. I also would like to give this information to the people listening in the House this evening. The Government is making a profit of thirty five dollars a case on whisky. That is what the Government is getting out of it. It costs about fifty shillings a case. At the present rate of exchange that comes to eleven dollars. The freight by the Sachem is 75c. Say it costs twenty five cents to cart it to the Bond store. That all comes to twelve dollars. The Government charges \$48 per case for it. The profit per bottle for the Government is three dollars a bottle. I would like to know how they propose to stop

moonshining and smuggling if that is what is going on.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—What Government are you referring to now.

MR. HICKMAN—There has been no change since you came into power. You have had the Government for three and a half months and the price has remained the same. Unless the price of whisky goes down smuggling and moonshining will not cease. Now there is another thing which I want to make clear. When the Prime Minister moved the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee the Speaker appointed three members of the Opposition to act on that Committee. This Bill states that there are to be three commissioners to be appointed to carry out the Bill. I asked who was to appoint the commissioners. I was told that that was a Government appointment. Now I think if we were asked to act on that Committee and assume our share of the responsibility we ought also have a share in the appointment of the commissioners. Now the revenue should not be the first consideration in a Bill of this nature and the price charged for liquor by this Government and past Governments should no longer exist. Now we did not attend every meeting of the Committee. One of the gentlemen on the other side of the House told us that he supported the Bill and had no hesitation in signing the report of the Committee and at the same time he did not know the first thing about the Bill. He told us that if the Bill went through, to-morrow morning he would be able to get a drink and then he would not be able to get another one until two or three weeks time when the petition would be signed that he said had to be signed to get liquor sold in St. John's. If the members of the Committee did not know more about the Bill than that they should not have signed it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Warren corrected himself.

MR. HICKMAN—Every man has a right to his own opinion on any matter and in a proposition like the one in question it should not be allowed to go through until everybody has a chance to express his opinion. I respect every man's opinion on this Bill before the House, and I respect the opinion of every man of the Government side who has spoken or is likely to speak. However, as I said before nothing that we can say is going to make any change in this Bill. The Government has the Majority in the House and they are going to put it through and therefore it is no use in any member on this side of the House making any very long speeches but I felt that it was my duty to-night to present these petitions which have been sent to me and signed by such a large number of people. If the House is open a little longer perhaps there may be many more petitions received and it is in the interest of these people and to ask that consideration be given them, that I have delayed the House for this short time.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Speaker: I rise to support this Bill and in spite of the speech which Mr. Hickman has just delivered I still feel that it is my duty to do it for this reason if for no other that I am convinced to-day and for a long time that prohibition has been a failure in this country.

I do not understand the attitude of the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition at all, as I understood he told me when we were dealing with the matter under the Joint Committee that he approved of not only giving the bottle a day but of giving it in any old way at all.

HON. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—I do not deny it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—

No, you don't, and I don't see why this opposition has broken out now in Messrs. Hickman, Grimes and Hibbs, because if they would only let go the subject of politics they would vote for this Bill. The Morris Government tried to go through with this prohibition law and the number of arrests increased in successive years from 78 to 105 and then to 278. The men who brought in the Bill tried to carry it out, but no sooner were they out of office than their successors lifted not only the lid in the Controller's Department but the lid of everything else as well. I can go down to the Controller's Department as Sir John Crosbie or as a member of the Government and get all the liquor I want, but the ordinary citizen cannot do so. Do you think that kind of thing is good enough? We are not trying to railroad this measure through, but we are trying to establish a law that will make the purchase of liquor equal for all. Under this Act all citizens can get only one bottle a day. I do not say the Act is perfect but it is the best of the kind that has been introduced yet. In his remarks the Leader of the Opposition has referred to the bonus on fish, but what has that to do with this measure. He could not lose the opportunity to talk politics—that's all that amounts to. He said that he had ten men behind him elected by a majority but we won the Government with a majority of 14,000 votes. I would like to say a few words as to the Prohibitionists, such as Dr. Curtis, Dr. Jones and Mr. White who fell down on their job. And now we have the report signed by Dr. Jones and Mr. Grimes asking that the liquor situation be dealt with so as to make revenue from it. In referring to this I would like to say the present Government has not been thinking of the making of revenue but of giving a square deal to all. In 1921 the Pro-

hibitionists—according to the report mentioned, were going to make everything perfect, but all of a sudden they now jump in, after letting everything go, and think we are going to take the ordinary citizen by the neck and make him buy a bottle a day. As Mr. Monroe has said, under this law, there will be no compulsion to abuse the use of liquor. Dealing with the conduct of some of those who are actively opposing the present Bill, I may say that "consistency, thou art a jewel" The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition says that the Bill should not be railroaded through but he does not say why he failed to oppose it before the Joint Committee, and I am sorry the wise man from Carbonear is not here to answer the same question. I am sorry that His Grace Archbishop Howley is not alive to hear the arguments as to this Bill, as he was the only one who understood the liquor situation properly, and his anti-treating law if it had been adopted would have proved the solution of the whole question of drunkenness. Now you come in here and hold up your hands in holy horror for fear saloons will be opened, but every place that is selling it now under the law that you supported, is a saloon that is open Sunday and Monday alike. And the liquor is never bought for anything but a beverage. Mr. Hickman refers to a woman coming to him about stopping her husband's pay, but I never knew anyone to come to me about holding back a labourer's wages. Now there is no Bill that can legislate a man into Heaven, nor can you make men sober or good by law. There is only one force that can help the man who over-indulges in liquor and that is moral suasion. That should come from the pulpit, but in some directions it has been sadly neglected of late. The Leader of the Opposition says the Government is making \$3.00

a case on whiskey, and later I will give you some figures on this point. As to the cost of liquor, why did not the late Government cut it down when they were in power. Some people must think we can do things that are miraculous, and also do them at once, but if we dismiss useless officials we are roundly abused. Why do you come in here and become an angel in an hour? Mr. Grimes says he is a prohibitionist—but if so why did he not walk clear of the late Government when they started to make revenue out of liquor. As to the duty on whiskey, he may be sincere, but we had nothing to do with it, and it will be dealt with later. If he is interested he might like to know that I voted for prohibition, but in two years I learned that it was no good, and I am against it now. Dr. Robinson may be touched on the back now by some and told that everything is all right. But that gentleman is the only Consistent Prohibitionist standing in St. John's to-day. If the present Bill is wrong, its defects will be discovered in a short time, but wouldn't it be better to have an Act in force which is intended to try and control liquor than to go ahead and leave an impossible one on the Statutes? Further I would like to say that this is not Mr. Morine's Bill, but the Bill of the Monroe Government. As a member of the Government, Mr. Morine naturally had a hand in it. But as a member of a previous Government did not Mr. Morine in upholding the law, send a warship to Bonavista Bay. Did he get any applause for trying to enforce the law? No—instead he got all kinds of abuse. I think that in a short time, if this Bill is carried out as passed, the temperance people or prohibitionists of this country will be blessing the Monroe Government. Some of the opponents of this measure may not think so to-night, but I would like

to ask them to give it a trial and then in six months—if it is a failure, to say so. The prohibitionists must admit that the existing law was not been successful. The Advocate to-night calls upon Rev. Dr. Jones, but their report states the enforcement of the law was impossible; and Mr. Grimes says the same thing by his signature. I believe that the present is the best law, and I can get 2,000 names signed to it as easily as going asleep. I believe this Bill will help out the labouring man and will mean a square deal to all, according to the programme of the Government.

MR. W. J. BROWNE:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks at this juncture particularly in reply to some hon. gentlemen of the other side of the House, who claim that this measure was not part of our platform. I would like to say, sir, that during the canvass prior to the General Election part of my duty was to make our attitude clear in this connection and to show that the present prohibition law was an absolute failure. The people who put that law in force had lost confidence in it. The Government who undertook to put that law on the Statute Book and worded it so that liquor could only be procurable for medicinal purposes made it only a laughing stock. The whole cause of the election at that time was because people were closing their eyes to what was going on with regard to liquor in this country. We did not fear to face the issue on the prohibition question and at the last public meeting we held in the Star Hall during the recent political campaign, and at which 2500 people were present, I took the opportunity to say that we would not hesitate, as previous Governments had done, to face the issue fairly and squarely and not allow to continue this hypocritical state of mind which was demoralizing the minds of the people of the coun-

try. Let me refer for a moment to the evil of prohibition. The evil of prohibition is worse than the evil of drunkenness. And has that not amply proven itself to be the case during the time that prohibition was tried out in this country and in Nova Scotia? I was in Canada when the Prohibition Act was introduced in this country and when the famous or infamous plebiscite was taken, and—I stand open to correction on this point—the Prohibition Act was put on the Statute Book by a minority vote of the people of this country. A majority of the people never voted. If I remember the terms of the referendum, only forty per cent. of the voting power of the country was necessary for the Act to be made law, and, if I am not mistaken, the majority of the people did not vote under a misapprehension that, if they did, their vote was to be recorded against prohibition. As I have already said, I was in Toronto, Canada, when the vote was taken on this liquor measure and I know the result. In a Halifax paper I saw a cartoon where you had all the Western Provinces and Quebec in a swimming pool with Ontario on the bank preparing to take the dive and join the “wets.” I was in Nova Scotia recently and I am happy to say that the prohibition law has not been any better enforced there than it has been in Newfoundland. I was introduced to a gentleman there and learned the proper methods to obtain liquor there and I found that it is only a question of knowing the ropes, just the same as it is in Newfoundland. I met a man in Nova Scotia whom I am sure my friend, the honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to know, who informed me how whisky can be purchased in New York at \$25 a case today. I have the documentary evidence to show that liquor is as easily obtainable in Nova Scotia as it is in Newfoundland and that liquor is obtainable in every hotel, cabaret or res-

taurant in the United States despite its dry laws. That is a fact that is borne out by a statement produced here this afternoon by the honourable member for Harbour Main, showing that the liquor consumption in each year since 1917 increased from 170,000,000 to 200,000,000 gallons. Surely a prohibition country would not increase its consumption of spirituous liquors by 30,000,000 gallons per year if it was possible to prohibit the illicit sale of intoxicating liquors. Then do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that that is an argument that answers many of the statements made by Opposition members? And then we are told by Opposition members that to make things easier for people to get liquor will encourage smuggling. My experienced friend from America informed me that it is preventing people from getting things is what makes them all the more determined to get them. An example of the ingenuity of the people in the United States in this regard is that they can sell liquor much cheaper than it is sold in St. John's. There is a rum row off the land about twelve miles and there is a line of steamers doing this traffic day and night with the shore. Then you have your motor car service running through all parts of the United States all the time as well. Take the men of Long Island, New York State. That is a fishing community where the people were always poor and living from hand to mouth. They were something like the fishermen along our own shores; but now they have their motor cars and bungalows as a result of being engaged in this rum-running business. The same conditions apply in Lunenburg, where the fishermen have been rumrunning on an extensive scale. We in this country do not want to resort to such methods. Honourable members on the other side of the House have been quite frank in showing how prohibition has been a failure. I am of the

opinion that there is but one honest-to-goodness prohibitionist among the Opposition ranks and that person is the junior member for Twillingate, Mr. Ashbourne. All the other members know from experience that it is impossible—and they have practically said it is impossible—to enforce prohibition in this or any other country and in taking this stand they have approached the question in the proper spirit. Mr. Grimes, the member for Twillingate, told us that he is disgusted with the present state of affairs; Mr. Duff, member for Carbonear, called the present prohibition law a farce, and he told us how it went too far; Mr. Hibbs, the hon. member for Fogo, in criticising the present state of affairs, said that the Act was never enforced and that he was a member of the Government that failed to enforce it, but he saved himself when he said that he may support the Bill, and he thinks that the country may support it, and I agree with him. I think it will be saving considerable expense to the people by not having this measure referred to the people, particularly at this time. Mr. Scammell, the hon. member for St. Barbe, told us that he voted against prohibition in 1915. How is he going to vote now when he told us here a few days ago that conditions under prohibition were scandalous and deplorable, and in view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition stated here that the members on the other side of the House are allowed to use their own minds and vote as they please. Therefore, if the hon. member for St. Barbe is consistent he will vote against prohibition and for this Bill. I am hoping that he has not changed his attitude. I hope he was not under the influence of anything at the time he made that statement, or that he has not come under the influence of the Leader of the Opposition since. The hon. member for Fogo, Mr. Hibbs,

said that there were features of the prohibition law that were objectionable and difficult to enforce. Well, if he would pay a visit to the Magistrate's Court he can see for himself how it is enforced. I saw a widow recently, who was in bad circumstances, fined \$300 for selling beer that contained 2½ per cent. of alcohol, while we were told by the member for Fogo that he gave out scripts with which to get liquor.

MR. HIBBS:—I beg your pardon.

MR. BROWNE:—Well, I think we all shared in these transactions.

MR. SCAMMELL—Does the hon. member for St. John's West admit that he issued a script?

MR. BROWNE—I gave a letter of introduction to the Controller. I did not happen to have one of those medical documents about me at the time so as to help along the flourishing practice. The hon. member for Fogo shared in having this iniquitous practice go on and he shared in failing to enforce the Prohibition Law, while on the other hand widows, who were unable to support themselves by any other means, were fined \$100 for their first offence; \$200 for their second and \$300 for their third—the grievous offence of selling beer that contained more than two per cent. of alcohol. Why it is enough in itself to demand some modification and some amendment of the Prohibition Act. There are members on the Opposition side of the House now who were four years in the Government and who knew of the abuses that were going on under this law. Some of them were actual accomplices to these abuses. Where was their Prohibition attitude then? I really cannot understand some people. And then we have the happy spectacle of Mr. Grimes, the hon. member for Twillingate, getting up here and telling us how Cardinal Begin in Montreal was getting very much wor-

ried about the state of affairs that existed there. Now to begin with they never had Prohibition in Montreal yet and they would have something to worry over if they had Prohibition there. He also quoted figures to show how British Columbia had experimented with Prohibition, how the people did not like it and where they went back to wet again and that since their National Debt had increased to sixty eight millions. Why our own little country, far less pretentious than British Columbia and less wealthy, has got nearly as much debt as that to bear. Look at the way our National Debt increased during Prohibition days? Will Mr. Grimes give me an answer to that? In 1915 we were making profits out of the Government. Every year before Prohibition we had increased surpluses, whereas almost every year since Prohibition we have had deficits.

MR. GRIMES—The war caused that condition.

MR. BROWNE—That is the excuse alright, but you did not mention that as a reason when you submitted your figures and I consider that is a very unfair line of argument to adopt. Now we had in Newfoundland no war times since 1919 and our National Debt has jumped very considerably. In regard to that little argument about Ontario and Quebec, that is an argument that I grew acquainted with when I was in Toronto, and, as the hon. member for Twillingate, Mr. Grimes, will bear me out, it is a National argument between the French and English. Quebec is a prosperous community and I defy Mr. Grimes to produce any figures here to show the contrary. This year Quebec had a surplus of one million dollars and that is the twenty-fifth successive surplus that the Government of Quebec has had. These surpluses were increased since the new Liquor Act came in there mainly because Nova Scotia and all the con-

tiguous Provinces went dry, and because Quebec remained wet it naturally attracted the tourists. That is one of the objects our Government has in mind in introducing this Bill. Now I defy Mr. Grimes to show me that as many tourists go to Ontario as Quebec. Members opposite tell us we shall have to increase our police force and our goals, under this new Bill. I might inform them, though, that it is necessary now to do that.

We have not had enough accommodation in our goals since the advent of Prohibition, but we always had sufficient accommodation before the passing of Prohibition. Members on the other side of the House must know and do know that Prohibition because of the hypocrisy and the abuse and the vices that follow in its train has been the cause of making that increased accommodation necessary. The tourist traffic, I think, is a subject that is near and dear to the heart of Mr. Hibbs. We are not repealing the Prohibition Law merely for the purpose of attracting tourists. Our own people have suffered great hardships under the Prohibition Law and they are dissatisfied with the cringing attitude they must adopt and the illegitimate means they are compelled to resort to in order to procure liquor. Mr. Hibbs, the member for Fogo, seems to be very anxious to look after the people who are not able to look after themselves. Now I want to tell him that most people in this country are able to look after themselves. I know in St. John's West I would not presume to tell a man what he was or was not to eat or drink; but if it was a question of stealing I would say a man should be punished for his act and I would assist in punishing him. As the member for Harbour Main pointed out, there is nothing morally wrong in a man taking a drink because the moral responsibility rests on himself. He has his own conscience to answer to for that. If a man drinks to excess and his

wife and family suffer as a result, that man should be reminded of the duty he owes to his family, but it is not the duty of Mr. Grimes or Mister anybody else to compel that man not to drink to excess. Sometimes people with the very best of intentions drink to excess, but they do no harm to anyone but to themselves. Now I think that we have had quite enough of experimenting with Prohibition. We have had seven years of it and if that is not long enough to ascertain whether Prohibition is workable or not, well no time is long enough.

I think Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Grimes and the other gentlemen who were in the Government for four years, had ample opportunity to stop the abuses that prevailed and to amend the present Act, but they did not do so. Now somebody else must be given a chance to remedy the intolerable state of affairs. As has been pointed out by the Hon. Minister of Justice, we are giving another Prohibition Act a trial, because this one is far more stringent than any Act that we have had on the Statute Book. A man can be put on the blacklist for six months if found drunk, and if a man assists a black-lister to the extent of getting liquor for him, he is brought before the Bar and fined from \$10.00 to \$200.00 for his first offence, and for a second offence from \$200.00 to \$1,000. If that is not a severe Act well I do not know what is. If this Bill is not an honest effort to try and overcome intemperance and to rectify the deplorable state of things for which the Prohibition Act was intended, I have yet to see some suggestion from the other side of the House to improve upon it. I have listened to appeals and requests for delay in the passage of the measure from the other side, but I have not heard any suggestion to improve the Bill from that quarter. We are endeavouring to

meet the difficulties and we are endeavouring to improve conditions, and although the Opposition members admit the deplorable state of things yet they will not come forward with a single suggestion in the way of improving things. There are several provisions in this Bill which are unlike anything we have had in this country before showing how severe punishment will be inflicted for a breach of the Act. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition stated that wives used to come to him and ask him for assistance, but that was in the days when they allowed sales to be made on credit. In this Bill everything has to be for cash. I know of cases in prohibition times when steamers were held up and accidents caused by firemen and seamen being drunk. It is unfair to accuse the Government of railroading through this measure, which is an honest attempt to meet the situation and an earnest desire to remove the deplorable state of things which has been so strongly emphasized by the members on the other side of the House.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he consulted the Medical Association in reference to this Bill? My reason for asking this question is because some time ago I read an account of an after-dinner speech delivered by the Prime Minister to the Medical Association which assembled in St. John's. If the speech was correctly reported, the Prime Minister promised that he would consult the Medical Association with reference to any Liquor Bills that would come before the Legislature. Realising that the Medical Association is a fraternity which has a great deal to do with the dispensing of intoxicating liquors, I would like to know whether they have been consulted on this Bill or whether they have approved of any of the sections contained therein?

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER
—Mr. Speaker: In reply to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I would say that I never at any dinner promised to consult the Medical Association on this Bill or on any other Bill. The Medical Association seemed interested in one point only and that was that they should be relieved of the necessity of issuing scripts and they received with acclamation the statement from us that, if this Bill went through, they would be relieved from issuing scripts. Nothing further was said at the medical dinner in question in connection with promising to submit any Bill for their consideration.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received.

On motion for adoption of the Report the House divided, when there appeared in its favor:—

Hon. the Prime Minister.

Hon. the Minister of Justice.

Hon. Mr. Cramm.

Hon. Mr. Bradley.

The Minister of Agriculture.

The Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Cashin.

Mr. Moore.

Mr. Vinicombe.

Mr. Chambers.

Mr. Power.

Mr. Puddister.

Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Linegar.

Mr. Browne. (15)

And against it:

Mr. Hickman.

Mr. Halfyard.

Mr. Hibbs.

Mr. Grimes.

Mr. Scammell.

Mr. Ashbourne (6)

so it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the

Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 68, Consolidated Statutes, 1916, entitled 'Of the Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors'" was stricken from the Order Paper.

Second reading of Bill to Amend 3 Geo. 5, Cap. 14 entitled "An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador."

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE
—Mr. Speaker: In moving the Second Reading of this Bill I would like to point out briefly that in 1913 an Act was passed respecting the construction of a railway through Labrador and the Canadian North Atlantic Corporation, Limited, was granted certain powers and concessions for the purpose of building a railway from Quebec city in Canada to a point at or near Cape Charles on the Coast of Labrador and the Corporation now ask for an extension of time for the financing and construction of the said railway. In May of the present year the following petition was presented to the Government then in office:

(Reads Petition)

This petition was forwarded with a letter dated May 5th to the then Prime Minister, Mr. Warren, and asking for this extension of time. Members will observe the way the Bill recites. So far as this Company is concerned there is one satisfactory feature about the Bill and that is there is nothing to exact from the country. There are certain rights of way given, but it is a case in which there is nothing to claim.

MR. HALFYARD—Does this mean that we are allowing this Company

ten years from the passing of this Amendment.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, in other words we revert back now to the position where we began.

MR. HALFYARD—I understand this Company has done certain construction work. Do they say how much money they have spent?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—I will table the petition. The petition does not say the amount expended, but it does say that certain work has been done. I do not know what work has been done, because I have had no opportunity of finding out. The reason why the matter was brought on this session is because the time expires shortly. I notice the petition is dated May 3rd, 1924, and the Act was passed April 16th, 1923, so that it seems to me that the Act has already expired.

MR. HALFYARD—Can you renew the old Act?

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Yes, if we pass this Act we do not count the time at all. So far as the present administration is concerned, this is a legacy that was left for them and we felt that we ought to continue it.

MR. HALFYARD—That Company no longer have any rights under that Act of 1913 and yet they are asking us to amend it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—It will be found that in 1916 they got an extension and that keeps the thing alive still. I notice that it was on May 4th, 1916, they got the extension. I take it that the situation is that they got from 1914 up to the end of the war period left out so that the Act is still in force. If there is any information desired further I can look it up. We have no objection to letting this matter stand until the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 3 Geo. V. Cap. 14 entitled 'An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 3 Geo. V. Cap. 14 entitled 'An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador.'"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 3 Geo. V., Cap. 14, entitled 'An Act respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador'" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

And it being after midnight.

WEDNESDAY, Aug. 13th, 1924

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Finance and Customs'" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until

this afternoon at three of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, Aug. 14th, 1924.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Select Committee, presented the Report as follows:—

“The Select Committee appointed to consider and report upon the accompanying Bill to amend the Election Act, 1913, beg to report that in their opinion this Bill should not be considered by the House at this Session.”

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE,

J. R. BENNETT.

W. J. HIGGINS.

August 14th, 1924.

On motion this Report was received.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to move an amendment to the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider the amendment to the Election Act of 1913.

(Mr. Halfyard reads the amendment.)

In moving this amendment to the Election Act of 1913, I have only one desire and that is to make it possible for the electors to vote in the places mentioned, and that a right be given to the people to exercise their franchise. We do not need to go outside this country to look for a precedent as we have it here already in Section 33 of the Act. Here in the City of St. John's when there is an election for the representatives of the various districts, the people who belong to other districts have an opportunity to vote. The elections usually take place in the Spring or the Fall of the year and many men from the outlying districts happen to be in St. John's and they are given the chance to exercise their franchise. I understand that during the recent election held on the third of June,

that 330 electors recorded their votes for the district of Bonavista at the Seamen's Institute. And if it is right that these men should get the opportunity to record their votes then it is right that the people of Corner Brook, Deer Lake, Grand Falls and Bell Island should be given the same privilege more especially in the industrial centres in the interior of the country. Hundreds of men were very much disappointed, even thousands were, because they did not have an opportunity to exercise the privilege of their franchise last June, and they could not understand why the Government could not open booths. The Government received numerous messages from these people right up to polling day that booths might be opened. They could not leave their work to go to their own districts even though they were very much interested in the elections, because they could not afford it. They had people depending on them who had received their wages—their wives and their children. The Government owned the railway and therefore it would be a breach of the Election Act if they were to use the railway to get these people to their homes. Therefore it is not with any ulterior motive that this amendment is made. Some persons have suggested that if it were not for the fact that there is to be an election in Bonavista Bay in the Fall this Bill would not be introduced from this side of the House. There was nothing of that nature in my mind when I introduced that Bill. I made up my mind last June if I were elected to the House of Assembly, at the first opportunity I would introduce an amendment to the Bill to make it possible for the men of these places to record their votes. It has also been said that there is to be a revision of the Election Act, and a re-distribution of seats. We do not know what will happen during the

next four years just at this juncture. It is said that it is likely that there will be an election in Bonavista during the autumn. We have no lease of existence of the sessions of this House. It may happen there will be an election in Trinity district in the near future. That is just as likely to-day as at any other time. I feel sure that if we conform to the principal of acting according to the will of the people we shall as representatives of the people give serious consideration before voting for or against the amendment.

Some people have been unkind enough to say that because this amendment comes from the Opposition side that the Government will unite and vote it down. If that is the opinion some people may have, I am very sorry. Personally, I would be only too glad to support this amendment if it came from the other side. As a rule, owing to the way party Government is made up, it is uncommon to get anything from the Opposition side unless for a sinister purpose. Well such is altogether foreign to myself at the present time and the Government as a Government will do well to remember and consider their responsibility in this matter now, if they do not want to inflict political disabilities on the voters of this country. You may argue that you are not doing this, but I say that you are just as responsible for your acts of omission as for your acts of commission, as it is your duty to act when the matter has been brought to your attention. Do you mean to suggest that the public are to be ignored in matters of State? Are you going to penalize the working classes and the manhood of the country, and are you going to subject them to a condition of despotism unequalled in the history of any civilized country. We are supposed to be living in a democratic country and democracy

means equal rights and privileges to all, no difference what their class may be, but it so happens that many of the working classes, the loggers if you like and a great many of the carpenters are not afforded an opportunity of remaining in their own districts to earn a living but are forced to go to industrial centres and while there are deprived of the right to have a say in the electing of a representative for the family he had left in his own district. I say, Sir, you are depriving citizens of their right to vote, just as much as if you brought in a Bill here to take away their rights. It is the duty of all members of this House to conserve the interests and the rights and the privileges of the citizens of Newfoundland, and they should be all given a square deal no matter in what section of the country they happen to be. If I understand the Constitution aright, the right of the citizens of Newfoundland to vote shall not be denied or abridged by any Act of this House on account of race, colour or condition of employment, if they are bona fide electors, according to the terms of qualification as set forth in the Election Act of 1913. We have the right to enact legislation or to amend legislation to give people their rights. Some people may argue that it is not done in any other country. I have not troubled to inform myself as to what is done in any other country in this connection. Apparently one cannot walk down on any one side of the street unless it is looked up to see if it is in accordance with Canadian usage. We have had too much of this kind of thing in this country, and not one instance in a thousand in which the Canadian way of doing things has been followed has been advantageous to this country. This present Bill is an entirely local matter and why should we want to know what they do in such cases in British Col-

umbia or Nova Scotia or anywhere else. All we want to know is what prevailed in June last when thousands of people were disfranchised in industrial centres to make us amend this Act. Provision is made for the opening of a booth in St. John's for the whole island. Therefore, we are only extending the franchise to people, who happen to be working in certain industrial centres and who are outside their own districts when an election is held, to allow them to elect their own representatives to the House of Assembly.

I will not elaborate further on my reasons for proposing this amendment to the Election Act, but I trust that the members of this House will give this matter their most serious consideration before casting their vote.

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the amendment proposed by the honourable member for Trinity. The original amendment to the Election Act proposed by Mr. Halfyard provided for booths to be opened at several places which he named, but since then Mr. Halfyard has agreed to alter that and bring in the following, namely, that the Governor-in-Council be given power to open a booth in any industrial centre in the country, provided that twenty-five bona fide electors of any one centre will send a petition to the Government asking that a booth be placed at the scene of their employment in order that they might be able to cast their votes for candidates in the district to which they belong. Therefore, it does not make it necessary to have a booth placed in every industrial centre for each district, and it only needs a booth for any responsible number of workmen who cannot get to their homes. I agree with Mr. Halfyard that this is a simple matter for the Government to do. It does not entail any great expense or any

great work. There are at the present time a great many transient workers in industrial centres like Corner Brook and the Humber who cannot afford to get to their homes, and those people want an opportunity to cast their votes at an election; and I think that those people should be given that opportunity if they petition for same. Every man is entitled to vote and I see no reason why he should be denied that right in his own country. Every man should be made interested in an election, in the Government and in the candidates, and this is one way to make him interested. If we disenfranchise him now it makes men disinterested in the future. A great deal has been said about this Bill to the effect that there is a bye-election pending and that was why it was brought in. I presume there will be a bye-election, but whether that election will be contested or not I cannot say; but, in case the election is contested, there is no reason in the world why the people of Bonavista Bay who are away from their homes should not be given an opportunity of casting their votes. The Government uses as an argument that sometime in the near future that district representation will be readjusted and that districts will be divided up on the one and two man basis. In this country I know that the near future is a time long to be looked forward to. It may be in the life of this Government or it may not; but I think that for the Government to open booths in industrial centres where necessary is the proper way to fulfill the requirements at the present time. Prior to the General Election of June last we had a great many requests from people in those centres asking to have their votes cast, but, according to the Election Act, there was only one booth where people away from their homes could vote, and that was in St. John's. Therefore, it is desirable for booths to be

opened in any other district where they are required. I give the amendment now before the chair my hearty support.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the amendment and I fail to see why any man should be denied the right to record his vote. The soundness of the principle of this amendment will be seen because of the fact that in certain other countries when elections take place electors in isolated parts are allowed the use of the mails to vote. That does not apply to non-residents but residents of a certain place who happen to be in some other part when the election takes place are allowed to deposit their ballot papers in the post offices, have them marked, stamped and posted, and when it is received it is counted with the other ballots. Thus the principle of this amendment is right. I also maintain that every one should have the privilege of registering his vote. I do not think that a man should be disenfranchised because he happens to be working outside his own district at the time of an election. Here in Newfoundland we have in certain sections people constantly moving to where certain industries are going on and it seems rather unfair to deny them the right of the franchise and to tell any man to go home to his own district to vote if he wants to; particularly is it unfair when there would be a likelihood of that man having to give up his position. It is true it might be too costly to have booths in every place where there are voters in this country, but in the amendment I notice that there is a minimum placed at twenty-five of the voters in an industrial centre asking for the right to vote. I would suggest that the Government give this matter careful consideration, and, if we are having a bye-election next fall, this experiment be tried out. There would be

only one district involved and who knows but that the Government might be able to gain the sentiment of the people on this principle thereby. If we have booths here in St. John's for every district why not have booths in other industrial centres? I support the principle of the amendment because it gives a square deal to all and also because I do not think that any man should be disenfranchised because of where he happens to be when an election takes place. I am not speaking because of any ulterior motive, but I am speaking purely on principle, and I strongly suggest that this matter be tried out because the experience that would be gained might be able to help us. I understand that the question of this Election Act will come up for discussion during the next session of the House in order that the idea of proportional representation and one man districts might be gone into thoroughly.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment as proposed by Mr. Halfyard. First of all I would like to make reference to the report of the committee in which they say that the Bill should not be considered this session. To my mind, sir, the committee is not in a position to advance, neither have they advanced any strong or feasible argument as to why the Bill should not be considered this session, because there is no principle involved from one point of view, and still from another point of view there is a principle involved, and a very vital principle at that, when it is considered that we are dealing with a situation which excludes thousands of Newfoundlanders from the right to vote in case of elections taking place in which, under ordinary circumstances, they would be entitled to vote. I fail to see, Mr. Speaker, how any committee or any Legislature can de-

ny to any man the right to vote within the confines of his native land. When this House met on April 25th last no one anticipated that we were going to have a General Election sprung on us. I feel sure that if the Warren Ministry had known at that time that a General Election was pending that they certainly would have afforded those working in industrial centres an opportunity to exercise their franchise. Speaking for members on this side of the House, all of us went through the sad experience of being deluged with messages from men in various parts of the interior of the island, particularly around the Humber and Deer Lake, asking for the opportunity to vote. In fact a great number of those men were under the impression that they were going to be allowed to vote, and in some cases men were so sure of being allowed the vote that they even made applications for positions as Deputy Returning Officers, Poll Clerks, Agents, etc., and when they were told that they could not vote they were astonished and disappointed. I can see no feasible argument, sir, as to why we ought not to go so far as Mr. Halfyard's amendment proposes. Surely if twenty-five men in any industrial centre petition the Colonial Secretary for a booth to vote in an election which affects their district, it ought to be the bounden duty of the Government to grant them their request. Who will dare deny a man the right to vote in his own country? Why, sir, is it not true that—

“The crowning fact,

The kingliest act

Of freedom is a freeman's vote.”

Then, sir, I ask, why deny him the right or the opportunity to exercise the greatest privilege he enjoys under the British Constitution? The Prime Minister says that the situation will be taken care of before the next General Election. How do we know how

soon a General Election may take place? The General Election of April came with surprising suddenness and found us unprepared in this connection—through no fault of our own, as I pointed out just now. And what about bye-elections? No one of us here has an absolute lease of our life or our positions, and scarcely a year passes but what some men pass from this chamber and their places have to be filled by others. Are we to go on unprepared for these emergencies and continue to deny thousands of men who are away at industrial centres the right to vote in elections in which they are interested as bona fide electors? The Prime Minister refers to the question of the expense entailed. I contend that this is a paltry excuse where the matter of only perhaps a dozen booths or so is concerned. Surely expense cannot be urged as a reason for denying a man the right to vote. In Canada they find it feasible for a man to vote when he is even outside his own province, to say nothing of being away from his native district. If that can be done in Canada why cannot we meet the situation in some way in Newfoundland? It has been said that the proposed amendment was brought in because of an impending bye-election in Bonavista Bay. I do not believe that such is the case. Speaking for myself, I do not know whether there is going to be a contest in Bonavista Bay or not.

I notice that Mr. Cahill, the member for Harbor Main, smiles. I wonder how he would feel if a couple of hundred men belonging to his district were deprived of the right to vote through no fault of their own in case of a bye-election in his district. I feel that if we are true to ourselves as legislators, no matter what side of the House we are on, we should all take the same attitude in a case like this, whether our own constituencies were affected or not.

I regret, sir, that the committee has not given the House some more substantial reason for not accepting this amendment. I do not suggest that the Prime Minister is actuated by personal motives in opposing the amendment, but I still feel that no solid argument has been adduced against the amendment and I still maintain that if this amendment is lost we shall have failed in our duty as legislators to those who in pursuit of their daily bread are disenfranchised at election times. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, for the reasons outlined I give this amendment my strongest support and ask honourable members on both side of this House to do the same.

I do not imagine that it would entail any great expense, and you would be giving every man his due right, namely, his right to use the franchise and to cast his vote. I merely rise, Mr. Speaker, to give my support to the Bill as introduced by the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard. I very much regret that the committee has not been able to give better reasons for their recommendation than the paltry one of expense and want of time to proceed with it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot possibly consider the amendment brought in by Mr. Halfyard anymore than they can consider the Bill. One reason why the committee did not recommend the amendment is because of the expenses which would necessarily be entailed, the expenses of a general election would probably be doubled. Another reason is because of the extra work which would of necessity arise, and members of the Districts have more work now than they can reasonably handle; and besides this it would open up the door for fraud and abuse. To place a booth for every district at the scene

of the Humber operations as suggested would certainly lead to great abuses and unnecessary expenses. Another substantial reason would be that a candidate who wished to get his views before the electorate during a campaign could not possibly do so, if he had potential voters at every industrial centre. People who are away from home, their friends and families are very different people from what you find in their homes, and the candidates could not possibly get around and see the people before whom they would like to place their views, or those from whom they would be seeking support. Take another instance. According to Mr. Halfyard's amendment twenty-five men down in the bottom of White Bay could demand and get a booth, even though they came from the West Coast, and how could any candidate get in touch with them? I am perfectly willing to believe that there is no sinister motive behind the proposition, and I would like to assure the Hon. members opposite that nothing but the most cogent and weighty motives are behind its rejection. There have been several insinuations cast that would seem to suggest that it is because of the Bye-Election in Bonavista Bay, that this Bill is being turned down, but it is not so, and besides I believe we have as many supporters at Corner Brook, and other scenes of operation along the Humber as any of our opponents.

Again Mr. Halfyard says that we should not be concerned with what is being done in Canada and elsewhere, and should not be governed by those places. Why should we not? Who else are we going to look to? It is right for us to find out what other countries are doing, and we may often find it a guide. I may say that the Government finds it impossible to accept or support this amendment, and I say quite honestly that even if there was going to be a General Elec-

tion I would not be in favour of the amendment.

MR. GRIMES:—Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that it is impossible for candidates to go to the interior and address their Constituents during a political campaign, and make them acquainted with their policy and platform. I cannot agree with him. You owe it to the voter that time be given him to ventilate the issues at stake which time will afford candidates on both sides to put their case before them. These men are not in the interior altogether from choice, but because circumstances have forced them there. Because they are there and away from the district they belong should not be availed of to deny them the right of franchise. They cannot leave their work and go back to their homes except at great expense to themselves, therefore you should place a booth where they are working. When you refuse to do this you are repeating what happened years ago, when Englishmen were forced by circumstances to leave England and go to America. Because they lived and worked there they did not permit them to have any say in the Government of England and America. It was called taxation without representation, and so it is now. The men in the interior have to pay their taxes, whether in or out of the district. You expect them to pay the taxes but refuse to give them the right to vote. That I claim is unjust.

To say the men working at Bell Island are in the same category as the men working in the interior is not stating the facts. Those working at Bell Island live within a few miles of the place and can easily reach their homes by motor boat or steamer in two or three hours, while those in the interior live many miles away. If there is a bye-election this fall and you carry out your decision at least

1,000 voters will be disfranchised. I therefore support the amendment.

On the motion for adoption of the report, Mr. Halfyard moved and Mr. Hickman seconded the following amendment:—

“That: Section 33 of the Election Act, 1913 is hereby Amended by adding thereto as subsection (1) that is to say:—

Whenever an Election is held to elect a representative or representatives to the House of Assembly, should 25 or more bona fide electors, from the district in the Colony, transient residents of the Industrial centre, such as, Deer Lake, Corner Brook, Grand Falls and Bell Island, by petition duly certified, request the Executive Government, through the Colonial Secretary, for Polling Booths to be opened, under the same conditions as set forth in section 33 hereof; the Governor in Council shall cause such Booths to be opened.”

Whereupon the House divided, and there appeared in favor of the Amendment:—

Mr. Hickman.
Mr. Halfyard.
Mr. Grimes.
Mr. Scammell.
Mr. Ashbourne. (5)

and against it:—

Hon. the Prime Minister.
Hon. the Colonial Secretary.
Hon. the Minister of Justice.
Hon. the Minister of Finance.
Hon. Mr. Sullivan.
Hon. Mr. Long.
Hon. Mr. Cramm.
Hon. Mr. Bradley.
The Minister of Agriculture.
Mr. Moore.
Mr. Chambers.
Mr. Power.
Mr. Puddister.
Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Browne. (15)

So it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills entitled respectively "An Act respecting a Tax on Goods Imported into Newfoundland," "An Act further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905," "An Act respecting the Encouragement of Agriculture," and "An Act Respecting certain Expenditures to be made under 'The Loan Act, 1923, without amendment."

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Amendment made by the House of Assembly in and upon the Amendments sent down by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up from the House of Assembly entitled "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery," without amendment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act Respecting the United Towns Electric Company, Limited."

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill "An Act for the raising of a sum of Money by loan on the Credit of the Colony for public purposes."

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and The Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a

Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and The Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, this Bill has already been read by sections, and the only alteration now is in section 4. (The alteration was then read by the Prime Minister.) The addition has been made to clause 4 because of some timber areas which the Anglo Nfd. Development Co. hold in the Gander section, and the difficulty is now being got over by inserting the clauses that I have just read. Those clauses should go in on page 4, after subsection c. of clause 3.

MR. HICKMAN:—I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he intends to bring in an amendment to the Crown Lands Act, as he suggested doing some time ago.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I may say Mr. Chairman that as we are not making any grants at present it has not been considered necessary to introduce any amendment to the Act.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to bring pressure to bear on the Government to grant timber areas, but I think that something should be done with regard to our timber lands. I have been lead to believe that they cannot be sold by tender or by auction, and I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice as to whether this is so or not?

MR. HALFYARD—My experience has been that pressure has been brought to bear on the Executive

Government to grant timber licenses for purely speculative purposes, and I have thought that now the new Government might be in a position to give themselves more authority so as to be able to dispose of timber limits with more advantage to the finances of the country and more conveniently. I think that Mr. Warren will be able to agree with me in what I have said.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

—The position of the Government at present is much better in that respect than it has been. I take the position as raised by Mr. Duff with regard to acquiring land limits. As the act now stands we have considerably more freedom of act on than Governments of the past have exercised. This Government has not made any grants since it came into power.

MR. HALFYARD—The position I took was that under the present act the Government could not dispose of lands by auction.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE

—I will give you a considered answer to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and The Gander Valley Power and Paper Co., Limited" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message, requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill

entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (3rd Series) entitled "Of the Department of Finance and Customs."

— Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill to amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Department of Finance and Customs."

MR. SCAMMELL—I would like to ask the Finance Minister just what this means?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—It just means that we are going to have a Deputy Minister of Customs instead of a Collector for the whole Island.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—There will not be any increase in the staff?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—No.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Department of Finance and Customs" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Honourable the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting certain retiring Allowances" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, on motion, of Hon. the Minister of Finance the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting certain Retiring Allowances" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting certain Retiring Allowances."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances" was read a third time, and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the 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, 1924, and the 30th day of June, 1925, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Ser-

vice for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1924, and the 30th day of June, 1925, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain Sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1924, and the 30th day of June, 1925, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the 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, 1924, and the 30th day of June, 1925, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER— I beg leave to reply to a question on the Order Paper of Aug. 12, asked by Mr. Hibbs.

Most of the teachers have been paid their augmentation in accordance

with the requisitions of the Superintendents, but others have not been paid up to date, owing to the present grant not being sufficient to meet all the demands in full. An increased number of teachers are entitled to more augmentation owing to taking higher grades and being longer in the service, the augmentation increasing every five years of service. The question of supplementing the grant to meet the annual requirements is at present under the consideration of the Government.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

— — —
FRIDAY, Aug. 15th, 1924.

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

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition to the House which is of more than usual importance. The petition was telegraphed to me and this is the first time in my experience in the House that I have even known a petition to be telegraphed here. The petition is from the residents of Pass Island in the District of Fortune Bay and the petitioners ask that the Telegraph Office there be removed to a more convenient place. I might say that the station, which is connected with the main land by wireless, was put there about eighteen months ago. At the time of its erection it was supposed that the higher up it was put the better efficiency would be the result. Instead it has been found to be absolutely inaccessible and the petitioners ask to have it removed to a more convenient and accessible spot so that people will not have to go to their necks in snow in winter time to reach it. I ask that the petition

be referred to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs for consideration.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House an answer to question 8 on the Order Paper of July 29th.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House the Report of the Select Committee on Bill "An Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland," as follows:—

House of Assembly,
August 15th, 1924.

The Select Committee appointed to consider the Bill sent down from the Legislative Council entitled "An Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland," beg to submit the annexed Bill, and recommend its adoption.

The Committee would point out that through possible inadvertence, the initial procedure is not in strict accordance with the rules respecting such Bills.

(Sgd.) W. S. MONROE.

W. J. HIGGINS.

W. R. WARREN.

A. E. HICKMAN.

F. GORDON BRADLEY.

On motion this Report was received and adopted.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do Business in the Colony of Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddester took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, In regard to this Bill I might say for the infor-

mation of honouable members that the Select Committee recommended the adoption of the Bill as it stands in the sense that all it does is that it clarifies the position of the Company. Under the Charter of Incorporation of the Montreal Trust Company doubt was raised as to whether the Bond of the Company was sufficient security, and this Bill is simply bringing their powers into conformity with the powers that other Companies got here now.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to Authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do Business in the Colony of Newfoundland" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message acquainting that body that the said Bill had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the United Towns Electric Company, Limited," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time later.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for raising a sum of money by loan upon the credit of the Colony for public purposes," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time later.

HON. J. J. LONG gave notice of question.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

(1) MR. SCAMMELL asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs: (a) Who is the present Telegraph Operator at Westport, White Bay, and what salary is being paid this Operator and if any increase in salary has recently been made this Operator; (2) Who is the Marconi Operator at Westport and what salary is being paid him.

HON. THE MINISTER OF POSTS:—In reply, I beg to say that Mr. Herman L. Pearce is the operator, he receives a salary of \$40.00 per month. No increase has been made recently; he also received wireless messages.

(2) MR. HIBBS asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs to table a statement naming the persons who obtained guarantees for fishery supplies in 1921. The amount each obtained and the amount each paid the Assessor on account of same to date.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I beg to inform the hon. member that the answer is being prepared.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House I beg to suggest that we rise and meet again at 8 o'clock this evening. There are two or three matters which are not ready for us to proceed with, and we would like to have an opportunity to prepare and discuss them before placing them before the House. I would therefore propose that we rise and meet again at 8 p.m.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the Prime Minister as to when he proposes to close the House?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I am hoping if at all possible to get through with all legislation by tomorrow night.

MR. ASHBOURNE—Mr. Speaker: I

would like to say that I have been notified that there is a meeting of the Fisheries Board at 8 o'clock this evening, and I would like to attend same, and I would not like to be absent from the House during the sitting.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I should imagine that the business of the House would be of more importance than the meeting of the Fisheries Board. I think however that Captain Winsor will agree to postponement of the meeting of the Fisheries Board.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker: I may say that the meeting of the Fisheries Board is an important one, and we have been trying to have a meeting for some time. I however agree to have the meeting postponed.

(The House arose at 5.40 to meet again at 8 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8 p.m.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, and with the consent of the House, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the raising of a Loan on the credit of the Colony for Public Purposes in substitution of the Loan Bill, introduced at the earlier sitting.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON LOAN RESOLUTIONS.

HON THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, at first glance the decision of the Government to raise a loan of the amount stated in this Bill might be cause for apprehension. When the party headed by Mr. Monroe went before the country in the spring of the present year its Manifesto promised that if given power his Government would undertake to introduce some constructive policy that would

be the means of giving employment to the people and at the same time bring revenue into the country. Mention was also made of the possibility of the development of the tourist traffic. After the most careful consideration the Government has decided to embark on a policy of tourist traffic development which it thinks will be the means of carrying out the promises of the Government to a large extent in three directions namely: by giving considerable employment to the people, considerable revenue to the country and necessarily, of course carrying out at the same time the promise made with regard to the tourist traffic. Of course all the money which we propose to raise in the present loan is not directly or some of it even indirectly for the benefit of the tourist traffic. More than one quarter of the total of the proposed loan is to meet the amount of the deficit left to us by the past administrations which have been in power recently. This sum of \$1,600,000 deficit is due, or so I attribute it, to the fact that the duty was taken, illegally as has been said before, off flour, pork, beef and molasses, kerosene and gasoline. I would have the hon. members remember in the debate on this bill that we are not responsible for this deficit and that we regret just as much as members opposite the necessity of raising money to pay it. Deficits must be paid, however, and we have included this one in the present resolutions now before the Chair.

The second item on the resolutions is the sum of two million dollars for the building of roads and highways. In the opening remarks of my speech in the introduction of this Bill, I referred to the development of the tourist traffic. This amount, as the hon. members, I feel sure already know, is essentially for this development and they can prepare their criticism for or against this measure

along these lines. Everyone of course in this House is only too delighted to see something done in this direction. But yet we will hear a large amount of criticism because we intend to use such a big sum of money for this purpose. Now it is impossible to get tourists to this country unless we have the attractions and accommodations to offer them. With regard to the first I think that I can safely say that we have the attractions to offer. We have attractions just as good as, if not better than, any offered by any other country in the world that is trying to develop a tourist traffic. The salmon and trout in our rivers offer the best sport that can be enjoyed. It has been truly said that our country is the Norway of the New World. With regard to the second, and I class roads as accommodations, I think that we have yet to make some improvements before we will have what we can call first class accommodations. The money which we have allocated for this purpose is to be devoted to the improvement of the highways which we now have by widening and improving them and straightening them and where necessary for the making of a continuous drive new roads will be built. Wherever possible the old roads which we are using now will be utilised. I may assure the House in this connection that the Government will endeavour to obtain the advise of the Board of Trade, the Rotary Club, the Motor Association and everyone else that we think will be able to offer good advise for the spending of this money and it is hoped that when the roads have been improved, as we hope to improve them, and a hotel company has built a chain of hotels throughout the country, we will be in the market for the best class of tourist traffic obtainable and we will have the goods to offer.

The next item is one of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the purchase of Rolling Stock for the

Government Railway. Because of the traffic that has been going over the railway during the past season much of the stock has become very delapidated and requires to be replaced. Some of the money in this vote will be used for this. It is also necessary to purchase an increased number of flat cars, etc., for the accommodation of the increased traffic. It may also be seen fit to put more up-to-date Pullman cars on the rail for the accommodation of passengers. These are the needs of this vote of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. The next is a vote of four hundred thousand dollars for the purchase of a new steamer for the Gulf of St. Lawrence, or the Cabot Strait, or whatever it is the custom to call that narrow strip of sea. The Kyle, as many Hon. gentlemen will know, is entirely unsuitable for this work. She is too small and because of the great number of passengers which she has to bring is often dirty and unwholesome. She comes over from Cape Breton every night with from two hundred to two hundred and fifty passengers and has accommodation at the most for ninety. This is, of course, one of the essential links which joins Newfoundland to the main land and if we are to have a tourist traffic developed this is one of the first matters that must be attended to.

The next item is the vote of fifty thousand dollars for the repair of the dock. This, as Hon. gentlemen know, is very necessary for the safety and accommodation of the ships which come into the dock for repairs. The next is the sum of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars as the cost of building sheds and making repairs to the pier at the Station. These proposed new sheds are necessary for the proper handling of freight brought in here by the coastal boats and the trains. It is also proposed in the course of repairing the pier

to remove the old ship "Desola" from the harbor and try to make it more convenient for ships coming in and out.

Fifty thousand dollars is to be devoted to the purchase of new machinery for the machine shops. This is a matter which needed to be attended to for a long time. The machinery up there has become, with the passing of time, obsolete and is now not able to handle and do properly the work which comes into the shops. The next item is seventy-five thousand dollars for the completion of buildings and stations of the railway. There have been new stations started lately along the line and it is necessary that proper accommodation be provided for passengers. It has been decided by the Government to rerail the road from here to Clarendville, a distance of one hundred and thirty-one miles, with eighty-pound rails. There is a vote here for the purpose of purchasing the rails and paying for the labor of eight hundred thousand dollars. The next item is one of fifty thousand dollars for the completion of bridges and filling in of old trestles on the railway. This is a matter which the Government Engineer thinks necessary. The last item is five hundred thousand dollars for the estimated cost of construction of a plant for coal and fuel at St. John's, West. The Government proposes to build a coaling station for the steamers which come into St. John's. It may also be necessary to provide oil fuel as well. That is the completed list of items which go to make up the proposed loan. It is provided, as Hon. members can see, that if there are any balances left over after the works outlined in this Bill have been completed they can be used as is most convenient for any other purpose that the Government may think fit. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I may say that the Government has decided

that it will not be necessary to pay any more than five per cent. for this loan and we will not go above this figure for this money which we propose to raise.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—How much will the coal contracts for the Dock amount to?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—About 50,000 tons, but I think that with improved facilities larger quantities can be landed there. There is no question in my mind that the Dock can be made a paying proposition. The conditions of the Dock, the piers and sheds is deplorable and must be attended to at once if a disaster is to be avoided. Reports we have had from the Government Engineer, the Dock Management and other competent authorities go to show that these facilities are in a very poor condition as any observant person can see for himself by walking around there. Repairs to the Dock are essential and I think it can be so arranged that ships such as many which could not before be handled for repairs will be attended to. Much work is being lost at present, hence the need of improved machinery, etc. The sunken steamer near the dock pier is a menace and must be removed and the whole place put in order for the safe handling of shipping.

MR. GRIMES:—Will that cover such ships as the Metagama.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—No, but smaller ships. As to a ship to replace the Kyle on the Straits, everyone knows that she is unsuitable and is often very much overcrowded. We must have an up-to-date ship for the encouragement of tourist traffic and therefore the Government is asking for this loan of \$400,000 to get a new steamer. In connection with this traffic we must also have improved stations at Corner Brook, Deer Lake and other points to accom-

moderate the increased number of travellers. The Government hopes by the adoption of a sound policy in this direction including good roads, better hotel accommodation etc. to make Newfoundland the favorite resort of the tourist from all parts of the world. I am in favor of this expenditure, Mr. Chairman, and I therefore move the adoption of these resolutions.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to move that at this stage the Committee rise so as to give members an opportunity to study the various items contained in these resolutions. A loan of six millions is appalling and should not be dealt with too hastily.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in acceding to the request of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and might state that it is with much regret that we find ourselves compelled to ask for this loan. But one-quarter of the amount is due to the deficit left us by the last Government. I fully appreciate the importance of giving study and attention to such a matter and would say that it is not the intention of the Government to raise the full amount of this loan at once. Perhaps not more than three or four millions will be needed the first year but as far as the building of highways is at question we have to consider it and establish a definite policy from the beginning. Where and just how they are to be constructed must be given close study and we hope to enlist the aid of the Government Engineer, who will probably be in charge of the programme—the Board of Trade, Rotary Club, Game Board and all others who can give assistance and advice. As to the providing of hotels we hope this will be arranged for without financial help from the Government but it has to be taken right

away so that we may have a definite scheme prepared before beginning active work.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a few questions. I notice that this loan calls for about 2 millions to be spent in connection with the railroad and would like to know if any arrangements have been made as to outside capitalists taking it over. When I was in London attending the Imperial Conference I had conversation with several parties who were willing to consider taking over the operation of it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, in reply I may say that the railroad as it stands cannot possibly be expected to sell but in an improved condition it may be saleable. Nobody wants it in its present state. For my part I have always thought we would be better off if there were no railroad and that we should have had good highways. The dock and machine shops might possibly be saleable—as a matter of fact we have had offers for them but I could not think of separating them from the railroad. To do so I think would be a great mistake. At present it would hardly pay a man's passage to go abroad to sell the railway.

MR. WARREN:—I am not so much concerned in the operation of the road as in the cost of it. The Budget Speech says it shows a balance of \$300,000 and in England I was in touch with people who were interested in taking it over.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, August 18th, 1924.

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

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table of the House the Report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Association for 1923.

MR. POWER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Sandy Point in the District of St. George's for the construction of a breakwater in that place.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from a large number of residents of the East End requesting that the rock crusher be removed. I would like for this matter to be referred to the Colonial Secretary. In presenting this petition I beg to give same my heartiest support.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

HON. J. J. LONG:—I beg leave to ask the Hon. Minister of Agriculture & Mines what are the water power concessions already granted in the peninsula of Avalon, to the Hon. J. J. Murphy or his corporation, or the United Towns Electric Co. Ltd.

HON. THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House the answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively, "An Act Respecting Cer-

tain Retiring Allowances," and "An Act for Granting to His Majesty Certain sums of Money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1924, and the 30th day of June, 1925, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act to Amend 3, Geo. V., Cap. 14, entitled "An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador," and "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Disembarking of Paupers," without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up, entitled "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the said amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the said Amendments were read a second time, and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Department of Finance

and Customs" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the said amendments were read a first time, and it was ordered that they be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the said amendments were read a second time and agreed to, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

MR. WARREN:—The motion, Mr. Speaker, which I propose is somewhat unusual, but I fear that this is the last opportunity that I may have to speak on this subject. I move that the Bill relating to alcoholic liquors be laid aside. I do this because this is the last occasion, as I have just said, that I will have of replying to the speech of the Leader of the Government in the Upper House upon this particular Bill. There are some occasions upon which I can sit down and listen to various criticisms of me while I was leader of the Government and while I was a member of the Squires Government; but on this occasion I am not going to sit down and take unprovoked and untrue criticism such as was delivered by the Leader of the Government in the Upper House. When that Bill came before the House it was treated on its merits. There were no party lines at all. The Prime Minister, in his speech in introducing this Bill did not in one single instance say one thing that might pertain to party feelings or was along party lines. There was no suggestion of anything of this kind when this was placed before the House. Then the Leader of the Government in the Upper House comes along with this uncalled for attack. Certain things were done during the last four or five years, and

the appeal for support for this Bill is on the ground that it is different than that done since 1919 and therefore we want to do something else. There is no justification for this measure if it is just because the Monroe Government wants to do something else. This Bill was taken on its merits. For anything that took place during the reign of the Government of Sir Richard Squires, I am prepared to take full responsibility. And for anything which went on during the administration of the Government of which I was Leader, I am also prepared to take full responsibility, provided always I knew of it. I do not want to go beyond 1919. There is no reason for that. The Minister of Justice said in his speech that the lid was off since 1919. The Minister of Finance said that Sir Edward Morris and Sir Michael Cashin tried to enforce the law. I do not find any justification for complaint in connection with matters discussed or statements made in debate in this House, but I do find fault with a carefully prepared, reasoned speech such as delivered by the Leader of the Government in the Upper House. I may say that I did not see this speech until after the House last met. Since then I have read the second installment in the Daily News described as the official synopsis. I do not know why it is necessary to accuse the Squires Government and those connected with it, Sir William Coaker, Sir Richard Squires and myself as Attorney General, in order to boltser up this Bill. I treated the Bill on its merits. I voted for it. I signed the report and assisted to some extent in making the Bill as workable as possible, but after that carefully prepared, reasoned speech of the Leader of the Government in the Upper House, it can go to the four winds as far as I am concerned. It is very unusual for a man of Mr. Morine's type to read a prepared speech. But Mr. Morine's

speech was read and carefully prepared and carefully thought out. I suppose that will be published in all the local papers and also sent to some of the foreign papers for publication. I dare say that it may also be published in pamphlet form before very long. Now there are certain particular statements contained in the speech of the Leader of the Government in the Upper House to which I take particular exception. They concern the Government of Sir Richard Squires to which I had the honor to belong, and also to the Government which I controlled for a short period. The first statement to which I take exception is the following:

(Reads from the speech delivered by Mr. Morine in the Upper House.)

There is no reference to the Leader of the Government there, so I presume that the learned Leader of the Government in the Upper House meant all previous Governments. The second item I take exception to is this:

(Reads from Speech of Mr. Morine).

That is pretty strange language. Either the Leader of the Government in the Upper House does not know what he is talking about, or he is deliberately using language of this sort. For his information I can say that the Revenue Act was not altered by the Squires Government. It was done during the last session while I was Prime Minister. When I became Prime Minister, I found that it was the practice to ship liquor to this Colony and then ship it to St. Pierre from whence it was run to the United States. The Colony got nothing out of it. All that was necessary was that a bond be signed by some responsible person that the liquor would be delivered to its destination. Thousands of cases of liquor were coming in and going out in this manner and the Colony was getting nothing. Under the present Act the Government of Newfoundland

collects 75c. per gallon on whiskey, and it is breaking no principle to collect this, or to have made the Act as it is, because whiskey and other liquor would come in for transshipment anyway. For this reason then we altered the law, we were breaking no agreement, and we are not making ourselves criminals or bootleggers, or doing anything that we need be ashamed of. If you want to find the beginning of this bootlegging or these criminal doings you can go over to England or Glasgow where the distillers are making the liquor simply for running into the United States, and I told them that at the Imperial Conference when the matter of the twelve mile limit came up.

The next statement which I consider offensive is the following:

(Reads).

There are only two members in this House to whom this can apply. Mr. Halfyard and myself. For Mr. Morine's information I will say that the Squires Government received a petition signed by twenty-one thousand people asking for something to be done with the Act.

Notice was given of the Bill. I think that it passed the second reading. I don't know what the reason for postponement was. But I do not see what reason Mr. Morine has for making statements like that about the Squires Government. The next paragraph to which I take exception is really an attack on Sir William Coaker. If the Hon. Leader of the Government in the Upper House wishes to galvanize Sir William Coaker into life he can go ahead and do it. The paragraph is this:

(Reads.)

I hold no brief for Sir William Coaker but I do hold one for myself, and I am not going to stand for this kind of stuff. He said that Sir William Coaker controlled the Government of that time. I do not think that

he controlled me at any rate. I think that any one who reviews my action during the last four or five years will agree with me when I say that if I decided on a line of action I took it. But what I object to are the remarks about the Government which Sir William Coaker controlled.

(Reads.)

I will speak about the matter of the Flat Island moonshiners later. No. 5 paragraph to which I take exception is the following:

(Reads.)

If Mr. Morine thinks that he can anathematise all the members of recent Governments in connection with the prohibition problem he is mistaken. I was a member of the Select Committee, and I am lead to believe that what Doctor Darby said is true when he stated that Mr. Morine had been heard to say the Act was a perfectly good one if it had teeth put in it. The next paragraph I take exception to is:

(Reads.)

Mr. Morine says that. At that time the Cornwall was sent down to Flat Islands to arrest men for moonshining and riot, and rightly so. Mr. Morine was in control of the Department of Justice then. At the same time a prominent man (I will not mention any names) gave an order for liquor without prescription and got it. Was not Mr. Morine playing fast and loose with the prohibition law? The same thing was the source of trouble with the Flat Islanders. They were getting liquor without prescription. After the election of that year I became Attorney General. I was asked if the Flat Islanders had broken the law. I advised no. It was merely against the spirit of the Act and not against the letter. Anyway the Cornwall was sent down to Flat Islands by Mr. Morine while he was Minister of Justice to enforce

the law. After the men were brought here they were marched through Water Street and finally taken to the Police Court, where they were arraigned. The result was that they lost their whole summer's fishing and their wives and families had to suffer. My position as a member of the Executive Government was that the men had learned their lesson and that they should be released. And we did release them. And the reason that we released them was that we did not intend to have one law for the influential and another law for the poor. These men were handcuffed and dragged through the streets of St. John's and had learned their lesson. Now last year when a certain politician of Bonavista Bay, I refer to Capt. Jesse Winsor, was arrested and sentenced to six months' imprisonment for the very same reason, namely, for defying the law, why did Mr. Morine hawk a petition for his release through the Board of Trade Rooms, supporting it and doing his best to obtain Capt. Winsor's release? And still Mr. Morine speaks as he did when we released the men from Flat Islands for doing the very same thing from the punishment of which he did his utmost to get Mr. Winsor released, and he succeeded. This man who speaks thus was the same Mr. Morine who got Jesse Winsor out of jail.

The next one is this.

(Reads.)

Mr. Morine says that Mr. Meaney was appointed to the Controllership secretly. When Mr. Meaney was appointed Acting Controller there was a vacancy in the department because of the death of Mr. Devereaux, and the Government appointed Mr. Meaney. He had left a good position in the Post Office to stand as a candidate in Harbor Main and when the position was left vacant he was appointed to it. It was a political appointment

and always had been, and Mr. Meaney had served his party and so received the appointment. Mr. Morine was never considered as a nominee for the Executive Government. Was not that done secretly?

Mr. Meaney was appointed full Controller, and it was not known until after the election. That is what Mr. Morine thinks is a shocking crime. But he has not told us that a man cannot be secretly appointed controller. If it is a sin to nominate a man to a position secretly that will have to come out afterwards what is the difference between that and his own appointment. Did anyone know that Mr. Morine was going to be Leader of the Upper House before the election. If it was a crime to appoint Mr. Meaney to the Controller, what is wrong with the appointment of Mr. Morine in the Upper House. We are tarred with the same brush. If I acted wrongly, and at the same time I am not saying there are no charges against Mr. Meaney, but if it was wrong to appoint a man to a position after the election and keep it secret during the election, then Mr. Morine falls under the same ban as Mr. Meaney. He is not in partnership with criminals now. Why? Because Mr. Morine believes in modified prohibition. If he was against prohibition he would be in partnership and in league with criminals. Because this Colony does not believe in prohibition, therefore it is legal to act in conjunction with rum-runners and boot-leggers of the United States. I never was in favour of prohibition. I voted against it and when I came into power in 1919 I found an Act which I could not carry out but which I did my best to carry out. But as I said the question was raised at the Imperial Conference, the question of the 12 mile limit, when I was in England, and I took the same position then and I told them to their faces that it was all very well to call us bootleggers

and rum-runners but the real bootleggers were the wealthy people in the Old Country, who made the stuff and sent it here and collected the profits on it. These people over at the Conference were grieved because I made a resolution for a 12 mile limit instead of three.

(Reads from Mr. Morine's Speech, "WE no longer profess Prohibition principles.")

Therefore this country has decided to give a bottle a day. Therefore it is legal to bootleg and rum-run in conjunction with the United States. Therefore it is legal to ship rum to the United States. Why we had a duty on rum and on wines. What has happened since Morine has got in the Government? But I would not get up here to attack those who are doing the same thing. What has Mr. Morine done since he has been in the Government? Not satisfied with the amount of liquor running into the United States, he has lowered the amount of duty so that he can do a bigger business. He has brought it down to 50 cents a gallon.

Mr. Morine according to statements, as the Leader of the Government in the Upper House, said that we should raise the issue above party lines. And the only man to put this Bill on party lines is the gentleman who has told us so forcibly that the Bill could not be enforced and then blames proceeding administrations for not enforcing it.

Sir, I am moving this motion because of Mr. Morine's carefully thought out speech in favour of the Bill, and I don't propose to sit down and take this sort of thing from the Leader of the Government in the Upper House, such unjustifiable, uncalled for and unprovoked attacks made by a man who is regarded as a sensible thinker and a sensible politician. If the idea is to go around with a rake and rake up all the muck he can think of and confine it to the last

four years he better look out. He forgets that he is not talking as if he made this speech to a Benovolent Institution where no reply can be made. He is making it in one of the Chamber of this Parliament and as long as I am in this Lower House I am ready to reply to anything brought up against me. Talking of Prohibition makes me remember the old proverb that good wine needs no bush. This Bill needs no advertisement. This does not need the unjustified attacks against those in charge of the administration of the Act for the last four years. No need to go and do that sort of thing. And he was opposed to the very measure that he is trying to engineer through now. A few days ago Sir, I listened to a speech from a friend, the member for Bonavista, Mr. Little. He wound up by quoting the case of the Wonderful Cure. I wonder if the gentleman who made this assault on a recent Government ever heard the Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. I don't mean to say that the Squires Government was right or the Warren Government was right, we had our faults. What I do object to is doing the same thing that he is doing and trying to convince the people that it is right. When Squires and Warren did it, it was wrong and criminal but when Mr. Morine does it, it is perfectly all right,—he is not as other men are. Then all I can say is "The Lord be merciful to me—a sinner."

MR. HALFYARD—I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion made by Mr. Warren. I didn't think when I came here this afternoon that I would have occasion to second this motion. But I am very pleased that Mr. Warren has taken upon himself to reply to the unjustified and uncalled for statement made by Mr. Morine, Leader of the Government in the Upper House, as printed in the newspapers. Mr. Morine would try to make the country be-

lieve that up to the time that the Squires Government were elected the Prohibition Act was being kept. But Mr. Morine should know during the time that he was Minister of Justice in the Cashin administration from July 1919 to sometime in November 1919 that the people could go, and did go to the Liquor Controller and get whiskey by the case. I may say that it was a great surprise to me that while the Prohibition Act had been on the Statute Book from 1916 to 1920 or 1921, I did not know that the people could get liquor otherwise than through a scrip from a doctor. And when I attended functions and dinners where liquor was freely used I wondered how the liquor was obtained. Liquor could be obtained from the Controller by the case previous to the Squires administration. Therefore if the lid was not taken off, it was raised sufficiently high to get a case out at a time, without even a script or note from a doctor. They used to get whiskey out without a script when Mr. Morine was Minister of Justice. Perhaps he was not as ignorant as I was. When members of the Government and representatives of Districts sent a note to a druggist or to the Controller to get what whiskey they wanted, how can we wonder that Prohibition became a farce and disgrace. I second the motion made by Mr. Warren and would take occasion to refute the unjustified, untruthful and uncalled for remarks made by Mr. Morine in the Upper House when he charged the members of the Squires and Warren administrations as being in league with bootleggers and rum-runners. We throw that accusation back in his teeth. He refers to a member of the past Government, who has been a member of this House for the past seven years. He must certainly refer to myself. I want to tell Mr. Morine that I never had occasion to be in anyway in sympathy with the breakers of the Prohibition Act. Or with rum-runners

or bootleggers or any body else, who was trying to get liquor in an illegal manner. I hate to speak of that but I can tell Mr. Morine that I have contested three elections since 1919 in one of the most important constituencies of Newfoundland, and I never won a vote by giving anyone a glass of liquor. Some people may be under the impression that you can't win an election without the distribution of liquors. To the credit of Trinity District I may say they are a law-abiding people, and have no respect for law-breakers, even if it is an infringement of the Prohibition Act. Mr. Morine went out of his way to refer to the telegrams or articles sent to the Evening Advocate by Sir William Coaker, giving his opinion as to what should be done with regard to the amendment of the Prohibition Act. Mr. Warren said that he did not know whether Mr. Morine was trying to galvanize Sir William Coaker into political life. He is going the right way about it. Mr. Morine can make up his mind that if he continues to make such references to men who are no longer members of this House and are not in active political life it will do him no good. Mr. Morine in his long speech has erected a gallows on which to hang himself. That is his worst fault. He cannot leave well enough alone. Therefore he will defeat himself and everyone connected with him. Mr. Speaker, I would take occasion again to reiterate that I refute the statements made by Mr. Morine when he in any way included me as being a party to breaking the Prohibition Act. Without further reference to the question I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. Speaker, under rule 236 I take occasion to move the amendment to review the Whole Bill, and the arguments in favour of it in the Upper House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In the first place in regard to the cri-

ticisms that have been made I don't think there is any occasion for any person to be concerned. I do want at least to say that the member for Fortune Bay was perfectly true as regards the matter of this imposition of taxes on liquors in transit during the last session. As a matter of fact this matter was endorsed by the then Opposition. I merely want to repeat that the lid was taken off in 1919 and the point that I wish to draw attention to was that in the short reign of Sir Michael Cashin he was not there long enough to get the lid off. But in the few months that he was there he was daily pestered and daily interviewed by people interested in the abolition of the sale of Tanlac. And from 1919 to 1923 when things other than Tanlac were being sold and when he was not Prime Minister there was never a word of protest. I was never a prohibitionist and can't believe in it. All that was said by the Opposition was only an official protest and they did not mean a word they said. I recognise that they had to act thus from official reasons. It was a lot of play acting and that was the spirit in which Mr. Hickman spoke in proposing the amendment. I want to repeat that there was a carnival of indiscriminate liquor vending from 1919 to 1923. My object in pointing this out is not for the purpose of delaying this Bill, but for the purpose of drawing attention to the fact that these people never made the slightest attempt to carry out the act or create an agitation against the state of affairs that is going on. I will go further and say that those very people who did not endeavour to enforce the act when they were in power, now, when they are out of office, say that it is very disappointing. It is a peculiar thing that in 1923 certain of those very people who voted for prohibition were sent back to power by these same prohibition voters. But I want to make my attitude perfectly clear. During the conditions that ex-

isted from 1919 to 1923 there was no sign of protest whereas a few months before the doors were beaten down about the sale of Tanlac at Connor's Drug Store.

MR. WARREN—Mr. Speaker: I beg to withdraw the motion, as its purpose was merely to provide me the right to reply to the Leader of Government in the Upper House.

MR. HALFYARD—Mr. Speaker: I beg to withdraw my support to the motion made by the Hon. Member for Fortune, in view of the fact that he has withdrawn the original motion.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON THE LOAN RESOLUTIONS.

HON. THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION:—Mr. Chairman, my purpose for asking the Prime Minister at the last sitting of the House to postpone the Debate on these resolutions was to give the members on the Government side of the House an opportunity to further consider what they are doing. It looks to me as if the bill had been hastily got up. The Government has certainly very hastily come to a decision as to the amount of money they should make the loan and very hastily filled in on the Bill the items for which the money is to be expended. It is hardly conceivable that they should take upon themselves to increase our indebtedness by six million dollars. It is a large amount. A staggering amount, and I cannot conceive the purpose. The people of this country were expecting a square deal

from Mr. Monroe's Government and this is the square deal, the placing on the shoulders of the people of this country a further debt of six million dollars which is entirely unnecessary. The Prime Minister in the debate on Prohibition laid great stress on his Manifesto claiming that he had a mandate from the people to change the Prohibition Act. He changed the Prohibition Act, but I cannot see that the Manifesto gives him a mandate from the people to saddle the people of this country with a further debt of six million dollars. He made a promise to look out for the vital industries but he has not given a bounty on codfish, herring or any other kind of fish. This is what the Prime Minister said in his Manifesto on the conditions of the finances of the country:—

Reads from the Prime Minister's Manifesto.

It is from this that he takes it for granted that he has received a mandate to place upon an overburdened and suffering people another six million dollars which he proposes to float according to the Act to which I will come a little later. He promised to decrease the salaries of the members, because he said that they were receiving too much for the work they did. The first thing he did when he came into office was to raise the salaries of departmental heads from \$3,250.00 to \$4,000.00 per year, and the public expenditure has been increasing steadily instead of being drastically lessened as promised. The position of the people of this country is worse than it has been for years. During the war they were able to put by a little as a savings, but during the past few years these savings have been totally expended, and now they find themselves unable to exist at the present time. These people are unfortunately unable to bear this additional burden and we, from this side of the House have to protest against this loan bill going through,

under conditions which the Prime Minister acknowledges as bad.

The people employed as laborers have been very badly paid in the Humber districts and on Bell Island and in other sections of the country. They are getting only two dollars and fifty per day out of which they have to pay all their own expenses and this leaves very little money to maintain their families. There was a request from the men on the Humber for the Prime Minister to go out to the Humber or for him to receive a deputation from them to endeavour to find some solution to their problems, but apparently this request received no attention. It has been put before the House that laborers employed by the B.E.S. Co., on Bell Island have been and are receiving a wage of \$2.50 per day, and that they are unable to live on that wage. It has also been brought before the House that the same company is employing men in Sydney to do the same work and that they get 40c. per hour, whilst our men get only 25c. per hour. And now without helping the man who has to earn his living by manual labour in any way, without assisting him to get a little income for his labor, the Government undertakes to put further trappings upon the people of the country in the shape of a burden of six million dollars, one half of which is unnecessary. What reason the Prime Minister must have conceived for the raising of the loan, I cannot say. It must have been conceived in the mind of someone. I am inclined to think that there is a nigger in the wood pile. Some man is trying to get rich at the expense of the people of this country. Otherwise the bill which is now before the House would not be brought in and forced on a people already overtaxed.

The first item on the bill is a deficit of one million six hundred thousand dollars. The next item is

for the building of roads—\$2,000,000. This, I presume, is to improve the roads of the country in order to attract tourists to this country. It will be a long time before we can attract sufficient tourists to this country to make reasonable an expenditure of two millions on roads and highways. The first thing that would be needed to encourage a tourist traffic would be to build a hotel, or some place for the tourists to stop. You cannot build a hotel in a day or a week or a month. It will take a long time to induce capitalists to come down here and build hotels and furnish them and make them suitable to live in. Then in the next place there are plenty of roads around this city of St. John's to accommodate visitors. This is with the exception of highways. We have enough of roads to satisfy us for the next two or three years until the country has the hotels for the tourists to stop at. It is not necessary to raise this loan at the present time and increase the burden on the already overburdened labourer and fisherman of this country. The fisherman and the labourer are not properly looked after.

Now the next item is the purchase of Rolling Stock for the Nfld. Government Railway. The amount is for three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I am not in a position to say whether this is necessary or not. I have not seen a single report from the railway. I have not seen a report from the Engineer of the Government Railway, and I am not in a position to know whether this money is necessary or not. The next item is for the purchase of a steamer for the Cabot Strait to replace the Kyle. This amount is for four hundred thousand dollars. It may be admitted that the steamer Kyle is not able to handle this traffic, but if that is the case then why not, if as the Prime Minister says we have a surplus of

ships, put the Portia on the same route, and you could easily accommodate all the people who might wish to come by that route. Thus you would save an expenditure of another large amount of money. Another item is the cost of completion of buildings or railway stations, etc. As far as I know every station has a terminus excepting those new places but lately established on the Humber. There are certainly not enough new stations necessary to need seventy-five thousand dollars. I notice the word "etc." I presume this is for some purpose not mentioned in the bill. The next item we come to is the estimated cost of re-railing 131 miles of railway, \$800,000.00. The Prime Minister said that that was from here to Clarendville. Now from what I have heard the cost of doing this will be nearer \$1,800,000 than \$800,000, and you will find at a future session of this House another bill for \$1,000,000 for the additional expense on this road. I have an idea that the statement has been made that the rails from here to Clarendville are good for the next ten years. Why, if this is the case, should we ask for a loan of eight hundred thousand dollars to carry out a work that is unnecessary. We cannot go on in this way because the country is not able to stand it. The railway has been called a depleted asset. It is costing the country a hundred thousand dollars a year to run, and now the Prime Minister is coming in and asking this House to vote \$800,000.00 for the re-railing of 131 miles of railway out of 600 miles. This is going to bring the whole cost of the railway up to a large amount. Far more than this country can afford to pay and far more than we should endeavour to place on the country. The next item is the cost of repairing the Dock. The amount for this is \$50,000. I have no doubt that the Dock is out of repair, and I have nothing to say

against money being raised if necessary to put the Dock in condition provided that it is put in condition to accommodate steamers that come here for repairs and make these repairs permanent and not temporary. This would give quite a lot of labor to the men of St. John's, and anything that would give labor I support.

The next item is the cost of equipment and new machinery at the machine shop, St. John's West—\$50,000. The Hon. Minister of Finance tells us that much of the machinery at this machine shop is obsolete and not able to do the work required of it. If it is necessary for the handling of work which comes into the shops to have new machinery, then there can not be any really sound objection to having this amount of money voted. The cost of building sheds, and repairs to pier, St. John's West—\$125,000.00. The object of this is I suppose, to accommodate the freight which is brought in by the coastal boats. I thought the sheds there were fairly commodious, and I think that the Government should give the matter serious consideration before going ahead with this work. The vote of \$500,000.00 for the estimated cost of construction of plant for coal and fuel, etc., St. John's West, is an item which is in my mind altogether unnecessary. No equipment for the discharging of coal is going to cost that amount, and again it is unnecessary. I understand that the coal for the railway is discharged at the terminals of Lewisporte and Bay of Islands and other places. The amount necessary at St. John's is very small. If the Government wishes to make a coaling station of St. John's it is not necessary for the Government to put up the money for this item, because I feel sure that there is plenty of private capital in St. John's to look after an enterprise of this sort if it became evident that there was a busi-

ness to be done in the bunkering business.

The Hon. Minister of Finance also stated that an oil fuel plant was going to be erected in the West End of St. John's. Now he knows that an oil fuel plant cannot be erected in the West End on account of the Municipal Regulations. Therefore, the whole amount which is brought forward for the construction of this plant for coal and fuel must be for the handling of coal at the present time for the railway and the coastal boats. Section (4) of this bill states that "Any stock issued in accordance with this Act may with the consent of the holders of the stock issued under the provisions of the Act 58 Victoria (1895), Chapter 13, be made available for the sinking fund connected with that issue." In this poor impoverished country it is only adding insult to injury to talk about a sinking fund we have to borrow money to carry ourselves along. I say that the late Government during its most extravagant thoughts never dreamt of saddling this country with a loan of six million dollars without a better reason and a better excuse than has been given by the present Government. I say that no Government that ever existed in this country could ever dream of the like; no Government could have the gall to ask to have such a loan to pass through this House of Assembly, under such circumstances. This Bill is wrong. It is outrageous, it is extreme and it is a vicious Bill, and it is a Bill that we memers on this side of the House cannot support in its entirety. We are willing to do anything we possibly can within reason to assist the Government to carry on, but when it comes to saddling our people with a further burden of six million dollars we find it our duty, on behalf of the people, to protest against the Bill and protest we must at the present time.

Now I do not intend to delay the House unnecessarily because I suppose it makes very little difference what we say because I dare say that the Government has made up its mind to put through this Bill; but I am going to ask the Prime Minister now if it is the intention to call for and to advertise for tenders in financial papers for this loan. When a loan, whether Municipal, Federal or State, is raised in Canada or the United States it is customary to advertise it in the financial papers and then the highest tender, if the party is a responsible one to underwrite the loan get the preference. I have before me at the present time a copy of the Financial Times, of Montreal in which the loan of two and a half million dollars for the city of Ottawa is advertised. The loan was put on the market and tenders were asked for. There were a great many tenders including tenders from all the large concerns which we know very well, such as Wood, Gundy & Co., Matthews & Company, The Dominion Securities Corporation, The National Bank of New York and the Equitable Trust Company. The highest tender was at 5 per cent. on \$100.65 which means that the tender reached above par. Now I want to ask the Prime Minister if it is his intention to take some steps to advertise by tender the loan his Government is about to raise for Newfoundland. I have the figures of many other loans that were floated, before me from different places. Some are Municipal and some are Provincial but they have all been sold by tender and the Municipality or the State or the Province gets the benefit of the amount that is paid. All the tenders are published in the financial papers including the accepted tender and everybody knows what the loan is sold for in the market.

MR. HALFYARD:—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks on the

Resolutions now before the Chair. I many say that when these Resolutions were introduced at the last sitting a great many of the members of this House and I presume the general public also were surprised when they heard of the amount of the proposed loan. We had an idea that a loan would be asked for although it was the hope of the past Government that we could get through the next financial year without a further loan. The ex-Minister of Finance and Customs thought that possibly matters could be arranged so that we would not have to go to the money markets this year, but from the statement given by the present Minister of Finance and Customs we are surprised to learn that there is a deficit to be met for the year 1923-1924 of \$1,600,000. The ex-Minister of Finance and Customs, of course, in making his estimates last year did not take into account the loss of revenue by the reduction of taxation, and the Budget Speech recently presented by the present Minister of Finance and Customs stated "that the shortage in the estimate of Customs revenue is due principally to the repeal of the twenty-five per cent. super-tax, the remission of export duties on fish and the placing of Flour, Pork, Beef, Molasses, Kerosene and Gasolene on the Free List." No doubt that action on the part of the outgoing Government by the lessening of duties contributed largely to this deficit. The statement was made—and I do not think it was called for—that the duties were taken off these articles illegally. If the duties had been removed immediately preceding an election, there might be some reason for saying that it savoured of dishonesty in trying to influence the electorate; but when the duties were actually removed there was not the slightest idea of a general election. When this House met in April and closed again the same day we had no idea up to within three hours of the

opening of the House that a vote of want of confidence would be proposed. Two members of the old Government came to my office about one o'clock in the day or two hours before the House met. They said they were trying to get in touch with Mr. Warren the Prime Minister, but they could not get him on the 'phone and they came to see me instead. They told me that it was their intention that if a vote of want of confidence would be proposed after the House met they would support the motion. I acquainted Mr. Warren by 'phone and the two members went up to see him. The consequence was, however, that the Government was defeated and a general election was declared and we are as we are to-day, as a result. I merely recite these facts to show that the idea of a general election was not even dreamed of when we took the duties off those goods. The idea that obtained at that time and what was broadcasted and encouraged during the last few years we held office was that if the fishermen of the country were to continue the prosecution of the fishery, and if suppliers were to be encouraged to advance supplies that the Government should reduce taxation on those articles which entered largely into the requirements of the fishery. It was to encourage the fisherman and the supplying merchants that we took the duties off those articles. We had been memorialized by representative people on this very particular. These people had canvassed the country and the idea was that people could not live in the country if the burden of taxation was not reduced. We were influenced, as some of the arguments put up were worthy of consideration and we were determined to give the matter a trial. It was thought by some economists that if the tariff was reduced that there would be an increased quantity of goods imported and that would make up for the loss of revenue. Whether

that theory was false economy or not, it was acted upon. Therefore, it is unjust to say that the Government was influenced by any ulterior political motive when they took the duty off flour, pork, beef, molasses, kerosene and gasoline.

Contrary to their pre-election promises, one of the first things that the present Government did after they assumed power was to put back the duties on these articles mentioned, and it is not strange to hear that this matter is being largely talked about by the members of the Board of Trade to-day as well as by the ordinary man on the street. Perhaps the Government have seen good reason to cause them to change their opinion within the past few months in this connection. Perhaps they can see what is going to happen in the future; but it is evident that no encouragement is going to be given by the Government to the fishermen of this country to carry on the prosecution of the fisheries, although any encouragement given them by lessening taxation on the necessaries of life will be shared in by other classes in the community who use the same articles but not to the same extent as the fishermen. The Government apparently are determined to do things which are contrary to what has been preached by themselves and others with regard to the civil service and the salaries paid to civil servants, especially to the Heads of Departments. It is unnecessary, perhaps, to refer to this matter, but at the same time it was proclaimed throughout the country by the present Government that a great many public officials were too highly paid and that they should be prepared to work and give better service for less money than what was paid them.

Now I do not know whether the Government had time to formulate a proper transportation service and to make a re-arrangement of the coastal service in this country, but two or

three services they have attempted to change are only causing confusion and extra cost. Certainly the Government should take time to carry out their policy and not to unwisely rush into any steamer transportation policy without knowing what the result of their action would be. They very unwisely interfered with one or two services and I am very much surprised over the reply I received from the Prime Minister in connection with taking the "Malakoff" from Trinity district and confining her services solely to Bonavista district. However, I think that this steamer is still operating in some part of Trinity Bay and I trust that she will continue the service for the rest of this year because it is time enough next Spring to consider a change. Then it was thought by the present Government, for purposes of economy, that a steamer on the Northern Labrador could be done without, also the "Wren" was taken off the Fortune Bay Service. But we find that steamers at a greater cost than before are put back on these routes. During the short period that this Government has been in office we fail to see where the economy and saving of money has come in, or where there is a reduction of taxation or a semblance of a reduction of expenditure. Pre-election promises have been utterly forgotten, the public that expected so much from the New Government have been sadly disappointed. Public opinion has been flouted and ignored. Take for instance the policy of the Government, in the repeal of the prohibition act. The requests, of the most highly respected citizens of Church and State, for the bill to be deferred, were treated with apparent contempt. The Prime Minister gives as a reason for rushing the Liquor Bill through the House, "That a certain clergyman whom he considered a temperance crank phoned him, and told him, to go ahead and put the

Bill through and not to take any notice of the so called prohibitionists who were asking for the Bill to be deferred."

Evidently the Prime Minister is taking the advice of one man, and absolutely ignoring the requests of representative clergymen and citizens in the city and outports.

Now with regard to building roads and highways, there is no doubt we need good roads but can we afford them. We have to consider whether we can borrow money to meet deficits from year to year and still carry on, I really thought that with a new Government they would be prepared during the first term of office to do their best to conserve the independence of Newfoundland, but in the absence of a financial miracle we are certainly travelling upon the road towards a financial crisis.

Do you know that when a country cannot pay its debts that it is bankrupt? What about annexation or confederation? We are not debating as to whether it will be good or bad but people will be rudely shocked if those conditions continue. According to the Prime Minister's promise to the country there was going to be economy and retrenchment, is this what you mean by economy? With regard to building roads and highways we should have some further explanation. Where are you going to build them?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—We are not going to build them at Deer Lake.

MR. HALFYARD—We could spend two or three hundred thousand dollars to repair roads in Trinity district. Only a few years ago if two million dollars were mentioned when we were on this side of the House, it would be called a mere flea bite, but apparently now such amounts are not even considered flea bites.

Such action as this on the part of

any other Government, except the present one would be called a wild cat scheme. Some people say that this money is to build roads to encourage tourists to come here. We already have roads and if money were spent on keeping them up, it may be a benefit. We have villages and hamlets in Newfoundland with no roads or communication to benefit from which to enable people to go from one to the other. If those roads were put in a passable condition it would be to the benefit of the country, and would no doubt tend to increase the earnings of the fishermen, it would enable them to have some kind of access to their gardens and lands, from which they derive the greater part of their living.

The first consideration if we have to borrow should be to use the money to help the fisheries and to encourage the fishermen, and not to have some parts of the country a mere wilderness, because you want to build paved motor roads that are questionable. A six-million dollar loan means an extra burden as interest charges of \$300,000.00 at least.

When we were hoping and praying that we had seen the darkest days, and that we were on the eve of prosperity, and once more in a position to carry on and go slowly, we are embarking on a new proposition and talking quite lightly about spending two million dollars on roads. If there is a balance from the 1923 loan of \$286,000.00 or even \$200,000.00, that will go a long way in meeting pressing and necessary requirements on repairs to roads and bridges. That is all that any sane reasonable man in this country can expect under present conditions. They cannot expect anything more at the present juncture.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I am going to vote for it with

the hope that it will increase the revenue of the country.

MR. HALFYARD:—If you are borrowing \$2,000,000.00 to build roads and highways we should certainly know where the money is going to be spent. I would say that we want half a million dollars at least to build or repair roads outside of St. John's which would be a benefit to the people and help increase their earning power. What satisfaction will it be to the fishermen who arrive from the fishing grounds some time in the night, and have to climb over rocks and boulders to get to their homes to know that the people in St. John's have paved streets and lovely smooth roads to ride over in their motor cars. That is one reason why I cannot vote for this loan until I know where the money is going to be spent. I know that we want some money, but it should be used to repair the roads that we already have.

With regard to rolling stock, that no doubt has been taken up with the manager of the railway, and we need a certain amount of rolling stock.

Repairs to the dock, \$50,000.00, that is needed, and I am surprised that the amount is only \$50,000.00.

Money must be found to put the dock in a safe condition for the accommodation of steamers and vessels which come here for repairs. The Government proposes to build sheds and make repairs to the Pier at St. John's West. I do not know whether it requires \$125,000 or not. The same applies to the new machinery. It is time that new machinery was bought. But I am not in a position to say what this will cost. With regard to the project of rerailing the railroad possibly that work is alright. A report was submitted to the Government by the Government Engineer, Mr. Hall, in 1919, almost five years ago and it was thought at the time that the wisest thing to do would be to use 80 lb. rails. He also thought that the whole

line of the railway should be raised six inches. This is the estimate which he made:

Reads.

The whole amount came to \$5,521,000.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN:—What did he estimate the cost of steel rails?

MR. HALFYARD:—The Government Engineer at the time estimated the cost of steel rails at \$70.00 per ton.

Mr. Chairman, previous to the war the price of rails was \$32.00 per ton. During the war the price of rails went up to \$70.00 per ton. The price quoted to-day is \$40.00 per ton. Whether this is a good time for you to buy these rails or whether it is a good idea to wait for a further drop in price, I cannot say. Possibly you would save some thousands of dollars if you waited until next year to purchase. As I was saying the estimated cost of rerailing the entire road was \$5,521,000. That was for 546 miles of railway. That was for stock only. From these figures we find that it would cost about \$778,000.00 for the 131 miles, at \$40 per ton.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN:—That includes the cost of laying also.

MR. HALFYARD:—No. That only includes the cost of the 80-lb. rails, and necessary stock.

The unfortunate part of this is that there is such a small amount of money left over after the rails are bought to give employment to the men who will need that employment. Unless the Government has taken into account what they think they will get for the old rails which are to be taken up. According to the estimate of Mr. Hall at that time the scrapped steel rails would fetch \$1,157,000. Of course this is for the 546 miles of railroad. Dividing this amount by four so as to get the amount which the 131 miles of scrapped rails would fetch and then again taking four sevenths so as

to get the depreciation in the price of scrapped rails as compared to new rails you would get for the scrapped rails about \$162,000.00. That would bring the cost of the rerailing from here to Clarendville pretty near to \$800,000. I think, however, that three million dollars would be enough for the present time. I hope that if this loan bill goes through and I do not see how we can stop it, that the money will be spent wisely. But it often happens that the man who is looking on can see what the actors themselves cannot see. It is like looking at a game of draughts. You were the onlookers during the last three or four years. We were the players. Now you are the players and no doubt you realize the changed positions. We were criticised for many things under the Warren and Squires regimes. We were criticised for raising loans but they were at that time absolutely necessary to provide the money to keep people from starving. At that time however the present members for St. John's East were sitting on this side of the House and they represented in their speeches in the House the awful conditions which existed as a result of unemployment. We were criticised under the Warren regime for the actions we took to relieve the unemployment. We consulted the leaders of every labour organization in the city. They were most reasonable men. The representatives of St. John's East and West were consulted. They all agreed there was nothing else to do but open the rock sheds. We were criticised for that. But the members of the opposition could suggest nothing better to keep people from starving. A quarter of a million dollars was spent in St. John's with practically no returns to the Government. All we got for it was abuse. This Government is going into a very speculative business. It is not right to saddle this

country with an extra yearly burden of three hundred thousand dollars.

It is not necessary, therefore I cannot vote for this loan bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—
Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition I would like to say that it is the intention of the Government to ask for tenders for this loan although I do not think that it is necessary to go to any very large expense in advertising for them. It seems to me that most of the large financial firms who might be inclined to tender for this loan know about it already. They make it their business to know when a colony like this is borrowing and their agents inform them almost at once. I was told by one of the agents of a big financial firm that it was a questionable policy on the part of a Government to ask for tenders for a loan or go shopping with your securities. It was questioned whether the wisest course might not be to have a large financial brokerage house take care of the colony's requirements. The policy of the Government has not as yet been fully discussed and we have not yet decided what is the best way to get the money on the best possible terms. I may say that the Leader of the Opposition made some statements which I would like to dwell upon for a few moments. When the House opened this session we were told that we were on the crest of a wave and that everything was bright. Mr. Hickman himself was the gentleman who was very emphatic that the prospects of the country looked well. This afternoon he tells us that the money the people saved during the war has been spent to the last dollar and that the people were now not able to exist. Which statement does Mr. Hickman wish us to believe? They are certainly most conflicting. He said that we have received no mandate from the people to raise this loan. Very few Govern-

ments do go to the country and ask to be given a mandate to borrow money. When this Government came into power we really thought that we could decrease taxation and still make ends meet, which of course is the duty of every Government to see to when they are arranging their supplies and expenditures. Now we are faced with a deficit of a million and a half dollars and money has got to be found to pay this deficit. The Opposition apparently agrees that now the railway is ours we have got to expend money on it to keep it in repairs. There has been no objection to raising the money to meet the deficit left to us, but the objection is to the two million dollars for the one constructive policy in view. All of the gentlemen on the other side of the House said that they were delighted we were about to launch on a tourist traffic proposition. The Leader of the Opposition was particularly delighted that we are going to encourage tourists to come here. Yet they think that we can do that without spending any money. One of them called our attention to the fact that the roads around St. John's were good enough for the tourists who might come down here to visit us. Well now gentlemen they are good enough for the tourist who has twenty dollars in his pocket after buying his return ticket, but that is not the class of tourist that we are looking for. We are looking for the tourist with money. The man who would spend five or ten thousand dollars on a vacation and would be perfectly satisfied if he had caught one salmon. There are tourists on the American Continent who would be delighted to spend a summer on our rivers, and there are no more attractive rivers than we have. Mr. Hickman referred to the necessity of roads for the fishermen. He wants to make a passage way from one place to another. I think that we have spent too much money tinkering with passage

ways from one place to another. It is no good. The roads are a disgrace. They are not worth the money that has been spent on them. We have got to build one big highway around all the important places and have no more tinkering with bits of roads here and there. If we have good highways they will be at the same time a source of attraction to tourists and satisfy the want that Mr. Hickman complains of. The people of Hants Harbour, Trinity Bay, would be quite satisfied if they had money to build a road from Hant's Harbour to Heart's Content. That is very reasonable. They do not want a steamer as long as they have a good road. There is no doubt that it is a pretty country. It can be used for the tourist. They think that it should be considered and we should put a road where it will be a benefit to the people of the country and would encourage the tourist traffic. I believe that two million dollars well spent on roads can be a great advantage to the colony and create a tourist traffic. Who is going to come down here unless they have roads to get away from their hotels. Money must be spent to build roads, and we must lay out a definite working plan before we begin. Two million dollars will only build 300 miles of really good roads, and still we are told it is an enormous amount to take permission to spend. We are going to build roads that lead to somewhere. I don't want to reflect upon past Governments, but there are 2 roads upon which they spent a pile of money and they don't seem to lead anywhere.

Mr. Hickman has said that no Government have the right to borrow such a sum as 6 million dollars. Mr. Hickman knows perfectly well that the past Government had borrowed 17 million dollars and they had nothing to show for it at the end of their term. Mr. Hickman also said that we should use this money to pay a bounty on fish. Every time he gets up to speak

he uses this bounty on fish. It is good stuff to throw out to the fishermen to show what a splendid man he is, and how we are not helping the fishermen, but as long as fish is \$8½ a quintal it is not necessary to put a bounty on fish. Is it right to the farmer or the labourer who is earning an honest dollar? Is it fair I say to tell that man that the fishermen should be paid \$8½ for fish and then a bounty, while he (the labourer) gets nothing? We have got to consider every man in the country. If the first consideration should be the fisherman I claim that as long as the fisherman is getting \$8½ for his fish he does not want a bounty. I say this to the credit of most of the fishermen that they do not ask for a bounty. It is simply a matter of politics with the Leader of the Opposition so he keeps on talking about it.

The Leader of the Opposition mentions that we should take one of the Government steamers that are up for sale and put her on the Port aux Basques route with the Kyle. Everybody knows that the Kyle is not suitable for the carrying a good class of tourists across the Gulf. We will not get them to come on her. We want a steamer more of the class of the Silvia. But she must be an ice breaker and as strong as the "Lintrose" formerly on that route. That is all I have to say. I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition was not here to hear the reply I made to his question, but no doubt he will have it conveyed to him.

MR. ASHBOURNE:—Mr. Chairman, there are a few thoughts which I would like to express while we are on this debate about the Loan Bill. I had hoped that we had come to the point where we had decided to get along without attempting to raise any more loans than we could possibly help. Now the Prime Minister in speaking in reply to a request of the Leader of the

Opposition that the Committee rise, said he could appreciate the fact that this might need a night's sleep or words to that effect. I am inclined to think that if it is our intention to go on in the manner which we have been going during the past few years and still keep on borrowing, according to the resolutions now before the chair, we are going to have a very rude awakening. We are told that there are to be two millions of dollars spent on roads and highways. I hope that if this is the case that we will have some good ones, and in that connection I hope that in addition to this something useful will be done with the ones which we have at present. This afternoon the Prime Minister said that the roads we have at the present time were a disgrace. I hope then that he will make some effort to improve them. I do not see myself why we should build new roads for the tourists that may come down here and leave the roads that we may need for ourselves in a disgraceful condition. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that we have failed to realise that if we continue to borrow from time to time without reducing our debt we will soon be facing ruin and financial distress. I remember hearing the story of a boy who asked his father for some pocket money. He was given a five pound note. The boy took the note and considered it with a very disparaging glance. But his father noticing the expression on his face took him to task and said, "My boy, do you realise that one hundred pounds have to work every day of the year for twenty-four hours every day at five per cent. in order to produce five pounds." I am afraid that the Government, like individuals has forgotten that we have to pay interest on the money, and that is one of the reasons that we have so many business failures, as the interest charges become so great that it is impossible to meet them, not to speak of paying the principal. We are told

here that there is an amount of \$1,600,000 of the proposed six millions to meet the deficit of 1923-1924. We have to raise a loan no doubt to meet that, but with regard to the other items I would like to say a few words. I notice in the Budget Speech delivered the other day by the Hon. Minister of Finance, Sir John Crosbie, reference was made to the Badger Road.

(Reads extract from the Budget Speech.)

With regard to that road I may say that it opens up the whole of the northern part of Twillingate District, and I would like to give the hon. member some information about it. It is of great convenience to the people going into the lumber woods from the northern part of the district. The journey can be accomplished in one and a half hours. It is a distance of thirty-four miles and it is a good wide road. It is possible to go to Twin Lakes, Badger or any of these places over this road. I believe that those who have come and gone over that road will bear me out when I say that this road is of the greatest possible assistance to the people of that district. And still this statement is delivered in the Budget Speech. Well, we are asked to vote two million dollars to build more roads. I suppose that the idea is that this money will be gotten back from the tourist traffic. I thought that I heard someone say that we had ceased to chase Will-o'-the-whisps and had no more intention of speculating and gambling. Still the Government is going to spend a great many thousand dollars on what I would be inclined to call a speculative proposition. We should take cognizance of the additional interest which we are going to have to pay on this six million dollars. At five per cent. that means that the people of this country will have to pay three hundred thousand dollars more a year in interest. And we

have also to think of the fact that we hope to pay this principal some day. We have to pay the principal. To do this we have to get some money from somewhere. There are several ways of raising revenue. The first is duty, the second taxation. Another source of revenue which the Government hopes to get is the tourist traffic. However, in 1894 the expenditure of the Colony was \$1,750,000. The revenue at that time was \$1,790,000. In 1914 the total revenue was three and a half million dollars. What do we find to-day. We find to-day, with the additional interest which we will have to pay for this new six million dollars, it will make the interest which we have to pay on the public debt as large as was the amount of revenue in 1914. That is a matter which is worth serious consideration. Newfoundland has always been, it is said, able to recuperate from any disaster very rapidly. That is because Newfoundlanders have always been thrifty. We have been good providers. We have lived within our income. But the case to-day is that the people are alarmed at the increase of debt, and not only will the people who have left our shores not come back, but I am very much afraid that many others will follow. To come back to the resolutions now before the chair. I notice in the Budget Speech that there is a statement referring to the fact that the savings accounts of the people of Newfoundland at present amount to over twenty million dollars. I would suggest that the Government give the people of our own Colony a chance to invest their money. There may be people at present who have not lost all hope in the country and who would be willing to invest some of their money to buy Newfoundland Government Bonds.

As I said before I have no confidence that this tourist traffic will come to any great financial advantage.

The next thing we come to is an amount of four hundred thousand dollars which is the estimated cost of a new steamer on the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I would suggest that instead of spending such a large amount as four hundred thousand dollars for a steamer for this job that we should charter one until we find whether this tourist traffic is a myth or not. I have crossed the Gulf and as far as I myself am concerned if I can get a half decent berth I do not care much what the rest of the steamer is like. The crossing is made mostly at night and only takes a few hours. We do not want a new steamer to do this work. If the Kyle is not large enough why not put another steamer on to help her? If this tourist traffic is developed it will only be for two or three months of the summer, and what will our costly ship do for the rest of the year? When we go to float this loan the country in which we are going to float it will ask for a balance sheet so that they can have a look at the condition of affairs in Newfoundland and see what our financial status is. What will it reveal? All that it will show is loan after loan. We had hoped that the time had come when it would be unnecessary to float more loans and so increase taxation. I know that you will tell me that the income from the tourist traffic will take care of the extra interest and that it will not be a burden on the country. That is nothing more than a hope. There is nothing definite about that, but we have to bear the responsibility that goes with it. At the present time we ought to live on what our income amounts to. I think that Dickens' story about the man who had an income of twenty shillings a week is timely. As long as he could get along on nineteen shillings a week he was happy, but when he had to spend a guinea a week he was miserable. I think that we should endeavour to

live on our income. To do this we have to reduce our expenditure.

It seems to me that we do not know whither we are tending and that we are very much in the dark when we embark on this voyage of experimentation. Perhaps I may be termed a pessimist, but I would rather say that I am conservative. I want some better and more cogent argument put up than has been given to convince me that the spending of this money at the present moment is necessary. The first time I had the pleasure of coming into this House I remember sitting in the gallery and looking at Sir Robert Bond. I was a mere boy and I heard Sir Robert say that an inflated balloon when pricked with a needle would soon collapse, and I doubt whether we are not living in a state of inflation now and that it is only a matter of time before we shall be on the verge of collapse. I consider that it would be a much wiser policy for the Government to go slowly at this moment. It has been said here that the raising of all this money is not needed and perhaps it is not contemplated to raise the whole of the six millions at the present juncture. Why then are we asked to vote for the raising of this six million dollar loan? There is to be another session of this House in January or February next and then I consider the Government might be better able to convince us that their policy is a wise and sound one; but at the present time I am not convinced. I consider that, as the fisheries of Newfoundland are the backbone of this Colony, there should be a certain amount of encouragement given to the fishermen. Conditions this autumn, no doubt, are going to be serious, and I consider that there are places in this country where a portion of this borrowed money could be spent equally as well as on roads to encourage tourists and to afford tourists an easy drive during their stay in Newfoundland. I do not say

that I am against inter-town traffic or inter-town growth, but I think, however, that we should endeavour to make our men producers rather than spenders. To-day we find that we are burdened with a debt that should not be increased. Some speakers in the past have referred to this debt as a cancer that hangs around us and which sometime may prove our undoing. I had hoped that economy would have been the watchword of the present Government instead of keeping on borrowing. What retrenchment have we seen during this session of the House? And where has the Government started to economize. We are told that there likely will be no difficulty for the Colony to raise a six million dollar loan. I am very glad that the spirit of confidence is abroad, but I do not know whether the present time is the most oportune to float that loan, but I do know that we should advertise it and call for tenders in order that the Colony might get the benefit of the very best terms that is possible to be made. We are stewards and custodians of the people and I do not think that we would be doing a wise thing in voting to give the Government a free hand in the spending of two million dollars on roads and highways without having a more definite programme of how the money is going to be spent laid before us by the Government. However, on the shoulders of the Government rests the responsibility and some day they will have to give an account of their stewardship to the people of the country. In the past a hue and cry used to go forth against the piling up of more debt, and I am strongly convinced that the time is not yet come for us to take two millions of dollars and spend it on roads for the encouragement of tourist traffic without knowing how or in what way that money is going to be expended. We have a railway on our hands and I am convinced that, as it

is a public utility, it has to be run. No doubt the allocation for rolling stock is a necessary one but I do not agree with the vote for the cost of a new steamer. I think that \$50,000 for repairs to the Dry Dock is quite a sum of money and I hope that concrete repairs will be made instead of wooden alterations. I have seen some wooden docks on the other side of the water with concrete walls around them and I think that the same thing should be done here so that our dock will not need repairs in three or four years' time again. With regard to the cost of building sheds and making repairs to a pier, I believe that the Prime Minister or Finance Minister spoke about raising that steamer up there. I wonder why she was not raised before and I wonder why it is that the people of this Colony should have to pay for the refloating of her. The vote for the machine shops may be necessary, but the vote of a half million dollars for the construction of a plant for coal and fuel is absolutely uncalled for. I have not yet been told to my satisfaction the idea of that vote. Is it that certain machinery is to be brought here to facilitate the easy discharging of coal? If that is so, then you are proposing to take away certain work from the laborers of St. John's. Steamers that come into St. John's to-day are discharged by laborers. I do not think that there is any short supply of laborers here now either, and I think that the Government is not well advised in seeking a half million dollars in order to bring in machinery to build a plant and have certain apparatus for quick discharging. Is it the intention of the Government, I ask, to go into the wholesale business with coal? Remember that times to-day in this country are not what they were ten, fifteen or twenty years ago. Every day almost there are inventions being perfected in order to make passenger and freight traffic more easy

and to eliminate the possibility of danger for shipping. We have wireless direction finders, fog alarms, etc., and I think that if the Government believe that they can sell coal here to foreign shipping at a profit they are making a great mistake. Another matter that crossed my mind is whether or not we are going to see the electrification of the railroad. We have latent and dormant possibilities in this country awaiting development. We have enormous water power, and I think the time will come when we shall see that the road across country will be electrified. Why then should we contemplate spending a half million dollars in order to build a coal shed here in St. John's? Large quantities of coal for the railway is landed at Clarendville, Lewisporte and other places and it is not at all necessary that the coal for the use of the entire railroad should be brought to St. John's. We are also told that some of this money may be spent for other public purposes| I have advocated here when presenting a petition that a certain shoal tickle needed to be dredged in order to help the fishermen in their daily work, and I feel that the encouragement of the fisheries and proper attention to marine works should be gone into rather than spending the whole of two million dollars for the encouragement of the tourist traffic.

I hope that this loan of six million dollars will be cut down by the Government and I hope that when the vote is taken in this House that it will be seen that we cannot possibly go ahead borrowing more than what we must absolutely have. I want to put myself on record that I am against the raising of the whole of this six million dollars at the present time. I consider that half of it would be as much as we should decide to raise at the present juncture.

MR. DUFF—Mr. Chairman, I

thought that I should have been able to see eye to eye with the Government on some things, but so far it has been impossible for me. Governments in the past have unquestionably made serious mistakes, and this Government is no exception.

I consider that the spending of two million dollars for tourist roads is poor business. Take the Badger and Deer Lake roads that cost so much. They are of little or no benefit to this country, and one wonders how 36 representatives could agree to such waste. Now we all remember when the branch railways to Trepassey, Heart's Content, Bonavista and Bay de Verde were started. People who were instrumental in having those lines built had no idea of what they were doing, although they might think it impertinent of me to say so. It was purely a matter of wasting this country's money and I fear that this Govt. is making a similar mistake in launching out so extensively on this road making policy. Now these Resolutions I assure you, Mr. Chairman, is "a bolt from the blue" to this country because the people had no idea that the present Government intended seeking such a large loan as six million dollars. There may be reason for asking for some of it so far as paying our debts is concerned, but, according to the Resolutions now before the Chair, there is no necessity for asking for money for some of the items contained in them, such as two million dollars for Newfoundland roads. We all would like to have tourists come here and spend money, but I am afraid that is only a dream because very few of them come here, they usually go fishing on the West Coast where they remain a short time and then get away quickly, and so it appears to me to be very poor business for this Government to go to the expense of two million dollars plus the interest on it for the purpose mentioned. Everything seems to get en-

couragement in this country except the main industry—the fisheries. People who are on the other side of the House now were wont to advocate the cause of the fisheries when they were in Opposition, and now is their opportunity to practice what they preached. Personally I am not in favour of a bounty on fish because the matter of the price of fish as well as improved cure is in the hands of the exporting merchants themselves to decide and why should this Government interfere. If the merchants do not know their own business it is up to the Government to show them. The Warren Government took the duty off molasses, pork, beef, kerosene and gasolene in lieu of giving a bounty, and after all it was a businesslike thing to do. It simplified matters considerably and fishermen, widows and orphans throughout the country benefitted by having the duty off these necessary commodities; and I am sorry that the present Minister of Finance could not see his way clear to leave them off. The encouragement of the fisheries this year is a greater essential than ever because there are hundreds of fishermen on the Labrador who have not got ten quintals to date, and the majority of them are poorer than when they went away. The fishermen this fall will need more than a bounty, and if the two million dollars to be spent on roads and highways will help those men I have nothing to say against it, although it is a pity that the country is in such an unfortunate condition. As far as I can see the retrenchment scheme of the Government has not worked very well thus far. We were told by the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs of all the money he was saving by taking steamers off Fortune Bay, Trinity Bay and the Northern Labrador. But we find to-day that these same boats are still going strong. Times are very serious in this country just now, although the Prime

Minister told us that things were rosy. We were told here by Mr. Bennett of labor troubles in this city; we have Bell Island and Sydney closing down and we have the Labrador fishery a failure, so that there is every room for pessimism. I notice that out of the six million dollars that one million is to be earmarked for work to be done in St. John's West. I suggested earlier in the session that St. John's would be heard from very often now. There is nearly one and three quarter million dollars allocated for this railway system. A gentleman of the Government said some time ago in this House that he would be glad for some one to take over this railway for nothing. Well, why are you now asking for one and three quarter million dollars to spend on a railway that is not paying and that you are willing to give away? You are also asking now for \$350,000 to spend on rolling stock, and all for a Railway, after all this money is expended on, that you will still desire to give away. I am pleased to notice that the Government at last recognizes our natives in the management. The former Government went to Winnipeg for a man to manage our Railway and steamship service, whilst we had men in this country that had forgotten more than he knew, and the condition of the rolling stock, etc. to-day I attribute to this importation.

Estimated cost of a new steamer on the Gulf St. Lawrence \$400,000.00. I think that the suggestion made by Mr. Ashbourne would be a wise one, to hire a boat for the time being to try out your experiment, rather than build a new one

Repairs to dock \$50,000.00 I really think that would be required, but when repairs have been done where are you going to get the boats to come for repairs there? Your port is blacklisted. The same thing will happen as happens now, temporary repairs only will be effected, and the

Government should take off the excessive port charges and encourage ships to come for permanent repairs thereby giving the square deal to ship owners and Nfld., art sens alike. Cost of equipment and new machinery at machine shop \$50 000.00, I have no doubt, but that is necessary as I understand that a considerable amount of hard work is being done now, and and it must necessarily be very slow, and costly.

Cost of completion of buildings on railway, etc., \$75,000.00, I would suggest that we leave that for awhile as we really cannot afford it at the present time, and we can very well do without it.

Estimated cost of construction of plant for coal and fuel \$500,000.00. I do not know whether the Government is going in the coal trade or not, if they are I would certainly suggest that it be left alone as we all know that Government operation or control is not very successful where ever it has been tried. I would suggest Mr. Chairman that the Government cut down some of these amounts, and consequently the amount of the loan, as we cannot really afford it at the present time. There are people on the Labrador at present they have little chance of knowing what they are going to do, for a livelihood with their fishing vessels and gear practically worn out through poor returns the past four years. Some encouragement should be given them at this time and consequently an encouragement to continue the fisheries. Fishmen from Portugal, United States and Canada come to this country to fish and our own people are denied a living at this industry, and have to leave this country to seek a livelihood elsewhere.

I spent twenty-five years down on the Labrador and it was not all sunshine believe me. I have friends still going to that coast doing the same

work as I did, and when I remember the way they have to work, as well as the manner in which the fishermen, from one end of the coast to the other, have to work in fog and storm to eke out a miserable existence—to keep up what one sees around him in this city, one is forced to conclude that there is something radically wrong in the state and I would bespeak some consideration and encouragement for our producer's at this time.

I desire the encouragement of our fisheries and economy, to make this country a better land to live in, and for that reason I would suggest to the Government that they bring in resolutions for a much smaller outlay, and for these reasons I cannot support the bill for such a tremendous loan.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few remarks relative to the Loan Resolutions now before the House. I understand that among the few privileges which the Opposition enjoys in matters of this sort is the privilege of suggesting reductions and we from this side of the House certainly intend to avail of this privilege in connection with this proposed loan. The Squires and Warren ministers were raising loans they went about it in such a conservative fashion that the Opposition found it necessary to suggest larger loans even, but to-day we, as an Opposition must suggest to the Government the advisability of a reduction. I think, Sir, that when it becomes known throughout the length and breadth of the land that one of the initial acts of the new Government is the raising of a loan of six million dollars there will be nothing short of widespread amazement and astonishment. The Prime Minister argues that he has a mandate for everything he has done, in the Manifesto which he placed before the electorate this Spring, but I fail to see how he can reconcile the passage

which I propose to read from his Manifesto with his action regarding this loan. Without any substantial or definite explanation he asks us to saddle the country with a loan of six million dollars in addition to our already heavy burden. The Prime Minister in his Manifesto asks: "Shall we have the old bad Government at the hands of those who gave it or a better Government at the hands of new men? Shall our course be downward or upward? Shall the Colony sink beneath a load of incompetency and corruption or go onward and upward to a better, happier day?" Now, Sir, it seems to me that in proposing this huge loan at the time the Government is pursuing the very course which the Prime Minister deplored in his Manifesto and one fails to see how he is, through this loan, guiding the country upward to a happier day. My first comment must be that the loan is too large. Three million dollars would suffice to meet the Government's pressing necessities at the present time. No definite information has been given as to how the various sums earmarked in these Resolutions are to be spent and certainly no substantial argument has yet come from the Government side in support of many of the items included in the Resolutions. The one million six hundred thousand dollars asked for to meet deficits may be all right and regarding that I have nothing to say. Now the next item is the huge sum of two million dollars for building public highways. In view of the lack of information as to where and how these highways are to be built and the manner in which this vote is supposed to be spent, I must protest against this idea at the present time.

Now the Prime Minister told us the other day that in his opinion the prices being paid for fish this season did not necessitate a bounty being paid on fish this year and that his Government could not see their way

clear to provide such a bounty this year. Then again the other day we had the spectacle of the Government increasing the duties on fishermen's supplies, duties, Sir, which the late Government took off. The Prime Minister went to the country on a plea of doing something to encourage the fishery as our staple industry, yet we find that every single act of the Government has been to make the fisherman's burden harder to bear. And to-day, Sir, in view of these facts we are asked to raise two million dollars for public highways on a pretext of encouraging tourist traffic. I am afraid that it will be a small consolation to the fishermen of this country to know that duties have been increased and a bounty denied them, and yet we are supposed to vote two million dollars for the benefit of tourists who may or may not come here. As regards this tourist traffic idea, I agree with the honourable member for Twillingate, Mr. Ashbourne, that we ought by all means try the experiment first in a small way before undertaking such a huge project in this direction without any absolute knowledge of possible results. But, Sir, if the Government will insist in voting this two million dollars for highways I want just now to make a passing reference to a remark delivered in the Budget Speech the other day.

Referring to the Halls Bay-Badger and the Deer Lake-Bonne Bay roads he said that no sane man could see any sense or any use in the construction of these roads and that they were useless and to-day grassgrown. The honourable member for Twillingate, Mr. Ashbourne, has discussed this remark in relation to the Hall's Bay-Badger road and I wish now to refer to the Bonne Bay road. I repudiate the suggestion that the road is useless and that the expenditure was an absolute waste. It might be true that the part of the road which was built by the Government without contract

cost a great deal more than was justifiable, but the work done under contract gave good returns for the money spent. I always insisted that the whole road should have been built under contract and I deplore as much as anybody the over expenditure as a result of Government operations in building some sections.

Now as regards this road, Sir, I wish to say that it is of good use and of very great use. It passes through one of the finest stretches of the country in the Island to-day from an agricultural and scenic point of view. The road is of great use to hundreds of men from Bonne Bay employed at the industrial centres in the vicinity of Deer Lake, and in the Autumn moreover is used for the transmission of mails when passage by sea is often out of the question. The people of Bonne Bay asked for this road because they felt that it would be years before they could get a railroad, and even if they had a railroad they naturally expected a tie up for months in the Winter season such as was in evidence on other branches. The Bonne Bay-Deer Lake road, Sir, must be finished, and I urge upon the Government if they decided to go on with this vote of two million dollars for roads, that one hundred and fifty thousand dollars be earmarked to complete this road. The people asked for it and want to see it finished. Then again, if the Government is sincere in its idea of promoting tourist traffic by building highways there is no place in the country that can demand better attention than the Bonne Bay road. There is everything in the vicinity to attract the tourist from the standpoint of scenery, fishing and game, and those who know Bonne Bay must admit that its scenery is unequalled in grandeur by anything else in the country. I must make a strong plea for the completion of the road and trust that we are not to be overlooked in this respect.

Passing on now, Sir, to a further consideration of the various items outlined in the Resolutions, I am surprised to find that such a large sum of money is to be spent in connection with the railroad without having any official statement from any authoritative source as to the necessity for the proposed expenditures. Surely before the Government asks the House to sanction these huge amounts for railway development we ought to have a statement from the Govt. Engineer or the railroad's management showing the necessity for such expenditures. I do not object to the fifty thousand dollars provided for repairs to the dock, as I feel that by repairing the dock we shall attract more shipping to this port for repairs, and consequently benefit ourselves considerably in that direction.

With regard to the proposed new steamer for the Gulf I am in accord with the member for Twillingate, Mr Ashbourne, and think that we ought to go slow and charter a steamer to take care of the extra traffic on the Gulf.

Now, Sir, as regards undertaking repairs to the railroad between this and Clarendville, I feel that there are many other places on the road that want to be re-railed as well as between here and Clarendville. If you recollect considerable money was spent last year on some sections of the road over which this proposed re-railing is to take place. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he says that the re-railing is a great deal more likely to cost \$1,00,000 than the \$800,000 provided in these Resolutions. It is deplorable that we have no official report showing the need for this undertaking and what it is likely to cost that we might better know our position on the matter.

Now as regards five hundred thousand dollars for the erection of a coal

plant in St. John's. What does this mean? Surely the Government cannot be contemplating entering the coal business and erecting a coal plant at such a huge expense? We have not heard a single word in explanation or defense of this matter and yet we are asked to vote five hundred thousand dollars for a project of this sort in the closing hours of the Legislature. If the idea is to bunker ships I cannot see any argument in its favour on that point because surely the organized legitimate coal trade of the town is in a position to take care of that situation. What about the people who have been in the coal trade for years and have made it their business to accommodate ships requiring bunker. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that these people are well able to take care of the bunkering trade in this port and that this proposition will mean a great cut to the trade of these firms if we vote for it. Surely after all the protests we have heard from honourable members on the other side, the Government cannot be contemplating entering the coal trade as a new experiment.

In conclusion, Sir, there is the proviso, that the Governor in Council shall have power to apply any balance over and above their expenditures to devote to any essential public service. What does this mean and what balances are we to anticipate? It seems to me that we are all in the dark as to what most of these Resolutions mean. The other day the Government asked us to authorise them to obrogate certain duties when felt the financial condition of the country warranted them in so doing. We have heard fiery protests from the other side of the House about the actions of the late Government as regards things being done by Minute of Council, but I must say, Sir, it appears to me that the Government of to-day propose to practice something of a

similar nature only they want to round the corner by a different method. I consider, Sir, that there is a great deal of political expediency attached to the Government's method with regard to these matters. The House in my opinion ought not to confer this power on the Government and I strongly object to the Proviso.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I must again protest against this loan of six million dollars just now until we really get on the right road. I consider three millions a substantial amount at this juncture and I consequently propose to vote against these Resolutions.

MR. WARREN:—Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to vote on those resolutions, and I therefore consider that it is for me to give my reasons. At first I was interested as to the objects for which those amounts were to be spent. First of all I fail to see how the Government can say that there is a deficit of \$1,600,000.00, from 1923-23, when as a matter of fact it could not be above \$1,000,000.00 or there about. It is merely a matter of book-keeping, and I may say that before rising to speak on those resolutions, I took the trouble to make certain as to the deficit, and I know for a fact that there is not a deficit of \$1,600,000.00. Last year we raised a loan of \$3,500,000.00, and we provided for the deficit of 1923. In taking up the Budget Speech, I find that the details on page 23 show that the loan netted us \$3,511,237.39, and the date of the Budget is July 28th. We paid the Bank of Montreal on Pit Prop Account \$1,000,000.00, and unless some balance of that has been spent by Minute of Council there should now be a balance of \$466,595.00.

We are asked to vote \$500,000 for the cost of the construction of a plant for coal and fuel in St. John's West. Five or ten years ago if any Prime Minister or Minister of Finance was to come into the House or the Legis-

lature and ask to vote half the amount for any one project it would have been prefaced by speeches of two hours duration. At any rate he would have given his reasons for such a request. We have heard nothing as to the necessity for such a coal depot. It has been stated that it would be a great investment. But no facts or figures have been submitted to show the necessity for spending this amount on this particular project at this particular time.

We have to scrape along as best we can under the present circumstances. I have been in the Government for five years and the Hon. gentlemen of this House will remember on a certain occasion the government indulged in business transactions of its own. It was not successful and those on this side of the House at that time never failed to reiterate the saying that the Government should never indulge in business. I think I learnt a lesson. I took advice and although various endeavours were made during the short period of my being Prime Minister to get the Government to engage in business I always turned it down. If the Government thinks they are going to indulge in coal business I wish them success. But from my own experience I don't think their experience is going to be a happy one.

Before proceeding I would like to ask the Minister of Finance with regard to the sheds in St. John's West is there any intention to make any deal or arrangement with the flour mill?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—The proposition was put up to a previous Government, and I am wondering if they are still of the same mind.

M R. W A R R E N:—The next item is an amount of two million directly or indirectly concerned with the transportation system of the Colony. I cannot support that

under the present circumstances. The Government must have some settled policy with regard to the transportation system. They stood on this side when I was on the other side and thundered at us and against the Government operation of the railway. If the Government has a settled policy with regard to the railway then I say spend the two millions on it. But if they have no settled policy, then this is no time to go and spend two millions on it. I asked the Prime Minister if there was anything done with regard to the future operation of the road. I think that the Government before spending two millions should come to a settled idea as to what they are going to do. If the Government are going to operate the railroad for ever, then I admit that two millions is little enough to spend on it. But if they are undecided then this is no time to spend it. If it is the intention of the Government to try and get outside people to operate the railroad as I say they should do, because Government operation is going to be a mistake and a failure, then we should wait and see what will happen before we immediately go and sink two millions in the improvement of the railway. First we should put it in good condition, then we could meet and see what we could do with outside capital. While I was in England I took the matter up with people over there. I was asked to prepare a statement showing the profile of the road. To have statements made giving an account of the rolling stock, condition of the road bed, where curves could be cut down, grades altered, so that economical trains could be run over the road. I instructed Mr. Russell, and when I left office the material was being prepared for those people. It is worth while to take it up, but I understand there is no effort being made to interest outside capital in the operation of the railroad. I think it is

a great opportunity. After all the only reason why the Reid Newfoundland Company operated the railroad was because they had interests in this country. And they operated the road for the simple reason that unless the road was operated their properties would be of little or no value. There has been a lot of money invested in the country since then. Investments on the West Coast, Grand Falls and elsewhere that we did not have at that time. And I feel certain that we ought to try and interest those who have money in the country to operate the road as economically as they can. Unless that is done I am not going to vote for the two million dollars for the railway under those unsettled conditions.

The last item is the matter of roads. And on this point I differ from the Official Opposition as Leader of the Independent Party. I consider that a real good investment. I have been round a good many places in this world and I have seen what can be done to interest the tourist in the country. If you were to go over to England and see the inducements offered to tourists by tu'penny and ha'penny towns you would not hesitate to vote for people to come here. When tourists come down here to see the scenery we tell them they can't get there. Look at a photograph and that is all they can do. They consider the money well spent provided it is properly spent. The reason that we don't have more tourists here is because those that come here can't see the beauty spots; can't get the fishing that you have been advertising. They go away and tell their friends that it is all bunkum. Don't go down there. Only a Newfoundlander who goes with a pack on his back and treks miles up the country ever sees it. That I think is the best thing and I would vote for it twice over. As

long as the money is well spent I am confident we will get returns.

The reason that I can't vote for these items is because I represent a constituency that has been up against it recently. And I need'nt reiterate what I have already said. But I have to ask those that sent me here. Can you conscientiously ask the people of Fortune Bay to pay their share of the taxes for a two mill on loan when they have no roads and the only boat they have is taken away. They don't expect me to do it. It's true the Government put on a boat recently but it does not fill the bill. And I learn it is only going to cause more trouble. All very well for those who are well looked after. How can I vote for that when I know that the people are destitute of any roads or any means of communication. You are going to rerail the road from St. John's to Clarendville. The railroad to Fortune Bay was torn up. Rails were taken away to rerail the road somewhere else. It is not as if they cannot pay the taxes. There were statements tabled a few weeks ago showing the amount of able bodied relief. There were only \$200 for Fortune Bay against thousands for other districts. Business men are building a new patent fish dryer. They have faith in the Bay and are spending the r money there. In addition to that years ago Fortune Bay was noted for its herring. And I want to tell you, Sir, Fortune Bay is better off to-day as regards the herring fishery.

Harbor Breton has a factory which makes bladders. It has one of the most prosperous outport merchants in this country, Mr. Garland.

The people support themselves. They are very industrious and never apply to the Government for relief. Everyone from the Priest down wears clothes made by their wives and s s- ters. Made in their own homes. They are cut out, sewn, and made at home. I can't, much as I would like to, ask

them to distribute their share of the taxes for roads, etc., until they have been looked after.

I am sure the members on the other side of the House will agree that what my constituents are looking for is the same comforts as themselves. And I am sure that if they were sitting here they would not agree to pay taxes for the interest on the loan to provide comforts for others. That briefly is my reason. I don't want to vote against the resolutions because some of them appeal to me. I only withhold my vote because of the reasons I have shortly outlined here.

HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY—Before proceeding further, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to the Resolutions now before the Chair. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks of my Honourable friends on the other side of the House, particularly the member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Warren, the leader of the Independent Party. Whilst I extend my sympathy to him that he finds himself unable to support the Resolutions although he believes in them, he is practically in no man's land, but still I know his heart is with those on this side of the House.

We have heard a great deal of criticism and an effort to create alarm about the raising of this Loan of Six Million Dollars, but if one would only examine the different headings under which the Loan is laid, and contemplate the absolute necessity for the amounts under those heads, no other conclusion can be come to, but that the loan is justified in every particular. The first item, namely, one million, six hundred thousand dollars, is not of our own creation, but a legacy handed down by our predecessors. This is a debt that has been piled up, and it is not my purpose this evening to go into the causes that led up to this indebtedness, but merely to say

that, in my opinion, under the circumstances, a great portion of this debt should have never been acquired.

The second item on the list is for two million dollars for the building of highways and roads to the different parts of the country. On all sides for the past ten or fifteen years we have heard people calling out for the development of a tourist traffic. That demand we are endeavoring to meet, and considering the first step in the development of that traffic is to put good and substantial roads in such parts of the country where people may come and spend their money and time, and bring them in closer touch with all our natural resources. The leader of the Opposition in his remarks, said that we should have hotels first, and roads afterwards. I join issue with him on this point, and state that we should have good roads as the preliminary to the building of Hotels, or at least the development of each should go hand in hand. A year ago, or less than a year ago, it would have been impossible to get a dollar invested in an hotel enterprise in this country unless it had a Government guarantee behind it. To-day things have changed, and although some people may not appreciate the situation, owing to the late change in the laws relating to the sale of beers, wines and alcoholic liquors, the possibility of tourist development and the successful financing of an Hotel project have been materially altered, and whilst I believe that if a good Hotel were started here in St. John's with some subsidiary hotels in other desirable parts of the country, a very large business would be built up in a short time, but it must of necessity acquire good roads to enable people to go afar, so that they can get conveniently near good sporting facilities; and if people are to come here who are prepared to spend a large amount of money, they must in the first place have ample and suitable accommoda-

tion for them, as well as facilities for going around the country to enjoy our unsurpassed scenery, and to experience the joys of our natural attractions. People will not come merely for the sake of having a glass of beer or wine at dinner; whilst these things might be quite acceptable for them, still we must find further means of entertainment if we would acquire and maintain a first class tourist traffic. Our great natural attractions, our salmon rivers teeming with salmon. If some of the people of the United States or Canada, or England, were told of the quantity of salmon in our rivers they would hardly believe it. Myriads of salmon are waiting there for the skill of the true sportsmen. Our trout streams are unsurpassed; and our game, in the way of caribou, grouse, wild duck likewise, makes up such an attractive picture, that few could refuse to participate. Apart from our sporting facilities is our unsurpassed climate and magnificent scenery. Thousands of people in the nearby Continent who are thirsting for pleasures new, would come to enjoy the natural beauties of Newfoundland, particularly as we have not, up to the present, attracted many of those of large means and time at their disposal to spend in the enjoyment of these natural attractions.

Of course it must be borne in mind that our present travelling facilities of coming and going from this country to Canada and the United States, as well as to the Old Country, are not at all like one would desire. When I was in Liverpool last spring, in conversation with the Furness Withy Co., they told me they would put on a new line of steamers, provided there was a good hotel in St. John's, but not otherwise. Sir Edgar Bowring, of the Red Cross Line, informed me a day or two ago, that if a good hotel and a few small subsidiary hotels were

built in Newfoundland, their Company would, without delay, put on two fifteen knot boats to carry four to five hundred passengers direct between here and New York, so that people with means particularly would have all the comforts and luxuries of first class sea travelling when coming to our shores. If these intentions on the part of people who are interested in our welfare, are sincere, then why should not we, as a Government of the country, lead the way, and with the co-operation of others, bring about and establish a source of revenue and wealth in this country that may surprise the most optimistic of us in a few years time. We must have faith in ourselves if we are to inspire faith in others.

I therefore feel that when the Minister of Finance goes into the money markets of the world, he will get a cordial reception, because to-day, the Bonds of Newfoundland stand in favourable comparison to any other of the British Dominions.

It has been claimed that the repeal of the Prohibition Act is the retrogressive step, but I feel confident that the Law as it now stands, will not increase the consumption of alcoholic liquors, and what is consumed will be sold through channels that have paid the full amount of Customs duties required.

We will not need to go to St. Pierre surreptitiously for our liquor supplies. I believe that the money to be spent on the roads in this country will be the best money ever spent and I believe that the people have confidence in this Government that they are going to spend it properly and I believe that the people are pleased that Mr. Monroe has grappled with this matter. Mr. Monroe has not faltered, he believes there is possibilities ahead for this country and its people. Is it the idea of some people that we must move along at a slow

pace all the time? Let us take on new life and let us go abroad with a new programme to show that we got faith in the country. We have the goods and if we go ahead with that spirit and that confidence we are bound to succeed. There is no question about it that the holiday seekers in the United States with the first class ships that they have at their disposal will teem here. They are pretty well tired of visiting other parts of the world now. They have seen the South of France, the Southern States, Norway and other European countries and here in Newfoundland is a new venture, a curiosity, where we got all the natural attractions in the one place, and there is not the least doubt about it that we will surprise ourselves with the result of the very programme that we are discussing to-night.

A great deal was said here to-day with regard to the fisheries. Now this Government is not neglecting the fisheries any more than previous Governments did; but we have to attend to other things, and this is not the time of the year to talk about giving a bonus on fish. Last year I was for a short time leader of a Party and I went to the country with a bonus on fish as part of my policy. I was sincere in that policy and those behind me were pledged to it and Mr. Hickman, the present leader of the Opposition, who was one of my colleagues at that time know that we were sincere in our programme. But the country turned us down. The people evidently did not want a bonus to be paid them on fish and honourable members on the other side of the House now were elected against that policy. Now I do not say this in any revengeful spirit. I am still of the opinion that, if this country can afford it, give a bonus on fish, but give it when the fisherman is fitting out for the voyage and not when the voyage is over when the man with the

biggest catch gets the biggest bonus and when the man with ten or twenty quintals gets nothing. That is the worst part of this thing. The very man you want to help gets nothing as a result of this system of paying a bonus on fish when the voyage is over. In other words the man who makes a good voyage avails of the bonus and is able to meet his obligations with the merchant, but the poor devil who got little or no fish is kicked out by his merchant and perhaps has to appeal for relief at the end of the season. But when this policy of road building will not conflict in any way with anything that can be done in the interests of the fishermen because if we can induce people to come into this country the money they will spend here will be producing revenue that will help to lighten the burdens on the fishermen and decrease taxation; it certainly will not increase the burdens on them because the Custom House will be able to meet the ordinary obligations on this loan. Therefore, these two million dollars which are earmarked to be spent on roads and highways will not alone mean the development of roads but will mean a great deal more for this country and its people in other directions. Therefore, I think that the answer to any criticism with regard to the wisdom of raising this loan has been successfully made. We must take a chance; we cannot help ourselves. This country cannot stand still, it is going down. I can see no opportunity or no avenue available for our people; then it is up to us to take a chance in the very Bill that we have before us to-night.

With regard to the other items in connection with the Resolutions, there is one important matter I would like to refer to and that is to the ship to be built for the Cabot Strait service. We have a boat over there called the "Kyle" which might be termed

a jolly boat trying to do the work of a topsail schooner. The "Kyle" is supposed to carry ninety passengers and yet it is nothing unusual for her to carry night after night across the Cabot Strait upwards of two hundred passengers. What sort of accommodation did these people have and what country would tolerate such a thing, if they had any possible means of avoiding it. The "Kyle" is a good and sound ship, but she is absolutely inadequate for the requirements of that service, and it has given the Government the utmost concern since they assumed office as to what could be done to relieve that situation. You cannot charter a steamer for that service because you cannot get ice-breaking steamers without great effort, and, perhaps, it may be impossible to charter one because there are very few steamers of that kind capable of doing the work in the winter or spring season. We have to build another "Lintrose" a ship that will be capable of contending with ice and other conditions as they are. I do not advocate the acquiring of a fancy ship for that service, but a powerful ship with suitable accommodation and one that will be decent and well kept. You do not want one luxuriously furnished like an ocean liner; all you want is a commodious and safe ship to ferry the people across the Strait. That type of ship may be built for a quarter of a million dollars. I hope she will. One can never tell what price the ship-building yards may demand, but, the Government, to be on the safe side, put down \$400,000. If it does not cost that figure, the balance may be required for some other purpose. The "Kyle" will then have to go back to the Labrador service, which service she was built for. Therefore, that is sufficiently justifiable for the safety of lives because it is not safe to travel by the "Kyle" under existing conditions to-day.

Now the Dry Dock is an institution that means a great deal in this town and it is too bad to see it going to decay. Why in a very short time it will be dropping asunder and some catastrophe may be happening there and are we too look on and see it falling down? Are we to do nothing to put it in a state of good repair. The Dry Dock is a good proposition and one worthy of being looked after properly, and the new machinery for the machine shops is absolutely essential to the dock. The only thing I regret is that we have not enough in this loan to re-build that dock and make it large enough to receive ships like the "Metagama" and others that came here for repairs.

It is also essential in the interest of safety for something to be done with the railroad. The cars are like concertinas when in motion, a considerable portion of the road needs to be re-railed while you cannot get an engine for God's sake. Ballasting of the road is now going on; but the great trouble is to get an engine, the majority of the engines being engaged on the Humber, so that rolling stock is the chief requirement just now. Some people will say that within a few months the Humber activities will be over. Well the Gander will be started then and I hope that other enterprises will have started also. Therefore, I say that it is very essential to keep our Dry Dock and our other utilities in good repair while we have them. I do not agree with letting them go to pieces because you want to sell them. If a man wants to sell his house, he will fix it up and make it habitable and presentable before he tries to sell, and after he has it painted and the windows polished he then asks somebody to examine it and when he does sell he gets considerably more than it was worth at first. The same applies to our utilities. We could command hundreds of thousands of dol-

lars more for them after repairing them than if we sold them in a dilapidated condition. But outside of that we must improve them in the interest of public safety. You will be told to-night, no doubt, that there is no necessity to re-rail the railroad between St. John's and Clarendville. Well everybody knows that is the worst part of the road and that is why the Government proposes to re-rail it with eighty pound rails instead of sixty pound ones.

The member for St. Barbe spoke about the Bonne Bay Road. Well I know Bonne Bay and there is not a more beautiful place in the whole Island than Bonne Bay and surroundings. It is a sight to see, and I feel sure that hundreds of people would go there, if they had the facilities. The building of that road would only entail a small amount as it connects with the railway and I have no doubt that the Government will give sympathetic consideration to his suggestion and people in that part of the country will be looked after as well as in other sections. Members of the Opposition have said that they have not been told where this road money is going to be spent. It will be spent on building and mending roads and highways from St. John's around Conception Bay, up towards Trinity Bay, up to Trepassey, up on the West Coast where the best salmon rivers in North America are, and where people who visit there can conveniently and comfortably get back to their hotels at night after the day's fishing. These are some of the plans that we have in mind but it is absolutely impossible at this juncture to outline all the details because we have not had the time to study the matter fully. Things of detail will eventuate as we go along but the first thing is we got to make up our minds to go ahead with the project. Expert engineers will be engaged to assist us to formulate a programme that we believe

will one day in the not distant future be the answer to the criticisms made against the raising of this loan. Remarks were made by certain gentlemen on the other side of the House this afternoon that we are following the dictates of some individual or individuals to lead us into Confederation. Nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that we are trying to keep out of Confederation. The country that is trying to develop itself is not going to sell itself. There is no man trying to lead this Government into Confederation and there is just as much loyalty to our own people among the members of the Monroe Government as there was in any Government that ever took charge of this country. I refute the suggestion that there is any desire or attempt made by any one to take our rights or our liberties. We are well able to look after ourselves. It is not always those who make most noise that are most effective, but I would like to say that we have in this party a body of men who love this country and who never want to see the old flag fall. As far as Confederation is concerned we hope that it is as far away from us as Mars to-night; but when we get our tourist traffic developed we may be annexing Canada instead of Canada trying to annex us. I have to thank the members on the Opposition side of the House for their fair criticisms of the Resolutions. We all know that they had to say something to justify their existence but they know as well as we do that these Resolutions are going to prove the salvation of Newfoundland.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—Mr. Chairman: I would like to say a few words on the subject matter now before the Chair. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Independent Party are not in the House now because they, as well as other members opposite, seem to want

information in connection with the different matters contained in these Resolutions. I listened with mixed feelings of amusement to the speeches of the different members comprising the Opposition party. They have a certain amount of work to do and criticisms to make and I have no doubt that they are doing it to the best of their ability. I have nothing whatever to say to the junior members of the Opposition, men who have entered this House for the first time. They have done their work as well as could be expected, and both of them—I refer now to Mr. Duff and Mr. Ashbourne—have nothing to be ashamed of for the way they have upheld the interests of their districts. The others are all hard-shelled politicians. In spite of that, it is regrettable that one of these gentlemen, Mr. Halfyard, a man whom we expected more from, should so far forget himself this afternoon as to make personal attacks on certain members of the Government who were simply asking for information and trying to assist him in the remarks he was making. It is regrettable that we should have to ask for apology from such a hard-shelled politician. Why he should have skin on him like a rhinoceros; but when you prick him he is up in the air at once. It is inconceivable that some members of the opposition should take these Resolutions in the spirit they did. We know they are not sincere and we know that they are trying to make political capital out of the Resolutions. They held up their hands in holy horror because we dared come here to ask for this loan of six million dollars. Of course they never did anything of the kind. They have been administering the affairs of this country for the past four years and what have they done? Have not they raised loan after loan and have not they frittered away twenty millions of dollars during their term of office and I ask them to-night, on behalf of the

taxpayers of Newfoundland, what have they to show for that squandering and extravagance?

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE
—The Normal School.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—A Monument. We were told by the Leader of the Opposition, and his colleagues who echoed and re-echoed his sentiments, that when this Loan Bill was tabled here that it was “a bolt from the blue.” I have been wondering where the bolt was. Is it not a fact that this country is faced with a deficit of \$1,600,000 caused through the carelessness, indifference and incapacity of the men responsible for handling the finances of this country the last four years. Is that a bolt? It might be for the junior members but not for the Leader of the Opposition or Mr. Halfyard or Mr. Grimes and others who must have known the frightful condition that this country was in, and then they come here and hold up their hands in horror because an attempt is being made to pay the debt that they brought upon us. And then the hon. member for Trinity, Mr. Halfyard says wait. Now we had enough of that wait and see policy. We cannot wait until it is too late to provide a remedy. Wait until the Fall comes and then give men rock-breaking like the late Government did. Is that what you mean by wait? The people of this country do not want charity or pauper relief. They are prepared to work, if they get half a chance. It is all very well to try and gull the fishermen by this talk of a bonus on fish. There are thinking men among the fishermen too, and they are not going to be fooled by your policy of bonus. Many of them are not going to get this bonus and you know it, although you try to ram it down their throats. We are looking ahead and that is why we have this road policy here to-night in order to bring tourists into this country, and this is the only policy in

a time like this that can bring back to this country that peace and prosperity which she enjoyed before the late Government came into power. Do you think that we are on our trial? We will leave it to the people of Newfoundland to decide that and not to the hands of the Opposition of this House. From the remarks of the members of the Opposition you would imagine that we had been in office for years? I ask you if the people who know us have not confidence in us? We have been in office ten weeks and to hear that hard-shelled crowd talking one would think that we had committed all the sins in the calendar. We have done nothing except inaugurate some constructive and sane policy and we are despised by certain members of this House because we have vision. The speeches of the Opposition members were very contradictory. Some of them said that we were voting too much money and others said that we were not voting enough. We realise as well as they do that work will have to be provided this Fall, but it is necessary for us to get ready now to make preparations for it and not wait until December next when the snow is on the ground to do it. Not in able-bodied pauper relief, but in work that will I hope bring back ten fold returns. Now gentlemen in connection with this tourist policy Newfoundland has every facility and we have the natural resources that will induce capitalists to come in here and I make this statement here now that as soon as those hotels are built, and roads to the salmon pools that the money we will have spent on it will be returned ten fold, or probably twenty fold. Take for instance the state of Maine, it is a rough rugged country, it has not anything like as beautiful scenery as Newfoundland, and it certainly has not the streams and pools which attract the sportsman and the tourist. Five years ago the authorities spent \$100,000,00 in advertising their at-

tractions to tourists, and what were the results of a tourist trade? Why last year tourists left \$75,000,000.00 in the state of Maine alone. Newfoundland would be quite willing to spend \$10,000,000.00 in preparing for the tourist trade to get back \$20,000,000. Again the same thing applies or has applied to other provinces and states. I am not afraid to take a chance on this tourist proposition. After we have been in power for a year and a half you can talk all you like, we have only been in power some ten weeks, and I say right here that by the time we are in power as long as you had been we will have far more to our credit than you had. The member for Twillingate said that he had hoped that we would not need a loan, I may say that when I went to my district and was elected I had hoped so to, but we did not know what we were going to be met with, until we were elected and took power. We did not know what legacies were going to be left us by the late Government, but we had a rude awakening. The hon. member for Twillingate said that all he wanted on the boat in crossing the Gulf was a bed, but I may tell him that he would be jolly lucky to get a bed. I have crossed on her without a bed. I crossed last December with the then Prime Minister, now the Hon. member for Fortune, and we had 100 passengers more than the steamer is supposed to carry. It is only three days ago that the Kyle crossed the Gulf with 190 passengers when she should only have had 90. supposing a collision occurred on that trip what would be the result. The hon. gentlemen opposite would be the first to condemn this Government for allowing such conditions to exist.

Now Mr. Scammell, the hon. member for St. Barbe wants to know why we are going to re-rail the road from here to Clarendville. I will tell him that is where we are going to start, and it is the worse part of the road.

It was the first part of the road to be built and statistics show that a greater number of fish plates and rails have been broken on that part of the road than any where else. Now listen to this which bears out my remark regarding the portion of the road which we intend to re-rail.

St. John's to Brigus Junction, fish plates and rails broken.

	1922	1923	1924
Rails	7	28	25
Fish Plates	0	14	1

Brigus Junction to Clarenville.

Rails	22	194	131
Fish Plates	2	115	46

Bishop Falls to Humbermouth.

Rails	3	0	0
Fish Plates	0	0	0

Humbermouth to Port aux Basques.

Rails	0	0	0
Fish Plaes	0	0	0

So the hon. gentlemen can see that the portion of the railway from here to Clarenville is the worst of the lot, as from Bishop Falls to Port aux Basques there were no fish plates broken, and only three rails.

I am glad to hear the hon. member for Twillingate say that he is not against inter-town trade. Now I am going to refer to some of the figures mentioned in this Loan Bill. There is a deficit of \$1,600,000.00, that is the legacy left us by the late Government, and I would like to point out to some of the hon. members opposite that if they had made proper use of the monies which were entrusted to their care when they were in power, there would not have been much need for this loan at all.

Now as regards \$2,000,000.00 for roads, why it is only about twice as much as you spent on the Badger Road. You spent a million dollars on poor relief, and you have absolutely nothing to show for it. We have every hope of getting back good returns

for what we propose spending on roads, when once you get those capitalists in here you will get people interested in our mineral resources. Then you will also need to have good boats from here to New York, and also from here to England.

You want to know where and how those roads are going to be built. I may say that we will get proper supervision and will spend the money to get 100 per cent efficiency from it, and not 25 per cent. or less, as resulted under former administrations.

MR. HALFYARD—That is how, now where.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN—I will give you the locations if you have patience, and I trust that I shall give the hon. gentleman the information in a less snappy way than he answered my question this afternoon. We are going to get 100 per cent. efficiency, and it is going to be by contract and in accordance with specifications to be laid down and submitted by the Government Engineer. It is going to be spent where it is going to give the best possible returns, and where there is every possibility of getting good returns. There will be a policy for Bonne Bay District and also for Trinity, and by the time that this policy is carried out every district will get a portion. Green Bay as well will get a share, but it is not going to be given per capita, but in accordance with the natural facilities of each district, in fact this policy will extend to every place where there are salmon pools, and attractions for tourists and sportsmen.

Now with regard to rolling stock. Lots of you may want to know what that is. You have been told that you cannot get a ballast car or engine at present because they are occupied and used at Corner Brook and vicinity, some of you may think that as soon as the Humber Valley construction has finished there will be plenty of rolling stock, but such is not so, be-

cause there will be a great demand for cars for the hauling of logs and so forth in and around the Humber Valley scenes of operation. Then there is the Terra Nova Sulphite Co., and now we have the Gander Valley proposition. There may also have to be a branch line of about seven or eight miles built from Glovertown to Rose-dale. There are some 50 flat cars to be built, thirty or forty ballast cars, two new sleeping cars, and some other cars to be converted into first class passenger cars and so forth; so that is why we have to ask for a vote of \$350,000.00 for rolling stock. It will all be built by our own mechanics which will give considerable employment here. We need rolling stock badly, as we have not really enough at present. So much for the \$350,000.00 worth of rolling stock.

Now with regard to the \$400,000.00 for a new steamer on the Gulf, that is badly needed. We must have a good boat, and not have passengers herded together like a crowd of cattle. Those passengers pay for their passages, and they are entitled to good accommodation. That boat is far too small to cope with the conditions which she has to meet in crossing the Gulf, especially in winter. She is a splendid little boat, such as she is, but she is too small, and was never intended or built to contend with such conditions as exist in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Do you not remember about two years ago when she was iced up so badly that the captain had to run south to escape with his life and those of his crew, and in doing so lost his mate overboard and had one of his crew badly injured. This boat which we propose to get may not cost \$400,000.00 we may probably get her for much less.

Now \$50,000.00 for the dry dock. We may not want as much as that, but it is badly in need of repairs. I think that \$15,000.00 will probably put it in fairly good condition. Then there are

the sheds; why the manager told me a few days ago that they were dropping down. So those things are really necessary. Some people say that the work up at the dock, that is repairs, etc., to ships is too expensive to attack foreign vessels and steamers to come here for repairs, but it may interest you to know that when the Metagama was in here a short time ago, that the costs submitted for repairs was fairly low, and that if we had been in possession of a dock sufficiently large enough to accommodate her we would have had the opportunity of effecting permanent repairs.

But when things get better, then, if necessary, go ahead and build a proper dock. There is another vote for \$75,000 for the completion of the buildings and railway stations along the Railway that is a legacy that has been left to us. It should have been done years ago. Several of the stations are under construction now. \$75,000 will cover all expenditure. Now then the estimate of re-railing 131 miles of the road. It is put at \$800,000. We have been asked how we arrived at this figure. Well from facts submitted by the Govt. Engineer and the engineering staff of the Government Railway. I think the figures are conservative. I will come back to that presently. There is another vote of \$50,000 for the completion of bridges and filling in wooden tressles, I may say this vote is asked to complete certain bridges that should have been completed years ago. Old wooden tressles are to be filled in with earth, they are not safe on account of fire. Then there is the re-railing of the road. The Hon. member for Trinity stated it would cost \$70 per ton for rails to re-rail the road. This figure has been cut down to \$40 a ton and figures received a short while ago quoted as low as \$38 per ton for 80 pound rails. The estimated cost of re-railing the road from here to Port aux Basques with 85 pound rail is \$4,-

287,893. That includes everything, bolts, nuts, etc., and marine freight at \$4 a ton. You can get freight cheaper than that. Also includes a charge of \$145,547 for distributing the rails. This freight is to be charged on the railway by ourselves. With an 80 pound rail the cost of re-railing at \$4,055,914 includes everything. As the \$500,000 voted for the construction of a plant for coal and fuel there may be a difference of opinion on that. But I can assure this House the Government has no intention of going into the coal business. But the interest of the port may make it necessary to erect a plant of this kind. The great complaint is now by ship owners that the cost of bunkering is too great. That is why if they possibly can they go to Halifax. But if we had a coal and fuel oil plant where both could be handled as economically as in Canada or the United States, there is no reason why we should not have the ships coming for bunkers. We, as a Government, do not want to go into this business. The Government would be delighted if a business corporation or company took it up. But there is no use coming in here to get cheap bunkers when only 600 tons of coal is discharged a day. Cost of handling puts the price up and in the interests of the port and to make it possible to complete, a proper bunkering plant should be erected so that we should be able to handle fuel as cheaply as possible. The cheaper we can unload and load the cheaper will our coal be. The amount asked for this purpose may seem large. I know a splendid coal plant can be put up for \$100,000. But at the present moment we have no facilities, we have not room in the West End. If this big scheme is to be carried out we will have to build a pier and acquire lands. While the price seems large, if all that I suggest has to be done, it is

not as great after all. The Government is not anxious to go into a competitive coal business, and would much prefer that coal merchants would take up the proposition of establishing an up to date coal and oil handling plant. I can tell you for the information of the members on the other side that brokers are already knocking at the Prime Minister's door anxious to get an opportunity to quote on the loan, they are squabbling for this \$6,000,000. If the local people want to they can have a part of this loan and the Government would be glad if they would subscribe to it. There is no reason why a person who has money to invest and requires a safe investment should not invest in those bonds. For the information of the gentleman who wanted to know how or where we are going to raise the loan, I can tell him that the Government intends raising this loan and are going to do so in the best interests of their country, and they are going to get the last cent out of the financial people who are clamouring to get an opportunity to quote and that we will get the best possible terms. We are going to give Newfoundland a square deal. Provision has been made in this Bill so that it can be raised in England, Canada, or the United States.

The Financial Institutions in London offer as a rule very favorable advantage to Dominion Government borrowers with the result that loans by the Dominions and Colonies can usually be placed in that market at approximately 1 per cent. cheaper than in other markets, the reason for this is explained by the operation of the Trustee Stock Acts which require the investment of considerable amount of Trust funds in stocks approved under the Trustee Stock Acts. Consequently, millions of pounds annually in the hands of financial institutions, the Public Trustee and Private Trustee

Corporation, and Insurance Company, ect., are limited to investment of their funds in Trustee Stocks. These stocks being of a particularly sound nature are placed in the market on a very low interest yield and consequently on very favorable terms to the borrower. For the reasons I have given, I think a loan can be raised on very reasonable terms in the London market, with considerable advantage to Newfoundland.

It may be news to many in the House and out of it that the money raised on the credit of this Colony recently in London is at a premium, while funds raised on account of the trade facilities are at a discount; this goes to show that the credit of the Colony stands high.

We have tried to show the members opposite how the money, when raised, is going to be used with advantage to the Colony, we have told you that the best possible terms will be secured and I think when the vote comes up that every member of the Opposition will be patriotic enough to forget politics and vote for this loan bill.

MR. GRIMES:—I do not think that the Premier will acknowledge that this Loan Bill of the Government is acceptable to the country as a whole. He would be deaf if he did not hear many of his own supporters express amazement at the size of the loan asked for. They are sadly disappointed, for they had been looking forward to a general reduction in expenditure, which, it was promised, would avoid the necessity of further increased taxation. They were promised that not only would there be no increase in taxation, but instead there was to be a decrease. Yet, in the short space of three months we are witnessing increased taxation and increased expenditure.

The increased interest charges on the loan to be paid by the taxpayers will be \$300,000, the duties placed

upon Kerosene Oil, Molasses, Beef and Pork will total another \$400,000, and there will be new expenditures connected with the King's Printer-ship and with the Board of Liquor Control to be appointed. How easy it is to condemn past Governments for extravagance and wasteful expenditure, of high taxes and bad administration. Now that you are in office you will find that it is some thing to criticize others for doing this but it is not so easy for you to better it. Out of your own mouths are you being condemned. You are asking for a loan of \$6,000,000 on which the yearly interest charge amounts to \$300,000 to be taken out of the pockets of the taxpayers. Are they in a better position to pay it? Have their incomes increased as much that they will not feel it? Ask the fishermen, the greater part of whom have toiled all summer and caught nothing worth while. Ask the labouring classes if they have any money to spare to pay additional taxation. All will answer you that the struggle to maintain their families in decency and comfort is as great as ever.

But we are told that the expenditure of \$2,000,000 on motor roads will solve the problem, more tourists will come to the country who will spend money which will increase employment for our own people. A will-o'-the-wisp! Rainbow chasing! is what we may truthfully term such visionary schemes. Gambling with the people's money. Taking two millions to spend, with the hope that we will rival Quebec and Ontario which are on the borderland of the United States making these provinces easy of access. This dream of an influx of tourist gold will vanish over night like Jonah's Gourd.

Why gamble two millions of the people's money on such a doubtful proposition when we have untold wealth in the waters surrounding our island home? Millions and millions

of fish of all kinds, of which only three or four kinds are marketed, while the rest are untouched. Take our herring in Notre Dame Bay, Piacentia Bay, Bonavista Bay, and on the West Coast. There we find thousands of undersize herring being thrown away because their sizes are unsuitable to the palate of our foreign customers. But in Norway they are not wasted, they are taken for the oil they contain and for the feed meal which they manufacture them into. Twelve thousand tons are manufactured by the Norwegians in this way some of which is exported to the United States for sale, and we, who are much nearer the United States have done nothing. This is certainly an evidence of lack of enterprise in Newfoundland and the failure of Governments to encourage such an industry. Herring factories for the manufacture of Herring Oil, fertilizer and feed meal, placed in these bays would give employment at home for the young men and maidens instead of having to leave their country as they do to-day.

The same may be said of canned fish of which the Norwegian export is 24,000 tons while we do not export a hundred tons. The canning of codfish, herring, caplin, smelts and salmon would also do much towards giving employment at home. If a hundred thousand dollars yearly of guaranteed interest on such industries was provided it would accomplish far more good in creating permanent employment for our people than the few weeks work given on motor roads. Motor roads may be essential in certain places but surely the encouragement of greater production from our fisheries is much more essential. I am therefore in hearty accord with the member for Carbonear, Mr. Duff, when he says the fisheries require greater attention for its development as well as for preventing a falling off in the

number who prosecute it, now.

As to the expenditure on railway construction and repairs of dock, I would judge that the management know what is required and if it is their recommendation we should act on it according to our means. When it comes to accepting the advice of certain members that we get clear of the railway, give it away if we can get some one to take it and saying that it is an absolute failure under government control, I hesitate to accept such advice. Even were it true that it is a failure we should not be broadcasting it to the world particularly if we are to sell it. If we are going to condemn loudly a railway we want to sell, who will buy it? Do we not injure our chance of doing good business by acting in this manner? But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to join with others that the railway under Government control is a failure. The facts as given to us by responsible ministers point in the other direction. The Minister of Finance, Sir John Crosbie says that the report of the management is that there will be no deficit to meet on the railway this year. Mr. Halfyard, who was a member of the Commission under the Warren Government says that a deficit of a million dollars of three years ago was last year down to \$160,000 and now the Finance says it will be wiped out altogether. This is the first time since 1897 that this has happened surely a very satisfactory condition.

When the railway Commission, of which Sir William Coaker was a member, spent two millions a few years ago, there was much hostile and unwarranted criticism. It was well known that under private management it was going fast into disrepair and would soon cease to operate. The Reds were unable, through lack of money, to do this work, and the Government appointed a Commission with the result that the road was improved.

New rails, new engines, and new cars were built and as a consequence the Humber enterprise was made possible. The Commission on which Sir William Coaker sat, and which was the target of all the abuse heaped upon it worked well, while others did nothing but criticize. Had it not been for that work there would have been no railway to-day and no Humber, and the thousands obtaining employment there would be either getting charity, or drifting around in Canada or the United States seeking employment. The Commission pursued its work regardless of the obstructonists and the result is that to-day for the first time we have the railway paying its way. The men who are operating the railway are all Newfoundlanders but one. They and those associated with them deserve our best thanks and we should say, having done so well we will leave you alone to continue your good work. It is the duty of the Government with such facts before them to hold what they have.

In every civilized country to-day the trend of public opinion is to uphold Government ownership, control and management of the railway. Railways do not permit of competition. They are monopolistic in their nature and consequently Labor organizations in Canada, United States, Britain and the rest of the civilized world as well as many business organizations favor Government control. When a few years ago it was mooted in Canada that certain private interests would take over the Canadian Government Railway, it was found that public opinion was strongly adverse to such a proposition and particularly the farming classes of the west. The attempt failed. While our own railway is being so well managed, I would strongly urge the Government to keep the railway and use it to the best advantage for the common good.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman: I

wish to move an amendment to these Resolutions. We cannot on this side of the House find any substantial reason why six million dollars should be raised at this particular time, when the country is in such a grave financial condition. This afternoon I asked the Prime Minister a question which has a great deal to do with this loan. I was absent when the Prime Minister made his reply, but I understand that he stated that it was his intention to ask for tenders but that he had advice from some financiers that such a method was a questionable policy to follow. That is no argument at all because, if to-morrow a bonded house in Canada or the United States under-wrote this loan for the Newfoundland Government either privately or by public tender, that should not keep a matter from being a secret from the country, as I pointed out this afternoon. If Newfoundland needs a loan I contend that you should go about it in the same way as every other loan is raised by the Municipality, Province or State in Canada and that is by advertising the tenders in the financial papers and accepting the very best tenders offered for the loan. As I have already said, if Ottawa can raise a loan at \$100.65, in addition to their immense debt, the Newfoundland loan should be worth at least part. Now we do not want to be told at the next session of the House that this loan was raised at 94 or 95 by some private corporation in Canada, United States or England. If we are going to raise a loan, let us go about it in the proper way. We have been told in this House on several occasions that we have followed the procedure of Canada, particularly in connection with the Liquor Bill. Well now let us follow Canada in this thing also and that is to advertise this loan in the "Financial Times" of Montreal or the "Financial Post" of Toronto and other financial papers of Nova Scotia so as we

can see who are giving us the best terms.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN:—Would you not advertise in the English papers also?

MR. HICKMAN:—Yes, if you want to, but I have not the least doubt but that you can raise the loan in Canada and get at the least par value. Why there are Branch Banks of Canada doing business in this country to-day who would be prepared to tender for this loan. It has been the custom in the past for a number of houses to divide up such a large loan as this. I know of cases where ten houses combined to under-write such a loan as this on a proportionate basis and this is one of the strong points we want to consider and this is one of the things that the Government must do for their own protection because we are not going to stand for a loan raised by a private corporation or concern at 94 or 95 when the least it could be raised at is par. This loan should not be as much as six millions of dollars and in the interests of the people of the country we cannot support a six million dollar loan. I think that this is the most serious Bill that has come before the House this session of the Legislature because this country is to be saddled with a burden of another million dollars debt when there is no necessity for it. We are told that this House will be in session again in January next and if that is so why saddle this country with a loan of six million dollars when it cannot be expended this year. I, therefore, propose an amendment to the Resolutions "that in view of the grave financial difficulties of the country the loan be reduced from six million to three million dollars."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable leader of the Opposition in that amendment how far he proposes to earmark that three million

dollars. Perhaps he will tell us what particular part of the loan he wants reduced. Does he suggest that we should not pay off our deficit of \$1,600,000 or does he suggest that we should not spend the money on the railway or on motor roads. In reply to the remarks of the honourable Leader of the Opposition as to the way we should raise this loan, I replied this afternoon during his absence that we intend to ask for tenders. I also remarked that I had been told by a large financial concert that by some-it was considered inadvisable for a Government to hawk around its securities; but we intend to make sure that we get the best terms possible for the loan. If my honourable friend opposite is anxious and desirous of seeing this loan reduced to three millions I would like him to depict the form and in what particular items he intends the reduction to take place?

MR. HICKMAN:—Mr. Chairman: The Prime Minister listened to the criticism I made this afternoon and in that criticism I took each item separately and expressed my opinion accordingly and I think that covers anything that I could say now. Certainly you have to pay your deficit. It is not my business to earmark in what direction reductions should take place, but I consider that three million dollars is sufficient to provide for unemployment during the coming winter but it is not my duty to earmark anything; it is the duty of the Government. After meeting the deficit of \$1,600,000 you have \$1,400,000 left and that \$1,400,000 is all you can possibly spend between now and the next session of the House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—We are not proposing to spend all the loan between now and another session of the House, but we got to look ahead.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Chairman: Just a word in reply

to the honourable Leader of the Opposition. I had not intended to delay the House at this late hour, but I regret very much that I have got to express my great disappointment because of the attitude taken by him. For a business man of his standing to come in and sincerely say and move an amendment that this loan be reduced from six million dollars to three millions, without depicting, as the Honourable the Prime Minister has pointed out, in which form the reduction should take place, is, to say the least of it, not acting in the direction that I expected him to act according to the ability that I know him to possess. He said that his position is defined in the amendment and that three million dollars is sufficient to pay our debts and provide for unemployment. The position of the Government on these Resolutions is that there is a deficit of \$1,600,000 to be paid and the Government merely specifies certain other public works and the various amounts to do them are estimated and earmarked. Every single member of the Opposition got in his mind the necessity of making repairs to the Dock and to the Railway and they know that the scheme of the whole thing is the enticement of people into the country to pay the interest on the loan, and they know that the policy they would adopt to meet the situation is the same policy adopted by this Government, and yet why all this flim-flam over the two million dollars to be spent on roads for the encouragement of the tourist traffic, and still worse than flim-flam is this amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Grimes in the course of his remarks said in effect to provide for the unemployed. Why this very expenditure on the roads is not only going to care for the unemployed but it is providing employment in a profitable way. What is the object of the loan anyway, except to cover two things namely, the paying of our de-

bts and to give work. These Resolutions merely ask that the Governor-in-Council shall have power to apply any balance remaining to the credits of the foregoing accounts, which are mentioned in the Resolutions, to any other essential public purposes. And I am very much disappointed to know that the Amendment before the Chair is nothing more than attempting to save the faces of a party in Opposition. There has been no serious condemnation of this loan by any member of the Opposition, there has been nothing at all practically said against one single item of this loan except the suggestion that it should be made a little less than it is. Personally I think that the time has arrived when we got to take a chance. This policy of moving slowly all the time has got this country where it is. Now, the only difference between this loan and the loans we have had in the past is that this loan is part of a constructive scheme and the others were not, but the effect is the same.

The difference between the present measure and past loans is that this amount is to develop a policy to put us in a position to get some returns from the resources of the colony. It is a great pity that the hon. member had no chance to be heard on the raising of other loans. I have no hesitation in saying that it is not worthy of the hon. gentleman, being such a business man, to come in here and say you should only raise \$3,000,000.00 without ear-marking as to how you are going to spend those \$3,000,000.00. The hon. gentleman is not sincere in his remarks, and that is proved by the amendment which he has just proposed. This loan meets two situations. In the first place you have got to amend and repair your railways and roads, and in the second place you must of necessity provide for your unemployed. Not one man on the other side of this House has said in debating this Bill that the amount

was not necessary. I have to stay in this country, and bring up my family here and I have every hope in the country. It is not appropriate of the Hon. Member to come in here and say that we can raise \$3,000,000.00, but we cannot raise \$6,000,000.00, because the country cannot afford it. We are trying to develop a policy so as to increase the revenue of this country and to bring us in greater returns. Why there is not a place in the country to-day where you can get a mug up, get a bed. At the present time we only get a cheap type or class of tourists, in fact they are not tourists at all, they are merely round trippers. Those are not the kind of tourists that we expect to get returns from. I say that the highest form of economy that you can have to-day is that of a country that takes the notion that if you want to make the burden of your people lighter, you got to tap outside wealth. We are confronted with the fact that we cannot raise a loan among our own people. You come in here and talk against raising a loan when you know that we cannot do anything except raise a loan. If you were raising it yourselves it would probably be a loan of ten millions instead of a loan of six millions. You have told us that our bonds can be raised at par, so what is the reason for your objections if our bonds can be raised at par? Now the trouble has been that we have a small population, and as the burden gets heavier, we want to bring some outsiders in to help us pay it. As the saying goes we are going to take in boarders, and having now provided for the refreshments we want to give them other facilities for amusement and pleasure, and to make sure of being able to tap outside wealth. The best conclusion to the debates from the opposite side of the House is the amendment proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. gentleman says quite frankly that we should raise this loan at par, so if the

credit is able to stand to get this loan then that is the finest word that can be said of the credit of our Colony.

I support the loan in its entirety and the hon. member is only proposing the amendment because he does not want us to raise \$6,000,000.00. Now you do not say we are not to raise \$6,000,000.00, but you suggest that we raise \$3,000,000.00 now and four or five months' time, if we need it, raise another three or four million; but personally I fail to see the difference and I support the resolutions entirely.

MR. HICKMAN—Mr. Chairman, I expected the hon. member to support the resolutions. He is very loud in his remarks, but that does not affect us on this side of the House, I know my position. I say that we cannot afford this loan of \$6,000,000.00. We are not going to get tourists to come here until we get hotels, and then when we get them we can build roads. I am a Newfoundlander, too, and I have as much interest in this country as the other members. All my investments are here, and I do not want to be burdened or taxed heavier than we are at the present time. The Hon. Minister lays great stress on the fact that I said the bonds should be bought at par. Yes, I say that they can be purchased at par, and they know very well that the Colony is backed by the British Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sincere, and as I have said before this is the most serious of the Bills that have come before this House this session. We cannot afford to raise a loan of \$6,000,000.00. In view of the financial standing of the country, and business at the present time we are not in a position to take a chance, and we should do the best we can to keep down expenses. We still have our difficulties. We have not turned the corner yet, so therefore it is no time to come in and tax this Colony with another \$6,000,000.00 loan.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE—Mr. Chairman, I had no intention to say anything until I heard the amendment, and I may say that I expected the amendment. It is not like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to do as he has, because it is not in keeping with his policy of business. He has been asked to ear-mark the three million dollars in his amendment, and he has not done so.

Now I like the hon. member as a man, but I also like a manly man; but it is only putting it mildly when I say he is not sincere in his remarks or in the amendment which he has proposed. There is Mr. Duff again, he is supposed to be a shrewd business man, but neither of them has told us one word about what they thought should be done. They have not thrown out one hint or suggestion to help us in this matter.

Now the hon. member for Twillingate did speak a lot about herring, but he did not tell us about the time that Mr. W. F. Penney went to Norway and brought back three or four bottles of herring which cost the Government about three or four thousand dollars.

Now the hon. member for Trinity says that it is a bolt from the blue. What blue? The bolt from the blue which you struck or which struck you was when your Government got defeated at the polls. The hon. member said that Mr. Monroe had a mandate from the people; yes he has. He has a constructive policy as well as a mandate, but you know, and Mr. Hickman knows as well, that no one can start business without some capital.

You borrowed \$20,000,000.00 and what have we got to show for it, except Dr. Parsons' nursery and the Normal School.

MR. GRIMES:—What about the roads?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—

What roads? I say frankly that I am fed up with people building railways here, selling them, and then arbitrating them. I am fed up with the whole business of people coming in here with silk hats and long coats. I do not think that Newfoundlanders can be beaten anywhere, and when they go out of the country they are sought after.

The hon. member for Twillingate said to-night that he had a dream. I wonder if that dream was a dream of marble building, or was it a Normal School.

You can't conduct business unless you borrow money sometimes. That is necessary. But I regard that \$500,000 for a coal shed certainly as a bolt from the blue. I think this Government can build a coal shed the proper kind and import for it and instead of paying 16 dollars a ton you can get it for seven. You wait and see. Now this Government that Mr. Monroe is the leader of is endeavouring to develop a policy of construction. It is up to the people to put their shoulder to the wheel to expend this money and get roads and hotels. No good in having hotels, as Mr. Warren said, unless you have some other source of amusement. You have your salmon pools that are seen no where else in the world. It is only a case of boosting up the country. Now what I want to say is that we have to keep the railway. We are unfortunate in having it. But we have got to borrow money to keep it going. We have got to re-rail parts if we want to keep it going at all. We have got to repair docks and build sheds and wharves at the dock. What would be gained even if we do sell the dock to the railroad. We would make a better use of it than to have it falling down. Now I heard people suggesting thing. I heard a member talking about canned fish and herring. I would like to hear some arguments to convince me to put some money in the

fishery. What is the result. Do you improve the fishery? There is only one thing that helps the fishery and that is supply and demand. We get out new methods. Are there any people of the world getting any better fish. Not at all.

Now speaking about a bounty on fish. I am almost sure the Leader of the Opposition will agree with me, but he does not want to say so. What good will a bounty do when the fish is \$8½ a quintal. Who wants it. A man with 10 or 15 quintals, what good will it do him. Down in Ashville they spent \$76,000 on tourist advertising. They have four hotels costing one and a quarter million each. Some people from Ashville spent the Summer here. They caught two salmon. They would give \$5,000 to be able to come back and repeat the experience they had in Newfoundland. The Kyle had no accommodation to bring the passengers that stayed over. You would justly blame us if an accident happened here. We would never hear the end of it for not improving her and protecting our people. I would be one of the first to blame myself.

With regard to the rolling stock of the railroad. If the venture is going to be a success we must have rolling stock. With regard to what the Leader of the Opposition said in discussing the loan to which the Prime Minister made a n s w e r. I will see that every publicity is made to that loan. Nothing will be kept back as far as I am concerned as Finance Minister. I will have nothing to keep back, but I will be only too glad to show it out. Not like some of the late Prime Ministers. There were lots of loans not opened up the last four years. The last loan sold at 80%. Others sold at 96, 97, 95. I would like someone to tell me what happened the difference. I want to say here now that I would back up any man for a clean up.

MR. WARREN—I had not intended

to take any part in this debate but some remarks falling from the Minister of Finance and Customs called me to my feet. The speech was rather incoherent. You jumped from loans to various subjects. But in all sincerity I took a tip from the colleagues of the Minister of Finance and Customs. Last year I happened to be Prime Minister. The question came up and in deference to a request of the Opposition, which was assented by my colleagues in the Government, we agreed to a temporary commission to operate the railroad. In view of that and in view of the criticism and argument put forth by members on the Opposition side then, now sitting on the Government side, saying that no Government should run or operate a railroad, I took certain steps to get somebody else to operate the railway. While he may be getting tired of getting outside people to run the railway, I want to tell you that if it is the settled policy of the Government not to attempt to have any outside people to operate the railway they are making a great mistake. Not that I want to criticize. I merely made a statement. I said I could not vote to put \$2,000,000 into the railway unless you get outside people to run it.

If the Minister of Finance thinks that the Government can run the railway better than a private concern. I have nothing more to say. Then he talks about people coming in and ridiculing us. He says it is a poor inducement for the tourist. That is all right if you are going to operate the railway. Then what sort of advertisement is the Minister of Finance giving to get outside people to come in here and look at us. If he does not want any outside capital why does he not say so. Then he touched on the railway problems. And last of all he talked of loans that were not opened up under late Prime Ministers. But you know there are lots of people that

have not got all the knowledge that the Minister of Finance has. Ordinary people don't know whether the loan is raised at 88 or 98. There may be loans not opened up under recent Prime Ministers. But the loan raised when I was Prime Minister was called for by tender and I am glad to say that the first man to congratulate me for the figure I got was Sir Michael Cashin.

MR. HALFYARD—I may say that the Minister of Finance in the course of his remarks referred to the millions borrowed during the last two years. That is no reason, as I have already said, why we should continue to borrow. That is one reason why we should discontinue it. No person borrows for the love of borrowing, and after the party, whether a Government individual or a business man borrows to tide over a certain tight situation, and when they find out the transaction does not realize the benefits anticipated they sheer shy of repeating the same procedure, and I think that is one reason why some of us are opposed at the present time to vote for more money than we absolutely need. You give as reason that you have embarked on a constructive policy. You hope it will be for the benefit of the country financially. In 1910 we were told that we wanted some vision. Then Sir Edward Morris embarked on his proposition of building a Branch Railway. The majority of the members of the House of Assembly and probably the majority of the electorate thought he was a man of vision, and that the policy was a wise one and that we should open up the natural resources of the country, and find out whether we had any minerals and agricultural and timber possibilities. People thought then that Lord Morris and the men behind him were men of vision. But we all realize the terrible mistake of building Branch Railways. As far as

we are concerned we are sincere in stating that we should not borrow six millions at the present time. The construction of the different items referred to in the resolutions could be provided for with less money. \$500,000 for a coal shed should be a matter for future consideration. I think that three millions would meet the situation at the present time, and to run the risk of burdening the country with any further expense other than to meet our pressing necessities. I therefore place myself on record as absolutely voting against the Resolutions before the Chair.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being after midnight.

TUESDAY, August 19, 1924.

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

On motion this Report was received.

On the motion for adoption of the report, Mr. Hickman moved and Mr. Halfyard seconded the following amendment:

“That in view of the grave Financial condition of the affairs of the Colony that the Loan be reduced from \$6,000,000 to \$3,000,000.”

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared in favor of the amendment:—Mr. Hickman, Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Grimes, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Duff, Mr. Ashbourne (6), and against it:—Hon. the Prime Minister, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. the Minister of Justice, Hon. the Minister of Finance, Hon. the Minister of Posts, Hon. Mr. Sullivan, Hon. Mr. Long, Hon. Mr. Cramm, Hon. Mr. Bradley, The Minister of Agriculture, The Minister of Public Works, Mr. Cashin, Mr. Moore, Mr. Lake, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Vin'combe, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Power, Mr. Little,

Mr. Puddister, Mr. Cahill, Mr. Linegar, Mr. Browne (17).

So it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

Whereupon, the motion for adoption of the report was passed, and the Bill entitled, "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Public Purposes" was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled, "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act for the Raising of a Sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the United Towns Electric Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act Respecting The United Towns Electric Company, Limited."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Chairman. I think there is a little explanation to make about this Bill for the benefit of the House. It is a Bill giving certain rights, but not exclusive rights to the United Towns Electric Company, Limited, to establish an electric power plant in certain districts where the members for the districts are particularly anxious to have it. I may say that particular care will be taken to limit the concessions to the Company. It will be noted in Clause (8) that the Act does not give the Company any exclusive right, power, privilege, or advantage in the particular districts mentioned in the Bill; while Section (6) says "The Company shall not sell, assign, transfer, or lease any right, power, privilege or advantage to the Company by this Act, nor agree or contract with any person, firm or Company whereby the aforesaid towns, settlement or parish or the City of St. John's as aforesaid or any of them may be deprived of the full exercise by the Company of any such right, power, privilege or advantage."

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the United Towns electric Company, Limited" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE—
Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to introduce Resolutions to the effect that the Export Duty on Cod Oil, Cod Liver Oil, Whale Oil and other fish oil be recommended.

Pursuant to notice, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting Certain Export Duties.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

On motion this Report was received and adopted, and the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905, and Amendments Thereto Schedule E. Export Duties," was introduced and read a first time, and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905 and Amendments Thereto Schedule E. Export Duties" was read a second time, and it was ordered that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole presently.

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House re-

solved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905 and Amendments Thereto Schedule E. Export Duties."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Puddister took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

Whereupon, on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905 and Amendments Thereto Schedule E. Export Duties" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited," without amendment.

MR. GRIMES:—Mr. Speaker: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is ready to make a pronouncement as to the personnel of the Commission appointed to enquire into the Loggers Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have suggested that a Commission of one be appointed on that Bill and it is the view of the Government that it is not necessary to have a large Commission which would entail considerable expense. We want someone with a legal mind who will go out to Grand Falls and possibly other places to take evidence from Mr. Brown, who is acting in the interest of the loggers,

from the employers, and from everybody else who wish to come before that Commission. We have nominated Mr. Warren, member for Fortune Bay, to act in the capacity of Commissioner and Mr. Warren has consented to act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker: In moving the adjournment of the House until two o'clock this afternoon, I would like to say that it is our intention to ask His Excellency the Governor to prorogue the Legislature at three o'clock this afternoon.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, August 19th, 1924.

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

MR. WOODFORD:—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from 150 residents of North Arm, Holyrood, I pray that this House may consider their request for a sum of money from \$50 to a \$100 towards the repairing of the country road known as the Country Path. There has been no money spent on it since I had the pleasure of representing the District. It is a most important road to the people of Holyrood and other localities. It connects the main road with the Salmonier Road. I hope it will come under the review of the Government later when the main highways are about to be built. I hope a sum will be granted for the general repair of this road. We have a number of such that require attention. Most valuable and important to the people of the District, but in particular to the residents of Holyrood. I beg to refer this petition to the department to which it relates.

MR. CAHILL:—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to support this petition and to

back up everything said with regard to the allocation of a sum for this work.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Bride's. It is signed by all the voters in that section. They ask that a small amount of money be provided for a fog horn station. It is 8 or 10 years since they were given a fog horn station. It is a wild shore and in rough and foggy weather and because of some shoals it is dangerous and inconvenient to the fishermen. Unfortunately two years ago the keepers house was burnt down and the lighthouse destroyed. I have much pleasure in supporting this petition and trust that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will make provision to have its request granted.

MR. WOODFORD:—Mr. Speaker: I beg to present a petition from the residents of Seal Cove in the District of Harbor Main. And I beg to present it on behalf of the residents there praying that a railway station be built at that place. It is not a railway station in the ordinary sense. You can call it a shelter 25 or 30 feet square. The people are in need of protection for their goods landed there to protect them from the storm and the weather as it is a very open place. It is a small settlement the residents numbering about 200 or 300 people. I beg leave to present this request and ask that it be referred to the railway commission.

(Reads petition).

It will cost very few dollars. Not more than \$200 or \$250 at the most.

MR. CAHILL:—I beg to support the petition presented by my hon. colleague.

HON. MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker: I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Jersey Side,

Placentia, on the subject of a break-water.

(Reads the petition).

The petition is largely signed by the residents of that section, and I think sir, that it is a petition that is deserving of every consideration. If something is not done very soon there is great danger of the houses and property on Jersey Side being washed away. I ask that the petition be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker: I rise to suggest and to express the hope that before the House meets again, more efficient service will have been given us as regards the reporters. You will agree that we are not getting service. It is enough to have to come down here and watch legislation without having to go out of the House and prepare and re-write our speeches if they are to appear in any decent way before the public. It is a very bad state of affairs if we have no men in St. John's that are able to do decent reporting.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled respectively "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905, and Amendments thereto, Schedule E., Export Duties," "An Act Respecting the United Towns Electric Company, Limited," and "An Act for the raising of a sum of Money on the Credit of the Colony for Certain Public Purposes," without Amendment.

At three of the clock, the Gentlemen Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Governor, commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:

May it Please Your Excellency:

The House of Assembly has voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the expenses of the Public Service. In the name of the House of Assembly I present the following Bills for Your Excellency's assent.

"An Act for 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, 1924, and the 30th day of June, 1925, and for other Purposes relating to The Public Service," "An Act to Amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps,'" A Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery," An Act "respecting the Salaries of Civil Servants," An Act respecting certain Expenditures to be made under "The Loan Act 1923," "An Act respecting goods imported into Newfoundland," "An Act further to amend the "Revenue Act 1905," "An Act respecting certain Retiring Allowances," "An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905 and Amendments Thereto Schedule E, Export Duties," "An Act for the Raising of a sum of money on the credit of the Colony for certain Public Purposes," "An Act to Amend 12 and 13 Geo. V. Cap. 20 entitled 'An Act respecting War Pensions,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace,'" "An Act to Confirm an Agreement with the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited," "An Act to Amend 14 Geo. V., Cap. 7, entitled 'An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding,'" "An Act to Further and Protect the Activities

and Interests of the Boy Scout Association in the Island of Newfoundland and Its Dependencies," "An Act Respecting the Game and Inland Fisheries Board," "An Act Respecting the Encouragement of Agriculture," "An Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquors," "An Act to Amend 3 Geo. V. Cap. 14 entitled 'An Act Respecting the Construction of a Railway through Labrador,'" "An Act to Amend Chapter 73 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Disembarking of Paupers,'" "An Act for the Confirmation of an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power and Paper Company, Limited," "An Act to Amend Chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Department of Finance and Customs,'" "An Act to Authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland," "An Act Respecting the United Towns Electric Company, Limited."

His Excellency 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:

You have given close attention to your legislative duties, at a season so pleasant out of doors that the performance of indoor tasks must have been more onerous than usual, and I am glad to be able to relieve you of them.

Short though the session now about to close has been, the legislation enacted has been of more than ordinary importance, and will, I am confident, be of enduring advantage.

For a period of more than ten years, the finances of the Colony have been disturbed by alternate expansion and contraction, but conditions have this year become almost normal, and there

is reason to hope that disturbing financial conditions will cease to recur. My Ministers will endeavour to enforce economy in expenditure wisely, and to aid the prosperity of the Colony by stimulating the development of its resources. Lavish expenditure by preceding Governments, imposing upon my present advisers the hard necessity of providing for the payment of debts contracted by others, has made it quite impossible for the present Government to decrease as largely as they desired the burden of taxation, but the abolition of import duties upon flour and gasolene, and export duty on Cod Oil and Whale Oil, is due to their courage and resourcefulness, and they hope to be enabled to still further decrease the burden of taxation, through reforms they purpose to carry out.

It is apparent that economy alone will not sufficiently meet the public needs, and that development of the Colony's resources must be vigorously undertaken. The attractions to tourists offered by the unexcelled summer climate, the beautiful scenery and the unequalled salmon and trout fisheries of this Island, are the assets which can be most speedily turned into cash, and realizing that desirable tourists cannot be expected to come to us in great and growing numbers unless good hotels and highways are provided, and the inland fisheries protected and replenished, my Ministers have decided to embark upon a forward movement in these respects, incidentally and immediately providing labor for the unemployed, and ultimately adding greatly to the comfort and prosperity of the people.

Years ago a crude measure to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors as a beverage was enacted, the enforcement of which became difficult, and was soon neglected, and later practically abandoned, so that at last its existence became a mockery, and its almost universal evasion a scandal,

with resulting lawlessness in many affairs and to an alarming degree. In his Manifesto to the people, upon the eve of the last General Election, my present Prime Minister promised a repeal of the Prohibition Act, and the introduction into the Legislature of an alternative measure, and this, I am glad to say, has now become law, and in due course will be put into force. I anticipate that great good will result.

The work of construction upon the Humber has progressed with unexpected and gratifying rapidity. Paper-making at Bay of Islands is expected to begin next Spring. A Contract has been entered into by my Ministers to secure development in the Gander River Valley, and soon a great addition to the labour-giving industries of the Colony may be expected. The merits of the proposition are so great in the opinion of its promoters that they have not thought it necessary to ask for any guarantee by the Colony, or other financial assistance. The great industry at Grand Falls continues its prosperous operations, and an expansion of its paper-making plant, or a completion of the Sulphite Pulp Plant at Alexander Bay, providing for the development of the Terra Nova and Gambo regions, is expected. Upon the whole, the outlook for steady and profitable employment of labour was never so good in our midst.

Your provision for the acquisition of a suitable Steamer to connect with the railway at Port aux Basques, for

the re-railing of a portion of the track, and for increasing rolling stock, are timely recognitions of the fact that both passenger and freight traffic are rapidly increasing, and are bound to increase, and an indication of the not distant day, I hope, when the railway will be self-sustaining. Your provision for the improvement of the Dry Dock cannot fail to add to the attractiveness of the Port of St. John's for ships. Its situation and its facilities should make it the most Popular Port on the Atlantic for ships needing speedy repairs.

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

In His Majesty's name, I thank you for your provision for the public service.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

I join with you in devout thanks to God for the prosperity and happiness He has granted to our people.

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 Tuesday, the Thirtieth day of September, then and here to be holden, and this General Assembly stand prorogued accordingly.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The first of these is the fact that the United States is a young nation, and its history is a history of growth and expansion. The second is the fact that the United States is a nation of immigrants, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better life. The third is the fact that the United States is a nation of free men, and its history is a history of the struggle for freedom.

The fourth is the fact that the United States is a nation of opportunity, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better future. The fifth is the fact that the United States is a nation of progress, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better world.

The sixth is the fact that the United States is a nation of peace, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better peace. The seventh is the fact that the United States is a nation of justice, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better justice.

The eighth is the fact that the United States is a nation of hope, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better hope. The ninth is the fact that the United States is a nation of love, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better love.

The tenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of faith, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better faith. The eleventh is the fact that the United States is a nation of courage, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better courage.

The twelfth is the fact that the United States is a nation of strength, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better strength. The thirteenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of wisdom, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better wisdom.

The fourteenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of honor, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better honor. The fifteenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of glory, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better glory.

The sixteenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of power, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better power. The seventeenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of influence, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better influence.

The eighteenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of respect, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better respect. The nineteenth is the fact that the United States is a nation of dignity, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better dignity.

The twentieth is the fact that the United States is a nation of pride, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better pride. The twenty-first is the fact that the United States is a nation of honor, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better honor.

The twenty-second is the fact that the United States is a nation of glory, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better glory. The twenty-third is the fact that the United States is a nation of power, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better power.

The twenty-fourth is the fact that the United States is a nation of influence, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better influence. The twenty-fifth is the fact that the United States is a nation of respect, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better respect.

The twenty-sixth is the fact that the United States is a nation of dignity, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better dignity. The twenty-seventh is the fact that the United States is a nation of pride, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better pride.

The twenty-eighth is the fact that the United States is a nation of honor, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better honor. The twenty-ninth is the fact that the United States is a nation of glory, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better glory.

The thirtieth is the fact that the United States is a nation of power, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better power. The thirty-first is the fact that the United States is a nation of influence, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better influence.

The thirty-second is the fact that the United States is a nation of respect, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better respect. The thirty-third is the fact that the United States is a nation of dignity, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better dignity.

The thirty-fourth is the fact that the United States is a nation of pride, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better pride. The thirty-fifth is the fact that the United States is a nation of honor, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better honor.

The thirty-sixth is the fact that the United States is a nation of glory, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better glory. The thirty-seventh is the fact that the United States is a nation of power, and its history is a history of the struggle for a better power.

INDEX

A.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

- Motion for, 9.
- Debate on, 17.
- Presented to Governor, 100.

ASHBOURNE, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 24.
- Supply, 67.
- Shipbuilding Act, 124.
- Logging Bill, 160.
- Strike at Corner Brook, 210.
- Ways and Means, 243.
- Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 265, 282.
- Disembarking of Paupers Bill, 272.
- Amendment to Election Act, 313.
- Loan Resolutions, 343.

B.

BUDGET SPEECH, 134.

BILLS, (Second Reading).

- Public Printing and Stationery, 79.
- Shipbuilding Act, 116.
- Stamp Act, 116.
- Boy Scout, 116.
- Newfoundland Milling Co., 116.
- Game and Inland Fisheries Board, 127.
- Salaries of Civil Servants, 198.
- Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 240.
- Expenditure under Loan Act, 1923, 254.
- Tax on Imported Goods, 255.
- Disembarking of Paupers, 255.
- Encouragement of Agriculture, 272.
- Revenue Act, 1905, 273.
- Construction of Railway through Labrador, 308.
- Dept. of Finance and Customs, 309.
- Gander Valley Bill, 317.
- Retiring Allowances, 319.
- Public Service Bill, 319.
- Loan Bill, 374.
- Export Duties Bill, 375.

BROWNE, MR. W. J.

- On Disembarking of Paupers Bill, 271.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 303.

BILLS (Third Reading).

- Newfoundland Milling Co., 117.
- Printing and Stationery, 122.
- Shipbuilding Act, 125.
- Fees and Charges by Stamps, 126.
- Boy Scout, 126.
- War Pensions, 152.
- Game and Inland Fisheries, 155.
- Salaries of Civil Servants, 199.
- Expenditure under Loan Act, 1923, 255.
- Tax on Goods Imported, 255, 269.
- Encouragement of Agriculture, 273.
- Revenue Act, 1905, 273.
- Disembarking of Paupers, 274.
- Construction of Railway through Labrador, 309.
- Gander Valley Bill, 318.
- Departments of Finance and Customs, 318.
- Retiring Allowances, 319.
- Public Service, 319.
- Montreal Trust Co., 321.
- Loan Bill, 374.
- United Towns Electric Co., 375.
- Export Duties Bill, 375.

BROWN, MR. K.

- On Address in Reply, 24.
- Printing and Stationery Bill, 109, 110.
- Logging Bill, 155, 172, 177.
- Strike at Corner Brook, 207, 208.

C.

CRAMM, HON. MR.

- On Motion to Adjourn, 193.

COMMITTEE OF WHOLE.

- On Stipendiary Magistrates and Justice of the Peace Bill, 45.
- Supply, 51, 65, 84, 102, 200.
- Newfoundland Milling Co. Bill, 77, 96, 117.
- Printing and Stationery Bill, 108.
- Encouragement of Shipbuilding, 123.
- Fees and Charges by Stamps, 126.
- Boy Scout Bill, 126.
- Ways and Means, 134, 201, 217, 243.
- War Pensions Bill, 151.

Game and Inland Fisheries Bill, 152.
Gander Valley Bill, 181, 201, 317.
Expenditure under Loan Act, 1923, 196, 255.
Tax on Imported Goods Act, 197, 255, 268.
Civil Servants Salaries, 198.
Disembarking of Paupers, 269, 274.
Encouragement of Agriculture, 272.
Revenue Act, 1905, 273.
Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 275.
Construction of Railway through Labrador, 309.
Departments of Finance and Customs, 318.
Retiring Allowances, 319.
Public Service Bill, 319.
Montreal Trust Co. Bill, 320.
Loan Resolutions, 322, 333.
Loan Bill, 374.
United Towns Electric Co. Bill. 374.
Export Duties Resolutions, 375.
Export Duties Bill, 375.

CAHILL, MR.

On Supply, 73.
Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 285.

COLONIAL SECRETARY, HON. J. R. BENNETT.

On Election Act Amendment, 55.
Supply 68, 69.
Printing & Stationery Bill, 79, 108, 109, 111, 114, 115.
Status of Newfoundland, 216.
Ways and Means, 244, 249.
Disembarking of Paupers Bill, 269.
Loan Resolutions, 355.

CASHIN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 43.
Motion to Adjourn, 194.
Ways and Means, 222.

D.

DIVISIONS.

On Ways and Means, 254.
Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 268, 308.
Amendment to Election Act, 316.
Loan Resolutions, 373.

DUFF, MR.

On Address in Reply, 34, 45.
Flour Mill Bill, 98.

Motion to Adjourn, 193.
 Ways and Means, 251.
 Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 284.
 Loan Resolutions, 347.

G.

GRIMES, MR.

On Address in Reply, 31.
 Reporting Debates, 46.
 Election Act Amendment, 61, 316.
 Supply, 68, 104.
 Flour Mill Bill, 97.
 Printing and Stationery Bill, 112, 113.
 Logging Bill, 177.
 Motion to adjourn, 194.
 Gander Valley Bill, 205.
 Strike at Corner Brook, 210.
 Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 262, 278.
 Loan Resolutions, 365.

GODDEN, MR.

On Address in Reply, 22.

GOVERNOR, HIS EXCELLENCY.

Delivers Speech (opening), 8.
 Delivers Speech (closing), 378.

H.

HICKMAN, MR., LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.

On Address in Reply, 12, 37, 45.
 Election Act Amendment, 61, 312.
 Supply, 68, 95.
 Publication of Debates, 80.
 Flour Mill Bill, 98.
 Printing and Stationery Bill, 112.
 Logging Bill, 159.
 Tax on Imported Goods Act, 197.
 Strike at Corner Brook, 209.
 Ways and Means, 217, 244, 252.
 Alcoholic Liquor Bill, 258, 298, 307.
 Loan Resolutions, 333, 367, 368, 370.

HIBBS, MR.

On Address in Reply, 17.
 Supply, 68, 72, 75, 76, 105.
 Flour Mill Bill, 99.
 Printing and Stationery Bill, 108, 110.

Logging Bill, 162.
 Gander Valley Bill, 202, 205.
 Ways and Means, 244.
 Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 264, 291.

HALFYARD, MR.

On Address in Reply, 26.
 Reporting Debates, 46.
 Supply, 54, 69, 74, 84, 92, 103, 106.
 Election Act Amendment, 58, 62, 310.
 Printing and Stationery Bill, 113, 114.
 Shipbuilding Act, 123.
 Logging Bill, 167, 177.
 Motion to Adjourn, 182.
 Gander Valley Bill, 201, 206.
 Ways and Means, 223.
 Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 258, 287, 331.
 Disembarking of Paupers, ~~247~~. 271
 Loan Resolutions, 336, 373.

I.

INTERNAL ECONOMY.

Commission, 102.

L.

LONG, HON. MR.

On Strike at Corner Brook, 211.
 Ways and Means, 236.

LAKE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 9.
 Supply, 91.

LINEGAR, MR.

On Address in Reply, 11.

LITTLE, MR.

On Motion to Adjourn, 188.

M.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, (Hon. Sir John C. Crosbie, K.B.E.)

On Address in Reply, 43.
 Supply, 52, 53, 68, 69, 84, 90, 91, 94, 95, 200.

Reduction of Duties, 64.
 Codfish Export Duty Refund, 83, 122.
 Stamp Act Bill, 116.
 Tariff Revision, 121.
 Ways and Means, 134, 249.
 Motion to Adjourn, 192, 193.
 Strike at Corner Brook, 211.
 Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 301.
 Loan Resolutions, 322, 371.

MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES,
 (Mr. Walsh).

On Address in Reply, 44.
 Shipbuilding Act, 124.
 Encouragement of Agriculture Bill, 272.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES,
 (Mr. Winsor).

On Supply, 71, 88, 90.
 Game and Inland Fisheries Bill, 154.
 Logging Bill, 175.
 Motion to Adjourn, 190.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS, (Mr. Russell).

On Motion to Adjourn, 193.

MOORE, MR.

On Address in Reply, 45.

MINISTER OF JUSTICE, (Hon. W. J. Higgins, K.C.)

On War Pensions Bill, 28, 151.
 Stipendiary Magistrates Bill, 28.
 Debates of the House, 29, 46, 80.
 Election Act Amendment, 60.
 Flour Mill Bill, 99, 100.
 Shipbuilding Bill, 116, 123.
 Boy Scout Bill, 116, 126.
 Game and Inland Fisheries Bill, 127, 152, 153.
 Logging Bill, 170.
 Gander Valley Bill, 202, 203, 206.
 Ways and Means, 230.
 Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 260, 295.
 Disembarking of Paupers Bill, 269, 271, 272, 274.
 Loan Resolutions, 368.

P.

PRIME MINISTER,

(Hon. W. S. Monroe).

- On Address in Reply, 13, 42.
- Reporting Debates, 29.
- Nfld. Milling Co. Bill, 51, 77, 98, 116.
- Supply, 69, 76, 92, 96, 104, 106.
- Shipbuilding Act, 123.
- Logging Bill, 158.
- Gander Valley Bill, 181, 204, 206.
- Motion to Adjourn, 187.
- Strike at Corner Brook, 207, 213, 237.
- Ways and Means, 251.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 256, 275, 308, 332.
- Amendment to Election Act, 315.
- Loan Resolutions, 341, 368.
- United Towns Electric Co. Bill, 374.

PETITIONS PRESENTED.

- Mr. Scammell, 15, 128, 213.
- “ Brown, 15, 17.
- “ Linegar, 15, 164.
- “ Cashin, 15, 17, 47.
- “ Sullivan, 46, 62, 117, 376.
- “ Walsh, 47, 376.
- “ Ashbourne, 62, 81, 195, 255.
- “ Cahill, 63.
- “ Halfyard, 63, 179.
- Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 63.
- Hon. Colonial Secretary, 117.
- Hon. Mr. Bradley, 164.
- Mr. Randell, 179.
- “ Duff, 196.
- Hon. Minister of Justice, 213.
- Mr. Warren, 320.
- “ Power, 326.
- Hon. Minister Posts and Telegraphs, 376.

PUDDESTER, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 44.

Q.

QUESTIONS ASKED.

- Mr. Warren, 16, 30, 55, 64, 83, 101, 108, 150, 269, 274.
- “ Scammell, 16, 31, 55, 82, 101, 119, 120, 149, 196, 214, 321.
- “ Grimes, 16, 30, 48, 64, 82, 83, 101, 102, 120, 167, 243.

- Mr. Randell, 30, 199.
 " Little, 165, 166.
 " Brown, 30, 100, 214.
 " Halfyard, 30, 102, 119, 121, 148, 167.
 " Duff, 55, 82, 102, 107, 120, 199.
 " Ashbourne, 55, 82.
 " Puddester, 55, 180, 241, 242.
 " Cahill, 64.
 " Hickman, 101, 120, 150, 164, 165, 214, 215, 269.
 " Hibbs, 101, 149, 321.
 " Cashin, 119.
 " Chambers, 149.
 " Long, 326.

R.

RANDELL, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 26.
 Motion to Adjourn, 189.

RULES SUSPENDED, 268.

S.

SPEAKER, (Hon. C. J. Fox).

- Elected, 7.

SELECT COMMITTEE.

- On Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 241.
 Election Act Amendment, 310.
 Montreal Trust Co. Bill, 320.

SPEECH FROM THRONE.

- (Opening), 8.
 (Closing), 377.

SULLIVAN, HON. MR.

- On Logging Bill, 172.
 Ways and Means, 232.
 Loan Resolutions, 359.

SCAMMELL, MR.

- On Address in Reply, 22.
 Supply, 69, 84.

Flour Mill Bill, 96, 99.
Shipbuilding Bill, 123, 125.
Game and Inland Fisheries Bill, 153.
Logging Bill, 156.
Strike at Corner Brook, 208.
Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 266.
Amendment to Election Act, 313.
Loan Resolutions, 349.

W.

WARREN, MR.

On Reporting Debates, 29, 51.
Address in Reply, 40.
Supply, 52, 85, 89, 91, 93.
Game and Inland Fisheries Board Bill, 127.
Logging Bill, 174.
Ways and Means, 248.
Disembarking of Paupers Bill, 271.
Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 281, 291, 327.
Loan Resolutions, 352, 372.

Proceedings

of the

Legislative Council

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

1924



The Evening Telegram, Ltd.

PROCEEDINGS

of the

Legislative Council of Newfoundland

SESSION, 1924

THURSDAY, July 10, 1924.

Following the formal opening of the House a short session was held. The Clerk having read the Speech from the Throne Hon. S. Milley rose to propose that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an address in reply.

He first extended a hearty welcome to Hon. A. B. Morine, whom he believed would be a great addition to the House and greatly augment its debating strength. Newfoundland, he said, did right when she decided to take a part in the British Empire Exhibition, and even at this early moment people can see that it is benefitting the country and greatly advertising it by the well ordered exhibits to be found there. It is said that in Councils there is wisdom, and if this is true his Excellency the Governor must be wise indeed as he has had four sets of councillors within the past twelve months. For some time past we have had too much turmoil but it is a pleasure to know that at last the unrest is over. The country has given with a clear voice a large majority to a new administration, and it is up to the upper chamber to see that everything possible is done to see that the country prospers as it can prosper, if the legislature so decides. The country is sick of politics and it is now in need of a period of reconstruction. The visit of Earl Haig marks an epoch in our history, and those who are inclined to talk disparagingly of our climate must

have changed opinions when they consider the excellent weather conditions prevailing here during Earl Haig's visit. The finances of the country give room for serious thought. For some time past we have not been thought very highly of in this connection in the outside world, and several times during his travels he had been forced to listen to things said about the country that he was not able to deny. Mr. Milley hoped that the present Govt. would take steps to see that the country's name in this respect was redeemed. He welcomed the opening of new industries because they will tend to increase employment.

As yet not knowing the details, he was not in a position to discuss them fully, but he hoped that when they were introduced that Newfoundlanders would not be hewers of wood and drawers of water whilst outsiders get the plums. He was glad to see that the Government will follow out the action of the Warren ministry in regard to investigations of wrong doing. It is the only way to show the outside world that we will no longer tolerate that state of affairs. With regard to Prohibition Act he hoped the Government will make an effort to bring in a law that will be carried out. He was sorry, that the Speech from the Throne made no reference to lotteries and sweepstakes etc., and he was afraid that unless some measures are taken in this matter we shall be in a

position, which will not be a happy one. In conclusion he hoped the session would be a short one, so that when the House meets the next time the Government will be in a position to bring in measures of progress.

HON. D. A. RYAN seconded the motion. He was glad to see that things are looking brighter. At present there is a good demand for our fish, and fair prices are being offered and he had no doubt that this will continue if the markets are kept from being overstocked. He was glad to see that something will be done to amend the Prohibition Act and was very pleased to know that measures are being taken to introduce the Gander and Flour Mills projects, both of which will provide much employment. He welcomed to the Council Hon. A. B. Morine, and offered him heartiest congratulations.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH congratulated both speakers and with what they had said he on the whole agreed. The members of the Legislative Council, however, are in a degree responsible for some of the things that have happened in the country for the past four or five years. When the Fish Regulations were introduced the Legislative Council had adopted them, practically without question and the members cannot unload the whole responsibility of their evils on the shoulders of others. Similarly with regard to financial conditions they were in a measure to blame. True it is that some of the expenditure was inevitable, but, as the Walker report pointed out, in several cases, there was criminal extravagance. He was of opinion that there should be a repeal of the Legislative Act of 1915 which removed from the council the power to reject money bills as without this power their hands are practically tied.

The Prohibition Law has been in practice very unsuccessful. He hoped that one feature of the new act to be

made will be the doing away of the script system. He was surprised that men of education and standing as are the medical profession should be so false to the ethics of their profession as to prostitute it as has been done during the last four or five years. He hoped the incoming government will endeavour to do something for the betterment of the country. To advocate a policy of clean up is very easy, but it is much more difficult to bring such policy to practice. In endeavouring to do it the Government will be assailed from many quarters, but the successful accomplishment will see the country at large commend them for it.

HON. A. B. MORINE thanked the previous speakers for what they had said about him. He agreed with the previous speaker and trusted the power of the House will be restored promising that such a measure will have his earnest support. When the measure was first introduced the Council should never have agreed to it; it is the duty of a conservative chamber to resist all sort of panic legislation. There are many things which ought to have been resisted. Whilst the Council had no power to vote on money bills, they could have been discussed, and if thought not proper should have been resisted to the limit of the Council's power. All interest is centred in the debates of the lower House, because the members of the Upper Chamber have not sufficient interest in their own debates. Clean up and keep clean is the policy which his colleagues went to the country on and for which purpose they have been put in power, and this they are endeavouring to carry out. In going over the affairs of some of the departments, he had been amazed and horrified at the looseness that seems to have prevailed in every department; it had been found that civil servants everywhere have been received much in addition

to the salaries voted them. The work of cleaning up is going to be a tremendous job, but he hoped that within the next six months much will have been done to bring about much needed reform. One of the largest expenses have been the public charities department, where it has been found that large amounts have been paid for doctors bills, etc., on account of people who could and should pay their own bills. He was in a position to state that the script system will be abolished and that in future they will be unnecessary. In this respect, however, he would say that all medical men are not alike and there are many who have been true to their principles. However, in every stage there will be found blacklegs. The matter of lotteries etc., has not yet received attention, but at an early date he will bring the matter to the notice of his colleagues. Concluding he hoped that soon the House will be restored to its ancient privileges.

HON. W. J. ELLIS wished to offer his congratulations and welcome Hon. A. B. Morine, whom he thought will be a big addition to the Council. He believed that the Premier has the earnest support of the whole country. The recent bye-election had showed that Harbor Grace is supporting him and had similar tests been made in the other districts concerned the same thing he thought would have happened. The Gander project is a thing that should be encouraged and he hoped that the House will give it all the help that is needed. With regard to Prohibition he has often expressed his views, and when the measure comes before the House he shall more fully discuss it. As to the lotteries etc., he was not so sure that there is much harm in them, especially as nearly all are for some charitable purpose. Our people have a gambling spirit and will always endeavour to appease this spirit. At a later date he would prob-

ably go into more details on some of the matters discussed.

On motion being put it was carried unanimously and the following Committee was appointed:—Hons. S. Milley, D. A. Ryan, Sir P. T. McGrath, J. Anderson and S. K. Bell.

On motion the House adjourned until Monday at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, July 14th, 1924.

House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. MILLEY presented report of Select Committee appointed to draft Address in Reply to Speech delivered by H. E. the Governor at the opening of the Session, which on motion was read a first and second time and passed.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at 4.30 p.m.

THURSDAY, July 24, 1924.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. PRESIDENT read communication from His Excellency the Governor announcing the appointment of the following to the Internal Economy Committee of the Legislature, namely: Hon. President of the Legislative Council, Hon. A. B. Morine, K. C., Hon. S. Milley, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, the Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary, the Attorney General.

Honourable members visited Government House and presented the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne which His Excellency had been pleased to deliver at the opening session.

The House resumed and the Clerk read His Excellency the Governor's Reply to Address.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the Bill entitled, "An Act to amend Chapter 3 of 11 George V. entitled 'An Act

to authorize the Montreal Trust Co. to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland,'” was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled “An Act to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ‘Of Stipendiary Magistrate and Justices of the Peace.’”

HON. MR. MORINE in moving the second reading of this Bill, pointed out that it was for the purpose of giving Stipendiary Magistrates jurisdiction as such over the whole Island and its dependencies. There had been difficulty in that Magistrates named in their commission for certain districts or places had no jurisdiction elsewhere and the Department of Justice had on occasion to send men from other places outside their jurisdictions. For instance some time ago the Magistrate had to be sent from Grand Falls to Bonavista Bay for a certain case and when the matter had come before the Courts later it was contented that he had no jurisdiction. The Bill provides that any Magistrate though still residing in his own district would have jurisdiction over the whole Island.

SIR P. T. McGRATH thought that whilst this was a step in the right direction, we should also consider the fact that at the present time we gave too many Magistrates in the Island. In 1898 there were 18 Magistrates whose salaries came to the sum of \$13,880, but at the present time we have 31 Magistrates who are paid the sum of \$37,700. The population of the country has since that time increased by about 25 per cent. whilst the number of Magistrates has increased 70 per cent. and their salaries doubled. Now that the country has such improved means of communication and travel and that people have, we might say, become somewhat morally improved, there should not be any need for such

a large number of Magistrates. He wished it to be understood that this was not a criticism of any particular Government and more especially the present Government. Every new Government for a long number of years has had to give Magistracies to political supporters and it is time now that some of these positions be done away with, and as some of the present Magistrates pass away, steps should be gradually taken to remedy the state of affairs. Even within the past two or three weeks it is true that some have resigned their positions and others have been appointed. As regards the movement that has been mentioned in the Lower House and in the press regarding the re-distribution of seats, he thought this deserved every consideration. Last week at Ottawa there was a Bill introduced for the re-distribution of seats and they now have a House composed almost entirely of one man seats, the only exception being Halifax and St. John, and in South Africa where the recent elections were held there were 135 one man constituencies. The sooner we have this system introduced in this country the better for all, and with this in use it would be possible for a Magistrate to be assigned to a political district and so greatly reduce the number.

HON. MR. MORINE would like to be permitted to make reference regarding the number of Magistrates being on comparison too large. Whilst be agreed that some could be undoubtedly abolished yet on a close consideration it would be seen that those figures were somewhat fallacious. The trend of recent legislation has been to increase the civil jurisdiction of the Magistrate and thus the work of the Supreme Court has been considerably lessened. Then again increased means of communication and transport has rather added to their work, than lessening it for a large number of people are continually moving around and

the number of strangers is larger than ever before. In 1898 when introducing the Budget he made an effort to cut down their numbers in Carbonear, Harbor Grace and Brigus, providing the late Alfred Penny as District Judge to do the work, and was immediately met with a storm of protest, so that to-day we have one for each of these places as well as Bay de Verde, and there have been demands for one at Heart's Content and other places so that it is hard to keep them to the number they are instead of decreasing. If the amount of the salaries paid to Magistrates has increased in it is cost because of the increase in the cost of living. As a whole this body is very poorly paid, and he would like to see their salaries increased fifty per cent. if possible. For a man in the position of a Magistrate living on \$1,100 or \$1,200 a year is really trying to get along on starvation wages.

With regard to a recent appointment in the place of Mr. Squarey, one of the best Magistrates this Colony has ever had, at Channel, which is the entry port for a great deal of our traffic, the Government had appointed his son who would have the benefit of his father's assistance in learning the duties. At Fogo the Magistrate has a large portion of the Gander District to cover which entails much work. Stipendiary Magistrates at many places could no doubt do much of the work which is now being done by other Government officials such as the collection of customs duties and the like, and we could thus bring about a consolidation of offices which would greatly help to increase economy in the public service. With reference to re-distribution, he thought it extremely likely that the matter would be grappled with at the next session, and improvements be made along the lines suggested by Sir Patrick McGrath.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be sent to Committee to-morrow.

NOTICE OF QUESTION.

Hon. D. A. Ryan gave notice that on to-morrow he would ask the leader of the Government:

1. If Dr. Mooney has completed building his pulp mill at Hr. Deep or when it will be completed or what has been done up to date.

2. Also to ask if Mr. H. J. Crowe has completed the erection of his pulp mill at Hampden, White Bay, or what has been done according to the terms of his contract.

3. To ask what amount was paid Mr. K. Brown, M.H.A., monthly as Inspector of the Logging Camps during Winter 1923-4.

4. To ask what amount was paid to each person of the Committee appointed by the Government to pay back the Export Tax of ten cents per quintal on fish shipped from the Labrador coast for the year 1922. The names and amounts of moneys paid to each person.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Morine the House adjourned until Tuesday at 4.30 p.m.

TUESDAY, July 29, 1924.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. D. A. YRAN asked the Hon. the Leader of the Government:

(1) If Doctor Mooney has completed the building of his Pulp Mill at Hr. Deep or when will it be completed, or what has been done to date.

(2) If Mr. H. J. Crowe has completed the erection of his Pulp Mill at Hampden (White Bay), or what has been done according to the terms of his contract.

(3) What amount was paid to Mr. K. Brown, M.H.A., monthly as Inspector of the Logging Camps, Winter 1923 and 1924.

(4) What amount was paid to each person of the Committee appointed by

the Government to pay back the Export Tax of ten cents per quintal on Fish shipped from the Labrador Coast, year 1922; the name of and amount paid to each person.

The following reply was tabled by the Hon. Mr. Morine:—

(1) The agreement between the Government and M. J. Mooney, dated August 9th, 1923, provided that Mr. Mooney should, on or before the 30th of November, 1924, commence the erection of a mill capable of producing one hundred tons of mechanical pulp per day, the agreement to become void unless this were done. The Lessee's right to export wood terminates of course with the agreement. Mr. Mooney has announced his determination not to commence the construction of the pulp mill, and the Government has decided that the wood cut for him to date may be exported, but that no amendment of the agreement will be permitted.

(1) Tabled the correspondence, and a copy of the Minute of Council referring to it.

(2) Mr. Crowe has not completed, so far as the Government is informed, a Pulp Mill in White Bay. The agreement between the Government and Mr. Crowe, dated August 9th, 1923, does not provide that Mr. Crowe shall erect a Pulp Mill in White Bay, but the ratifying act provides that a pulp or paper Mill shall be erected in the Colony within ten years, or the agreement become void. At the time this Act was passing through the House, there was some announcement about a shortening of this period, and I lay upon the table of the House all the correspondence about this matter which I have been able to procure. Mr. Crowe undertook to establish and install in White Bay one or more rossing plants and one or more saw-mills on or before the 31st day of October, 1924. Rossing machines have been installed and operated but no

saw-mill has been commenced, as far as the Government is aware.

(3) The amounts paid Mr. K. Brown M.H.A., as Inspector of Logging camps during the winter of 1923-1924 are as follows:

6 months salary	\$250.00	per
month\$1,500.00
Travelling Expenses		370.85
		<hr/>
		\$1,870.85
		<hr/>

(4) In answer to this question I beg to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing items paid for services and expenses in connection with the Export Tax Refund, showing the amount refunded to be \$105,650.10 and the expenses therein to be \$9,272.11, and the way in which such amount was made up.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH said he distinctly remembered that the principle objection of the Select Committee at the last session in putting the Crowe Bill through was the 10 year term clause. The Premier, Mr. Warren, during the time the Bill was under consideration, and in order that it would pass the Council, gave the assurance that the Bill would be amended at the next session and the period of ten years reduced to five years, which would put the Crowe undertaking on the same status as others.

HON. MR. MORINE explained that once a Bill passed the Council, and capital had been floated for a project, it would be a very dangerous matter to amend such a Bill, for the reason that it might damage the credit of the Company engaged.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH remarked that Mr. Crowe had undertaken to abide by Prime Minister Warren's suggestion.

HON. MR. MORINE said that it was all very well if only Mr. Crowe were interested, but a different matter where a company was interested.

HON. D. R. RYAN remembered that Prime Minister Warren had asked the Council to pass the Bill containing ten year clause and promised that the Bill would be amended next session. Mr. Warren went further, he said and informed the Council that if Mr. Crowe did not agree to this he would cancel the contract.

HON. MR. MORINE drew attention to the following despatches between Mr. Crowe and Prime Minister Warren during August last, when the Bill was under discussion.

From Prime Minister.

"Bill ratified by Lower House now before Upper House. Your telegram 14th reached me after Bill had passed. Except Bill to pass Upper House to-day. Period altered to ten years."

From H. J. Crowe.

"Will undertake carry through White Bay deal with period reduced to ten years. Making arrangements to commence operations earliest date."

MR. MORINE tabled further correspondence between the ex-Prime Minister, Mr. Warren, and Mr. H. J. Crowe, also correspondence in connection with Dr. Mooney contract.

HON. MR. GIBBS thought there was probably some mistake about the wording of the telegram of Mr. Crowe. The Bill, according to his recollection, passed the Council with the distinct understanding that the period would be altered to five years at this session. Mr. Crowe, he, understood, had agreed to this provision.

HON. MR. ELLIS said he remembered quite clearly that the term was to be altered to five years at the next session, and that some of the members suggested a three year period. The only reason for extending the period was to get the Bill through, so that employment could be found dur-

ing the winter of 1924. He voted for the Bill with the distinct understanding that it would be amended this season.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH expressed opinion that if Mr. Warren were still Prime Minister the Contract would be amended this session, and suggested that the present Prime Minister consult his colleagues and see if the matter could be dealt with without interfering with or hampering Mr. Crowe's industry. So far as Dr. Mooney was concerned he regretted to say that he had tried it out and failed, and would not likely be operating the coming winter.

HON. MR. MORINE considered that the contract and the circumstances surrounding it were a little bit loose. He thought it possible, however, that something may be done to change what is a very disastrous form of contract. If Mr. Crowe only was concerned it would be easy enough to deal with the matter, but when others had placed capital in the enterprise on the face of that Bill, we could not change it and would have to be the victims of our own carelessness. Mr. Crowe, he said, has apparently defaulted in the amount of wood cut, which is probably better for Newfoundland as the timber is still intact, but on the other hand the work given in White Bay last year was considerable and timely. Mr. Crowe, he understood, never held out the idea that he would erect a paper and pulp mill in White Bay. What he had in view was the erection of a mill in Fortune Bay. The wood would be cut in White Bay, and taken to Fortune Bay in its raw state and milled there when his great project had taken full scope. For that he had ten years and during that time he was allowed to export 25,000 cords yearly. In view of the fact of his having defaulted in White Bay, and now asking for some extension and also for water power grants in Fortune

Bay, it may be possible for the Government to reach back at Mr. Crowe and have something done, and he assured Hon. Gentleman if anything could be done it would be done.

SIR P. T. McGRATH.

MR. PRESIDENT:—I ask leave, before we enter upon the Orders of the Day, to make a personal explanation as to my part in the Labrador Boundary Case, respecting which there seems to be some misunderstanding.

First, I did not seek this work. Three years ago Lord Morris wrote me from London that a day or two previously the lawyers engaged in this case had held a conference and decided that they required much additional material, when he had suggested me as a suitable person to undertake its collection, and he asked me if I could undertake the work. His letter set out "that it will be necessary for us to have all the documents in the Canadian Archives examined, at Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, and Winnipeg, and it may be at two or three points in the United States; and when the matter was mentioned at our conference I pointed out that the only one I knew in Newfoundland who would be capable of such undertaking was yourself."

As I had opposed the Squires party 18 months previously, I felt that, to make my position clear, it would be only right to lay the matter before some of those with whom I had been associated in the election of 1919. I did so and they saw no reason why I should refuse this work, so I agreed to take it on.

Secondly, this was not a political job. There was never any suggestion either directly or indirectly by Sir Richard Squires, through whom my employment was arranged, or by Mr. Warren, under whose directions my work was carried on, that this was a political job, or that any party service

was required of me. The underlying principle, it was understood, was that this was a matter of vital importance to the Colony and that it was thought that I could best perform the service.

Thirdly, every feature of my work has had to stand the scrutiny of Sir John Simon, K.C., the leader of the English Bar, who is our senior counsel, and of Sir Thomas Berridge, an ex-President of the English Law Society, who is our Solicitor; and I think I am entitled to take pride in the fact that it has been satisfactory to them and the other legal gentlemen in England engaged in the case. As proof of this I would read a letter written to me on the eve of departure from London in December, 1922, by Mr. W. T. Monkton, who is the Junior Counsel in the case, and who, with Mr. Burn, of Burn and Berridge, has had to do most of the work of preparing it for its final revision by Sir John Simon and Mr. Barrington-Ward, K.C.

LONDON, Dec. 3, 1922.

"Dear Sir Patrick:—I feel I cannot let you go back to Newfoundland without a word of thanks for all your help in the Boundary Dispute. Your work, both in the discovery of documentary evidence and in the collection and arrangement of the material has been absolutely invaluable, and I am honestly amazed at the amount of work you have been able to do in the time. I may have made many mistakes in the preparation of the case, but I know now that I am entirely right in advising that your presence over here this autumn would be of the greatest assistance. I feel that I have had perhaps better opportunities than any one else for appreciating your work, with the possible exception of Mr. Burn, who, I know, shares my view of it. It has been a very great pleasure to me to work with you, and

I hope to have your help again before the case is disposed of.

With many thanks, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

(Sgd.) WALTER MONCKTON.

For nearly three years I have given my best efforts to this task, devoting practically my whole time to it, both week days and Sundays, for while we were here at home Mr. Warren and I spent most Sunday afternoons at it, as he could not in his office on week days give the time needed for the consideration of the problems it involved.

Statements published in the newspapers show amounts paid to me in this case in three years, \$19,800 in all. But, as a matter of fact, I have only received \$8,000 of this sum for my services. The arrangement was that I draw remuneration on account of this work at the rate of \$3,000 a year, and the third year is not yet completed.

Another \$3,000, in round figures, represents payments to me for out-of-pocket expenses. For instance, I pay my stenographers, (of whom I sometimes have to employ two) from week to week, and get repaid every six months. I do the same with typewriting supplies and all other minor outlays. Then, on my trips abroad, searching in Universities, Libraries, Museums, etc., I have had to pay for books, maps, photographs, copying of records, etc., out of my own funds and secure repayment after my return. Vouchers for every dollar of this outlay will be found in the Department of Justice.

The remaining \$9,000 covers travelling expenses for three trips in connection with this case. In the autumn of 1921 I was away for over three months, going from here to Ottawa, then to Winnipeg, back to Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, back to New York, Harvard University, near Boston, Brown University at Providence,

Rhode Island, etc., back to Ottawa, Quebec, and then home. In the course of this trip I interviewed and obtained statements from every white man then alive, who had been in the interior of Labrador. In 1922 I left here in July and was absent six months, I went as far west as Detroit, back to Toronto, Ottawa, Montreal, Boston, and New York, crossed to England, and on the return trip revisited Washington, Ottawa and then returned home. My stay in London of nearly four months was prolonged partly because Sir Richard Squires and Mr. Warren were engaged in negotiating the West Coast paper mill contract. A General Election also occurred in England at that time, which put us out of touch with Sir John Simon for six weeks, as he was a candidate.

Last year I left here in August and was absent about five months, again visiting Canadian and American cities and crossing to England. Here I was delayed again by Mr. Warren, Sir Marmaduke Winter and myself being occupied with the Economic Conference for six weeks and still further by another English General Election, which made Sir John Simon inaccessible for a similar period.

For the expenses of these trips, totalling 15 months, I have been paid \$9,000, which works out at about \$600 per month or \$6.20 per day, out of which I have paid my hotel bills, railroad fares, trans-Atlantic steamer tickets, and other expenses. I leave it to Hon. Gentlemen of this House, who are accustomed to travelling extensively, to say if this is an excessive figure.

On December 17th last, following on the English General election of December 6th, Sir John Simon gave us a special conference to enable us to leave for home next day. At this final conference he approved of this Colony's case for exchange with the Canadians, who were to hand us their

case in return. This exchange was to take place on December 31st, but the Canadians were not ready then, and are not ready yet, though we have lately had assurances that they will make the exchange in October. After that the preparation of a counter-case has to be undertaken. This, it is hoped, will not take longer than a few months, and then the matter will be ready for trial. It will, I presume, be submitted to the Privy Council at the first session of that body after that exchange is made.

I do not make this explanation as an apology because I do not feel that I have anything to apologize for. In my work on this case I have given the best that is in me, and I do not think that any fair-minded person will claim that I have been guilty of any "grafting" or "profiteering" in regard to it.

HON. MR. GIBBS in moving the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 3 of II George V., entitled "An Act to Authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland," said that the object of the proposed amendment was to give to the Montreal Trust Company the same powers as those exercised by the Eastern Trust Company. The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace,' Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair. Hon. Mr. Morine briefly pointed out that the object of this Bill was to have Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace jurisdiction over the whole Island, the necessity for which had at an early date been submitted to the Hon. Members.

The Bill was passed without an amendment and on motion was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with the message that this House had passed same without an amendment.

A message was then read that the House of Assembly had passed the following Bills entitled:—

(1) An Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.

(2) An Act concerning payment of certain fees and charges by stamps.

(3) An Act to further and protect the Activities of the Boy Scout Association.

(4) An Act to confirm an agreement with Nfld. Milling Company.

(5) An Act respecting a Department of Public Printing and Stationery, etc.

(6) An Act to amend 12 and 13 George V. Chapter 20—War Pensions.

(7) An Act to amend Game and Inland Fisheries Act, in which the concurrence of the Legislative Council is requested.

HON. MR. MORINE moved that all these Bills be read a first time, and excepting Nos. 4 and 5, if it were the pleasure of the House a second time also as they involved no new principles and by doing so it would expedite matters.

The Bills were read a first and second time.

HON. MR. MORINE then said that the Bill referring to the Milling Company was more important, and the members of the House may prefer having it stand over. He stated that the Company asked for the privilege of being the only one to erect a flour mill for a period of twenty years. In return it would erect a large mill involving considerable capital. The Company also asked that the grain imported by them be on a basis protecting their flour 25 cents per barrel. There are other provisions of the

usual type as to bringing in machinery, etc.

An argument in favour of the Flour Mill outside of the large amount of labour which it will afford our men, is the benefit this country will derive from the many bi-products in the form of feeds for cattle and poultry which we would otherwise have to specially import. Grain can be loaded at the head of the lakes and imported much cheaper than under the form of flour.

The only serious point of objection that one could find in the Bill is in the section regarding the Company's monopoly for a period of 20 years. But it is evident that if a company puts up a good mill, properly equipped, it is not likely that any other concern would start in opposition. As far as the provision for a protection of 25 cents a barrel is concerned it is really very insignificant when we consider the advantages to the country in possessing such a mill. The Bill as it now stands has been slightly amended from the form which it held under the previous Government. The Bill was read a second time and ordered committed on to-morrow.

Hon. A. B. Morine said with reference to the Printing and Stationery Department Bill that he would briefly outline the main principles of the Act. It was the Government's intention to appoint an official in the Colonial Secretary's Department who would have the control of all printing and the purchase of stationery for all Departments. This man is to be one with a practical experience of about ten years and is to be known as the King's Printer. In some quarters it was said that this would necessarily entail much expenditure, and the appointment of a large staff, but in reality the only person needed outside the official himself would be a competent stenographer. Then again, as this department would be connected with the Colonial Secretary's Depart-

ment, the aid of the officials there could be utilized when necessary. The work at first will no doubt be somewhat arduous, but when things become standardized it will not be so hard. A competent man is to be had for \$2,600 and although no one has been definitely decided on enquiry has led to one who could no doubt competently fill the position. A stenographer can be obtained at \$900.00 a year so that the expenditure all told will be about \$3,500 a year.

Stationery will be stored in the various departments as it is now but will be under the key of the King's Printer and not the Department officials. At the present time each Department has the care of ordering its own printing and as it is bought in small lots and not ordered by experienced printers, the cost is very great. A printer may come into any department and request that he be given some work to do and in all probability his request is acceded to. This kind of thing will be done away with and the various classes of printing for the different departments can be calculated for the exact year's requirements. The printing of the Statutes and the Statistical Books of the Legislature have for many years been done separately by political supporters and no attempt whatsoever has been made by competing bids to find the lowest cost available.

When commenting on the Bill in the Lower House the argument used was of this nature "You can show us what the cost of printing will be but you cannot show what the savings will be." How could you. But he was of the opinion that a Bill putting all the printing work under one experienced man was bound to result in saving. If, as one had suggested, all the work be put to tender and contract, what would happen? The Government would ask for tenders but who was there in the Departments concerned competent

to say if the price were low enough. A track will be kept of the various departments by the King's Printer, billing each department separately and he in turn will tender for the lowest orders and the Departments will apply to him.

Last year the printing bill, although in his opinion it was by no means the largest, was:—

Printing	\$71,748
Stationery	24,207

giving an expenditure of over \$96,000. Then also there are the special charges for elections and the census which amounted to \$36,000.

As one with a large experience of printing. Sir P. T. McGrath said that it would no doubt result in a large saving of money if carried out in the spirit in which it was introduced. This was not the first time that such an experiment was tried, as in 1917 a purchasing agent was appointed, but the system didn't last long. It was his firm hope that this would be of longer duration. Three or four years ago the census was taken and ever since this time people are being steadily paid in connection with work for same, and he had no doubt but this would probably go on until the time comes for a new census. A great saving could be made here and also in connection with the Hansard, which he heard was published last year but which up to the present he hadn't seen.

He also expressed regret at the manner in which the reporting of debates was carried on. It had been the intention of the Government at the opening of the season to have an Official Synopsis made each day, for if the debates are to be of any value to the people they should be published the next day, and he was sorry this was not continued. When the Hansard was introduced in 1909 it was based on a principle then in vogue in Nova Scotia. There were two papers in Hali-

fax supporting different political parties, and they had an arrangement by which each paper would publish so much of the debates for each day. Sir Edward Morris had endeavoured to get the Daily News and Evening Herald to come to an agreement similar to this in 1909 and as the type was set it was put aside for the publication of the Hansard, but the first thing he found was that he had to meet the opposition of the Printer's Union. He thought the debates should be published next day in the form of an intelligent condensation and was therefore strongly in favour of the Official Synopsis, which given competent people to do it was very satisfactory. The position now was that the papers give at their own expense a synopsis and the Hansard is not published until after the House closes. The Bill was read a second time and ordered committed on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at 4 o'clock.

THURSDAY, July 31, 1924.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. M. P. GIBBS moved the House into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 3 of 11, George V., entitled 'An Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland.'"

HON. A. B. MORINE wished before proceeding any further to draw the attention of the House to the manner in which this Bill was being proceeded with. All private Bills should be introduced by petition, notice in the Royal Gazette, and in addition certain fees paid, which, however, the Company were prepared to do. Nevertheless the proceedings were in violation of the strict rules of the House, but as the Bill was not of a very important character, and if all members were satisfied it might be proceeded with. But in future it should be in-

sisted that all Bill be introduced in the proper manner.

SIR P. T. McGRATH held that a Bill could not be introduced twice in the same session, and although they would not be strictly following rules he thought that in this case formality might be waived and the Bill proceeded with. If this was done a record should be made of the matter on the Journals of the House for future reference. It is the usual custom to first introduce a Bill of this kind in the Lower House, but as it really involves no new principle it might be as well to waive the point and with the unanimous consent of all the members to proceed with it.

HON. W. J. ELLIS was of the opinion that the Bill was a very fair one, and it was only just that the Company referred to should enjoy the same privileges as many others at the present time. But the House should be most careful in proceeding not to give the Lower House any cause for reflection upon the manner in which it had been proceeded with. He thought the members should have raised their objections when the Bill was first introduced.

HON. M. P. GIBBS wished to point out that many Bills of a similar nature to the one under discussion had been introduced in this manner. For instance the Gander Bill and the Humber Bill. It is quite true the rule has not been clearly adhered to, but this was not the first time it had been done. In future he thought it would be well if Bills were introduced in a strictly proper manner.

SIR P. T. McGRATH did not quite agree with the opinion expressed by Mr. Gibbs that the Humber was a private Bill. Perhaps on a very strict interpretation it might be so construed, but not wholly so.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill, Hon. Mr. Ellis

in the Chair. The Committee rose and reported Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Bills re amendment of Act for the encouragement of Shipbuilding, Of Payment of Certain Fees and Charges by Stamps, and Boy Scouts Association Encouragement passed through Committee stage without amendment and were ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Committee stage of Newfoundland Milling Company Agreement Bill was deferred until to-morrow.

In submitting the Printing and Stationery Bill to Committee the leader of the Government, Hon. Mr. Morine, said the gist of the Act is contained in Section 3, in the words: "The Governor-in-Council may, by commission, under the Great Seal, appoint an officer, who shall be called the King's Printer." The remainder of the Act is largely supplementary and assisting, while the outstanding Sections are Nos. 7 and 10 which read: "All purchases and all printing made or done under the control of the King's Printer, shall be made or done upon requisition approved by the Minister, and as far as may be convenient in accordance with contracts entered into with the Minister's approval after the tenders have been called for. Wherever possible all printing under the control of the King's Printer shall be done in Newfoundland." "The King's Printer shall cause to be printed and published under his superintence, the statutes and official gazette, which shall be known as the Newfoundland Gazette, and all such official and departmental and other reports, forms, documents, commissions, and other papers as he is required to cause to be printed and published by or under the authority of the Governor-in-Council; whatever is printed under his superintence, by authority of this Act, shall be held to be printed by him." The reason for

the change is that the right to the name of Royal Gazette, which is ancient and perhaps of late inappropriate, was possessed by the late Mr. Withers, and later by those who purchased it. The Newfoundland Gazette is to be printed like everything else under contract and tender. The King's Printer will receive all fees that are now payable to the publishers for notices, etc., and will turn them into the consolidated revenue of the Colony. Everybody knew that the prices of advertising in the Royal Gazette had always been excessive as compared with the other newspapers, and he imagined it had always been a remunerative proposition, and thought it could be so under the Government. With regard to the supply of Stationery, the different Departments will each year submit to the King's Printer the required amount for the following year. The cost of the total for the different departments will be placed in the Estimates and a regular supply will be distributed to all the Departments. The cost of and the amount used by each Department will be checked up, a regular audit made and the cost to each Department will be easily arrived at. He had made further inquiries since last meeting and find it will be quite easy to procure a competent man at a \$2500 salary and he anticipated, providing the Act was faithfully carried out, a saving from \$30,000 to \$35,000 yearly.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH said he would like to reinforce what Hon. Mr. Morine had said. He has no reason to doubt that the "Newfoundland Gazette," properly conducted, should pay its way and the salary of the King's Printer. The cost of the production should not be great, it being a small weekly paper, and with advertising and circulation judiciously attended to should be a paying venture. The proposed practice, he said, was in line with what was happening on both sides of the water. In England the Gov-

ernment had its stationery department which was profitably carried on by the State and the same applied in the Canadian provinces, with one or two exceptions. The principle adopted in England was for the Government Stationery Department to put work out on tender and where Blue Books, important reports of Commissions, etc., several of which he exhibited in the House, were concerned, they were sold by the Department through regular news dealers. That printing profiteers existed outside Newfoundland Sir Patrick showed conclusively in referring to an English concern who held a contract for printing stamps. This concern was not only able to make a large profit for its shareholders, but was able to contribute twenty thousand pounds yearly to its rivals to keep aloof from tendering. Sir Patrick without desiring in any way to offer unfair criticism as to Government printing of past years, took occasion to refer briefly to the system of printing the Hansard. That for 1923 he had seen for the first time in the Library this afternoon. He could not see the value of them, as nobody read them, yet they represented an outlay of thousands of dollars. He produced the Journal for 1922, which was the last he had seen until this afternoon, when he had found that for 1923 in the Library, but which had not been sent to him, nor, he supposed, to anyone else. He pointed out that the Estimates were not included at all. If it were to be of any value it should contain that, and also the Budget Speech, to show the financial standing of the Colony. But it did contain a long lunacy report by our friend Dr. Mosdell, an excellent report no doubt, but it should not be in the Journal. Some of the volumes contained the one speech twelve times over, while important matters were only briefly referred to. One contained a report in detail of the Agricultural Department as to the number

of cattle, pigs, barrels of potatoes, etc. but as so much money had been given out in that Department, it was probably thought proper to spend a little in this particular way. He considered the compiling showed great lack of judgment. In Ottawa a personal friend of his named Cook, with the assistance of three deputy heads and known as the Editorial Board, got together a few years ago and got down to the proper compass of compiling by cutting out any unnecessary detail, and there efforts were rewarded by a saving of \$1,000,000 yearly. He did not think we could get down to a proportionate saving here, but he looked forward to good results. While listening to the discussion of the Bill in the Lower House, he was surprised to see some of the members look upon it and express themselves that it was experimental. Every Bill is experimental and nothing can be attained without experiment. He was sorry that the Lower House had gone back to the old system of reporting debates. He preferred a digest from day to day, but apparently the pressure from both sides of the House was so great that it had to be abandoned so that there will be no saving at all. With regard to the Legislative printing, and speaking from experience, he believed a very considerable saving would be effected if the principles of the Bill were carried into effect. The Government could withstand the pressure from party supporters who think they have a claim. The difficulty in the past was that Government printing was given to offices where other work was done, with the result that Government printing was held over to the last, customs returns, etc., at times being months behind in delivery, and all the offices he said, were offenders in this case. With regard to filling the position of King's Printer he believed it was an easy matter to get a competent man or men, and felt sure that the results of the first year would

justify the introduction of the measure before the House.

HON. MR. GIBBS suggested that the word "pleasure" in Section 3 of the Bill be crossed out, and the words "good behaviour" submitted. He stated that he supported the principles of the Bill, and felt assured that the House would co-operate in the effecting of economies.

HON. MR. MORINE, in replying to Hon. Mr. Gibbs, said that the Government was not disposed to accept his suggestion. He added that the person who should be appointed may prove incompetent or become infirm and because of the wording suggested could not be removed from office. This, Mr. Morine felt, would not commend itself to the Lower House, and wished the words "who shall hold office during pleasure" to remain unaltered.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH moved as an amendment to Section 4 that the words "for 10 years or upwards" be added. He thought it would assist the Government in securing a competent person.

HON. MR. MORINE moved as an amendment to Section 9, that the word "Legislature" be substituted for the word "Parliament." The Committee then rose and reported having passed the Bill with some amendments. Report was received and adopted and the Bill ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

The Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to amend 12 and 13, George V., Chapter 20, entitled, 'An Act respecting War Pensions,'" was deferred.

The House next went into Committee of the whole on Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Game and Island Fisheries Board." Hon. Mr. Murphy in the chair.

HON. MR. MORINE said that the object was to consolidate the Beaver Acts and the various Game Acts. The

Act, he added, had been prepared under the direction of the late Government by Mr. Harry Winter, and was correct in form., No new principles were introduced but the Act as it now stood was clearer and consolidated. The Committ. reported the Bill with some amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

House adjourned until 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

FRIDAY, August 1, 1924.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. MORINE tabled report of the Comptroller and Auditor General for Revenue and Appropriations Accounts for period ending June 30th, 1923. Report of C. and A.G. on Section 33 of Audit Act up to February 28, 1924 and Supplementary Report on same to date.

On motion the following Bills were read a third time and passed, namely:

1. Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 3 of 11 George V., entitled 'An Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland.'"

2. Bill entitled "An Act to amend 14 Georve V., Chapter 7, entitled, 'An Act for the Encouragement of Ship-building.'"

3. Bill entitled, "An Act to amend Chapter 24 of the Consolidater Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of payment of certain fees and charges by stamps.'"

4. Bill entitled "An Act to further and protect the Activities and Interests of the Boy Scouts Association in the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies."

5. Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery."

6. Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Game and Inland Fisheries Board."

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to confirm an agreement with the Newfoundland Milling Company, Limited." Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. ELLIS asked if the place where the mill is to be erected was decided upon.

HON. MR. MORINE replied that a site was under consideration on the Southside of St. John's, and it was understood the mill would be erected there. The Committee reported the bill with slight amendment and with the unanimous consent of the House it was then read a third time and passed.

House went into Committee on the War Pensions Bill. Hon. Sir M. G. Winter in the chair.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH in reference to section one, increasing the number of the commission from two to three, said that in 1920 when the number had been reduced he had strongly opposed the changing of the number from three to two. This he did on the grounds that at times one or other of the members would be absent from the country and sometimes both of them. On one occasion when this happened temporary appointments had been made, and considerable expense incurred which would have been avoided had the number not been reduced. Sir Patrick asked if the members were to serve gratuitously and was assured by Hon. Mr. Morine that that was the case. He presumed one of the new appointments was at the suggestion of the G.W.V.A., and asked if anything was being done to bring the Pensions Act into conformity with the suggestions of that body at their recent convention. He was particularly interested in this Bill because he had had several years experience on the Board, and had been instrumental in introducing legislation as re-

gards this Pension Board. Sir Patrick said that a good many hard cases had resulted from disagreement between the Pensions Commissioners and returned men as to the claim of the latter for pensions and as to their disabilities by which there were disputes regarding whether they were due to war service or aggravated by war service or preceded war service. He thought that while the Pensions Commissioners were doing their best to act generously, yet they suffered from the fact that the Pensions Act limited their powers, and he thought the Act required more elasticity, and in particular with men suffering from tuberculosis. A good idea would be to do as has been done in Canada that is appoint a legislative committee to go fully into the whole matter, and give sympathetic consideration to the many hard cases that exist. Every week he has received requests from men for assistance from the Patriotic Association with which he had also been connected, and some provision would have to be made immediately to look after their wants. Another question that arises is as to the Sudbury Hospital. He called attention to the resolution of the G.W.V.A. Conference passed as a result of reports by three separate committees of that body which had investigated conditions existing there. Despite the report of the Committee, however, indicting the members of the staff, all from the Superintendent down have received an increase in salary. Though not contending they were not entitled to it, he thought it an anomaly when all were under a cloud as they were.

HON. A. B. MORINE begged to be allowed to make a few remarks regarding some of the statements made by the previous speaker. The increase of salaries at Sudbury Hospital referred to was because this Government had put civil servants on the salary

basis they had previously enjoyed before the cut last year. It is the Government's intention to revise bad conditions, when found existing, and already they have appointed a Committee originally consisting of three members, but now of two, both members of the Executive. One of the original members has been dropped because as this commission was to report to the Government and he was not a member of the Government it was thought unnecessary. Added to this was the fact that it had been claimed in some quarters that he was one of the original accusers so it was thought best to proceed with the other two. The idea of the appointment of a Joint Committee of both Houses to enquire into War Pensions conditions was one he did not favor as being an evasion by an Executive of its duties. Such inquiry ought to be by the Executive itself and if that proposal revealed necessity for inquiry into the Pensions Act it would be undertaken by the Government. With regard to the last speaker's remarks re hardships existing in some cases in the matter of claims for pensions, he felt the Government and Legislature would be disposed to give the most liberal treatment to all who went to the war, and would look favorably upon unfit men who did their bit, because they encouraged others to go and helped in a great many ways by doing work that released a strong man for harder service elsewhere.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH. With regard to the appointment of a Legislative Commission he did not agree with Hon. Mr. Morine, that such an appointment was merely the evasion of Government responsibility. In the case of the Loggers Bill in the Lower House it was referred to a Legislative Committee, and it was not proposed that the Government was shirking or evading responsibility.

HON. MR. MORINE said this was a

different matter altogether. The one was dealing with public moneys while the loggers' bill was dealing with money of a private concern.

Referring to section 2 of the Act Mr. Morine stated it referred to bonuses which were granted two or three years ago for one year only, but were continued to be paid ever since, and would be up to June 30, 1925, and probably thereafter. These bonuses which were after the Canadian system were being paid illegally, and the amendment was to legalize the payments.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH said the same thing occurred in Canada which resulted in a conflict between the two branches of the Legislature. The pensions were increased 50 per cent. and paid from year to year. Last year at Ottawa the Legislature decided to make the bonus permanent, but the Senate objected and thought two years more sufficient when the bonuses should be dropped. There was no reason why we should not adopt the Canadian system, and if the Canadians reduced bonuses we would probably do the same, but we should not do so until careful investigation was made on all sides.

The Committee reported the bill without amendment and with the consent of the House it was read a third time and passed.

The House then adjourned until Tuesday next at 4 p.m.

TUESDAY, Aug. 5th, 1924.

House met at 3.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. President read message from the House of Assembly announcing the passage by that body of the Council's amendment to the Game and Island Fishery Board Bill.

Also message accompanying Bill respecting Salaries of Civil Servants requesting the Council's concurrence therein.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Morine said bill was read a first time, and with the unanimous consent of the House a second time.

HON. MR. MORINE stated the bill is for the purpose of repealing the Statute which subjected the salaries of Civil Servants to a certain percentage of reduction.

The Government had found that through evasions of the Audit Act attempts had been made from time to time to supplement the salaries of certain servants. This had led others to clamour and the result had been increases by bonuses and overtime and other illegalities. The salaries had now been put on the former basis and will be left at the amounts rated by the Legislature with no additions whatever.

SIR P. T. McGRATH was of the opinion that a step further could be made and the salaries standardized. He said it was a public scandal that while a cut in the salaries of the Civil Servants was under consideration, an increase had been made in the salaries of Government officials connected with the Railway and Dry Dock, in some cases the increase making the salaries equivalent to that received by the Chief Justice.

MON. MR. MORINE said that the more he saw of the Public Service the more he was astounded at the looseness which had crept in on every side. He said as late as 1919 a Committee appointed to enquire into this department had made a rather extensive report, but nothing had been done. For the past five years, he stated, matters had been growing steadily worse. He agreed that a remedy was needed at once, but just how it could be effected was a question. The method of payment because of necessity in the past was wrong. Salaries, he continued, should be graded according to office held and work done. As an example of irregularities, the

salaries of stenographers, Mr. Morine stated, might range anywhere between \$600.00 and \$3,000.00 with bonuses and pickings, etc., and in the case of minor clerks, it happened that those who were doing similar work were receiving entirely different salaries. Mr. Morine's own opinion with regard to this, he said, was the Civil Servants ought to be employed in Classes not in Departments. Then a third class clerk employed by the Government, attached to one department, and who had become familiar with the work there, or if there were more work in another department, could be removed to it. He then cited a case of a stenographer who had been engaged by a Minister and who refused to work for a Deputy. That, he thought, was the wrong spirit to have. If employees did not feel that they were the servants of the Government and working for the good of the country, others must be found who would undertake the work. There was much work to be done, Mr. Morine continued, and so few workers to do it, but he hoped that some method of classification would be brought about.

He considered the matter of the salaries of the Railway and Dry Dock officials most extraordinary, and promised that the matter would be carefully gone into in a short time.

HON. MR. MURPHY said it was no good overlooking matters at this juncture, but that facts must be stared in the face. He considered that the country was in a desperate state and desperate remedies were needed if the country's finances were to be improved. The borrowing of money, he thought, could not continue much longer. In connection with the Civil Service, he added, that we could not afford to be particular—we were over-staffed and should reduce, and the overpaid should be cut down. It was, he continued, a difficult matter to bring about these changes and would make those who undertook to clean

up very unpopular. A reduction, he said, must be brought about nevertheless, and if men could be found to undertake this thankless job they would have his sympathy and assistance.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to come before a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

A message was read from the House of Assembly stating that they had appointed a committee consisting of the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Duff, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Cramm, Mr. Grimes to deal with the Liquor Bill requesting the appointment of a similar committee from the Legislative Council to consider jointly the said Bill.

HON. MR. MORINE in reference to this Bill, stated that there were two bills before the House of Assembly—the first was an Act respecting Alcoholic Liquors and containing a clause repealing the Prohibition Act, the second aimed at an alternative measure viz. to allow alcoholic liquors to be used as a beverage, as well as a medicine, but controlled as regards amounts, places and hours. In the main provisions are based on the Quebec Liquor Act but stricter and better. The Bill provides for the sale of wine and beer at meals in hotels. A board of Control taking the place of the Controller, will have all jurisdiction of the sale of spirits. If the Bill passes through in suggested form branches will also be established outside St. John's but only in areas of not less than 5000 people in which a majority of the electors request the establishment of such branch. And there would be no more branches in any constituency than that constituency had members of the House of Assembly. Mr. Morine explained that in view of the lateness of the session and the perplexities and wideness of opinion with regard to this question arising from

this important Bill the House of Assembly referred it to a joint select committee. At the same time a second bill has been introduced amending the Prohibition Act and proposing that the Controller may issue permits to hotels to serve wine and beer with meals at tables this provision being taken out of the larger bill. The reason for dealing with hotels in this manner he said, as to increase the tourist traffic. During past years there had been many attempts made to get a first class hotel. Our tourist season is short, and the proposition could not be entertained unless wine and beer were sold. The Government thought the Fishery Board chiefly, have been looking into the question of our inland fisheries and the question of motor roads, and a loan bill will likely be introduced in the Lower House in connection with motor roads, fish hatcheries, hotels and other attempts to stimulate tourist traffic.

HON. MR. MILLEY asked if it were intended to hire out our salmon pools to wealthy sportsmen.

HON. MR. MORINE replied that the rod licenses would be increased, but that matter could be considered when it became important. He thought that there were many rivers in the Island which would afford entertainment for hundreds of tourists to which we seldom resorted.

It is realized that the first requirement is a good hotel in St. John's where visitors may stay prior to making arrangements for their trips to fishing places outside. He had been told by Mr. H. D. Reid that he had been assured by a company running hotels in Canada and the United States that if they could sell wine and beers, they would be willing to come down and operate a hotel in St. John's. Others have arrived at the same conclusion.

Besides the large or parent hotel a

number of smaller ones built on the bungalow type would be situated at suitable places where the tourist could graduate to the salmon pools and other places of interest. This would eliminate overcrowding at the main hotel. Whilst the whole idea is not yet sharply defined it would greatly advance matters if a bill were passed at this session of the House permitting beers and light wines to be sold over the tables at those hotels. This is a necessity as an inducement to the tourist traffic and the hotels must be under the management of experts at their business.

The successful hotels in Canada and the United States are chain hotels so that when a guest leaves one hotel pleased he is sure to proceed to another of the same chain. So, if the committee reports favourably on the smaller bill it will put this project ahead twelve months, otherwise we must give up hope of reviving the tourist traffic for another year.

The two bills have been introduced into the Lower House and they have requested that a committee of the Legislative Council be formed in conjunction with them. He therefore proposed the appointment of five members from the Council to act with the Joint Committee.

Hon. President nominated the following:—

Hon. Mr. Morine, Hon. Sir Patrick McGrath, Hon. Mr. Milley, Hon. Mr. Ellis, Hon. Mr. Steer.

The House then adjourned until Friday next at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, Aug. 12, 1924.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. MORINE moved first reading of Bill respecting Salaries of Civil Servants.

HON. D. A. RYAN wished to bring to the notice of the House the incon-

venience caused by closing of the Postal Telegraph Offices in the Outports at 6 p.m. During the summer months there are more messages sent between 7 and 8 o'clock than at any other time, and although he has repeatedly brought the matter before the notice of past Ministers of Posts nothing has so far been done. He hoped Mr. Morine would take the matter up with the Government as it was of great importance to business men all over the country.

SIR. P. T. McGRATH said it was easy to understand why the Postal Telegraphs didn't pay when the Government offices closed at 6 p.m. and Anglo Telegraph offices remained open until 8. As a whole the Postal Telegraph operators were not a hard worked body, and he understood the reason why the Government had been reluctant to grapple with the matter was because a strike was threatened. In Canada a similar state of affairs had arisen a few weeks ago, but the Government quickly disposed of it. The Government should not be terrorized by this sort of action but should take prompt action.

HON. MR. MORINE thanked Hon. Mr. Ryan for bringing this matter forward and assured him that it would be instantly considered by the Government. He undertook to say that he misunderstood his colleague if before to-morrow morning the order did not go out. This might be a very good opportunity, as far as a strike was concerned, to reduce the staff that was already twice too large. This service was one that required moving in, and it had already engaged the attention of the Government. Very drastic reforms were necessary and if a strike took place it might be all the better for the Government, so that these drastic reforms might be carried out. Mr. Morine asked Mr. Ryan as to the period he thought the offices should be kept open, and was inform-

ed from the first of May to the end of the year.

House went into Committee on the Bill, Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH proposed giving the House some figures to show how the cost of the Civil Service had grown within the past ten years.

In 1914 the total of Salaries paid to civil servants was \$780,000. It was now \$1,800,000, or an increase of over one million dollars. Coming to the Postal Telegraphs' Department we find that the salaries paid amount to \$310,000, and in the Post Office Department \$305,000, or a total of \$620,000, while the revenue collected only amounts to \$400,000 altogether.

The increase in these two Departments amounts to 320 per cent., while the increase in the Customs Department for the same period is only 26 per cent.

These figures, he thought, made a strong case for a complete revision of the civil list and the sooner it was done the better it would be for all.

HON. MR. MORINE took the position that in this country these services had never been looked on as money making, but as public conveniences. The receipts and distribution of mail were not an indication that such office was not a paying institution. With regard to the increase in the salary list this was another case where figures lie. He ventured to say that the million dollars did not represent any better pay in view of existing circumstances than in 1914, as the increased cost of living must be more than 100 p.c. The increased cost may not show up proportionally, the reason was that the individual with \$500.00 a year in 1914 was further advanced that the man to-day receiving \$1,000.00 a year.

HON. D. A. RYAN offered the opinion that not one-third of the Tele-

graph Offices were self-supporting. Many of these offices could be substituted by telephone service, and if the Government intended to save money they could accept his suggestion. So far as he had learned, some of the people in Bonavista District went further than asking for ordinary telegraph communication, they asked for and were given Marconi stations. In his opinion the trouble was that too much taxation was unnecessarily placed on the few, and old and young were being daily driven from their homes to enrich foreign countries.

HON. MR. GIBBS fully agreed with Mr. Ryan that telephone service would serve in many places where telegraph service is at present being used. To transfer from one to the other, however, was a matter that required serious thought. In his opinion it was practicable to put the whole of Conception Bay under telephone service, and with better results than under telegraph service. He did not, however, agree that because a telegraph station was not a paying concern that it should be abolished. If it were a public utility and only gave benefit to a few it served the purpose intended and could not be considered as a loss.

HON. MR. MORINE agreed with the remarks of Hon. Mr. Gibbs. The idea that every telegraph station should pay was wrong in principle. The benefits secured should count. Reading of the latest marvellous discoveries of Marconi in relation to wireless communication suggested to him that at a no later date would there be no need for telephones or telegraph systems, but instead the radio would take the place of both; science would take the place of losses that present systems cost. As a matter of fact, or as he had read, Marconi had, during a recent experiment, been clearly heard in conversation with a friend in Wales, while he himself was on a

yacht near Australia, and that not on a high powered station but on a light powered, so that he has announced high powered stations will be done away with, and the cost of the service reduced some 90 p.c. In a short while he anticipated that a man's fiancée in America and her love in Asia could converse without the slightest question as to who was speaking and with absolute secrecy as to their conversation.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH thought we would be a good deal older before such expectations would be realized. More than twenty years ago he was with Marconi at Signal Hill when the latter received his first trans-Atlantic signals. He met Mr. Marconi again last year in London and heard him discuss his ideas. He was not quite sure, however, that all said by Mr. Marconi would come to pass so quickly. It would be just as well to wait a while.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and by unanimous consent it went through the third reading and was passed.

Hon. President read a communication from H. E. the Governor granting leave of absence to Hon. S. K. Bell; also messages from the House of Assembly accompanying and requesting concurrence in the Loan Bill, Bill respecting Tax on Goods and Bill re Encouragement of Agriculture; also a message from the Assembly requesting concurrence in amendment to Council's amendment on Printing and Stationery Bill. On motion the Council agreed to this amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Morine and with the unanimous consent of the House the Bill respecting Tax on Goods went through all its stages and was passed without amendment.

With the unanimous consent of hon. members the Bill entitled "An Act to

amend the Revenue Act, 1905," was read a first and second time.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill. Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The Bill was read a third time and passed.

In moving the first reading of the Bill entitled an Act for the Encouragement of Agriculture, **Mr. Morine** stated that the object of the Bill was to do away with two abuses—(1) the appointment of a so-called commission which may have known something of everything else, but which knew nothing whatever about Agriculture; and (2) the seed business, which had been taken out of the hands of those who originally carried on this trade, and turned over to this Department, so that this section of the Department had been turned into a seed shop. The Government, **Mr. Morine** continued not wishing to make two bites of a cherry decided to repeal the whole Act.

The Bill passed its second reading.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill and reported having passed same without an amendment.

The Bill was read a third time and passed.

By unanimous consent the Bill respecting Certain Expenditure to be made under the Loan Act of 1923 was read a first and second time.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH asked what had been done in connection with the laxity in the public service as disclosed by the Hollis Walker report. Had any changes been made, and if so, what different procedure prevails.

MR. MORINE in answering said that owing to the many things which the Government had to deal with, and to the Legislature being in session, it had not been possible to take steps to enquire further into matters. The

Government would much prefer, he added having **Mr. Hollis Walker** to undertake the enquiry into several departments because of the satisfactory manner in which he conducted the enquiry a short time ago, but **Mr. Walker** considered it unwise to come. Enquiries were being pursued, **Mr. Morine** stated, by the firm of **Reid Son and Watson**, and many things were being brought to light and a great deal of effective work done. He was of the opinion that the enquiry into the Department mentioned should not be in the nature of that conducted by **Mr. H. Walker** or by a commission, but rather an enquiry into the system by chartered accountants. The enquiry by **Mr. Walker** had, by showing up much of the looseness, sharpened everyone, **Mr. Morine** thought, and he believed that nothing was being carried on in this department which was not strictly regular.

The Bill went through all stages by unanimous consent and the House adjourned until Thursday at 4 o'clock.

THURSDAY, Aug. 14th, 1924.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

Message was read from the House of Assembly accompanying a Bill respecting Alcoholic Liquors requesting concurrence therein.

On motion of **Hon. Mr. Morine** the Bill was read a first time and with the unanimous consent of the House he moved its second reading.

HON. MR. MORINE:—In his Manifesto to the country, at the outset of the election campaign which resulted in the return to power of the party he led, he who is now Prime Minister included these words:

"But why should the great expense of such a vote be incurred for a mandate to repeal a law admittedly unpopular and ineffective, and enforcement of which has long been openly

abandoned? How could the people intelligently and prudently vote to repeal a measure which might replace it? No such cowardly and expensive expedient shall be resorted to by any Government I shall lead. If empowered by your votes at this election to act in this matter, a measure embodying the repeal of the Prohibition Act, and the principles of an alternative measure, shall be introduced into the Legislature, and be referred to a joint Committee of both Houses, before which Representative people shall have the opportunity to express their views fully and freely; and I shall hope to thus be enabled to procure the enactment of a satisfactory law upon this important matter."

A mandate to repeal the Prohibition Act, was therefore, one clear result of the last general election. Fairly construed, that mandate was that in place of the Prohibition upon the sale of alcoholic liquors as a beverage was to be enacted some measure which should permit legal sale for beverage as well as for medicinal purposes. It is the aim of the Government to implement that mandate according to its understanding of its true intent and meaning of the Bill now before you.

Attention may be drawn to the fact that the Manifesto promised that when the alternative measure was introduced and referred to a joint Select Committee of both Houses, which has been done, an opportunity to fully and freely discuss it would be offered, and that the progress of this Bill is more hasty than was indicated or expected, or than is desirable. The appointment of a Commission of Inquiry, soon after the close of this session, is still intended, and it is hoped that its proceedings will be of value in framing amendments and additions to this measure, but upon earnest consideration of existing conditions, it was felt that no day should be unnecessarily lost in seeking the enact-

ment of a reasonably enforceable law, and so end the carnival of law-breaking in connection with the traffic in alcoholic liquors which commenced with the adoption of the Prohibition Act and has steadily continued and swollen to the present moment, to the knowledge of everybody, and with the aid or acquiescence of authorities who should have enforced the law to the best of their ability. Law-breaking is in itself pernicious, fraught with dire consequences to the morale of the country, aside altogether from the immediate effect of the breach of the broken law, and it is not too much to say that in this Colony more harm is being done by disrespect for all law caused by flagrant breaches of the Prohibition Act than by all the alcoholic liquor consumed in consequence of such breaches. And so the Government has felt compelled to introduce this Bill at this session, promising to consider sympathetically all that a Commission may report hereafter, and to seek at subsequent sessions of the Legislature all amendments that may seem desirable. This, I submit, Sir, is a much better method of proceeding than delay to hear representations to a Committee would be, for the latter is not usually a very satisfactory tribunal, and a Commission will have power to summon and swear witnesses who would not care to come before a joint Select Committee.

REFERENDUM.

It will be objected, also, that as the Prohibition Act was adopted by the people, by referendum, its repeal ought not to take place except as the result of another referendum. But that device is only a means of clearly ascertaining public opinion, and that opinion, we hold, was unmistakably expressed at the recent general election, by frank appeal and unmistakable response. Some will say, other issues complicated question and reply, but so did other issues at the

adoption of Prohibition, when religious and patriotic emotion, and inadequate comprehension of all that was involved, powerfully contributed to the result. Personally, I entertain little respect for the un-British method of transferring responsibility for enacting laws from representatives to the represented themselves, by referendums. These are socialistic contrivances, American in application, and contrary to the sound constitutional principle of representative government, as Britons understand it, that at least for their expert training laws shall be made by chosen representatives supposed to be chosen for their intelligence, and to some extent lawmakers. But whatever may be said in favour of referring to the people themselves a measure so coercive of personal liberty and destructive of individual habits as strict Prohibition threatened to be, nothing so cogent and logical can be said about a measure aimed to restore normalcy, to confer liberty of action, and to end a reign of lawlessness after the high endeavor of Prohibition is universally admitted to have largely failed. A referendum would cost a very large sum of money (perhaps \$100,000), and in any event would cause grave delay. The Government have, therefore, felt compelled to proceed with this measure.

I am not sure that a referendum would not result in a majority for "Prohibition." It would be supported by all still unconvinced enthusiasts, by all moonshiners and smugglers, and not be opposed by those of the "wets," who get now all the alcoholic liquor they want, and very naturally ask why they should change a law which does not distress them. Many people would be too unconcerned to go to the polls. The only voters against Prohibition would be those good citizens who deplore the lawlessness they think it has caused, and who would hope for better conditions

under a reasonably good law regulating the drink traffic.

But, Sir, suppose a referendum resulted in a majority opposing the repeal of the Prohibition Act. No Government has enforced it. No Government which rigidly enforced it could be kept in power. Effective enforcement along our great coastline, bordered by St. Pierre, Cape Breton and Quebec, and with their harbors visited by the ships of many nations—effective enforcement, I say, is physically impossible. Better enforcement than heretofore is possible. A stronger Act, with "teeth in it," as I have been quoted as saying, is possible, but in my considered opinion, an opinion I did not hold when the Prohibition Act was passed, but is based on observation of the experience of British North America since that time, enforcement of a reasonably satisfactory kind cannot take place, in the very nature of things, and it is better to recognize the fact, and act accordingly.

THE PROHIBITION ACT A FAILURE.

As an advocate of laws to aid the enforcement of temperance, I never had any sympathy with the argument, that interference with personal liberty was unjustifiable if for the good of the community. And so I was a Prohibitionist in principle, and voted for and supported the Prohibition Act, both within and without this Legislature. Its most ardent supporters in this Colony have recognized in me, I think, a strong and willing co-worker. It is as a temperance man convinced that the attempt to prohibit has failed, that I support this Act, hoping that it will help to terminate lawlessness, and believing that it will not increase the consumption of spirits, but may cause the substitution of light wines and beers, as beverages instead of alcoholic liquors.

When I say the attempt to prohibit has failed, I do not admit that the Prohibition Act has been honestly tried, and after such trial has failed to effect any of the good its advocates hoped for. It would be more accurate to say that we have failed to have Prohibition; the Prohibition Act has not broken down, for no honest attempt has ever been made to enforce it; it is the Governments of this Colony, since 1915, and the authorities, who have failed to do their duty, who have suffered breaches of the law to prevail, who have, in many cases, and in high places, aided in such breaches, and have calculated on the profits. But to those who will say, "well, give the law an honest enforcement before repealing it," I say that it is, humanly speaking, impossible to obtain an honest continuous attempt at enforcement, and that such an attempt, if made, would fail, for facilities for smuggling, moonshining and bootlegging, are so pervasive that "all the King's horses and all the King's men" could not prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors as beverages in this Colony. So let's recognize facts as they are, and seek to do the good we can.

GOOD RESULTS AND BAD RESULTS

I am not ready to admit that no good results have come from the Prohibition Act, scandalously as it has been treated, to set over against the undoubted evils that have flown from it. The closing of the licensed saloon is admittedly a good result. Nobody worth while wishes the saloon to turn. Street corners do not present the repugnant scenes not uncommon in prewar days. Drunken men are still seen occasionally upon the streets of this city, and their number may be increasing, but they are so infrequent as to challenge a degree of attention they would not have received in saloon days. Then, too, I am hopeful that the closing of the saloon,

the withdrawal of open invitation to drink, may have good effects upon the young which by and by may be attributed to the Prohibition Act. This I admit is speculative only, and over against it may be set the claim that there may have been inculcated in the young a disrespect for law more damaging to them morally than any harm which could be done them by drinking habits. I desire in this connection to pay a tribute of respect to the living and the dead who have advocated Prohibition. It is all too common to hear them called "Fanatics" and "Hypocrites," but I wish to say that the world has reason to thank God for its fanatics, and that if there are hypocrites in the ranks of Prohibition, they are not confined to these ranks. Good men and true, self-sacrificing patriots, sturdy Christians, are also to be found in Prohibition ranks, laboring for the common good, and suffering obloquy and loss of breast high, for their ideals. They may suffer disappointment over the results so far in this country, but if they will give due regard to the advance of temperance in their day, they will thank God and take renewed courage.

DRAFTING THE BILL.

In drafting the measure before you, regard has been had to the Liquor License Act and the Local Option Act, which were law before the Prohibition Act, to the latter Act itself, and to the Quebec Act Respecting Alcoholic Liquor. Something has been drawn from each of them, and while criticism and time will reveal mistakes and omissions, it is believed that this Bill is fairly complete for its purpose. The Alberta Act to provide for Government control and sale of Alcoholic Liquors has been considered also, but has not been followed, in the respects in which it differs from the Quebec Act, for Government Control is a principle of the Alberta Act, while

Board Control is a principle of the Quebec Act, and the measure before you is based on Board Control. Then, in the Alberta Act, all regulations have to be approved by the Governor-in-Council, while under the Quebec Act, and here, the Board can make regulations regarding its own internal economy without interference by the Governor-in-Council. In other words, we have done to the utmost constitutionally permissible limit, as it were, to make the Board non-partisan, to free the Government from responsibility for details, and to place the Board in such a position that success will be its own glory, and failure its own shame, not that of some other body.

In Alberta, permits to buy have to be obtained, for a fee, but no limit is placed on the quantity a person with a permit may buy, while in Quebec, no permit is necessary, but a limit of a bottle is placed on each sale, in which respect this Bill follows and goes beyond Quebec, for here a bottle a day is the limit. I do not understand why Alberta has adopted a system of permits without limiting quantities unless it be that she has whole classes of people to whom alcoholic liquors should not be allowed, and who could not be interdicted for any safely assignable cause. Under this Bill (as well as in both Alberta and Quebec), persons may be interdicted (or blacklisted) from obtaining liquors, upon dependents. The Alberta permit system seems to us too much like script system here, and we saw no good in adopting it.

SALE OF WINE AND BEER.

In Alberta, Quebec and under this Bill, the sale of "Spirits" is confined to Board establishments. In Alberta the sale of wine is also so confined, but the sale of Beer by the glass in licensed clubs and hotels is permitted, while in Quebec wine as well as beer can be sold in these licensed places,

and beer by the glass can be sold in Quebec by the licensed "taverns," so-called, in towns or cities, and by the bottle in licensed grocery stores. In these distinctions, National habits crop out, the Englishman of Alberta inclining to Beer and the French of Quebec leaning to Wine. Under this Bill both wine and beer may be sold by the bottle in hotels and grocery stores, but taverns are not permitted, nor can that quality of beer which comes under this Bill be sold anywhere in this Colony by the glass. To be under this Bill at all, beer must contain three per cent. or upwards by volume of alcohol, while in Quebec the sale of all beer, and in Alberta all beer containing one per cent. or upwards, which, practically, is all Beer, is under control. The reason for not putting the sale of beer with less than 3% of alcohol under this Bill is this, that there are many places, especially in this city, at which so-called "light beer," often including some mineral water in the makeup, and supposed not to contain more than two per cent. of alcohol, by volume, is sold, and it is contended that this sale has tended to decrease the sale of spirits, and that inasmuch as it is not intended to permit the opening here of "taverns," as in Quebec, for the sale of beer by the glass, it is desirable in the interest of temperance that no interferences shall take place with the sale of such light beers. Of course, the vendors will continue to be subject as they are now to penalties for selling over-strength beer. I confess that personally I should have liked that the sale of beer should have come under the control provided by this Bill, and should have been sold under permit, even if it involved the opening of beer taverns, for this would have helped the restrictions of shebeens. It may be that later on this principle will be adopted. It would mean beer in better places. A recent report of the Quebec Liquor

Commission says that "during the last two years, the sale of wine in Quebec has increased six hundred per cent., and the sale of spirits proportionally decreased." We hope a similar result will happen here.

BOARD OF CONTROL.

This Bill provides for a Board of Control of the importation, manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor. In this respect, it follows and improves upon the Prohibition Act, which provided for a Controller, and later, for an Advisory Board, which failed to function. The best Act ever passed would fail if its administration were placed in unworthy or inefficient hands, and the weakest Act would not wholly fail were its administrators worthy and efficient. The failure of our Prohibition Act was due more to Controllers than to the defects of the Act itself. And so the Government have determined to have a Board composed of three experienced men of high reputation, fitted to command the implicit confidence of the people, paid salaries large enough to place them above temptation to graft, and prohibited from engaging in any other occupations. When you consider the onerous nature of their work, the immense detail involved, the money invested, the profits expected, and above all, the responsibility upon them of wise and honest administration, you will not grudge them good pay. Their work will be more onerous and difficult than that of Cabinet Ministers. The men have not been finally chosen, but persons have been discussed, and when the names of the Board are published implicit confidence will be felt in them.

SALE OF SPIRITS.

It is a principle of the Bill that all sales of spirits, for beverage purposes, shall be by the Board or its Agents, in Board establishments, where nothing else may be sold. Wine and beer in bottles may also be sold

in the same places, and in hotels and Clubs holding the Board's permit. Sale anywhere of wine or beer by the glass is not permitted. It is provided that the chief establishment of the Board, and two branches, shall be at St. John's, and that branches may be opened by the Board in areas having a population of five thousand or upwards, a majority of whose electors petition for a branch, which may by the petition be confined to the sale of spirits alone or of wine and beer alone. You will notice that in these particulars, respect has been paid to the principle of local option, and also to the arguments of those who have advocated the sale of wines and beers. The Bill goes further than the old Local Option Act in respecting the will of the electorate, for it throws upon those who desire a branch store the onus of asking for it, and it gives to a majority the right to say no, whereas, in Local Option days, it was the friends of temperance who had to do the uphill work of prohibiting or closing licensed saloons. No more branches may be opened in any electoral district than the number of members it may elect to the House of Assembly.

MEDICINAL USE.

Provision is made in the Bill for a supply of alcoholic liquor for medicinal use in places where no sale as a beverage is permitted. The Board has power to make regulations as to the keep, distribution and sale of liquors for medicine. No scripts will be essential, and the sufferer who needs the medicine will get it for its price without an added charge for a doctor's recipe.

It was an absurdity that under the Prohibition Act, it was easy to get both script and liquor here in St. John's for medicine, where drug stores abound, and medicines of all kinds can be got, while in outports, without doctors and without other

medicines, there was ordinarily no liquor for sale, and if there had been no script to legalize its sale was procurable. If anywhere in this Colony liquor is necessary or valuable as a medicine, it must be in the remote places, and while it cannot be stored for medicine in every place, it will be the duty of the Board (and a difficult task it will be) to provide a convenient stock for medicine as widely as may be practicable.

Incidentally, I wish to draw attention to the provisions for prohibiting that kind of drug store which has sprung up in this city, chiefly for the sale of alcoholic liquors. They can henceforth receive no permit to sell alcoholic liquors. They can obtain alcohol or spirits from the Board only, for compounding with drugs, and if the compound is drinkable as a beverage, the Board may prohibit its sale. Henceforth, there need be no trouble about the sale of Tanlac or similar preparations, for the Board has ample authority under this Bill to put them out of sale. A druggist caught selling prohibited articles can be refused alcohol or spirits for his trade, and be at the same time subject to the other penalties provided for the sale of alcoholic liquors.

SCOPE OF BILL.

The Bill includes alcohol, spirits (brandy, rum, whiskey and gin) wine and beer containing three per cent. and over by volume of alcohol under the general title of "Alcoholic liquor," and provides that alcohol and spirits (for beverage purposes) can be sold in Board establishments only, in which wine and beer will also be for sale. No consumption on Board premises is legal. No sale must take place therein between six o'clock in the evening and nine next morning, or on Saturday afternoon, Sundays, holidays or election days.

HOTELS, TOURIST HOTELS AND CLUBS.

Hotels, tourist hotels and clubs may be permitted by the Board to sell bottled wine and beer, at dining tables, during meals, to travellers and members. No permit may be given to a hotel in any town, village or settlement not included in an area, a majority of whose electors had asked for a branch establishment of the Board to be opened therein. In other words, there is to be local option as to sale of wine and beers in a hotel. But as regards Tourist Hotels, so-called, they may be permitted anywhere, provided that they may not sell to any person ordinarily residing within ten miles. The idea is that they shall sell only to those who are travellers from abroad, for sport or health. This is the definition:—

"The words Tourist Hotel mean building provided with special accommodation to provide food and lodging for travellers, and where such accommodation is habitually furnished, and which is specially and mainly for the accommodation of travellers from places outside the Colony visiting it for sport and health, and which the Board is satisfied is desirable for the promotion of tourist traffic."

PERSONS UNDER DISABILITY.

Except for medicinal purposes, no kind of alcoholic liquor may be sold

- (a) To any person who has not reached the age of twenty-one
- (b) To any keeper or inmate of a disorderly house.
- (c) To any person already convicted of drunkenness or of any offense caused by drunkenness.
- (d) To any person who habitually drinks alcoholic liquor to excess and to whom the Board has, after investigation, decided to prohibit the sale of such liquor upon application to the Board by the

husband, wife, father, mother, brother, sister, guardian, employer or other person depending upon or in charge of such persons. The prohibition of any person by the Board may be removed by the Board.

- (e) To any Esquimaux or Indian.
- (f) To any Constable on duty, except by authority of his superior officer.
- (g) To any inmate of a Lunatic Asylum, Poor House or Hospital.

Besides the power of the Board, quoted above, to "blacklist" a person for excessive drinking, there has been re-enacted that power which the old License Act gave a Stipendiary Magistrate to blacklist. Sales of spirits or wine, but not of beer, may be made for medicinal purposes to any of the aforementioned interdicted or prohibited persons. The sale of wine and beer on passenger trains and coastal steamers by persons specially authorized, may be permitted by the Board, to travellers, at meals, but not otherwise. There are exceptions to the Bill providing for sale of alcohol or brandy and rum to dentists, and alcoholic liquor to druggists for use in their work, but they must buy from the Board, and may not sell it except when compounded with drugs. There are stringent provisions against adulteration of liquors, which are to be used as beverages. Only the Board may import alcoholic liquor. By permission of the Board, wine and beer may be manufactured, but such wine and beer can only be sold to the Board, or to a person holding a permit from the Board (such as a hotel-keeper). The Board may appoint its own agent at the manufactory, and delivery may be made directly to the purchaser, the price being collected by or for the Board. The manufacturer must pay a duty of five per cent. to the Board.

All sales by a manufacturer must be accounted for to the Board.

All prosecution under the Bill are to be adjustable by the Board, before Stipendiary Magistrates, and penalties not less than ten dollars nor more than two hundred, for a first offence, with imprisonment in default of payment, and not less than two hundred dollars nor more than one thousand, for a second or subsequent offence, may be imposed. Appeals must be to the Supreme Court, but all remedies by writs of quowarranto, mandamus, injunction and certiorari to remove proceedings, are taken away in the interest of speedy trial and prompt judgment.

ONLY JUSTIFICATION FOR PROHIBITION.

Some people (a small minority, I think, of whom I am not and never was one) object to the drinking of alcoholic liquor of any kind, even in moderation, as a sin, and to these people any measure, permitting its legal sale is anathema. A very large number of people (of whom I have been one and still am one), who were proved in 1915 to be a majority in this Colony, hold it proper to prohibit its sale as a beverage, even to moderate drinkers, for the purpose of ending the terrible curse to the community caused by drunkenness, if possible. The Prohibition Act was regarded with the individual liberty, even of moderate drinkers, but justifiable only if it ended or greatly modified drunkenness and its attendant wretchedness, and not justifiable if merely an annoying interference, not doing great good, but causing many evils, and alienating the sympathies of many estimable people with all forms of temperance endeavor, ranging them on the side of lawbreakers of many kinds and degrees. A very large part of the Colony's population were from the outset opposed to Prohibition some, it is true, because they were

"wets," but many because they were experienced and wise enough to foresee evils to which ardent prohibitionists were blind, evils which have undoubtedly followed. The first evils were adulterated intoxicants and wide-spread moonshining, then came bootlegging and smuggling, and then came government acquiescence and partnership in law evasion, and then wide-spread, almost universal law-breaking, not only concerning alcoholic liquors, but many other matters of daily life also, and if adulterating and moonshining have decreased of late, as I am inclined to think they have, it is largely because smuggling has been unchecked, and the Controller's office has, until recently, been wide open for consumers. The Colony's Government consented to become a partner with the rum brigade of America, and to aid the rum pirates and bootleggers of a continent to break the laws of sister states, similar in principle so that we had so unctuously adopted as our own. Well, Sir, this Bill is based on the proposition that the endeavor to prohibit alcoholic liquor as a beverage in this Colony has failed, has brought great evils in its train, and that it must be abandoned in an attempt to bring about better conditions in this respect than exist to-day. This Bill will not initiate the sale of liquor as a beverage, it will legalize it. We have failed to make practices conform with the law, and this Bill aims to make the law conform with better practices. We cannot prohibit, therefore we seek to regulate. We hope to enlist on the side of law enforcement that large body of moderate drinkers and thinkers who have been out of sympathy with prohibition, and with their aid to rigidly enforce a law which, while it provides reasonable facilities for moderate drinking, aims to make immoderate drinking impossible, and drunkenness a forgotten vice.

NOTABLE PROVISIONS.

I wish to draw particular notice to the following provisions in this Bill:

No person shall:—

(1) Possess a still or other implement of a kind commonly used for the manufacture of alcoholic liquor (except a person holding a permit of the Board to manufacture wine and beer), and the possession of such a still or implement shall be prima facie proof of a violation hereof, and unless the innocence of the accused is proved to the satisfaction of the Magistrate, he shall be held to be guilty of a violation of this section, and shall be liable to imprisonment, without the option of a fine, for three months for the first offence, and for six months for a second or subsequent offence; or

(2) Consume any alcoholic liquor in any public place; or

(3) Be in an intoxicated condition in any public place; or

(4) Sell any alcoholic liquor to any person apparently under the influence of alcoholic liquor; or

(5) Permit drunkenness to take place in any house or on any premises of which he is the owner, tenant or occupant; or

(6) Permit or suffer any person apparently under the influence of alcoholic liquor to consume any alcoholic liquor in any house or on any premises of which the first-named person is owner, tenant or occupant; or

(7) Give any alcoholic liquor to any person apparently under the influence of alcoholic liquor.

"Public Place" includes any place, building or conveyance to which the public has or is permitted to have access, and any place of public resort, including any shop or store in which any goods are exposed for sale, but not a hotel, club or banquet in respect of which a permit has been granted hereunder.

These strike boldly at offences long deplored. They will terminate happenings on our streets all too common of late. Liberty—not license—is the meaning of this Bill, and those who misuse it will be punished.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

In the Joint Select Committee on this Bill, a repeal of the Prohibition Act, and the substitution of a measure allowing the sale of alcoholic liquor as a beverage, was adopted by a large majority, without any party distinction. On two succeeding days, opportunities to discuss the principle and details of the Bill were given. On the first occasion, one citizen only made helpful suggestions as to details, and on the occasion deputations were heard, who intentionally avoided all discussion of details, but made various suggestions as to why the Bill should not be proceeded with at this session. Some of the female speakers confined themselves to familiar arguments in favor of temperance, but not one of these attempted to show in any way how temperance could be advanced by allowing a continuance of present lawless conditions, or how those conditions could be ended. The male speakers were only in agreement on the plea for delay, but were not unanimous in their objects in asking delay, and upon the whole it appeared as though they pleaded for delay not to improve the Bill, but to defeat any measure negating the principle of Prohibition, for instance, one said that a mandate had made Prohibition law, and "British fair play" required that it should only be repealed by another mandate, but when asked if by this he meant that referendum, costing perhaps one hundred thousand dollars, should be held to decide this question, his answer was inconclusive, and another prominent associated speaker said "Yes," and yet another said "No, not necessarily," and made the remark which implied that he wished that an

opportunity should be afforded, by delay, to create a public agitation, during which it could be decided whether a referendum should or should not be held; by which he really meant, I think, that he would favor a referendum if sure its results would be as he wanted, and oppose it if he thought the result would be in favor of repeal. The plea most strongly insisted on was for delay, upon the ground that the Premier's Manifesto had promised an "ample" opportunity to discuss the details of an alternative measure to Prohibition, and such an opportunity had not been afforded, to the outports especially. The Premier's reply was, that the opportunity already offered, and which would be extended, if need be, had not been availed of in the slightest degree by those present, or by others, to be helpful as to details, and it had not been argued that by any greater delay any really valuable suggestions could be hoped for. It was the intention to appoint a Commission of Inquiry after the Bill passed into law, and all suggestions worth while could be added to the law by way of amendment, with the advantage gained from experience of the working of the new law. He could not see that present lawless conditions should be allowed to continue, and felt that some attempt to regulate existing practices now lawless ought to be made without a delay which could do no real good. He had promised to repeal the Prohibition Act, had made that at least perfectly clear on every platform he had spoken from, and felt he was elected to "clean up," if he could, this dirtiest of all offences in the Colony.

NOT IN GOOD FAITH.

Upon the whole, I was impressed with this conviction, that the arguments for a referendum and for delay were not made in good faith, in this sense, that they were made by people who had no thought whatever of

supporting any Bill not strictly prohibitory in its nature, that what they really wanted was a measure making the Prohibition Act stricter, and more readily enforceable, and that nothing short of this would in any sense or degree meet their desires. They were, I thought, not asking a delay to make the details of this Bill more desirable, but to give an opportunity for emotional appeals against it, during which its details would be misrepresented, and rethorical exaggerations would be made. In the course of the discussion, I put forward this proposition:—I said, “many of our population are uncompromisingly opposed to the principle of Prohibition, and regard it as an unjustifiable interference with personal liberty. They have no sympathy with its enforcement. Many who favored Prohibition are for various reasons now convinced that it is unenforceable. Composed as it is at present, a majority of members of the Assembly of the Prohibition Act designed to make it stricter. As it is, it is a hopeless failure, a breeder of all forms of lawlessness. Is it not, then, preferable than an attempt should be made to pass a law regulating an existing traffic now lawless, in the hope that a reasonable measure of regulation may command the sympathy and support of the vast majority of our people, and so make the law enforceable, thereby at least decreasing lawlessness, decreasing moonshining, decreasing smuggling, and possibly also decreasing the consumption of spirits.” That, Sir, is in brief the justification for this bill, and is why I ask the House to pass it.

AMUSING ASSERTIONS.

I was much amused by the remarks of one ardent speaker before the Joint Committee, who argued (1) in favor of the “old fashioned open saloon,” as opposed to buying a bottle under this Bill for private consumption, (2) that

hotels would be more prosperous without the privilege of selling wines and beer to travellers at dining tables during meals, citing in support the great increase of hotels in American cities since Prohibition was made law, and (3) the completeness of Prohibition in Nova Scotia, of which Province both he and I are natives. Why, Sir, if any argument of temperance workers is familiar to our ears, it is that the open saloon, with its bright lights, its good cheer and its treating habits, was the bane of the world, and yet in the eyes of the speaker I could almost see enthusiasm for the good old days when they existed. It is generally admitted that drunkenness in our streets is not so offensively exhibited as before the Prohibition Act. The very speaker to whose remarks I am referring asserted that a decrease in arrests for drunkenness had resulted from the Act. It is also generally admitted that the wives and children of manual laborers and artisans are better clothed and fed than in the days of the “good old fashioned saloon.” It will not, however, be generally admitted that these improved conditions are due to any scarcity in the liquor supply. Moonshining, smuggling, and “scrips,” and the ease with which (in the near past, if not now) supplies could be got, even from the Controller’s office, negative that argument. In so far as improvement is due to Prohibition, it is ascribable in the main to the closing of the open saloons, with their invitations to the unwary good fellows who went in to get a drink, treated and was treated, and remained there until his week’s pay was gone. Many people say with deep conviction that the closing of such saloons is the only good which has done from the Prohibition Act. As for the increase of hotels in great cities, it is due, of course, to increase of population, of business, and perhaps to restlessness since Prohibi-

tion, on the part of those who in the past stayed quietly at home, or were habitués of "good old fashioned saloons." Hotels in great cities, to which people must go, and hotels in far off places, to which people will only go for sport, or health, or for a vacation, are very different propositions. There, they must exist, here they can only exist for special reasons. The tourists we wish to attract here are those who at home live luxuriously, who can eat and drink there the things they like, and who will not come to the comparatively limited food and accommodation we can now give them. Hotel operators have offered to come here to operate hotels if permitted to sell wine and beer to other guests, and have refused to come if not permitted, and these men are better authorities on these matters than the Reverend gentleman who misunderstood the significance of the hotel figures he quoted. As for Nova Scotia, I desire to say that I am not convinced of the completeness of Prohibition there, but that long before Prohibition was adopted, Nova Scotia, with its "wigwammed slopes," was the banner temperance province of British North America, and has not greatly changed in this respect in the half century I can remember it.

DEBATE IN ASSEMBLY.

The discussions amongst members of the Joint Select Committee, and the debates in the Assembly, presented certain notable, one might rather say, reasonable, features. Not one man said a word in defence of the Prohibition Act or its effects. Not one man, so far as I can recall, advocated its amendment and enforcement. Not one of the three men who refused to sign the Committee report in favour of this Bill proposed an amendment or an alternative in Committee, or in any way either criticized it favorably or unfavorably. In the debate in the Assembly, the opposition

to the Bill has been confined to pleas for delay, but the pleaders even there indicated no way in which they thought the Bill could be made better, or suggested any better Bill. The majority of the advocates for delay had been delaying ever since 1921 over the report made by the Commission appointed by the Squires Government in that year. One was a member of governments that for seven years aided in the violation of the Prohibition Act, and others were supporters of those governments through all those years. The majority of the objectors took part or supported the scandalous misconduct of the Squires government, in this regard, from 1919 to its fall in 1923, and now their only contribution to the debates on this Bill is an appeal for delay.

COMMISSION REPORT, 1921.

I propose to publish as an addenda to my speech the Report of the Royal Commission appointed in 1921 to inquire into the operation of the Prohibition Act. It is a remarkable document for many reasons. The Commission was unanimous in its findings. In the quality of its membership it was a strong Commission, professionally, intellectually, denominationally, and in breadth of view. I agree with its findings as to matters of fact, and in almost every one of its recommendations. It is a remarkable fact that I did not read the report until I had completed the draft of the Bill now before you, yet with few exceptions the recommendations in the report are reflected in the Bill and more also. Dope, moonshine, smuggling—these followed one another, says the report, as results of the Prohibition Act, and finally the report recommended that every family, sick or well, should be allowed spirits, wine and beer every three months. No stronger temperance men than Dr. Levi Curtis and Dr. Jones were ever known in this Colony

yet their hands are to that report. The evils they deplored admittedly existed, the legislation they recommended was urgently needed, and yet the men who pigeon-holed that report, who suppressed its publication, and never attempted to carry it out, are posing to-day as temperance advocates, and pleading for delay. "Manana"—"to-morrow" should be the badge of their party.

Up from Port Union has come upon this matter a voice as from one long politically dead. Sir Wm. Coaker has sent an incoherent cry for delay. He wants "a bottle twice a month, and light wines and beers for travellers," and he threatens dire things to the Government if it permits "any further departure from the principles of temperance." This from one who in 1920 agreed that his government should sell \$485,000 worth of liquor "for sickness." This from a man who kept Meaney in office as Controller. This from one who aided the Colony to become a base for rum-running into the United States. This from a member of the Government which shelved the Curtis-Jones report. This from one who for many years arbitrarily controlled the government under which the Prohibition Act became a scandal and a reproach, the friend of moonshiners, and the partner of rum-runners. The hypocrisy of it all is not the least revolting part.

PLEAS FOR DELAY.

Delay to permit the holding of a Referendum (if that be desirable) is a reasonable request, but we do not think a Referendum desirable. But delay to consider details is not reasonable, not desirable, and ought not to be granted. How can the complexity of this Bill be intelligently discussed before it has been enacted and published. Then it can be seen in working, and understood, and all desirable amendments be enacted.

I cannot agree, therefore, that there

are any merits in the plea for delay, to discuss the details of this Bill. In the first place, the details are necessarily many and technical, and competent criticism is only possible by experts, and by those enlightened by the actual working out of the Act. Popular discussion of the details would be a confusion. In the second place, the Commission of Inquiry which will be appointed will be a better tribunal for hearing criticism of details than this Legislature can possibly be. In the third place, the effort which has to be made to secure tourist traffic cannot abide delay. If hotels and motor roads are to be built, for any traffic even in 1926, they must be initiated now, and delaying this Bill means delaying a great enterprise, calculated to afford labor now, and a profitable industry, I may well call it afterwards. There are some narrowminded people who speak of tourists as though they were all lost souls, people of the baser sort, with "guns" in their hands and flasks in their hip pockets, but the tourists we shall aim for, are sportsmen, lovers of fine scenery, capitalists with eyes open for investments, not mere trippers, but cultivated and capable citizens who have time, money and desire to see this fine little out of the way part of Paradise. Then, my fourth objection is this: Admittedly a state of almost universal lawlessness exist in this connection, and moonshining and smuggling are rampant. They bring other lawless practices in their train, especially disrespect for all law. The mandate to this Government, given by the people, is "Clean Up: Keep Clean", and to this end we ask you to make law of this Bill, and leave to us the enforcement of it, aided, as we shall be, by all good citizens. I confess I cannot understand, with the charity I wish to accord to them, the excited opposition of certain good people to this Bill, in defense of the bare bones of a measure falsely

called Prohibitory, but which nobody obeys, nobody respects, nobody defends, and which "all the King's horses and all the King's men" could not make a vital, living law.

At the risk of worrying you, there are two more points in this connection that I feel I should speak to you about, and through you to the public; one is the incapacity displayed by Prohibitionists since the Prohibition Act was adopted, in 1915; and the other is the doleful and wholly absurd cry that an orgy of drunkenness will follow the enactment of this Bill.

INACTIVE PROHIBITIONISTS.

When I speak of the inactivity of Prohibitionists, I shall be asked if I and others like me were not of that class, and how we can excuse ourselves from a share of the blame. I shall make no excuse for myself, except to say that my counsel and advice were always freely given to the advocates of Prohibition, who sought it, from 1915 and upwards, and the only reward, by the way, I have received was, that the speakers for a deputation, a few days ago, misrepresented my advice, to insinuate my inconsistency in supporting this Bill. But, Sir, the leadership of the Prohibitionists of the country had been accorded to and accepted by certain individuals; they were regarded by the people at large as leaders in whom confidence could be reposed; and after the Prohibition Act was enacted they continued to pose as such leaders. It is altogether fair, then to regard them as chiefly responsible for the astounding inactivity on the part of temperance advocates that followed upon the adoption of the Act, especially after 1919. Up to that year, "dope," (such as essence of Lemon) and patent medicines (such as Tanlac) were the most troublesome bye-products of Prohibition, and it will be remembered that delegations to the Government demanding prohibitory Orders-

in-Council were frequent. Then came the "Moonshine" trouble, when I, as Minister of Justice, had to advise the Governor to send H.H.S. Cornwall to Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay, to enforce upon certain of my constituents that respect for the law and its officers they were bound to show. Almost immediately after the Squires Government came into power, the charges against the men who had been arrested were dropped, and the Magistrate who had been most prominent in asserting the law was banished, as it were, as a punishment for duty done. The man who brought this about, by the way, was he whose voice is now heard from Port Union in asserting the sacredness of the Prohibition Act. I was defeated in Bonavista Bay, and Magistrate Miffen was banished, and who amongst all the influential Prohibition leaders lifted voice or pen in our defence.

BLATANT DISREGARD OF DECENCY.

Then, the Squires government appointed Meaney Acting Controller, and planned to sell half a million dollars worth of liquors "for medicine", and who denounced them, or said a word publicly by way of protest? Then followed years of broken law, of blatant disregard of decency, the climax of which was the appointment of Meaney as full controller, secretly, it is true, but voted for by men now in opposition of this Bill who are pleading for delay. Last of all came the Act to make this Colony a rival depot with St. Perre for the profit disgrace of helping the rum-runners of a whole continent break its laws. I shall be asked if we are not now helping the same disreputable traffic, and my answer is twofold. We no longer profess a prohibition principle we help others to violate, and in this Bill you will find provisions to make the transshipment traffic open and above-board, not a secret partnership

with criminals, as it was with preceding governments. Well, Sir, during all the saturnalia of broken laws and bad faith since 1919, what was done in defence of prohibition by the men who had been so prominent as Prohibition leaders before the Squires government came into power. They had a vigilance committee in this city, and they consulted lawyers from time to time, but when told they were powerless unless they would raise the issue above party lines (as I, Sir, told them forcibly), they contented themselves with more or less secret action, with calls upon governments who disregarded them, and never took one red-blooded step until they came to life again quite recently, not to oppose the details of this Bill, not to suggest a better one, but to demand what their own friends, in the main, had failed for years to do, amend and enforce the Prohibition Act, and to ask for delay to allow others to consider the details of a Bill which they themselves made no attempt to understand or improve. I do not say that the men I refer to were hypocritical, I readily admit that many of them were sincere men, but I do say that they have not shown the energy, the courage, the zeal, the insight to entitle them to offer advice which we should acquiesce in when conditions have grown so desperately bad as they now are.

WHY SHOULD DRINKING INCREASE.

Turning now to my second point, let me ask why the enactment of this Bill, and the calling of the new law into force, should be followed by an increase in liquor drinking. Moonshining and smuggling are admittedly common, scripts can yet be got, the Controller's department yet sells by the case, there is no scarcity of alcoholic liquor under the law as it is, for those who have money to pay for it. I heard a member of the Assembly

who voted against the passing of this Bill, say, that he saw no hurry for it, because "he could get all the liquor he wanted." I heard another member on the same side express the fear that the cost of Board spirits would lead to a continuance of smuggling, and impliedly suggest that "lowering the price was a most desirable thing." Well, then, if liquor is plentiful and cheap now, why should the passing of this Bill increase the sale, if the price is now to be lowered? May it not, on the contrary, be expected to decrease moonshining and smuggling, by making them unnecessary and dangerous, and result in the regulation of a traffic now wholly lawless, and to a substitution, at least, of good liquor for bad, with many incidental advantages.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION OF 1921.

To His Excellency Sir Charles Alexander Harris, Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and Saint George, Companion of the Honourable Order of the Bath, Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Island of Newfoundland and its Dependencies.

Your Excellency:—The members of the Royal Commission have the honour to return the Commission and to submit with it a statement of their findings and a list of their recommendations.

Its members held very many sessions in St. John's and also a number of sessions at Port Union during which they took very considerable evidence in the form of sworn testimony, answers to interrogatories and police records. They have enquired into and considered the Prohibition Plebiscite Act 1915 and the Amendments thereto; (1) the object, scope and defects thereof; (2) the Adminis-

tration of the said Acts, and (3) the evils which have arisen since the said Acts became law.

The Commission itself sets out the representations contained in two petitions presented to the House of Assembly in the session of 1920; one petition praying for greater stringency in the enforcement of the said Act; and the other praying for the providing of facilities of obtaining alcoholic liquors as beverages under a system of control.

Your commissioners observe that both petitions point out the existence of certain abuses which have developed under the Prohibition Act.

- (1) Sale of "Dope"
- (2) Abuse of prescriptions
- (3) Manufacture of "Moonshine"
- (4) Increase in smuggling of liquors.

The enquiry has satisfied Your Commissioners of the existence of evils which call for adequate remedies.

One of the first evils which grew to considerable dimensions under the Prohibition Act was the use of essences commonly called "Dope" for beverage purposes. The evil, which was apparently inappreciable before Prohibition, gradually grew in spite of partial blacklisting of particular essences until last summer, when sterner steps were taken to suppress it. Up to that time most of the convictions on the charge of being "drunk" and "disorderly" arose from the drinking of "dope". This is borne out by the police records of arrests of "drunks" and "drunks and disorderlies". The numbers are as follows:—

1917	87
1918	95
1919	228
1920	276

In 1917 and 1918, the police records do not show the number of drunks

etc., due to "dope." But in 1919 and 1920, the evil has grown to such a proportion that the police began to keep a record of the causes which were leading to a marked increase in drunkenness and disorderliness.

In 1919 there were over 20 p.c. more arrests than there were in 1917 and 1918 together. This was due mainly to the drinking of "dope." Of the 228 cases in 1919, 160 were due to dope; and of the 276 cases in 1920, 198 were due to dope, showing an increase of nearly 25 p.c. over that of 1919.

The first four months of the present year show a marked decline of drunkenness from this cause. Out of 83 arrests reported by the police 14 were due to dope or an average of 3 1-2 monthly in 1919. This may be attributed partly to the steps taken last summer in blacklisting a large number of essences, the activity of the police and other causes. Last September, the police began to keep a record of the information they elicited from persons arrested for drunkenness as to what they had been drinking. This record points to liquor obtained by smuggling and on scripts as manifest causes of drunkenness.

Further the decline in the use of "dope" in St. John's has seen another evil springing up, viz: the use of "moonshine." The police records show that during six months dating from and including September 1920, to the end of February, 1921, there were four arrests for "moonshine," in the last two months, March and April—there were nine arrests for the same cause.

Another ugly feature shows itself by the comparison of the figures of 1916 and 1920. In 1916 less than one-third of those arrested were disorderly. In 1920 about half of those arrested were disorderly. This makes clear that the use of dope or moonshine creates far more disorder than the use of ordinary liquors.

Your Commissions are satisfied that

the use of moonshine is prevalent not only in St. John's but extends over the Island. Out of the 82 places from which evidence was gathered, 39 reported the manufacture of moonshine; 43 reported no moonshine. Out of the 65 places giving evidence outside of the South West Coast 38 reported the manufacture of moonshine 27 not any; of the 17 places on the South West Coast furnishing evidence only one reported moonshine. The close proximity of St. Pierre and the general preference for ordinary liquor to "moonshine" give the clue to the dissimilarity of the proportions.

Dr. Brehm expressed the opinion "that the fusil oil in moonshine has a definite poisonous effect, is bad for the nerve centres, will sometimes cause blindness and in the case of women and children the effects would be more pronounced and especially in a child. It certainly would have a bad effect on the progeny of those addicted to it."

This evil calls for special remedial measures and a strong determination to enforce them. Your Commissioners are of opinion: 1st, that the possession of a still for the distillation of spirits should be a substantive offence, and that the possession itself should be presumptive evidence it is possessed for that purpose; 2nd, that possession, giving, selling or treating any person with moonshine should be a substantiative offence; and that the penalties provided should be double of those provided for the illicit sale of liquor.

Your Commissioners are also of opinion that an educational campaign should be inaugurated to teach people the danger of the use of "moonshine" and "dope," and suggest that this campaign be conducted through the churches, the sunday schools, public schools, the press and by the distribution of leaflets and pamphlets.

The matter of "prescriptions" has received much attention and there can be no good purpose served in disguising the fact that a large proportion of the liquor obtained by prescriptions is used purely as a beverage and not for medicinal purposes, as the Act provided. This abuse has become quite clear to the police. Their records obtained as has already been indicated show that the liquor obtained by prescriptions has caused quite a number of arrests. For instance, out of 63 arrests for being "drunk" and "drunk and disorderly" from March up to and including May 12th of this year 6 were due to "dope," 9 to "moonshine," and 27 to liquor obtained by prescriptions. The following is illuminating.

Month, arrests, dope, moonshine, scripts—otherwise.

January	21	7	9	5	
February	11	1	3	7	
March	26	3	6	10	7
April	25	3	3	10	9
May (12 days)	12	3		7	2

While your Commissioners are loth to attempt to suggest "regulations" which would unduly interfere with the exercise of the discretion of a medical practitioner who honestly prescribes "liquors" for medicinal purposes, they find there is need of a strong check to stop the loose giving out of prescriptions. They consider it should take the form of a refusal for a period of time, to fill the prescriptions of any medical practitioner who gives out prescriptions loosely under the guise of preserving liquor for medicinal purposes.

In many parts of the Island, particularly where medical practioners are not resident, there are no facilities for obtaining liquor for medicinal purposes, and even where medical men reside in places outside of St. John's, the cost of the prescription, the high cost of the liquor and the frequent loss on transportation

through pilfering place the use for this purpose out of the reach of the poorer members of the community.

Your Commissioners consider that some quantity should be obtainable for a household without a prescription from a medical practitioner under as strict a safeguard as can be provided by rules and regulations, not to exceed the rate of:

A. 24 oz. of Spirits, 24 oz. of Wine, 2 doz. 12 oz. bottles of beer or stout or,

B. 24 oz. Spirits, 48 oz. of Wine or,

C. 24 oz. of Spirits, 4 doz. 12 oz. bottles of Beer or Stout

every three months, or the same proportion monthly or half yearly, as the Board may deem circumstances warrant.

Your Commissioners are of opinion that the method of distribution in the city and the outports should be left to a Board of Control, under a system of identification of the applicant and the recording of the quantities obtained.

Your Commissions find, further, that in the present Act there is no provision for the supply of liquor for the medical chest of steamers and vessels.

The question of smuggling has also received attention. From the evidence gathered there is good reason to believe that St. Pierre liquor finds its way into not only the west coast and south coast, but also into St. John's and the Northern Bays. Liquor is smuggled from many other places than St. Pierre.

Your Commissioners are of opinion that in order to successfully grapple with it, the detective force should be augmented. Its present strength is too inadequate for the constant vigilance necessary to cope with liquor smuggling. Special rewards might be offered to police and customs officials to stimulate the vigilance.

Your Commissioners are convinced that the success of the administration of the Prohibition Law depends on the efficiency of the authority controlling the distribution of liquors. They are of opinion that the present dual control should be abolished.

Your Commissioners have considered the question of the purity of liquors and are of opinion that no liquor should be sent out which has not been analyzed and the analyst is satisfied as to its purity.

Your Commissioners have also considered the question of manufacturing of beer and stout locally and are of opinion that local manufacture of beers should be allowed, provided manufacturers are allowed to sell only to the Board of Control hereinafter recommended.

Your Commissioners have considered carefully the matter of providing supplies of liquor for beverage purposes purely, in limited quantities and under strict supervision, but they have not found sufficient grounds to justify in going further than appears in this Report.

RECOMMENDATION.

1. The retention of the Department for the purchase, dispensing and distribution of liquor.

2. The abolition of the office of the Controller.

3. The placing of the sole control of the Department under a Board of three members; a Medical Practitioner, a Clergyman, and a Business Man, who shall retire in rotation, the medical practitioner at the end of the first year; the clergyman at the end of the second year; and the business man at the end of the third year. Retiring members to be eligible for reappointment. Appointment of original members and the filling of vacancies to be made by the Governor-in-Council.

4. Grants to be made to Board and the accounts to be audited by the Au-

ditor General; net profits to be paid to Treasury.

5. The power of the Board to include terms of engagements of officials and servants and all financial arrangements to be in the Board.

6. A general manager to be appointed to take charge of the Department. The power of appointment, suspension, dismissal, and direction of the general manager and other officials and servants to be in the Board.

7. Rules and Regulations (including penalties) after approval by the Governor-in-Council and publication in the Royal Gazette, to have the force of law.

8. The Board to be given discretion to refuse to fill any prescription of any medical practitioner whom they find is not acting in accordance with the Act, with a right to appeal to the Supreme Court for any person aggrieved by the action of the Board.

9. To make it an offence for any person to obtain a prescription under false pretenses.

10. Prescriptions to be filled in the City of St. John's only by the Department and the Department to be kept open at such hours on working days, Sundays and holidays as the Board may from time to time appoint.

11. The possession of a still for distillation of spirits to be an offence; and possession itself to be presumptive evidence of possession for distillation.

12. The manufacture, possession, sale, gift, or the treating of any person to "moonshine" to be an offence with penalties double those provided for the illicit sale of liquors.

13. The right to search and the indemnity in regard to search for illicit manufacture, importation and sale of liquors, or of possession, manufacture, sale, or gift of or treating persons to "moonshine," or of the possession of

stills for distillation to be similar to the provisions of the Licensing Act, 1906.

14. The Board to be given authority to sell to the heads of households, and under rules and regulations, with penalties, certain quantities of liquors not to exceed the rate of

A. 24 oz. of Spirits, 24 oz. of Wine, 2 doz. 12 oz. bottles of Beer or Stout, or

B. 24 oz. of Spirits, 48 oz. of Wine or

C. 24 oz. Spirits, 4 doz. 12 oz. bottles of Beer or Stout

every three months, or the same proportion monthly or half yearly, as the Board may deem circumstances warrant.

15. The Board to be given authority to supply under rules and regulations with penalties, vessels, and steamers, going coast-wise or foreign, with liquor for medicinal purposes.

16. The Board to be given authority to supply under rules and regulations with penalties, manufacturers with liquors for manufacturing purposes, provided that where the manufacture is not of medicines, essences, food-stuffs, or aerated waters, it shall be made non-potable before it leaves the Department.

17. The onus of proof for offences under the Act to be on the accused.

18. Imprisonment without the option of a fine to be imposed for fourth and subsequent convictions from the date of the new Act.

19. Special rewards to be offered to police officers and customs officers who show marked vigilance in enforcing the Act.

20. Detective force to be increased for the enforcement of the Act.

21. No liquor seized by the police to be sent out until its purity is ascertained by analysis.

22. Manufacturers to be authorized

to sell to the Board of Control such beers and stout as the Board may order.

23. Provision to be made for carrying on an educational campaign on the detrimental effects of drinking "dopes" and "moonshine."

24. The whole statute law as amended to be consolidated.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM F. LLOYD,
Chairman.

L. CURTIS,
EDGAR JONES,
T. M. MITCHELL,
A. R. ANDERSON,
J. V. O'DEA,
GEO. F. GRIMES.

HON. MR. MILLEY—Mr. President, I rise to oppose the second reading of this Bill, and in doing it is not my intention to delay you with any lengthy remarks. I wish first of all to state that I have not been waited upon by any individuals, clerical or lay, asking that I take this stand, I am acting entirely upon my own convictions in this matter.

I have no desire at this time to discuss the law now upon our Statute Books or the one which is now before us, all I ask is that time be given so that all who wish may have an opportunity to give their views either for or against, or in favour of some other legislation, so that with all opinions before us we may be better able to bring into force an act which will, as far as possible, harmonise the many conflicting opinions which we are now up against.

Just one word here with regard to the act now in force, or to be more correct, the act not in force. The Prime Minister stated in the Lower House, a day or two ago, if he is rightly reported, that no helpful suggestions had been offered by those opposing the passing of this new act. Well, I'll give one for what it is

worth. It is a fact well known to all that the Controller's department—which is the department which has the responsibility of carrying out the Act—has been staffed by individuals who are known to be opposed to the very principles of it. In saying this I do not blame or criticise these men because of their opinions, but I do blame successive Governments for allowing them to occupy positions in which they are asked to carry out a law in which they do not believe. One of these very individuals has done more during his tenure of office to bring this country into disrepute in the eyes of the outside world, than all the rest of our civil servants put together a dozen times over. His opposition to the principles of the Act were well known to everybody, and I have very little hesitation in saying that he was appointed to the position in order that the government of that day might "take the lid off" and go ahead with the open and gross violations of the law which they contemplated when they introduced the notorious estimate of over \$400,000 for intoxicating liquors. Now, what am I driving at? Just this, clean out the Controller's Department, and put in charge a staff who are as notoriously in favor of the principles for which the Act stands, as the past staffs have been opposed, and see what the result will be. We are told that four ex-Ministers of Justice have stated that the Act could not be enforced. Did it ever occur to them to put its carrying out into the hands of men who were anxious to do it? If it did then they were never very anxious to find out whether the law could be enforced or not for no attempt was ever made along these lines. Imagine a business man to-day employing in his office or premises any man who he knew was opposed to the very principles upon which the business was run. I have given this suggestion for

what it is worth, it is put forward in answer to those who say that no alternative to the proposed legislation has been offered. I do not wish it to be understood that I am in favor of the present law, as it now stands, but I do think an honest attempt should be made to carry it out, with some amendments that do not conflict with its principles, which will make it a common sense law.

Now my chief reasons for opposing the second reading of this Bill are these. In the first place, the number of protests, which do not so much oppose the measure, as ask for sufficient time for its consideration. These have come from gentlemen who are held in high esteem in this community and we think they should not go unheeded. I might mention Rev. Mr. Elliott, of St. Thomas', Rev. Canon Smart of Heart's Content, Rev. Mr. Rusted of Carbonear, Rev. Mr. Cracknell, Rev. Mr. Higgitt, Rector of St. Paul's, Harbour Grace, and others whose names have not yet been given to the public. Then I have no need to mention individually the names of any Methodist Clergymen, for that denomination is entirely in sympathy with prohibition principles. The fact that some of the laity do not agree with their clergy is no reason that the opinions of these people should be considered sane and reasonable, while that of the clergy be absolutely ignored. These gentlemen have the moral welfare of the community at heart, are not personally affected by either prohibitive or non-prohibitive legislation, but in the pursuance of their sacred calling they feel convinced that caution should be observed before we rush through a bill of this nature without mature consideration. Some people have been kind enough to call these gentlemen cranks, fanatics and lunatics, yet when they want to be married, when they want to have their children baptised, when

they want their dead buried, when they want their sick and suffering to have the consolation that the Church alone can offer, it is to those same cranks, fanatics and lunatics that they send. No gentlemen, let us listen to these men, in so far as they ask for delay, then between now and next session, they will have ample opportunity to consider this legislation, proposing amendments or alternative suggestions, which can be submitted to us at that time. It may be that after due consideration this very act will be the least objectionable under all the circumstances, and if so, it can then become law with the consent of those who seem now to be very much alarmed about it.

In the second place I ask for delay because we have not had time to consider what may be involved in future years because of the precedent we establish if we pass this bill now. It is a well known fact that hitherto all provinces, countries or towns that have become "dry" by a vote of the people, that have since become "wet" save so done by a further vote of the people. I am not asking for a plebiscite, but I am suggesting that the matter of a plebiscite should receive careful consideration before we pass this act.

It has been stated that this House will meet in January next, why not delay this matter until then? In the meantime the necessary thought can be given to it, and instead of wasting a week or more, as we usually do, at the opening, we can at once take up this legislation, which by then should be ready to come before us.

While the Manifesto of the Prime Minister referred to prohibition, it was not seriously considered during the election campaign. The literature of the opposing parties had no serious reference to it. As a matter of fact it is well known that the whole issue of the election was "a clean up," and

the people asked for that in no uncertain sound. It is my humble opinion that the liquor business was not a factor in the election, at the same time I am free to admit that the Prime Minister was elected upon a Manifesto which included the repeal of the present Act, but in a manner which is not the one he has chosen to adopt.

As a member of the Select Committee which had this Bill in hand, I heard the protests of those who appeared before us, they were, for the most part, courteously given, and I was convinced that the welfare of this community was the motive that actuated them one and all. I refused to sign the Report for that reason, and for that reason only, and I repeat that this House should defer legislation on this important matter at the request of these gentlemen who appeared before our Committee.

One more word. There is no class in our community more interested in this business than the women of our country. I am not going to preach a sermon on the conditions into which many of our women and children are thrust because of the liquor traffic, but I am going to ask, in their behalf, that they be given a chance to meet in their several communities, if they so desire, in order that their views may also come before us.

For these reasons Mr. President, I must oppose the second reading of this Bill, during this session, in doing this I am not committing myself as to the merits, or demerits, of the Bill, as I do not feel called upon to consider such at this time.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH congratulated Hon. Mr. Morine on the comprehensive and illuminating address he had given. He favored the principle of the Bill, not that he had abated in any way his belief that the desirable state was that of Prohibition. He did not agree with many of

the Hon. gentleman's observations, and thought Prohibition had more to its credit than was admitted, for instance, the closing of the bar. He did not think the reign of lawlessness began with Prohibition and quoted figures given by the Minister of Justice as to arrests for drunkenness, which he thought disproved that, as follows:—

In 1915 there were	714
" 1916	618
" 1917	87
" 1918 (last year of war) .. .	95
" 1919	228
" 1920	276

After that the number rose.

In 1921 there were	241
" 1922	606
" 1923	610
And for first six months of 1924	290

As regards moonshining he did not think there was nearly as much as some people thought, and was of opinion the number of stills was very few. In his opinion the death knell of the enforcement of Prohibition was sounded when the Cornwall was sent to Bonavista Bay to enforce the law, and the proceedings made political issue of. The fact that four Ministers had said it was unable to be enforced did not in his mind condemn its effectiveness. During the early years of the Bill, it was comparatively effective. He realized that the law had not been perfectly kept, if, he said, all laws were perfectly kept, what need were there of men to deal with offenders. He added that in 1914 25,000 persons voted in favour of Prohibition and only 5,000 against it. Why was it then he asked it could not be carried out.

MR. MORINE replied that it was impossible for the Government to enforce it.

SIR P. T. McGrath stated that the mass of the Outports wanted it, and the whole machinery of justice had

become so demoralized that at the present time it could not be enforced. If those who were responsible for putting the Prohibition Law on the Statute Book were prepared to carry it out, Sir Patrick said he would vote for it again.

MR. MORINE interposed that 250,000 police would be necessary in the carrying out of it.

SIR PATRICK McGRATH did not agree that that was necessary, and quoted the United States as an example.

MR. MORINE said it cost the United States millions of dollars to try and enforce the law.

SIR PATRICK McGRATH agreed and said it may cost them millions a few years longer, but the conditions in America were better as a result, and he was convinced that the Prohibition Law had done a great deal to add to the comfort and welfare of the people there, and he wished that the law could do the same here. Such a state of demoralization existed—dishonesty was rife—that now, it was hard to enforce the law, he added and the Government, not of to-day, but each in turn had let the bars down until the whole thing was a scandal.

Because of the existing state of affairs Sir Patrick McGrath stated he would support the Bill before the House and give it a trial. A year or two would show whether the experiment were satisfactory or not. The Act, he said, had a good many teeth in it and if the machinery provided were effective the result may be beneficial.

He knew of cases during Prohibition years of medical men getting 8 or 10 books of scripts a month. If the nominal charge of \$1 were made per script an income of \$1000 a month would result. And again of medical men from the Outports selling scripts in town. They, however, were prosecuted and fined.

In reference to the Controller's staff, he stated with one exception, they had acted honestly, and in the case of that exception those in authority who permitted the wrongdoing were responsible. The suggestion to re-staff the Dept. came too late, he thought, it should have been done long ago. Sir Patrick McGrath said that a hearing should be accorded outsiders as members of the Temperance Societies or as individuals, but he did not admit that the welfare of the country was of greater concern to them as it was to him. He was prepared to do his duty and give notice that as an amendment he would ask that "a bottle a week" be substituted for "a bottle a day." He would then be prepared to support the Bill and give the Government every assistance in enforcing it.

MR. GIBBS congratulated the Government on having the courage of his convictions in bringing in a Bill such as that before the House. In reference to the United States he said that it was quite a common practice for bootleggers to call at private houses for weekly orders.

SIR P. T. McGRATH in reply stated that when the British Government asked Geddes to make his report in regard to Prohibition in the States he said that in the main it was a success.

HON. M. GIBBS did not consider that U.S.A., with its easy divorce laws, murders, etc., was so prosperous as might be imagined. He considered that a law could not be enforced which had not the sympathy nor the co-operation of the community, and mentioned Egypt, India and Ireland by way of example. In referring to those who voted for Prohibition he said some did so on advice and some were grossly misled.

The Honorable gentleman was incorrect in his opinion as regards the number of stills. Within 120 miles

of the city, going north, he heard from a reliable source that there were over 300 stills in operation, besides the large number in operation in the city itself. As regards the open bar, he was always opposed to it, but that was far enough to go. He thought the Police Statistics were no criterion as to the amount of drunkenness prevalent, as many drunks, particularly since Prohibition, kept off the streets when under alcoholic influences either through fear of arrest or of detection of the parties who furnished them with liquor. Another horrible aspect of the subject was the use of so-called substitutes. When men had to resort even to the consumption of shoe polish to take the place of spirits. When the Bill goes into Committee he would have some amendments to propose which he hoped would be helpful. He supported the second reading.

HON. MR. MURPHY said it was all very well to talk of Prohibition but who was going to enforce the law? Are good men to be penalized for the actions of the offending. That is just what Prohibition has done and it is up to us to remedy the existing state of affairs. This may not be an easy task but if the new law now being introduced is found unworkable in any respect then by all means we can make room for amendments, as soon as abuses crop up. No state of affairs would be any worse than that now existing.

HON. MR. ELLIS congratulated Mr. Morine upon his clear explanation of the new Bill which should go far to dispel the wrong impressions that were current regarding it.

As a member of the Joint Committee, he had gone into the matter very thoroughly—and he had decided to support the principle of the Bill because he thought it was the one most likely to be enforced.

When this Bill was before the Sel-

ect Committee of both Houses, a few days ago, he had endorsed its principles, being convinced that the Prohibition Act in force in this country the past 8 years is unworkable and that this condition gave rise to lawlessness throughout the country to such an extent that respect for our laws generally would, he feared, soon be held in utter contempt.

He was not altogether in agreement with the means proposed to carry out the measure and intimated as much upon signing the Committee Report, making a reservation that registration or some form of machinery should be proposed to ensure further restrictions upon the issue of spirits.

All his life he had been connected with an institution whose main endeavor was to check the abuse of intoxicating drinks and for over half a century a good deal was accomplished in that direction. While thus engaged, though being fully aware of the evils resulting from excessive indulgences, he had never regarded the deed as an unforgivable sin, and was always of the opinion, though voting to give Prohibition a trial, that moral suasion helped on by Legislative enactment would be more effective than any measure of an arbitrary nature and the feeling was always strong and it is so to-day that when a person who arrives to the age of manhood his latitude to think and act should not be too closely circumscribed. He therefore thought that in this case every man should be allowed reasonable scope to exercise his own judgment as to how far he would make use of the privilege embodied in a Bill—such as the one now before the House.

The chief defect he saw in the new Bill was that it had no provision for registration or other machinery to prevent abuses in the way of parties getting excessive quantities of liquor. He believed in a system of individual licenses such as he understood they

had in Sweden. Under this a man applied for a certain quantity each week or month and was issued a license accordingly. In his opinion such an application for license in the case of a family should be counter-signed by the wife and not issued otherwise. This permit would have to be produced at the Control Store every time a quantity of liquor was sought. By this means one of the greatest opportunities for practising fraud would be prevented. This would enable the Board to make a fairly close estimate of the requirements in the way of liquor from year to year.

HON. MR. MORINE craved permission to correct some of the statements made by Hon. Mr. Milley. He had stated in his speech that the Premier's Manifesto said that "if a repeal Bill was introduced it would be as the result of the work of a Commission "a Bill shall be introduced and referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses" which had been done. The only part he thought to which exception might be taken was the statement "and before which representative people shall be able to fully and freely express their views." Sufficient time may not have been given for that but a Commission would be appointed after the passing of the Bill which could get all the information necessary during the next three months before the House meets again.

Now nothing had been said by him in any way criticizing the motives of those opposing this Bill, but on the contrary ulterior motives were attributed to the members of the Government and those supporting the Bill, and that is one of the sad things in connection with it, that people are ever prone to criticise and attribute motives. He did not yield to any man in this country in his claims as a Prohibitionist, but the Committee were absolutely unanimous that the Prohibition Act had failed; the Bill could

not be enforced and they were compelled to introduce a Bill of this kind. Why was it not possible to differ without having ulterior motives?

All the arguments he had heard from those not favouring the Bill had been of a criticising type, they had offered nothing materially constructive and he assured the Hon. Gentlemen that the motives of the Government in constructing this Bill were as pure as those of the Rev. gentlemen who had pleaded their cause at the Bar of the House. He was convinced that they were sincere but he was also convinced that they were wrong.

As to Hon. Mr. Milley's statement that the Controller's Department had never been properly staffed he concurred, but surely the Controller was not to be blamed for the existing traffic in dope and smuggling and moonshining. By the passing of this Act an efficient Board of Control will be invested with adequate powers so that there will be no excuse for failure of enforcement.

He also reminded Sir P. T. McGrath that statistics very often lie. The number of arrests for drunkenness in the city was no proof of what was happening in the outports and many reasons were accountable for the falling off of the number of arrests in 1917 for drunkenness other than the actual enforcement of Prohibition, such as the number who enlisted for war service, the feeling against Prohibition as well as it being a general "dope" period.

As far as the use of stills were concerned it was seemingly very general, and in 1919 on the North Side of Bonavista Bay, nearly every house had a still. But when he had made an honest attempt with Magistrate Miffin to remedy this state of affairs, the action was made use of as a political weapon against him and the new Government did not follow matters up to a proper sequence and enforce the law.

After the Cornwall incident and the New Government came in and pardoned the offenders, the whole machinery of keeping the law broke down, as the Government had shown itself in sympathy with the people who broke the law.

Mr. Morine said when he spoke of the Prohibition Act as being unenforceable, he referred to the condition of public and political sentiment. No Government since 1919 had tried in even one instance to enforce it, and he did not believe any Government could be composed which would enforce it. There are other matters, and if this were made as the breaking point and defeated Government after Government, we might have others coming in power which might do much worse in other respects. Take the late Government from 1919 to 1923, their first act was to dismiss the charges against the Flat Islanders and transfer the best Magistrate in the country to some more remote place and embark on the selling of liquors by wholesale, and put the control in the hands of Meaney, and to-day they are Temperance advocates. In his opinion you cannot get a Government in this country so composed that it will make an issue of strict enforcement of the Prohibition Act and put it in full practice and when he said it is unenforceable, he comprised within his view everything of that nature. We pass laws and never enforce them and that is going on and is bound to go on.

Mr. Morine stated that politically, geographically and educationally, the conditions were such as to make it impossible to carry out the law. The reason that it did not get the support was largely due, he considered to the fact that people did not believe in it, and it did not get their sympathy on that account. He did not believe that every man who was a 'wet' was opposed to good Government, as a mat-

ter of fact he was desirous of it. This Bill, he argued, was to give men decent drinking, and he believed it would have the support of 90 per cent. of the people and be enforced with their aid.

SIR P. T. McGRATH said again that the death blow to Prohibition was given when the law was made a political issue of in Bonavista Bay. Its descent after that was disastrous. He contended that at the outset the public were disposed to respect and live up to it, and adhered to his opinion that if the people had not wanted it they would not have voted for it.

MR. MORINE said many voted for Prohibition because of religious and patriotic sentiment, and after doing so were sorry.

SIR P. T. McGRATH pointed out that smuggling was not a matter of Prohibition times only. He gave an instance of a tremendous smuggling crusade many years ago, organized because of the smuggling of liquor into the stores and basements along the waterfront of St. John's. Neither he contended was 'dope' a new thing. He remembered cases, years ago, of prominent men getting drunn on Jamacia ginger, and a regular business was done in Beef, Iron and Wine and later Tanlac. He stated he would vote again for a Prohibition Bill, if there were a prospect of its being enacted and enforced, for conditions would be much better.

The motion being put was carried and the Bill was read a second time, and will be committed on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, at 4 o'clock.

FRIDAY, Aug. 15, 1924.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

The House went into Committee on the Bill respecting Alcoholic Liquors.

Hon. Mr. Murphy in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved as an amendment to Section 3 that members of the Board of Liquor Control should hold office "during good behaviour" instead of "during pleasure." He pointed out that the powers given the Board were very great, in fact no other person in the Government's employ is vested with such powers. It will have the control of the expenditure and collection of hundreds of thousands of dollars free from control except an audit of accounts. It may pledge borrowed money, guarantee loans, but in the most important essentials, that is the personnel of the Board, the officials come under the control of the powers that be. You cannot have efficiency and honesty when the Board and its officials are subjected to political control, at least not in this country. There will be branches opened, officials will be required in those branches, and the party supporter will go to his representative and demand one of the positions. The representative having to depend upon the votes of the applicant and his friends to retain his seat in the Legislature, will bring pressure to bear upon the Board to have his political supporter appointed, not because he is the most capable of applicants, but because he has sufficient political pull to get the position. In this manner will the work of the Board be rendered nugatory, and instead of efficient administration there will be the very opposite. He contended that if the members constituting the Board were to hold office during pleasure, they would be subject to the control and domination of the powers that be, and would carry out the wishes of the Government in power at the time. In other words, he added, the Board would be made a political football of as the Controllers Department was in the past. He thought that this amendment would be not only fair to the Board which should be ap-

pointed, but would also be greatly to the country's interest in the carrying out of the Bill.

MR. MORINE replied that the success of the Bill depended upon the way in which the members of the Board carried out their duties. He stated that when the Act was drafted two arguments appeared which were met by a compromise. In the first place if the members were appointed during good behaviour, no matter how incompetent they proved the Government would have to sit helplessly by for, he added, members holding office on good behaviour cannot be removed because of old age or inefficiency. On the other hand, he said, if office is held during pleasure, the Government if displeased could discharge members who were not giving satisfaction. If it were a political Board, Mr. Morine considered, it was political business, and the Government should be responsible. To meet this, it was proposed that the Chairman hold office during good behaviour and the other members during pleasure; so that the two members could be removed if the Board were not functioning properly, but this had been overruled, and it was decided to appoint all three during pleasure. After all the responsible Government of the country should interfere and appoint others who would.

SIR P. T. McGRATH thought that the Bill called for a superman as Chairman. If a wrong man were appointed the Bill in his opinion would be wrecked. If he proved a headstrong man he could not be interfered with and a farce would be made of the whole thing. The holding of office during good behaviour, Sir Patrick thought would act as a check. He referred to the fact of the Auditor General as one holding office on good behaviour and he considered that it had not in any way affected his position. The Hospital Board was also mention-

ed as being non-partisan. This Board, he said, had jurisdiction over Sudbury Hospital, the Sanitorium and General and he did not think any member had ever been assailed or interfered with because of political opinion. He thought that if the right men were appointed to the position on the Liquor Control Board, neither would they be interfered with. The great difficulty, however, in his opinion, was to get the kind of men to carry the law out as desired.

MR. GIBBS thought that to contrast the duties of the Hospital Board with those of the Control Board was ridiculous. In the first place he said that the Medical Board had no patronage at its disposal, no positions to offer, while the Board of Liquor Control had to appoint every officer, clerk or other employee required for the operation of the Act from one end of Newfoundland to the other, and he thought that they should be free from Government Control. If on the other hand, the Government wanted to assume the responsibility as in the case of other departments, he did not see why they should not. Judging from his experience, he added, that a man who catered to the whims of a Government got more out of it than a man who faithfully and honestly performed his duties.

HON MR. MORINE differed with Mr. Gibbs in the idea that the faithful official did not reap the reward due him. He considered such men had the respect of all Governments and were practically able to defy the Government. Then as regards the Board being responsible for appointments, purchasing liquors, etc., he considered this the better way, rather than have an already overburdened Governor-in-Council with the usual list of political heelers, appointing officials, purchasing liquors, etc. If a reliable and competent Board is appointed, why should the Government be made

to bear the additional responsibility which is bound to occur? It is one of the greatest advantages for a Government to be able to rely on a good and competent Board and it is for this reason that such a Board has been constituted. It would soon be seen that this Board would be as sound as "the Rock of Gibraltar," and they could be relied upon to thoroughly enforce the law as it will be composed only of capable men with public confidences.

HON. MR. GIBBS knew from experience heads of Departments have been overridden and things done over their heads. Here we have an Act which affects the whole country and it is only natural to expect that great pressure will be brought to bear on them by those desirous of obtaining privileges, whereas if they were entirely free from Government control they could deal with such matters without interference of any kind.

HON. MR. SHEA thought that the faithful performance and operation of the Bill depended entirely upon the calibre of men appointed. Whilst he agreed with Sir Patrick McGrath that it would be a hard task to get three competent men, we must, nevertheless, place thorough confidence in them once they are obtained. He would give the Board unqualified powers and put no restriction on them. He hoped the Government would find them, and they and the people would have to put their trust in them. He thought the Government would have to take the chance of getting the right men, and that the amendment should not go in.

The amendment being put was lost, the section passed in its original form.

HON. MR. GIBBS thought that the acceptance of Section 5 would be creating a dangerous precedent. It reads:—"The Board or any member

thereof may not be prosecuted for doing or omitting to do and act in the performance of its or his duties prescribed by this Act, unless by consent of the Minister of Justice."

If any ordinary individual not a member of the Board, breaks the law, he is at once prosecuted, but here it is left to the Minister of Justice, who is himself influenced by politics to give consent or withhold it for the taking of legal proceedings. He thought it a dangerous precedent to establish in a Bill of this character.

HON. MR. MORINE wished it to be clearly understood that this was not creating a precedent. The Section had been taken verbatim from the Quebec and Alberta Acts and is intended to prevent the Board from being harassed continually by all sorts of petty complaints. He further pointed out that in any criminal proceedings the Minister of Justice can refuse to carry on.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH thought an explanation of the Section was unnecessary as it was clearly intended to prevent a needless waste of expense by charges of a visionary character being piled up. It had even been found necessary in England a few years ago to pass a special Act of Parliament to prevent a madman from taking action against the King.

HON. MR. ELLIS said there were two points on which he was quite satisfied: First, that the Prime Minister was quite justified, in view of the conditions existing throughout the country in making a declaration in his Manifesto that he would deal with this liquor question, and second, that his Government were also justified in concluding that the people were desirous of obtaining a quantity of liquor. The report of the Commission appointed in 1920 which was before the Joint Committee and which Hon. Mr. Morine included in his

speech yesterday recommending that a limited quantity of liquor for family use and social requirements be provided for the people. That Committee was composed of representatives of every shade of opinion on this question and as was pointed out by Mr. Morine yesterday, practically 22 of its 24 recommendations are included in the present Bill. With the main principle of the Bill he was in full accord but of course did not subscribe to every detail of it. One to which he took exception is that there is no provision for registration which provision he sincerely believed would be most essential in enabling the people to give expression to their wishes as to the use they would make of the privileges granted by the Act and the prevention of abuses of the measure and he proposed an amendment to cover that point, as follows:—

"To put into operation a system of registration of applicants for spirits and the issuing of individual permits therefor to the residents of this country and that no spirits shall be sold or delivered to any person unless he has been so registered and issued a permit and all applications for such permits shall in the case of a married man be countersigned by his wife."

HON. MR. MORINE said the Government appreciated the support the previous speaker had given the Bill. His good work for the cause of Temperance was well known and he therefore regretted that the Government could not accept his amendment. It was absolutely unworkable, not sound in principle and would cause a great amount of detail work that would cause unnecessary trouble and delay. He had never thought he was a man with sinister designs, but now being unmarried himself he wishes to interfere with all married men in the country and put a premium on celibacy. If this passed, no man who

wanted a drink would dare get married as he would have a continual fight with his wife on the contrary she could get all she wanted. It was indeed a funny idea to hold that a man who couldn't resist the temptation of a bottle a day and might be suffering from the effects overnight can be trusted to sit down and make a cool calculation for the amount of liquor he would consume in a year and as to the man's wife having a say in the amount he should require, in his opinion, the only result it would bring would be a great amount of domestic discord. We have either to trust to moral suasion or Prohibition and in this country, Prohibition has only proven itself to be a great temptation and a stimulator of public tastes. First we had dope, then moonshining and smuggling and in so far as a restraint is put on people, a premium is put on and men get a taste for them. Perhaps the best restraint on this sort of thing would be to give people the best kind of cheap liquor.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH suggested that in spite of the Hon. Gentleman's playful consideration of the matter Hon. Mr. Ellis's suggestion was entitled to more serious consideration. As regards the permit, we had Mr. Morine's admission that in Alberta some form of permit is in vogue. It was therefore not unreasonable nor impossible. He thought some steps should be devised for dealing with distribution by the Board. In Sweden, under the Gottenburg system every man is licensed, and such licence must be presented before he can obtain a bottle. He suggested Hon. Mr. Ellis's amendment might come before the proposed Commission for consideration before the next session.

HON. MR. ELLIS did not think his suggestion would cause friction in the home. He doubted whether the Hon. Gentleman understood the tem-

perament of the people of this country where such matters would be considered jointly by husband and wife. He did not see why his suggestion should cause mirth; he himself was perfectly serious about it. He was not bound as to the quantities to be supplied, but he hoped in time to see the bill in much better form than it is to-day.

The House took recess until 7.30 p.m.

House resumed at 7.30 p.m.

SIR P. T. McGRATH proposed as an amendment to Section D., paragraph 23 that the word 'Day' be stricken out and the word 'Week' substituted. Which, he added, briefly meant that instead of a bottle a day, a bottle a week only could be procured. He assumed that the object of the Bill was to allow people to receive a reasonable amount in moderate quantities for medicinal, family or social uses—and not sufficient for abuse. He felt safe in saying that in advocating a modification of the Prohibition Law men never expected the pendulum to swing so far. Mr. Smith, as Secretary of the Moderate Prohibition Movement, had written a letter to the Telegram some time ago, Sir Patrick added, in which he had 'rubbed it in to the extremists who had opposed vigorously his motion for a bottle a week,' now, he continued, they were to be cursed with a bottle a day. A message from James D. Munn voiced the sentiments expressed in the amendment and he also had the opportunity of knowing that a number of Roman Catholic Clergymen had expressed themselves as favorable to it. The amount of whisky sent out weekly from the Controller's Department was roughly 600 bottles, that was 100 per day he continued, and this met the demands of the outports, city, and drug stores, and 400 bottles of rum which went to all parts of the Island. That, he said, was more creditable than what one hears or

reads of. "A bottle a day" would lead to a much greater output of liquor. He then formally moved the amendment of a bottle a week as the maximum quantity to be procured.

MR. MORINE explained that the section referred to did not mean that there should be a bottle a day sold to any one person but that it simply limited the amount that one person might buy for his whole family which perhaps was a family of seven. He stated that there was no compulsion to purchase a bottle; a phial full or a gill might be procured. The bottle a day was the limit that could be obtained according to the Act. He considered that the cause of the dope trouble and smuggling was restriction and that the attempt to prohibit reasonable and liberal quantities increased temptation. If you could do away with moonshine and smuggling and then enforce Prohibition it would be a different matter. In his mind Sir P. T. McGrath was the victim of statistics and was always quoting from them but never drew the right morals from them. Sir Patrick had said 50 cases a week was the maximum of the Controller's Department but it was well known that much more than this amount was being consumed in the country. Where does it come from? And why all the drunkenness if this were true? It is because smuggling has gone on wholesale, moonshining unchecked and the Government had strong reason for belief that much liquor coming in for transshipment is consumed here. He further held that the attempt to prohibit having failed if any restrictions are to be on at all they must be so reasonable that 99 p.c. of the people would want to uphold them. He wished to remind those through the country who had protested against the Bill that there is no compulsion in the Act to force any man to drink any specified amount of liquor; for from it, great care has been made to

provide the Board with powers to refuse to sell to drunkards and others who are duly covered by provision. If we were to adopt the amendment which has been offered it would merely be endorsing another form of Prohibition on a smaller scale which the Government was not prepared to do. He could not accept the amendment and asked the House to reject it.

HON. MR. GIBBS agreed with the previous speaker that such restrictions as a bottle a week would only be a milder form of Prohibition and was contrary to the rights of the people. He then went on to show by elaborate reasoning how the state had no more right to interfere with a man's choosing his own drink than it did with his own food. We have certain natural rights and it is not because some abuse those rights that they are to be taken away. It is the duty of the State to limit and not to destroy. A State that tries to take away rights from its citizens is doing the opposite to what it should. If we say a man shall have no more than a bottle a week, they will break the law to get it elsewhere, by smuggling here in St. John's every week, and scarcely a vessel or steamer touching our shores but has it on board. This section did not mean everyone was going to get a bottle a day; some could not get one a month. It is not because some people abuse a right we should take it away from others who do not abuse the privilege. More people die from over-eating than from over-drinking. Because one man consumes too much meat and gets sick, should we say to his neighbour you cannot have so much meat because your neighbour got sick. The figures as to consumption quoted are no criterion of the quantity consumed in this country. There are places in the country where you can get champagne and brands of whisky never seen at the Controller's. any amount of it. Then take the United States with its

records as the greatest drug consuming country in the world. More people are treated there than anywhere else and the use of drugs has increased nearly a thousandfold since Prohibition came into force.

HON. P. T. McGRATH referred the attention of the House to the section regarding special safeguards and said he thought it had been included here because this was the kernel of the Act and the section most likely to be abused.

The amendment being put was lost on division, those appearing in favor: Hons. Sir Patrick McGrath and W. J. Ellis; and against: Hons. Sir M. G. Winter, Gibbs, Power, Shea, Steer, Ryan and Morine.

The section as originally in the Bill then passed.

The Committee reported the Bill passed with some amendment, and with the unanimous consent of the House it was read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. GIBBS had intended moving a further section providing that no member of the Government or Legislature might have any dealings with the Board in the purchase or sale or receiving or giving of commissions in connection with the sale of liquor, but thought perhaps this should be provided for under the Legislative Disabilities Act.

HON. MR. MORINE was much impressed with the idea of such a provision but thought it would better come under the Act referred to.

HON. MR. GIBBS knew if all members of the Government were actuated by the example of the leader of the Government there would be no danger. He understood that that gentleman was accepting no patronage whatsoever for his firm and thought that a splendid example.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Morine and

with unanimous consent, the Bill respecting Labrador Railway Extension providing merely for an extension of time for the rights granted under this Act, was put through all stages and passed.

Bill respecting the Department of Finance and Customs was read a first, and by consent, a second time.

HON. MR. MORINE explained that this Bill provided for the appointment of a Deputy Minister of Customs who should act for the whole Island and be separated from the official known as the Assistant Collector of Customs who shall have to do with the affairs of the port of St. John's.

Bill passed through Committee stage without amendment, and by consent was read a third time, and passed.

The Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowance" was read a first time.

In moving the second reading Mr. Morine explained that none of the persons, whose names were to be found on the list, had been retired under the present Government, but under the past and previous Governments and by Minute of Council. These people had been retired and their successors named and it was the intention of the Government to provide the necessary authority.

The Bill and also the Supplementary Public Service Bill passed through the various stages without amendment.

The Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm an Agreement between the Government and the Gander Valley Power & Paper Company, Ltd.," was read a first time.

In moving the second reading Mr. Morine stated that the Bill was practically completed before the present Government had come into office. In its main provisions it follows the Humber scheme, he added, its distinguishing feature being that it did not ask

for endorsement. The Reids have acquired a large portion of the lands by purchase in Gander River Valley and proposed to erect there one mill at the mouth of the river and another farther up. As to which would be proceeded with first was dependent on the engineers. He confidently believed that when the Gander proposal composed favorably with the Humber and the other larger industries of the country. All this would depend upon the Bill passing this session of the House so that necessary capital might be raised. As is usual in a Bill of this kind there are certain privileges requested, precedent for which had been established the passing of the "Humber Act." He had fought against the granting of such privileges in past years but the Bills were put through and thus the status for all great enterprises in this country has been fixed. We need the labor and employment now just as much as we did in the days of the passing of the Humber and with this in view he could see no reason which would justify them in refusing in this case concessions that have been given to others. The Government had already settled certain amendments in the original Bill re the expropriation of lands, etc., which slightly modified it in this respect.

The Bill was read a second time and will be committed on to-morrow.

"A Bill regarding the disembarking of Paupers" was read a first, and by consent, a second time, and passed without amendment.

House adjourned until Monday at 3 p.m.

MONDAY, Aug. 18.

Council met at 3 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on the Gander Valley Pulp and Paper Co. Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. MORINE having explained the Bill at the previous Session said he presumed Hon. Members were familiar with its provisions, having had time to persue it, and he would be glad to further explain anything required as the Sections were proceeded with.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH asked the Hon. Leader of the Government what is the position with regard to the Humber Company and the Agreement between it and the subsidiary Company which was published in the Daily News of August 12th and made the subject of editorial comment on that occasion. He said he had read the editorial and studied the Agreement and the Correspondence in relation there to fairly closely and drew the conclusion from the whole that a serious position had been created for the Colony, but being a layman was not sure that these deductions were right. He said he had talked with a prominent member of a former administration in regard to the matter, whose name he did not care to state, though he would give it privately to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill as an evidence of good faith. This gentleman's opinion was that if the Agreement became effective it would constitute a matter of such serious import that a judicial pronouncement would have to be obtained either in England or here as to the rights of the debenture holders under the original Bill, whose status was guaranteed by the British Government and by the Newfoundland Government. He added he had then gone to a legal gentleman who took the Company's side of the matter, and his view was that the agreement was merely one to create a holding Company as between the Power and Paper Company which was building the mills and the subsidiary Company which had been formed to find the money to build the transmission line, a wrapping paper

machine, a paper storage shed with a capacity of 35,000 tons, also to build the town at Corner Brook and likewise to construct two freight steamers to carry the paper to market.

The view of the Company's spokesman was that as money has to be raised from outside parties to construct all these utilities it was only right that the people from whom the money was to be raised should have the property as a mortgage, that the standing of the Armstrong Company and the extent of their venture in Newfoundland constituted the best evidence of good faith and that nothing of an underhand nature was contemplated. He (Sir P. T. McGrath) said he presented both views but would like to have an expression of opinion as to the Government's position in the matter, particularly as his informant had also told him that the British Treasury had waived its objection, that the Agreement had been signed quite recently. Sir Patrick went on to point out that critics of the matter were arguing like a section of the press, that with the Power House at Deer Lake and the Mills at Corner Brook 22 miles away, owned by the two governments and a power line connecting these two, but owned by different people altogether this power line constituted a jugular vein and could be cut at any time that difficulties arose in the successful operation of the paper mills.

HON. MR. MORINE asked to be excused for a few minutes while he went out to consult with the Prime Minister on the matter and on his return stated that so far as the Government was concerned in any way from that indicated in the Correspondence already tabled and published in the daily press. That was that the Government had not been informed of any change in the situation and were satisfied that the Trade Facilities Committee and the British Treasury

which had entered the first object on were actively working to protect the interests of the British Government, which interest was the same as ours. He said that the Prime Minister had received a letter recently from our Solicitors in London which stated that the matter was having their closest attention and further indicated that a satisfactory settlement of the matter was probable, so he thought that something in this direction had possibly been accomplished. He was informed also that a meeting of the directors of the Power and Paper Co. would be held at Montreal shortly and that he thought the Newfoundland Government would be represented at the meeting. He considered that probably this matter was one of the subjects which would have to be discussed and he felt sure the position of the Government would be put forward very clearly.

He said that in looking through the original contract made with the Newfoundland Products Corporation in 1916, he was struck with the loose way in which the Sections to protect the Colony had been drawn and the opportunities which were afforded by their loose phraseology to evade compliance with the obligations intended to be imposed on the Company but he felt that the reputation of the Armstrong Company was a guarantee that nothing harmful to the country was intended and he pointed out that if the owners of the transmission line could tie up the paper mill, they had, on the other hand, no other customers to this country for their power and he thought it very unlikely that these Companies would disagree or that any condition would be created in the future which would bring about such a contingency as had been suggested.

MR. STEER thought that what was meant by all material in section 5, should be more definite. His reason

for speaking was that the Board of Trade had been flooded with letters from business men of the West Coast stating that goods had come in under that heading, duty free, such as blankets, stoves, etc., and they should not have been allowed in for these were not to be used in the actual construction. What was meant he thought, should be definitely put in and not left to the decision of any inferior Custom House Officer.

MR. MORINE in replying said, the clause as it stood was an exact copy of the provision made for the Humber Company. That, he thought, made it difficult to alter, as the company would consider that something was being imposed on the one which had not been imposed on the other. The difficulty in his opinion could be overcome by having proper Customs administration. The materials, he added, meant the plant fixtures, tools, machinery, etc., and not things indirectly required. If looseness had occurred, he added the privilege had been violated and the true cure would be rather in the proper administration of the Act on the part of the Customs service, than in the altering of the wording of the section.

MR. ELLIS asked if it gave people the privilege of getting what others got should it not be checked?

MR. MORINE stated it could not be improved. The remedy lay in the Customs Department having all these cases examined and if things were gotten in free which should have paid duty, make them pay. He would draw the attention of the Minister to the matter and cause inquiries to be made.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and by consent of the house, it was read a third time and passed.

The House then adjourned until to-morrow (Tuesday) at 10 a.m.

TUESDAY, Aug. 19th, 1924.

House met at 10 a.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Morine and by unanimous consent, Bill to amend Revenue Act of 1905 and amendments thereto, was put through all stages and passed without amendment.

Bill respecting the United Towns Electric Company Limited, was read a first time, and by consent, a second time.

HON. MR. MORINE explained the object of the Bill was to allow this Company to extend in various parts of Placentia District and St. John's East. It did not give any exclusive rights, but allowed the usual privilege of free entry of material for original construction.

HON. MR. ELLIS recalled that last year on a similar Bill, the matter of the charge for electricity was brought up. Everyone knows we are charged far in excess of what is paid elsewhere. We are granting privileges session after session, and apparently no effort is made to reduce the price of light.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH said when this Company was first projected the idea was they would come into St. John's and supply power in competition with the Reid Company, then in existence. Now they have made an arrangement whereby they supply the City Company with a certain amount of power, there is to be no competition and citizens are still paying tremendous rates, at least twice as much as in Halifax and Sydney, and three times as much as Montreal and Toronto. He believed water power rights on the Southern Shore had been given, but we did not seem to be deriving any advantage.

HON. MR. MORINE said that in any case the Company had not made matters any worse, but had conferred a great blessing on the people in many of the Outports. It was his opinion

that a Public Utilities Tribunal should be appointed to deal with such matters as this. The whole question of the rates to be charged in St. John's should have been provided for when the Bill went through. This Bill did not have any bearing on that position, but is a matter that will have to be dealt with in the near future.

HON. MR. ELLIS said he thought the Public Utilities Tribunal idea a good one. Some years ago the City Council had made an endeavour to acquire some water powers within an area of 60 miles of the city. It was their intention to try and reduce the cost of electricity but their application was turned down as some one had made a previous application, although the Council had expended some five or six hundred dollars in surveying the ground.

The Committee reported the Bill without Amendment, and by consent it was read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. MORINE moved the first reading of the Loan Bill and by consent the second reading. He stated that it was proposed to spend an amount not exceeding \$6,000,000 on repairs to the Dry Dock, the improvement of the Railway, etc. He had heard the criticisms in the main of two items only, first the construction of a plant for fuel and coal in St. John's. It seemed fairly general, he said, among people who ought to know that the coal plant for the bunkering of steamers would not be necessary. It appeared attractive at first but if on examination it would not be essential it would not be embarked upon and care would be taken to get expert advice on the matter. The money could be directed towards the other purposes stated in the Bill. Then the rails between Brigus Junction and Clarenville have been getting worse and worse and it is proposed to lay new rails. The sum stated for repairs was said to be too

low. If that proved to be the case Mr. Morine thought that if the money were not needed for the coal plant it could be spent in re-railing a longer distance. Mr. Morgan had stated that the whole line needed to be re-railed. The condition of the railroad was a very important factor in the success or otherwise of an undertaking such as the Humber. The rails very often have to bear loads which are too heavy for them. The rolling stock also is not sufficient. Quantities of wood cut some months ago, he continued, had not yet reached the mills. The only matter he had heard much discussion about is the most important in connection with tourist traffic. He said he was an enthusiast on this matter and that anyone who had doubt about it was behind the times. There was, he added, need of a highway on the West Coast between Port aux Basques and Bay of Islands. The numerous fishing rivers thus connected and the agricultural district opened up would be a beautiful country for tourists. Then again he thought all around St. John's there were many attractions of scenery and fishing inducements so different from those offered elsewhere, which had only to be thrown open to invite a crowd. He explained what had happened in Canada and the United States during recent years. At one time the rich man and those of leisure only, could afford to travel across the border and visit the new and strange places. Today because so many possess "flivers" the middle and labouring classes are doing the same thing. The rich man who wants a degree of seclusion is being driven away and is seeking new fields. If Newfoundland could be made attractive and proper steamers and railroads provided those seeking new sights would visit it. This proved the case in Nova Scotia. In Yarmouth and through the Valley of Evangeline, a large amount of money was spent on the roads with

the result that they are now much frequented by tourists. He felt satisfied that if the plans to attract the tourist in this way were carried out we should soon not be able to entertain all who would come. Nova Scotia with all its beauty has nothing like Newfoundland to offer the tourist, and if we have a good steamer across the Gulf and can provide a motor road of 150 miles on the West Coast, we shall have that steamer's decks loaded with motor cars of people who want to see our scenery and visit our fishing rivers and pools. And many of these visitors will invest their money here as they have done in Nova Scotia, and leave vast sums in one way and another with our people. With regard to the road building Mr. Morine stated that it was the intention to have the whole scheme in control of a commission and department with probably the Government Engineer in control. The advice of the Motor Association would be asked and an endeavour made to make the movement a popular one. There was no idea of having the work divided up into districts and the money dribbled away. Nor was the money only to be spent in building new roads. The object was, he continued, to connect up old roads and repair them, so that motorists could go over the whole length of the country. A number of people, he said, talked of the motor roads as if they were to be constructed for pleasure only, while in reality they were to develop the country and afford to people the opportunity of getting in touch with one another, and of raising them above the level of local affairs. He remembered a time, he said, when the farmer was the bitter enemy of the motor, because of drawing in their horses when one passed. To-day, he added, the motorists in Canada are the farmers. Their whole method of living has been changed. The farmer's wife is happy. She is no longer isolated but can, by

means of good roads, keep in touch with the outer world. This same state could be reached here in a fishing country. He mentioned the case of a son of a fisherman who had a "flivver" in which he and his wife had made a tour through Trinity Bay. Not only did he enjoy the scenery but was surprised to see the various industries carried on in that part of the country. In all places motor roads respond to the call of progress. Fine fishing ponds, he said, were to be found near Portugal Cove and a few thousands would make a beautiful open road to the ponds. If we are to have a big hotel in St. John's and keep people here a few days we must have something to attract them. The hotels and sporting places must be linked together. With the co-operation of the Motor Association and the Rotary Club a Tourist Association could be formed and the attractions of our country widely advertised. A large office might be opened on Water Street and an agent appointed to visit steamers, etc. He also stated that if there were an agent in the United States, competent to meet the monied men and explain what we had to offer, we could sell our country in another sense, to the tourist. Mr. Morine thought that this was the first place of constructive policy attempted for many years and would largely benefit the fishermen. They would get work on the roads, the traffic would increase, there would be greater importation, for the way to import luxuries is to import the men who want them. Increased importations means decreased taxation. Fishermen may not wish to remain such all their lives, he added, and if we could give them something more profitable and improve the place where they live, it would benefit him. A large sum of money had been spent in the past to build roads in the wilderness to no end, but spent in the proposed way it could not fail to be

for the advancement of the Colony. The work, while not given as such for the unemployed, will afford employment to many but will be done under tender or contract under the Government Engineer, and men must render good service or be discharged. These were the principles and he hoped that they would enlist public sympathy and enthusiastic support.

SJR. P. T. McGRATH stated that he considered the amount of money appropriated to re-railing inadequate. The cost of the 16 tons of rails would absorb the whole amount as the cost of steel rails in England was about \$40.00 per ton. If for a reasonable figure the rails could be obtained in Sydney, he thought it would be commendable. Freight, he added, may go to \$10.00 per ton, depending on whether the steamer got a return cargo. If 80 lb. rails be used instead of the 50 lb. used at present, the sleepers would have to be put nearer together he said, and if the road bed were to be improved an additional amount of money would have to be expended. In reference to the Gulf steamer, Sir Patrick asked whether it were worth while to carry on this means of communication during the winter season? In his opinion it had not proved a success. He suggested doing away with the idea of an ice-breaking steamer and for the four months of the year when ice conditions made the Gulf difficult to cross the steamer could ply between St. John's and Halifax, a route, which, he considered, would be a much more satisfactory one. For this purpose he thought a second-hand steamer could be procured in England for half the amount proposed to be spent on an ice-breaker. He thought that with regard to the bunker scheme the criticisms had much to commend them but he considered if the Government did not intend to carry out the scheme it would be debateable whether the amount of money should be voted at all, for if

it were, there would probably be an irresistible temptation to spend it. Four years ago provisions had been made in the Act for the construction of a new Long Bridge and Freight Sheds but nothing had been done and the money was spent in some other direction. As far as the Government's tourist policy was concerned there was a diversity of opinion. Everyone realized the great possibilities which the country affords and we can only hope that it brings the good results looked forward to. The Farmers' Government in Ontario embarked on a road building policy and no doubt it has been tremendously successful in bringing people into the country but some people have doubted whether the return is sufficient to warrant the cost.

HON. MR. MORINE stated it was the intention of the Government to offer a portion of the Loan locally, so that any person who might wish to take it up might do so. It was intended also to float it by tender and contract and take the very strictest care in considering the awarding the contract.

The Bill was reported without amendment and by consent was read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. MORINE in moving the adjournment said he wished to make some comments upon remarks made by Mr. Warren, M.H.A., for Fortune Bay, in the Assembly yesterday, relative to his speech on the second reading of the Alcoholic Liquor Bill. He started by saying that it had been quite unnecessary for him to refer to alleged misconduct on the part of previous governments as a reason for supporting the Alcoholic Liquor Bill. I consider, sir, that the fact that previous governments had not enforced the Prohibition Act was one of the strongest reasons for its repeal; those governments had either tried to enforce the Act and failed, or had

been remiss in their duties for a number of years. After a law has been upon the Statute Book for ten years, without strong enforcement at any time, and at last becomes a mockery, a reason is presented for the repeal of the Bill and the enactment of some other law. It seems to me that the conduct of the Squires Government particularly was a powerful reason. In the second place, Mr. Warren defended the conduct of the government for the repeal of the Prohibition Act, of which he was Premier, in 1923, in placing a duty of seventy-five cents per gallon upon liquor brought into this country for trans-shipment. He said that the trans-shipment itself had been lawful, and that the imposition of a duty was simply a method of increasing revenue without increasing the traffic. That was not half the truth. At first enacted the Prohibition Act did not permit the importation of alcoholic liquors for trans-shipment, but in 1917, under the coalition government of Sir Edward Morris, Sir William Coaker and his colleagues procured the enactment of an amendment providing that goods brought into this country for trans-shipment should not be held to be "importations." That was to enable trans-shipment to such places as St. Pierre, and to facilitate St. Pierre's illicit trade with the United States. Then for a number of years St. Pierre was making profits on a business that in part went through this port, but in 1923, envious, apparently of the prosperity of St. Pierre, and desiring part of that illegitimate trade, Mr. Warren's Government imposed a tax of seventy-five cents per gallon upon liquor. Mr. Warren's defence for doing this is the duty of seventy-five cents per gallon simply gave this Colony a part of the profit that would otherwise go to St. Pierre, and did not increase the consumption of liquor. He forgot also to say at the same time his government secured the enactment of a

measure making it possible for the rum traffic to be done from this port as a base instead of from St. Pierre. In other words, he facilitated the operations of the rum runners. Prior to 1923 upon trans-shipment a bond had to be given for the delivery of the liquor at a named port, and to get the bond cancelled, proof had to be presented to the Government that the delivery at the named port had actually taken place so that secrecy was impossible. To make this port a successful rival for St. Pierre, Mr. Warren's Government procured an amendment to the Customs Act, by which is become unnecessary to give a bond upon the shipment of liquor from here, and no proof had to be offered at any time that the liquor shipped ever reached the destination named upon the export entry. In other words, Mr. Warren's Government made it possible for liquors to be brought here in large quantities and exported for ports unknown, but such ports were in fact, in the Dominion of Canada or in the United States of America, Warehouses were opened in this city, and very little care taken about their character and a large amount of the smuggling into consumption in this Colony was from these warehouses, as we know.

In the next place, I notice that Mr. Warren referred to the Flat Islanders and to the "Cornwall" incident, with a pathos that I think was entirely hypocritical. He referred to the arrest of the offenders, to their being brought "handcuffed" through the streets of St. John's, and to the loss of their living during the fishing season. Now I wish to say that the men brought here as the result of the "Cornwall" cruise would have been tried in the ordinary way in their homes if they had not resisted the police; that I do not believe that they were brought handcuffed through the streets of St. John's but that if they were it was improper and it was

the fault of the police, that they were not imprisoned for any length of time, but allowed out on bail, so that so far as I know neither the living of themselves nor of their families were sacrificed. Mr. Warren was employed by me to prosecute these men, and when in turn he became Attorney General his first act was to withdraw the charges against them. He ought to have brought them to trial, and, if possible, secured a conviction, and then if there had been any hardness in any particular case, it should have been considered in connection with mitigation of their sentences. The majesty of the law ought to have been upheld. But Mr. Warren conveniently forgot to make any reference to another fact in this connection, his removal of Magistrate Miffen from Greenspond to Twillingate, at the demand of his colleagues, the members for Bonavista Bay, the now Sir William Coaker and others. Mr. Miffen had done his duty. He was a valued and valuable Magistrate. He had aroused the apathy of lawbreakers by his courage. He was banished at the demand of the lawbreakers, and Mr. Warren consented to and carried out the shameful removal.

Finally, Mr. Warren referred to the appointment of Mr. Meaney as Controller, just before the general election of 1923, and said that it was no more secret than my appointment to the Government of this Colony and to this House. Now, the offence of secrecy about Mr. Meaney's appointment is this, that after Mr. Warren and his colleagues had made a minute appointing him, they resolved that the minute should be suppressed in order that the people should know nothing about it. There was no secrecy about my appointment to this House or to the Government. Who will be appointed to Governments or to the Legislative Council is not usually announced beforehand.

The Council took recess at 11.30

a.m. until 3 p.m. when it resumed and his Excellency the Governor having arrived commanded the presence of the Members of the Honourable House of Assembly, who attended at the Bar of the House. His Excellency was pleased to assent to the Bills passed. He then delivered the following speech from the Throne:—

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Mr. Speaker and Gentle men of the Honourable House of Assembly:

You have given close attention to your legislative duties, as a season so pleasant out of doors that the performance of indoor tasks must have been more onerous than usual, and I am glad to be able to relieve you of them.

Short though the session now about to close has been, the legislation enacted has been of more than ordinary importance, and will, I am confident, be of enduring advantage.

For a period of more than ten years, the finances of the Colony have been disturbed by alternate expansion and contraction, but conditions have this year become almost normal, and there is reason to hope that disturbing financial conditions will cease to recur. My Ministers will endeavour to enforce economy in expenditure wisely, and to aid the prosperity of the Colony by stimulating the development of its resources. Lavish expenditure by preceding Governments, imposing upon my present advisers the hard necessity of providing for the payment of debts contracted by others has made it quite impossible for the present Government to decrease as largely as they desired the burden of taxation, but the abolition of import duties upon flour and gasolene, and export duty on Cod Oil and Whale Oil, is due to their courage and resourcefulness, and they hope to be enabled to still further decrease the burden of taxation, through reforms

they purpose to carry out.

It is apparent that economy alone will not sufficiently meet the public needs, and that development of the Colony's resources must be vigorously undertaken. The attractions to tourists offered by the unexcelled summer climate, the beautiful scenery and the unequalled salmon and trout fisheries of this Island, are the assets which can be most speedily turned into cash, and realising that desirable tourists cannot be expected to come to us in great and growing numbers unless good hotels and highways are provided, and the inland fisheries protected and replenished, my Ministers have decided to embark upon a forward movement in these respects, incidentally and immediately providing labour for the unemployed, and ultimately adding greatly to the comfort and prosperity of the people.

Years ago a crude measure to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors as a beverage was enacted, the enforcement of which became difficult, and was soon neglected, and later practically abandoned, so that at last its existence became a mockery, and its almost universal evasion a scandal, with resulting lawlessness in many affairs, and to an alarming degree. In his Manifesto to the people, upon the eve of the last General Election, my present Prime Minister promised a repeal of the Prohibition Act, and the introduction into the Legislature of an alternative measure, and this, I am glad to say, has now become law, and in due course will be put into force. I anticipate that great good will result

The work of construction upon the Humber has progressed with unexpected and gratifying rapidity. Paper-making at Bay of Islands is expected to begin next spring. A contract has been entered into by my Ministers to secure development in the Gander River Valley, and soon a great addition to the labour-giving industries of the Colony may be expected. The

merits of the proposition are so great in the opinion of its promoters that they have not thought it necessary to ask for any guarantee by the Colony, or other financial assistance. The great industry at Grand Falls continues its prosperous operations, and an expansion of its paper-making plant, or a completion of the Sulphite Pulp plant at Alexander Bay, providing for the development of the Terra Nova and Gambo regions, is expected. Upon the whole, the outlook for steady and profitable employment of labour was never so good in our midst.

Your provision for the acquisition of a suitable steamer to connect with the railway at Port aux Basques, for the re-railing of a portion of the track and for increased rolling stock, are timely recognitions of the fact that both passenger and freight traffic are rapidly increasing, and are bound to increase, and an indication of the not distant day, I hope, when the railway will be self-sustaining. Your provision for the improvement of the Dry Dock cannot fail to add to the attractiveness of the Port of St. John's for ships. Its situation and its facilities should make it the most popular Port on the Atlantic for ships needing speedy repair.

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

In His Majesty's name, I thank you for your provision for the public service.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

I join with you in devote thanks to God for the prosperity and happiness He has granted to our people.

The Hon. President then prorogued the General Assembly until Tuesday, the thirtieth day of September, 1924.

INDEX

C.

COMMITTEE.

- On Address in Reply, 5.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 21.

E.

ELLIS, HON. W. J.

- On Address in Reply, 5.
- Montreal Trust Co. Bill, 14.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 43, 53.

G.

GIBBS, HON. M. P.

- On Montreal Trust Co. Bill, 14, 15.
- Printing and Stationery Bill, 17.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 47, 51, 52, 55.

M.

MORINE, HON. A. B.

- On Address in Reply, 4.
- Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace Bill, 6.
- Flour Mill Bill, 12, 19.
- Printing and Stationery Bill, 13, 15.
- Salaries of Civil Servants Bill, 20.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 21, 25, 49, 51, 53, 55.
- Gander Valley Bill, 56.
- Loan Bill, 60.
- Motion to Adjourn, 62.

MURPHY, HON. J. J.

- On Salaries of Civil Servants Bill, 21.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 48.

MILLEY, HON. S.

- On Address in Reply, 3.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 44.

Mc.**McGRATH, HON. SIR. P. T.**

- On Address in Reply, 4.
- Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace Bill, 6.
- Labrador Boundary Case, 10.
- Printing and Stationery Bill, 14, 16.
- Montreal Trust Co. Bill, 15.
- Flour Mill Bill, 18, 19.
- Salaries of Civil Servants Bill, 20.
- Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 46, 50, 51, 54.
- Gander Valley Bill, 57.

R.**RYAN, HON. D. A.**

- On Address in Reply, 4.

S.**SHEA, HON. GEORGE.**

- On Alcoholic Liquors Bill, 52.

STEER, HON. F. H.

- On Gander Valley Bill, 59.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

- (Closing), 64.